EDITORIAL GUIDANCE NOTES

BRITAIN IN EUROPE AND EUROPE IN BRITAIN: THE EUROPEANISATION OF BRITISH POLITICS?

INTRODUCTION

by

Ian Bache and Andrew Jordan

PREFACE

This short paper provides guidance notes and an analytical framework for contributors to the forthcoming volume on 'Britain in Europe and Europe in Britain: The Europeanisation of British Politics?' (Ian Bache and Andrew Jordan, eds.).

OVERVIEW: OUR APPROACH

The growing interest in the domestic consequences of European integration has generated a need for new theories, analytical frameworks and conceptual tools (Buller and Gamble, 2002; Hix and Goetz, 2000). The organising focus of much of this work is the term 'Europeanisation'. This term provides the main conceptual reference point for all the contributions to this volume. However, despite the recent proliferation of studies, there remains 'no single grand theory of 'Europeanization'" (Olsen, 2002, 944), nor is one likely to appear soon. Indeed, the concept has been used and defined in at least five different ways, to refer to:

- **A top down** process of domestic change deriving from the EU
- the creation of **new EU powers**
- the creation of **a new, European lodestar of domestic politics**
- **horizontal transfer** or 'crossloading' of concepts and policies between states
- an increasingly **two-way interaction between states and the EU**

1. The top down impact of the EU on its member states. This is the oldest and the most widely adopted usage of Europeanisation and the one of most relevance for this study. . Héritier *et al.*, (2001: 3) defined Europeanisation in this sense as 'the process of influence deriving from European decisions and impacting member states' policies and political and administrative structures.' In this mode, the EU acts in a very top down fashion through legal and other policy acts. Buller and Gamble (2002: 17) referred to Europeanisation as, 'a situation where distinct modes of European governance have transformed aspects of domestic politics'. More recently, Bulmer and Radaelli (2004: 4), suggested that Europeanisation consists of 'processes of a) construction b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, "ways of doing things" and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public policies'.

2. The accumulation of policy competences at the EU level. Cowles *et al.* (2001: 2) equated Europeanisation with 'the emergence and development at the European level of distinct structures of governance.' In this mode, Europeanisation is synonymous with European integration – i.e. the EU itself.

3. The growing importance of the EU as a reference point for national and sub-national actors (e.g. Hanf and Soetendorp 1998: 1). In this mode, the EU is akin to a lodestar that is difficult if not impossible to ignore.

4. The horizontal transfer of concepts and policies in the EU between member states. Bomberg and Peterson (2000) related Europeanisation to the similarly popular term 'policy transfer', while Burch and Gomez (2003: 2) and (Howell, 2003) have argued that it encompasses examples of 'cross loading' through which states share ideas and practices. In this mode, the EU is at best a facilitator of inter-state transfer.

5. *The two-way interaction between states and the EU.* This definition arose from the empirical observation that states routinely pre-empt domestic adjustment by shaping an emergent EU policy in their own image (Bomberg and Peterson 2000: 8). They attempt to 'domesticate' the EU by uploading national models to the EU. In this view, Europeanisation is 'circular rather than unidirectional, and cyclical rather than one off' (Goetz 2002: 4). The EU, therefore, is both a cause and an effect of national change.

These five usages are only the most popular ones. Olsen (2002) argues that Europeanisation could just as well encompass the territorial expansion of the EU (e.g. the process of enlarging the EU to incorporate new members), or the process through which European forms of governance spread out to other parts of the world.

OUR ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK[1]

In this book, the term Europeanisation is used to frame an analysis of the impact of European integration on British politics, and specifically on its institutions, organised interests and policies. More specifically, we conceive of Europeanisation as *the reorientation or reshaping of aspects of politics in the domestic arena in ways that reflect the policies, practices and preferences of European level actors, as advanced through EU initiatives and decisions.* While we focus primarily on the downward pressure exerted by the EU on its member states, (i.e. definition 1, above), this definition does not exclude the possibility that Europeanisation may also involve a more dynamic and interactive relationship between the EU and Britain, or that it may encompass processes listed under some of the other definitions identified above.

On the basis of this essentially 'top down' definition, we distinguish between *Direct Europeanisation*, that is the intended impact of an EU initiative, and *Indirect Europeanisation*, that is the inadvertent impact of an EU initiative. It is based on this distinction that our definition of Europeanisation refers to 'politics in the domestic arena' rather 'domestic politics'. The latter suggests an emphasis on the inadvertent impact on

---

[1] The definitions and typologies outlined here draw on earlier work by Bache (2002, 2003 and 2004) and Bache and Marshall (2004).

domestically determined initiatives only, while the former incorporates both these and the intended impact of EU initiatives also.

Drawing on the policy transfer literature (see Dolowitz and Marsh, 1996), we also distinguish between *Voluntary Europeanisation* (i.e., embraced by key domestic actors) and *Coercive Europeanisation* (i.e., opposed by key domestic actors). Again, there is a distinction here between direct and indirect impacts. Thus, *Voluntary-direct Europeanisation* is the willing adoption of EU decisions in a given area (e.g., compliance with EU regional policy regulations); while *Voluntary-indirect Europeanisation* refers to the adoption of EU preferences and/or practices and/or policies in another area (e.g. adopting EU approaches to regional policy in domestic regional policy). Similarly, *Coercive-direct Europeanisation* refers to the forced acceptance of European preferences and/or practices and/or policies in a given area, while *Coercive-indirect Europeanisation* refers to spillover consequences of Coercive-direct Europeanisation in one area to another. These dimensions, which are summarized in Figure 1, emphasise the interactive dynamic between the EU and member states levels, highlighting the possibility of different routes towards and responses to Europeanisation.

Figure 1: Different Types of Europeanisation

	Voluntary	**Coercive**
Direct	intended impact of an EU initiative unopposed by dominant Member Sta actors	intended impact of an EU initiative opposed by dominant Member State Actors
Indirect	unintended or inadvertent impact of EU initiative on the Member State unopposed by dominant Member Sta actors	spillover consequences of coercive-dir Europeanisation in one area to another

OUR GUIDING QUESTIONS

To make the whole volume sufficiently coherent, each contributor is asked to address the following empirical questions.

- What has been Europeanised and to what extent?

- When has Europeanisation occurred and in what sequence?

- How and why has Europeanisation occurred, and through what process? Has it been largely voluntary or coercive, direct or indirect (see above)? Has the process been predominantly top down, or has it involved more interactive, two-way processes (see below)?

- Has the process of Europeanisation created an identifiable set of 'winners' and 'losers' in Britain, and (how) has this pattern altered over time?

- Has Europeanisation had any other important effects? (e.g. on policy efficiency or effectiveness, transparency, accountability or legitimacy)?

- Where appropriate, how does Britain's experience of Europeanisation in your sector/institutional setting compare to that of other countries?

As well as address these questions, we would also like you to reflect on how well the 'top down' definition and typologies outlined above, fit your own empirical findings. Where appropriate, please also consider the value of the other definitions of Europeanisation outlined above. By proceeding in this way, we hope that the book will make a valuable contribution to conceptual debates about Europeanisation within EU studies, as well as add to our empirical understanding of the Europeanisation of Britain.

TECHNICAL DETAILS

Length: 7,000-7500 words including references, bibliography, notes and illustrative material etc.

References: Harvard style

Deadline: the conference on July 16 is designed to facilitate debate based on draft contributions to this collection. Therefore please send Ian Bache (i.bache@sheffield.ac.uk) an e-copy of your paper to post on the conference website by **Wednesday July 7th**

Ian Bache and Andrew Jordan (revised 18 June 2004)

Bibliography

Bache, I. (2003): 'Europeanization: A Governance Approach', paper presented at the *EUSA 8th International Biennial Conference*, Nashville, March 27-29, http://aei.pitt.edu/archive/00000554/

Bache, I. (2004): Europeanisation and Higher Education: Towards a Core Curriculum in European Studies?, paper presented to the *ESRC Seminar Series/UACES Study Group on the Europeanisation of British Politics and Policy-Making*, Sheffield, 23 April, 2004, **http://www.shef.ac.uk/ebpp/meetings.htm**

Bache, I. and Marshall, A. (2004): 'Europeanisation and Domestic Change: A Governance Approach to Institutional Adaptation in Britain, *Europeanisation Online Papers*, Queen's University Belfast, No. 5/2004, **http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudies/Research/Paper Series/EuropeanisationPapers/PublishedPapers/**

Bomberg, E. and Peterson, J. (2000): 'Policy Transfer and Europeanization', *Europeanisation Online Papers*, Queen's University Belfast, No. 2/2000, **http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudies/Research/Paper Series/EuropeanisationPapers/PublishedPapers/**

Bulmer, S. and Radaelli, C. (2004): 'The Europeanisation of National Policy?', *Europeanisation Online Papers*, Queen's University Belfast, No. 1/2004, **http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudies/Research/Paper Series/EuropeanisationPapers/PublishedPapers/**

Burch, M. and Gomez, R. (2002), "The English Regions and the European Union" *Regional Studies* 36/7: 767-778.

Burch, M. and Gomez, R. (2003), 'Europeanization and the English Regions', paper presented to the *ESRC Seminar Series/UACES Study Group on the Europeanisation of British Politics and Policy-Making*, Sheffield, 2nd May, http://www.shef.ac.uk/ebpp/meetings.htm#

Cowles, M., Caporaso, J., and Risse, T. (eds.) (2001): *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (1996): 'Who Learns What from Whom: a Review of the Policy Transfer Literature', Political Studies, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp 343-357.

Hanf, K. and Soetendorp, B. (eds). (1997): *Adapting to European Integration: Small States and the European Union*, Addison Wesly: Longman.

Héritier, A., Kerwer, D., Knill, C., Lehmkuhl, D., Teutsch, M. and Douillet, A-C. (2001): *Differential Europe. The European Union Impact on National Policymaking,* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Howell, K. (2003): 'The Europeanization of British Financial Services', paper presented to the *ESRC Seminar Series/UACES Study Group on the Europeanisation of British Politics and Policy-Making*, Sheffield, 2nd May, http://www.shef.ac.uk/ebpp/meetings.htm

Hix, S. and Goetz, G. (2000): 'Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems', *West European Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 1-26.

Olsen, J. (2002): The Many Faces of Europeanization', *ARENA Working Papers*, WP 01/2.