SECTION I

Chapter 1

EUROPEANIZATION OF AND BY CIVIL SOCIETY
TOWARD AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Kerstin Jacobsson and Håkan Johansson

Europeanization research has become an increasingly productive research field, focusing on how European Union (EU) integration and EU policy formation in various ways induce changes in the member states, and how they affect policy as well as politics and the polity (e.g., Falkner et al. 2005; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003; Graziano and Vink 2008; Olsen 2002; Risse, Green Cowles, and Caporaso 2001). To date there has been much more focus on the effects of EU integration and EU policy formation on state structures and public policies in the member states than on the Europeanization of civil society (for exceptions, see, e.g., Kendall 2010; Rek 2010; Ketola 2013; Sánchez-Salgado 2014; Karlberg and Jacobsson 2015; Kröger 2016). The limited research attention given to the role that civil society organizations (CSOs) might play in Europeanization processes is surprising given the increasing number of civil society actors operating at the EU level, the development of multilevel interactions between EU-level and national-level civil society actors, and the EU's interest in involving civil society to overcome its own legitimacy problems and limited mandate in certain policy fields (see Johansson and Kalm 2015; Kendall 2010; Ketola 2013; Sánchez-Salgado 2014). When civil society actors have been in focus, most of the attention has been on either the participation of civil society actors in EU-level governance arrangements (e.g., Jobert and Kohler-Koch 2008; Kröger 2016, 2018; Lindgren and Persson 2011) or on their participation in

European umbrella structures (e.g., Johansson and Lee 2014; Kohler-Koch 2010a; Kröger 2018; Ruzza 2011; Steffek and Hahn 2010; Steffek, Kissling, and Nanz 2008; Tomšič and Rek 2008).

This chapter aims to contribute to how we can understand the roles of civil society in Europeanization processes and above all how the EU offers both enabling and constraints for the scope for action of CSOs. The chapter proposes an analytical perspective that conceives of CSOs as both the *subjects* in and *objects* to Europeanization processes. It seeks to take a perspective that acknowledges how civil society actors can be engaged in using Europeanization processes for their own purposes aiming to shape the circumstances or the policies of relevance for them and their beneficiaries (subject position) and/or being subordinated to Europeanization processes, directly or indirectly accepting or adapting to requirements from the EU (object position). While other studies have focused on one or a few types of Europeanization and their relevance for CSOs (e.g., Johansson and Kalm 2015; Ketola 2013; Sánchez-Salgado 2014) we propose a more inclusive multidimensional approach to civil society Europeanization stressing regulatory, financial, and organizational Europeanization as well as participatory, discursive, and cultural Europeanization.

The chapter is structured as follows. First, we provide a brief overview of existing research on Europeanization generally, arguing for an analytical perspective that is sensitive to both top-down and bottom-up dynamics. Second, we outline our own analytical framework. Third, we relate our perspective to previous studies on the Europeanization of civil society, and, fourth, offer a brief conclusion.

Perspectives on Europeanization

While studies of European integration have existed for a long time and have paid attention to the formation of the EU as a common political, social, and economic project and governance structure, the ideas underpinning the term "Europeanization" are more concerned with if, how, and to what extent the EU matters for institutional changes at the national level as well as the mechanisms by which such influence operates. The Europeanization literature also pays attention to the domestic factors that mediate the influence from the EU, explaining why the impact of the EU differs across member states and domestic contexts. Moreover, different definitions of Europeanization hold different views of what exactly it is that is Europeanized. These issues are crosscutting in various theoretical perspectives on Europeanization. For the purposes of this chapter and our volume, we will shortly discuss three key approaches on Europeanization—top-down, interactive, and usage of

Europe approaches—focusing especially on the conceptualization of agency within each.

Much debate on Europeanization has been conceptualized as top-down approaches. In the mid-1990s, for instance, Ladrech (1994, 69) defined Europeanization as "an incremental process re-orienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EU political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making." A few years later, Börzel (1999, 574) approached Europeanization as "a process by which domestic policy areas become increasingly subject to European policy-making." These definitions emphasize Europeanization as the impact of the EU on national policies and institutions or the extent to which "the implementation of European policies implies adjustments in domestic institutions" (Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999; see also Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002). Definitions of this kind hence separate the European domain from the domestic level and stress aspects of downloading of European policies to domestic levels (Kallestrup 2005).

Also within top-down models there is an implicit actor dimension. On the one hand, Europeanization might affect how power is dispersed across the domestic political system. Europeanization "leads to a redistribution of power among a variety of domestic actors, from legislatures, courts, regional governments, to interest groups and companies" (Risse, Green Cowles, and Caporaso 2001, 11). On the other hand, Europeanization processes might also cause and be assisted by changes in domestic actors' ideas, interests, and self-identification (see also Börzel and Risse 2003). Risse, Green Cowles, and Caporaso (2001, 12) label this process as learning (see also Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999, 2002). In Börzel and Risse's (2003) vocabulary, such learning processes might be facilitated by norm entrepreneurs helping to diffuse European ideas and norms in the domestic context.

Scholars have also stressed more interactive perspectives (or process-perspectives) on Europeanization because it cannot be reduced to what is happening in Brussels, but needs focus on the complex processes and actions that take place at the national, regional, and local levels (Radaelli and Pasquier 2008, 36). Radaelli (2003, 34) argues, "European policy is not a mysterious deus ex machina situated 'up there,'" and that analyses of Europeanization must focus on the domestic level (e.g., conditions, structures and actors). Unlike the more formalistic top-down oriented approaches, this approach includes a wider array of aspects about what is Europeanized, including not only formal policies, but also belief systems, policy paradigms, and ways of doing things. Europeanization is in this respect defined as the processes of "construction, diffusion and institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ways of doing things and shared beliefs and norms, which are at first defined and consolidated in the making

of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies" (Radaelli 2000, 4). This also suggests a broader view on how processes of Europeanization might take place. Those processes might follow formal political channels and procedures as national actors implement decisions taken at the EU level, yet also follow from the diffusion, transfer, and translation of ideas and policies into a national context and vice versa. Analyses of Europeanization should thus not be restricted to national reform processes or changes in political institutions but include changes in discourses, identities, belief systems, actor constellations, power relationships, and so on.

A third approach to Europeanization further stresses the agency dimension to the Europeanization processes. Within this approach, the key question to be analyzed is the relevance of the EU for domestic actors, and how they make active use of the EU in the context of their domestic institutions, policies, and actor setups (Jacquot and Woll 2003; Kallestrup 2005; Sánchez-Salgado 2014; Woll and Jacquot 2010; for discussion on bottom-up approaches, see Bache and Jordan 2006; Jordan and Liefferink 2004). The stress on agency and the strategic element of actors is most notable in the "usage of Europe" approach. Woll and Jacquot argue that the EU "can become a vector of change by providing new resources, references and policy frames, which national policy actors use strategically. It therefore becomes crucial to understand what motivates these different strategies and to study the action of individual participants in the policy process" (Woll and Jacquot 2010, 113). This implies that domestic actors can (and want to) take a very active and strategic stance on EU policies in that they "engage with, interpret, appropriate or ignore the dynamics of European integration" (Woll and Jacquot 2010, 116). It arguably accentuates that a proper understanding of Europeanization cannot be limited to formal political processes, but emphasis rather lies on what domestic actors do with "Europe."

The strong emphasis on actors also paves the way for a closer analysis of the various resources embedded in Europeanization processes. The development of EU ideas, court cases, and policies carries different types of resources for domestic actors to try to exploit and make use of. The sets of resources analyzed within this approach often include legal resources (primary legislation, secondary legislation, case law, etc.), financial resources (budgetary constraints as well as new funding opportunities), cognitive and normative resources (communications, ideas, etc.), political resources (argumentation, participation in multilevel games, etc.), and institutional resources (access to committees, agencies, networks, etc.) (Woll and Jacquot 2010). As such it also has a strong resemblance to other theories stressing the EU as a political opportunity structure for civil society actors to act on, to try to push their

agenda, mobilize resources, or engage in building collective action (e.g., Koopmans 1999).

However, domestic actors are in this respect not just passive transmitters or receivers of ideas and policies from one political level to another. They rather try to use EU resources to pursue their political agenda—in other words, to strengthen their own position against others' positions. Emphasizing the strategic element in this political game, the authors claim that such political actors might use the EU when it suits them and their agenda, while in other instances they might not refer to the EU at all (Graziano, Jacquot, and Palier 2011, 13–14).

Toward a New Analytical Framework

These three perspectives on Europeanization have their merits, but we suggest that a more elaborate framework is needed for the study of the constraining and enabling effects of Europeanization on CSOs and their scope for action. To understand civil society as shaped by, as well as participating in shaping, European policies, politics, and polities, including European identity-making, some elaborations are needed.

Top-down approaches are central and above all contribute to the analysis of how and why civil society becomes object to Europeanization processes but there is a tendency to downplay the agency dimension in analyses of Europeanization. The usage of Europe approach has key relevance for how we view civil society and Europeanization in this volume, above all with regard to our analytical interest in the role of actors in Europeanization processes. At the same time, the usage of Europe approach is heavily influenced by a strategic action framework that makes the assumption of rational actors using European resources to forward their domestic interests and to achieve their ends. Rather than assuming fixed interests to be pursued through the strategic use of European resources, analysis into Europeanization and CSOs would benefit from exploring the links between interests, ideas, and identities to capture how these are negotiated and changed in processes of Europeanization. While CSOs can be conceived as rational actors involved in political game-playing or strategic agents using new opportunities, the EU and Europeanization processes offer both opportunities and constraints. Considering such a duality of Europeanization further stresses how studies of CSOs need to recognize their social positions in relation to Europeanization processes, expressing aspects of constrained and embedded agency (see Johansson and Kalm 2015). Such an institutionalist view on Europeanization suggests that CSOs can hold different roles or positions in Europeanization processes—both as subjects in or objects to Europeanization

processes. The former suggests a status of being actively engaged or even having the potential to shape and influence outcomes, while the latter suggests a status of being the addressee or subordinate to such processes (see Streeck and Thelen 2005). Several chapters in this volume elaborate on the complex relationship of being engaged in, as well as forced to adjust and adapt to, Europe.

The perspectives discussed above moreover tend to be overly focused on public policies, formal political and policymaking processes, and public actors. This is particularly evident in top-down approaches. We argue for a more comprehensive view of the multiple ways in which CSOs can engage in and/or be affected by Europeanization processes, sometimes related to formal policymaking but certainly not limited to it. Expanding on Radaelli's view on Europeanization as including both formal policies and belief systems, as well as the multiple types of resources identified within the usage of Europe approach, we argue that studies of civil society and Europeanization would benefit from taking a broader view on dimensions and types of Europeanization. Taking stock of other studies (see, e.g., Johansson and Kalm 2015; Sánchez-Salgado 2014) Europeanization takes place through the diffusion of formal regulation and binding rules, ideas, and discourses, but also through financial transfer and the spread of organizational models. Considering the mediating role of CSOs, Europeanization also includes the development of networks, alliances, and social partnerships across levels and new arenas for participation, or even the construction of a public sphere that potentially crosses political levels.

Studies of Europeanization and civil society can certainly benefit from an interactive approach to Europeanization. Many of the chapters in this volume follow at least in a broad sense Radaelli and Exadaktylos's (2010, 193) definition of Europeanization as "an interactive process, rather than a simple process of unidirectional reaction to 'Europe.' It covers both the notion of Europeanization as 'domestic impact of Europe' (or pressure) and Europeanization as creative usages of Europe." Such an approach is highly valuable considering that apart from posing rules for domestic policymakers as well as domestic CSOs, the EU allows for processes of constant interactions between CSOs (and other actors), horizontally as well as vertically (e.g., Holzhacher 2007; Kendall 2010; Mau and Mewes 2012). They engage in multilevel games, moving between levels and going back and forth between the EU and national levels with their demands. Such movement between political levels is sometimes framed in terms of a boomerang effect (Keck and Sikkink 1998) or a ping-pong effect (Zippel 2004). It might include participation in EU lobbying processes and the creation of EU umbrella organizations, or might also involve transnational networking and cooperation and the exchange of experiences and learning from CSOs in other countries.

Taking stock of these arguments, we propose a typology for the study of Europeanization of and by organized civil society. We consider the typology as a heuristic device for the studies of civil society and Europeanization. Following from previous arguments, we identify six types of Europeanization—see further discussions below—and for each we identify the mechanisms at play, which are understood as the mechanisms by which potential influence takes place and thus change is brought about (cf. Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999). In naming these mechanisms, we use the term "transfer" to account for such mechanisms of influence, remaining aware that such influence can go in different directions (vertically from the domestic setting to the European or vice versa, as well as in horizontal directions). We stress that transfer here does not necessarily mean the wholesale transference of rules, norms, models, and so on, but also entails processes of active use and translation during the transfer process (cf. Czarniawska and Sevón 1996) depending on the subtype at hand. Considering Europeanization in this manner also stresses that there are enabling as well as constraining elements involved. Linked to each of the different types of Europeanization, we furthermore identify different positions or roles that CSOs are assigned or play, accounting for their roles as subjects in and objects to Europeanization processes and linked to the enabling and constraining factors of various Europeanization processes. The typology is analytical and parsimonious, while in real life types, mechanisms, and roles are intertwined and most likely mutually reinforcing.

Types of Europeanization in Previous Research

To further explore this typology, in the following we draw on previous research on civil society and Europeanization in order to address the different types of Europeanization as well as how roles of being subjects and objects have been identified.

Regulatory Europeanization

One of the distinctive features of the EU is its nature as a legal entity, thus it is not surprising that regulatory Europeanization stands out as one of the most important ways in which Europe impacts on conditions in the member states, including civil societies. Regulatory Europeanization thus shapes the legal environment in which CSOs operate; the mechanism at play here is the transfer of, and thus the pressure of, legal norms on civil society. This pressure may be exerted either through the formal pressure of binding

Table 1.1. A Typology of CSO Europeanization

Types of Europeanization	Main mechanism	CSO roles and activities (subject–object positions)	
Regulatory	Transfer of legal norms	Lobbyist in policymaking	Subordinate to formal regulations
Financial	Money transfer	Applicant of EU funding	Adapting to financial requirements
Organizational	Transfer of organizational models	Organizational entrepreneur	Target for organizational models
Participatory	Transfer of access to arenas for participation	Included participant	Excluded from participation
Discursive	Transfer of ideas and knowledge	Norm broker	Receiver of discursive changes
Cultural/identity	Transfer of social identities/ identifications	Promoter of social identities	Addressee of socialization

regulations or through the soft pressure of guidelines, codes of conduct, and soft laws (see e.g., Jacobsson 2004a, 2004b), all of which have direct and/or indirect relevance for CSOs. Civil society might thus be the direct object of regulation, the adaptational pressure of which will depend on existing national structures and civil society models. The EC VAT Directive, for instance, puts pressure on national policies and CSOs because it requires governments to treat nonprofit and for-profit organizations in the same way (see introduction). Member states that, by tradition, have exempted non-profit organizations from paying VAT are thus directly in conflict with the EU in this regard.

Transfer of legal norms might empower CSOs differently, affecting their centrality or marginality in national policymaking processes. CSOs can also be indirectly affected by regulation in other areas, such as economic integration and internal markets that reshape the domestic opportunity structures in which the CSOs operate. CSOs can be subjects in these processes—for example, in terms of being engaged in lobbying to influence the formulation of these models, norms, and regulations (see, e.g., chapter 10). In some national contexts, the regulatory ambitions of the EU can pose a threat or provide an opportunity because they challenge existing domestic policies, practices, and positions. Because CSOs may not have the same aims and priorities, it is evident that regulatory Europeanization might have different meanings and consequences for different segments of domestic civil society.

Financial Europeanization

Financial Europeanization takes place through the transfer of money from the EU to CSOs. Such financial transfers can be distributed directly by EU institutions to CSOs to fulfill certain tasks under particular budget lines. They might be distributed through agencies in member states, as in the case of the structural funds, and might affect the opportunity structures for CSOs in different ways. The financial dependency of CSOs operating in Brussels is well known because they tend to receive a large share of their resources from the European Commission (EC), raising concerns about their independence and their willingness to criticize the hand that feeds them (e.g., Johansson and Lee 2015). Financial Europeanization thus includes EU funding to national, regional, and local CSOs (Mahoney and Beckstrand 2011; Sánchez-Salgado 2014), the impact of which might differ in different contexts. In countries where domestic funding sources are sparse, support from EU sources might be a highly valuable and substantial part of domestic CSOs' budgets. What has emerged is thus a complex multilevel financial infrastructure for domestic CSOs to adopt, adapt, and act on.

Money transfer might have several outcomes on the part of CSOs considering their status as subjects in and objects to Europeanization processes. Classic subject positions of course include being engaged in seeking (and gaining EU) funding, yet the object positions could include more-complex aspects of how financial Europeanization pushes organizations in certain directions. For instance, Sánchez-Salgado (2014) notices that financial Europeanization has promoted changes in domestic organizations' working procedures (e.g., in terms of professionalization, internal structures, and working orders) and might channel CSOs' engagement in specific directions and lead to goal displacement (reflecting our previous argument on overlap between types of Europeanization). Similar effects might also be indirect as domestic CSOs seek to build administrative and professional capacities just to be able to compete for and gain EU funding and as a way to respond to certain management techniques and evaluation criteria. At the same time, to receive funding from particular sources, such as the EU, might give particular recognition and status, or it might have the opposite effect and make one a target of criticism from the public or peer CSOs due to the acceptance of certain norms and values. Another effect of EU funding has been found to be a differentiation between haves and have-nots in domestic civil society where large organizations or organizations belonging to umbrella organizations often have the administrative capacity to apply for funding while smaller organizations do not (e.g., Rek 2010; Roth 2007). This in turn might lead to differential empowerment in the domestic context.

As mentioned above, the significance of financial Europeanization differs due to national conditions and structures. European funding has been found to enable the growth of professional and effective advocacy organizations in the region of Central and Eastern Europe (Císař and Vráblíková 2010). Others have assessed the development more negatively and have shown that EU support has fostered short-term project orientation among CSOs and has benefitted mainly the wealthier organizations with high administrative capacity at the expense of smaller organizations, and this has sometimes resulted in professionalized organizations being decoupled from their grassroots support or the local population (e.g., Rek 2010). Funding requirements might force informal groups to formalize, as in the case of the community organizations in Lithuania studied by Aidukaite and Jacobsson (2015), where in some cases local activists were talked into forming community organizations by local authorities in order to access EU funds for renovations or the development of local infrastructure.

The outcomes of financial Europeanization are thus complex because it can have spillover effects on domestic CSOs' advocacy functions and empowerment and can influence to what extent they might be willing to bite the hand that feeds them. While this might be a more straightforward

relation between a state and domestic CSOs, the multilevel style of financial Europeanization implies greater complexity. For instance, financial Europeanization might foster and promote the independence and advocacy function of domestic CSOs vis-á-vis national public agencies and authorities but might also imply new interdependencies between CSOs and domestic authorities. Thus, the outcome of financial Europeanization might be new forms of co-optation or goal displacement, indirectly creating new power balances among domestic actors. How EU funding might affect organizational identities and strategies is analyzed in chapter 6.

Organizational Europeanization

Organizational Europeanization takes place through the transfer of organizational models, including transparency requirements and other management techniques, which induce processes of formalization and professionalization of domestic CSOs. This type of Europeanization is interactive because top-down and bottom-up processes tend to be enmeshed. The EC has actively encouraged domestic CSOs to mobilize at the EU level or to be directly engaged in setting up European peak associations (Johansson and Kalm 2015). An even stronger element of pushing domestic CSOs in a certain direction can be found with regard to the widespread use of partnership models between public authorities and CSOs (or umbrella organizations) (e.g., Aidukaite and Jacobsson 2015; Císař and Vráblíková 2010; Karlberg and Jacobsson 2015). The promotion of partnership models through the European Social Fund (ESF) is a pertinent example of the transfer of models across levels, and thus an example of expectations—or direct pressure—to change domestic working procedures to conform to EU standards.

Many large international CSOs tend to maintain an office in Brussels, and national CSOs have formed umbrella networks and pooled resources in order to maintain a daily presence there. What has emerged is thus a complex multileveled structure of associational relations between EU umbrella networks and domestic CSOs (national, regional, and local). Such a multilevel associational structure might have effects on domestic civil society, potentially changing internal power structures as well as creating new types of hierarchies, actor constellations, and forms of exclusion and segmentation. The transfer of organizational models also takes place through horizontal Europeanization processes between and within civil society itself, and the growth of and coordination among CSOs across borders is a pertinent feature of the European integration process.

Whereas some domestic actors might gain positions that allow them to engage in either the vertical or the horizontal style of organizational

Europeanization, others might be excluded (partly because they do not have the resources needed to be present in such networks or umbrella structures). The expectations to form coordination among domestic actors, such as the setting up of national or local umbrella structures, might thus promote new alliances, but also might promote disputes, tensions, and conflicts regarding aims and causes for one's operations, as has been found in studies of domestic women's movements (see chapter 8 and 9; Strid 2009; Karlberg and Jacobsson 2015). The setting up of national and/or local umbrella structures might help CSOs gain leverage in relation to domestic policymakers, such as in the case of community organizations in Lithuania where the formation of such structures has enabled dialogue and cooperation with, as well as provided new funding opportunities by, local and national authorities (Aidukaite and Jacobsson 2015). We thus find a number of roles and positions for CSOs in organizational Europeanization such as members and organizational entrepreneurs.

Participatory Europeanization

Participatory Europeanization follows from the establishment of new arenas. Such arenas might be closely linked to various EU institutions or to political processes and decision-making taking place at the EU and domestic levels. Here we might include participation in high-profile arenas such as the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI; e.g., Hedling and Meeuwisse 2015) and open consultation practices developed by the EC (2015). Other arenas for participation are much more disentangled from the EU and are set up in response to or even in direct opposition to the EU, such as the European social forums (e.g., della Porta and Caiani 2011). To some extent these participatory arenas can be linked to the organizational structure that EU-based umbrella peak CSOs offer for domestic organizations.

The significance of these arenas for civil society actors differs depending on their spread, accessibility, and degree of inclusiveness. EU peak associations might act as mediators as they collect, analyze, and package domestic concerns and transfer such information to EU institutions (e.g., Kohler-Koch 2010a; Steffek, Kissling, and Nanz 2008; Steffek and Hahn 2010; Tomšič and Reik 2008). Kohler-Koch (2010b) found that much of the participation at the EU level tends to be exclusive and based on forms of elite participation because few (domestic) CSOs are engaged, and those that are participating tend to have limited grassroots connections (see also Hahn and Steffek 2011; Kohler-Koch 2012; chapter 8).

Participatory Europeanization also gives rise to complex processes of how CSOs need to subordinate to participatory demands. This may entail facing

extensive barriers when engaging in Europeanized arenas, such as language, knowledge, and financial barriers. It might also be due to limited time and interest among peers for the relevance of Europe to their domestic activities and agendas (Rodekamp 2014). Previous studies also indicate weak chains of representation when domestic actors engage in European arenas. Studies find that only a few domestic actors are invited to participate and included in European arenas. This implies processes of disempowering on parts of actors who are not included or lack sufficient resources to participate (e.g., Johansson and Lee 2014; Kröger 2016).

Discursive Europeanization

Discursive Europeanization occurs primarily through the transfer of ideas, including knowledge; this transfer operates at the level of thinking about policy, politics, or polities (Jacobsson 2004a). Discursive Europeanization includes specific ways of defining and framing problems (Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999), the establishment of distinct policy paradigms, or, through the production of discourse ("Euro-discourse" as Jacobsson 2004a puts it), the establishment of a common language and a set of statements based on a specific problem understanding, thus privileging some problem understandings while excluding others. Engaging in common discourses might also lead to shared sensitivity to common problems, providing new focal points for attention and thus affecting the agenda orientation of CSOs (Kendall 2010). Discursive Europeanization at times takes place in or via other types of Europeanization, for instance regulatory and/or participatory, but is kept separate in the following discussion.

CSOs are influenced by European discourses (either by consciously or unconsciously adopting them or having to relate to them) while also defending and putting forward and uploading their own alternative understandings at times, thus being both subjects in and objects to this discursive battle. Discursive Europeanization offers CSOs opportunities to act as norm entrepreneurs, or change agents helping to diffuse European ideas into the domestic context and to mobilize domestic actors in support of these ideas and norms (cf. Börzel and Risse 2003), or, alternatively, they might be engaged in communicating and mobilizing norms and ideas upward to the EU level. However, CSOs can also actively resist, refuse, and counteract European ideas and norms and thus they function as gatekeepers, as discussed by Karlberg and Jacobsson (2015) in their study of the Swedish Women's Lobby (SWL), which actively resisted and refused to circulate some policy ideas coming from the European Women's Lobby (EWL). At the opposite end of the spectrum, CSOs can certainly also be objects to

discursive Europeanization and subordinate to discursive changes directly or indirectly affecting them and their institutional environment.

Apart from Europeanization in the form of ideas and discourses, we also include in discursive Europeanization the building of a common knowledge base at the European level and the systematic production, diffusion, and sometimes standardization of knowledge (such as common statistics or indicators) (Jacobsson 2004a). Such standardization of knowledge or policy-thinking is often implemented and reinforced by between-country comparisons of performances, benchmarking and the identification of best practices, and peer review processes. Indeed, discourses tend to become operational through such mechanisms. CSOs might be actively engaged in these processes, once again recognizing that such forms of Europeanization might affect them differently.

Recognizing Europeanization as an interactive process implies that CSOs also can function as brokers (mediators) of knowledge and ideas at different levels or between different spheres of society (see Sahlin-Andersson 1996 on the editing of knowledge; also Mörth 2003). As stressed by Czarniawska and Sevón (1996), transnational knowledge is seldom diffused wholesale, but instead is actively interpreted and thus translated into domestic contexts. Such discourses tend to be interpreted differently in different contexts with different policy traditions and institutions, and where civil society actors are engaged in giving concrete meaning and substance to EU discourse. In any case, CSOs are affected by being assigned specific roles and expectations that they can resist, adapt to, or embrace. One example is how the discourses on social economy and social enterprises are diffused and translated in a specific national context, challenging national discourses and subject positions for domestic CSOs and illustrating how discursive Europeanization might constitute a shift in policy thinking or problem formulation nationally (see chapter 7).

Identity Europeanization

Identity Europeanization occurs in and through the transfer of identities and forms of identification as well as through the social interactions that take place as individuals meet and participate in, or experience, European or transnational processes, all of which affect the identification and self-understanding of the actors (cf. Börzel and Risse 2003; Beyers 2005). Thus, social interaction can lead to changes in social identity, such as gradual changes in outlooks and behaviors following the logic of appropriateness in these transnational arenas (cf. March and Olsen 1989). Epistemic communities and advocacy networks—of which CSOs can be part—are held together

by common knowledge claims as well as by shared beliefs and values (Börzel and Risse 2003, 67), and participation in such networks readily implies norm internalization and thus resocialization. CSOs can also act as brokers and translators of social identities, thus they can act as norm entrepreneurs mediating between the supranational and domestic identities and self-understandings.

Identity change can go in both directions, and existing identities can be reinforced by exposure to European or other (trans) national ideas and identities. For instance, Bengt Jacobsson (2000) has claimed that participation in European arenas and transnational political processes tends to reinforce the national outlook of actors. They are forced or experience a need to develop their national positions and standpoints, thus re-creating national actors. While Jacobsson's focus was on government actors, the same might be true for CSOs. Karlberg and Jacobsson (2015), for instance, found that participation in the EWL means that Swedish women's organizations are expected to develop and communicate national positions to the EWL, sometimes revealing clashes with the dominant problem and self-understandings of the Swedish member organizations and those of the EWL or women's organizations of other member states. And these clashes might reinforce rather than challenge existing norms and identities.

Accordingly, CSOs can function as agents of political socialization, but their willingness and capacity to do so might differ considerably (Warleigh 2001). They might also be the object of such political socialization processes because other actors try to impose particular identities on them. Whether they instrumentally adapt to, unconsciously adopt, or actively resist identities assigned by EU discourses are empirical questions, explored, for instance, by Scaramuzzino and Scaramuzzino in chapter 9.

Concluding Discussion

The analytical framework developed in this chapter seeks to pave the way for a more comprehensive understanding of how the EU and Europeanization processes might affect CSOs and how CSOs might engage in such processes. The framework is developed in response to current debates on Europeanization and aims to go beyond the state of the art by explicitly exploring CSOs as subjects in and objects to Europeanization processes, particularly emphasizing the interactive, multidimensional, and embedded agency elements of Europeanization. The interactive element refers to an understanding of Europeanization as a process of constant interactions between different sets of actors, horizontally as well as vertically. The multidimensional aspects refer to the variety of ways in which Europeanization

takes place, as illustrated in our six types of Europeanization. This typology opens for theorization of how different types and mechanisms of Europeanization interact and support—or contradict—each other in real-life processes of Europeanization. The embedded agency element refers to an understanding of CSO agency as bounded and constrained due to CSOs' embeddedness in social relationships, social structures, and political cultures. Interests and identities are shaped by the context in which CSOs operate but are also renegotiated and reshaped during the course of multilevel and horizontal transnational interactions.

Our discussion hence elaborates a more complete list of roles potentially played by CSOs as they become engaged in, or choose to be involved in, European processes compared to the types of roles and subject positions found in the existing Europeanization literature. The discussion furthermore suggests that subject and object positions should not be considered as separate; instead, these positions can also be entangled in complex ways because CSOs might be both engaged in seeking to change the rule of the game, for instance though intensive lobbying activities, as well as being the object of such regulations. Similarly, CSOs might be engaged in using the opportunities of financial Europeanization, applying and receiving EU funding, yet such activities might also force other considerations and activities—for instance, compliance with EU regulations, and potentially the change of organizational routines and models.

Moreover, while the most prominent roles certainly include subject and object positions, our review also suggests that there is a position somewhat in between, illustrating that CSOs can act as a form of a mediator in Europeanization processes. Such a mediating role might include CSOs acting as a translator or transmitters of ideas and models or engaging in cofunding or coregulating practices.

The framework also opens the way for the analysis of the outcomes and processes that such different types of Europeanization might give rise to, for instance in terms of changing positions, relations, and statuses of civil society actors at the national and EU levels. This implies as well that our argument goes beyond much of the current debate on Europeanization that mainly focuses on formal political actors (or business actors). The analytical framework also has significance for civil society studies generally because it recognizes that the EU is not something that is located separate from the countries themselves that can be separated from investigations of civil society, its forms, and its actors at the national level.

Finally, implicit in these debates lies the broader question of whether Europeanization will lead to the assemblage and interaction of national civil society models in a multilevel structure or the formation of a common European civil society. Delanty and Rumford (2005) suggest that the

difference lies between thin and thick forms of Europeanization. European integration involves and therefore carries implications for not only the legal and political spheres, but also the social and cultural spheres; that is why theories on Europeanization need to accommodate the consequences of European integration along multiple dimensions. Indeed, it is typically through what we have discussed as participatory, discursive, and identity mechanisms that the thick form of Europeanization as social transformation can be achieved, while regulatory, financial, and organizational mechanisms can be better interpreted as the building blocks of a multilayered European civil society. The different chapters in this volume provide some insights into these processes, engaging with empirical investigations of different types of Europeanization and different subject positions ascribed and taken, as well as the processes and outcomes such involvement might result in. These investigations moreover illustrate the significance of certain types of Europeanization for particular sets of actors as well as the overlap and interconnectedness between different types of Europeanization.

Kerstin Jacobsson is Pofessor of Sociology at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. Recent publications include *Animal Rights Activism: A Moral-Sociological Perspective on Social Movements* (coauthored with Jonas Lindblom, University of Chicago Press, 2016) and *Civil Society Revisited: Lessons from Poland* (coedited with Elzbieta Korolczuk, Berghahn Books, 2017).

Håkan Johansson is Professor of Social Work at the School of Social Work, Lund University, Sweden. His research interests include civil society, the EU, advocacy, social policy, poverty, and elites. He is currently leading a research program on civil society elites in Europe (funded by the Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences) and recently published a book titled *EU Civil Society: Patterns of Cooperation, Competition and Conflict* (coedited with Sara Kalm, Palgrave, 2015).

References

Aidukaite, Jolanta, and Kerstin Jacobsson. 2015. "Europeanization and Urban Movements: Political Opportunities of Community Organizations in Lithuania." In *Urban Grassroots Movements in Central and Eastern Europe,* edited by Kerstin Jacobsson, 247–72. Farnham, UK, Surrey Ashgate.

Bache, Iain, and Andrew Jordan, eds. 2006. *The Europeanization of British Politics.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beyers, Jan. 2005. "Multiple Embeddedness and Socialisation in Europe: The Case of the Council Officials." *International Organisation* 59, no. 4: 899–936.

Börzel, Tanja. 1999. "Towards Convergence in Europe? Institutional Adaptation to Europeanization in Germany and Spain." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 37, no. 4: 537–96.

Börzel, Tanja, and Thomas Risse. 2003. "Conceptualizing the Domestic Impact of Europe." In Featherstone and Radaelli, *The Politics of Europeanization,* 57–80.

Císař, Ondřej, and Kateřina Vráblíková. 2010. "The Europeanisation of Social Movements in the Czech Republic: The EU and Local Women's Groups." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 43: 209–19.

Czarniawska, Barbara, and Guje Sevón. 1996. *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Delanty, Gerard, and Chris Rumford. 2005. *Rethinking Europe. Social Theory and the Implications of Europeanization*. London, UK: Routledge.

della Porta, Donatella, and Manuela Caiani. 2011. *Social Movements and Europeanization*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

European Commission (EC). 2015. "Better Regulation Guidelines." COM (2015) 215 final, September 5. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.

Falkner, Gerda, Oliver Treib, Miriam Hartlapp, and Simone Leiber. 2005. *Complying with Europe. EU Harmonisation and Soft Law in the Member States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Featherstone, Kevin, and Claudio Radaelli, eds. 2003. *The Politics of Europeanization*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Graziano, Paolo, Sophie Jacquot, and Bruno Palier. 2011. "Domestic Reconciliation policies and the usages of Europe." *European Journal of Social Security* 13, no. 1: 3–25.

Graziano, Paolo, and Maarten Vink, eds. 2008. *Europeanization. New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hahn, Kristina, and Jens Steffek. 2011. "Transmission Belts or Satellites? How Transnational CSOs Interact with Their Constituents." European Consortium for Political Research Conference, Reykjavik, Iceland.

Hedling, Elsa, and Anna Meeuwisse. 2015. " The European Citizens' Initiative Stage: A Snapshot of the Cast and Their Acts" In Johansson and Kalm, *EU Civil Society*, 210–28.

Holzhacher, Ronald. 2007. "The Europeanization and Transnationalization of Civil Society Organizations Striving for Equality: Goals and Strategies of Gay and Lesbian Groups in Italy and the Netherlands." Working Paper 2007/36. San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy: European University Institute.

Jacobsson, Bengt. 2000. *Världen i staten. Europeisering, politik och statens organisation*. Scores rapportserie 2000: 11. Stockholm, Sweden: Stockholm University.

Jacobsson, Kerstin. 2004a. "Soft regulation and the subtle transformation of states: the case of EU employment policy." *Journal of European Social Policy* 14, no. 4: 355–70.

——. 2004b. "Between Deliberation and Discipline: Soft Governance in EU Employment Policy." In *Soft Law in Governance and Regulation: An Interdisciplinary Analysis*, edited by Ulrika Mörth, 81–101. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Jacquot, Sophie, and Cornelia Woll. 2003. "Usage of European Integration—Europeanization from a Sociological Perspective." *European Integration Online Papers* 7, no. 12.

Jobert, Bruno, and Beate Kohler-Koch, eds. 2008. *Changing Images of Civil Society. From Protest to Governance.* London, UK: Routledge.

Johansson, Håkan, and Sara. Kalm, eds. 2015. *EU Civil Society. Patterns of Cooperation, Competition and Conflict*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johansson, Håkan, and Jayeon Lee. 2014. "Bridging the Gap: How do EU-Based Civil Society Organizations Acquire Their Internal Representation?" *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 25: 405–24.

———. 2015. "Competing Capital Logics in the Field of EU level CSOs." In Johansson and Kalm, *EU Civil Society*, 61–80.

Jordan, Andrew, and Duncan Liefferink. 2004. "The Europeanization of National Environmental Policy." In *Environmental Policy in Europe: The Europeanization of National Environmental Policy*, edited by Jordan and Liefferink, 1–14. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kallestrup, Morten. 2005. *Europeiseringen av nationalstaten. EU's konsekvenser for dansk reguleringspolitik of de nationale aktörers undervurderede rolle*. Köpenhamn, Denmark: Jurist-och Ökonomfornundets forlag.

Karlberg, Eva, and Kerstin Jacobsson. 2015. "A Meta-organizational Perspective on the Europeanization of Civil Society: The Case of the Swedish Women's Lobby." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 26, no. 4: 1438–59.

Keck, Margaret, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kendall, Jeremy. 2010. "The Limits and Possibilities of Third Sector Europeanisation." *Journal of Civil Society* 6, no. 1: 39–65.

Ketola, Markus. 2013. *Europeanization and Civil Society: Turkish NGOs as Instruments of Change?* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Knill, Christoph, and Dirk Lehmkuhl. 1999. "How Europe Matters. Different Mechanisms of Europeanization." *European Integration Online Papers* 3, no. 7.

———. 2002. "The National Impact of European Union Regulatory Policy. Three Europeanization Mechanisms." *Journal of European Political Research* 41, no. 2: 255–80.

Kohler-Koch, Beate. 2010a. "Civil Society and EU Democracy: 'Astroturf' Representation?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 17, no. 1: 100–16.

———. 2010b. "How to Put Matters Right? Assessing the Role of Civil Society in EU Accountability." *West European Politics* 33, no. 5: 1117–41.

———. 2012. "Post-Maastricht Civil Society and Participatory Democracy." *Journal of European Integration* 34, no. 7: 809–24.

Koopmans, Ruud. 1999. "Political. Opportunity. Structure. Some Splitting to Balance the Lumping." *Sociological Forum* 14, no. 1: 93–105.

Kröger, Sandra. 2016. *Europeanised or European? Representation by Civil Society Organisations in EU Policy-Making*. Colchester, UK: ECPR Press.

———. 2018. "Strategic or Principled? The Engagement of Civil Society Organisations with the EU." *Journal of Civil Society*, 14: 41–57.

Ladrech, Robert. 1994. "Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 21, no. 1: 69–88.

Lindgren, Karl-Oskar, and Thomas Persson. 2011. *Participatory Governance in the EU: Enhancing or Endangering Democracy and Efficiency?* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mahoney, Christine, and Michael, J. Beckstrand. 2011. "Following the Money: European Union Funding of Civil Society Organizations." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49, no. 6. 1339–1361.

March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Mau, Steffen, and Jan Mewes. 2012. "Horizontal Europeanization in Contextual Perspective. What Drives Cross Border Activities within the European Union." *European Societies* 14, no. 1: 7–34.

Mörth, Ulrika. 2003. "Europeanization as Interpretation, Translation and Editing of Public Policies." In Featherstone and Radaelli, *The Politics of Europeanization*, 159–78.

Olsen, Johan. P. 2002. "The Many Faces of Europeanization." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40, no. 5: 921–52.

Radaelli, Claudio. 2000. "Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change." *European Integration Online Papers* 4, no. 8.

——. 2003. "The Europeanization of Public Policy." In Featherstone and Radaelli, *The Politics of Europeanization*, 27–56.

Radaelli, Claudio, and Theofanis Exadaktylos. 2010. "New Directions in Europeanization Research." In *Research Agendas in EU Studies. Stalking the Elephant*, edited by Michelle Egan, Neill Nugent, and William Paterson, 189–215. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Radaelli, Claudio, and Romain Pasquier. 2008. "Conceptual Issues." In *Europeanization. New Research Agendas,* edited by Paolo Graziano and Maarten Vink, 35–45. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rek, Mateja. 2010. "Europeanization of Civil Society Sector in Central and Eastern Europe." *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences* 3, no. 1: 160–86.

Risse, Thomas, Maria Green Cowles, and James Caporaso. 2001. "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction." In *Transforming Europe, Europeanization and Domestic Change*, edited by Maria Green Cowles, James Caporaso, and Thomas Risse, 1–20. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rodekamp, Meike. 2014. *Their Members' Voice. Civil Society Organisations in the European Union*. Cologne, Germany: Springer Verlag.

Roth, Silke. 2007. "Sisterhood and Solidarity? Women's Organizations in the Expanded European Union." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 14, no. 4: 460–87.

Ruzza, Carlo. 2011. "Social Movements and the European Interest Intermediation of Public Interest Groups." *Journal of European Integration* 33, no. 4: 453–69.

Sahlin-Andersson, Kerstin. 1996. "Imitating by Editing Success. The Construction of Organizational Fields and Identities." In Czarniawska and Sevón, 69–72.

Sánchez Salgado, Rosa. 2014. *Europeanizing Civil Society: How the EU Shapes Civil Society Organizations*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Steffek, Jens, and Kristina Hahn, eds. 2010. *Evaluating Transnational NGOs: Legitimacy, Accountability, Representation*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Steffek, Jens, Claudia Kissling, and Patrizia Nanz. 2008. *Civil Society Participation in European and Global Governance: A Cure for the Democratic Deficit?* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Streeck, Wolfgang, and Kathleen Thelen, eds. 2005. *Beyond Continuity. Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Strid, Sofia. 2009. "Gendered Interests in the European Union—The European Women's Lobby and the Organization and Representation of Women's Interests." PhD diss., Örebro, Sweden: Örebro University.

Tomšič, Matevz, and Mateja Rek. 2008. "Governance and Civil Society at the EU Level." *Managing Global Transitions* 4: 403–20.

Warleigh, Alex. 2001. "'Europeanizing' Civil Society: NGOs as Agents of Political Socialization." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39, no. 4: 619–39.

Woll, Cornelia, and Sophie Jacquot. 2010. "Using Europe: Strategic Action in Multi-level Politics." *Comparative European Politics* 8, no. 1: 110–11.

Zippel, Kathrin. 2004. "Transnational Advocacy Networks and Policy Cycles in the European Union: The Case of Sexual Harassment." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society.* 11 , no. 1: 57–85.