THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF EUROPE

THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE DIFFUSION OF IDEAS

FORTSETZUNGSANTRAG AUF WEITERFÜHRUNG EINER KOLLEG-FORSCHERGRUPPE

PROF. DR. TANJA A. BÖRZEL UND PROF. DR. THOMAS RISSE

Gekürzte Fassung/Condensed Version

1. Zusammenfassung

Die Kolleg-Forschergruppe (KFG) untersucht Diffusionsprozesse von Politik und Institutionen innerhalb Europas und der Europäischen Union (EU), von Europa in andere Weltregionen und von dort nach Europa zurück. In der ersten Förderperiode haben wir uns mit drei Themenbereichen beschäftigt: 1) Europäisierung von kollektiven Identitäten und transnationalen Öffentlichkeiten, 2) Regeleinhaltung innerhalb der EU, Verbreitung europäischer Politiken und Institutionen in die Beitrittskandidaten und die europäische Nachbarschaft und 3) Transfer-Prozesse von Europa in andere Weltregionen. Diese Diffusion nach Lateinamerika, Afrika und Asien und die damit verbundenen Aneignungs- und Abwehrprozesse stehen in der zweiten Förderperiode im Mittelpunkt der Aktivitäten der KFG. Gleichzeitig werden wir den Einfluss außereuropäischer Politiken und Institutionen auf Europa und die EU in den Blick nehmen. Theoretisch geht es darum, Ansätze der Europäisierungsforschung mit der sozialwissenschaftlichen Diffusions-, der historischen Transfer- und der kulturwissenschaftlichen Übersetzungsforschung zu verbinden. Zu den Formaten der KFG gehören ein Gastwissenschaftler-Programm, ein Programm zur Förderung von Nachwuchswissenschaftlern (Promovierende und Post-Docs), gemeinsame Publikationen, Beiträge zur Lehre sowie ein Programm zum Wissensaustausch mit Praktikern in Politik, Medien und Gesellschaft.

2. Stand der Forschung und eigene Vorarbeiten

2.1 Arbeitsbericht

Theoretical and Empirical Findings

The main goal of the Kolleg-Forschergruppe has been to integrate and synthesize the results of our research by discussing them with eminent scholars and junior researchers in the field using diffusion of ideas as an integrating perspective on European Union (EU) studies that also promotes theory development. More specifically, we have been investigating the EU as both a subject and object of diffusion asking three sets of interrelated questions:

1. How and under what conditions do Europe and the EU function as *promoter* of ideas, both internally and externally? What diffusion mechanisms does the EU employ in which contexts?

2. What about Europe and the EU as *recipients* of diffusion processes at the global level? Which diffusion mechanisms are particularly conducive to transformative changes inside the EU and its member states, and under what conditions?

3. What are the *institutional effects* of these diffusion processes on political, economic, social, and cultural structures and processes inside and outside the EU and its member states, which factors promote and constrain the diffusion of ideas, and how are these differential effects to be explained?

In the following, we summarize our most important findings focusing on our contributions to research on Europeanization and diffusion. During the past three years, we have explored to what extent EU policy ideas and institutions spread across different contexts. In EU studies, these issues have been the subject of Europeanization research.[1] The early literature developed various causal mechanisms through which EU policies, institutions, and political processes impact upon the domestic structures of the member states.[2] Eastern enlargement allowed extending the research agenda to states that have to adapt their policies and institutions to the EU as a condition for rather than a consequence of membership.[3] With the borders of the European Union moving south-eastwards, we have been awarded yet another real-world experiment on the diffusion of EU ideas, policies, and institutions. As in the case of Eastern Europe and the Western Balkans, the EU seeks to transform the domestic structures of its

---

[1]   While we recognize, of course, that Europe encompasses more than the EU, our empirical research focuses on the latter as sender and receiver of diffusion processes.

[2]   See Cowles et al. 2001; Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999; Radaelli 2000; Goetz and Hix 2000; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003; Börzel and Risse 2007.

[3]   See Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005; Vachudova 2005; Börzel and Sedelmeier 2006; Sedelmeier 2011; Börzel 2012c; Elbasani 2012; Schimmelfennig 2009.

Eastern and Southern neighbors in order to foster peace, stability, and prosperity.[4] Finally, the EU seeks to promote regional integration in other parts of the world where its institutions have become a major reference point for region-building initiatives.[5]

Overall, EU ideas, policies, and institutions have traveled well across the borders of Europe. Yet, the further we move away from the EU, the less appropriate it is to refer to the spread of EU policies and institutions as Europeanization (Börzel and Risse 2012b). First, the "top-down" perspective of most Europeanization approaches that take EU ideas, policies, and institutions as the starting point, tends to prejudge the EU as the main source of domestic change "screen[ing] out other domestic causes" (Bulmer and Burch 2005: 864; cf. Radaelli and Pasquier 2006). Second, these approaches heavily rely on the "shadow of hierarchy", which not only allows the EU to legally impose its policies and institutions on its member states but also provides important incentives for them to comply. The further we move away from the EU and its immediate neighbors, the more this criticism seems to hold and the less it makes sense to call the spread of EU policies and institutions "Europeanization". The EU Treaties have influenced the Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 2008 (see Jetschke and Murray 2012), and the Court of Justice of the Andean Community has been modeled on the European Court of Justice (ECJ) (see Alter 2012; also Alter and Helfer 2010). But neither Asia nor Latin America are becoming European in the process. Nor is the EU the only source of regional and domestic institutional change. Moreover, with the geographical proximity to the EU and Europe in general decreasing, the EU's ability to make non-members comply with its standards and its institutional prescriptions becomes weaker.

Rather than (over)stretching the concept of Europeanization, we suggest to draw on the diffusion literature to capture the more indirect ways in which the EU influences domestic institutional change in third countries and regions. More specifically, Europeanization research can be regarded as a special instance of policy and institutional diffusion. We opt for a broad understanding of diffusion *as processes through which ideas, policies, and institutions spread transnationally, i.e., cross-borders and cross-regions, across time and space*.[6] In contrast, normative, policy, and institutional change which can be explained purely on domestic grounds with no cross-border influence would be outside this conceptualization of diffusion. For diffusion to occur, there has to be some relationship among countries or regions of the world. The spontaneous co-occurence of similar institutional or behavioral patterns does not constitute diffusion in our understanding (e.g., the simultaneous use of umbrellas in case of rain is not diffusion, even though it results in converging behavior).

We have developed a typology of mechanisms of diffusion that draws on three major logics of social action, instrumental, normative, and communicative. Our typology gives rise to different expectations regarding the conditions under which actors seek to spread ideas and decide to adopt them respectively (see Börzel and Risse 2009b, 2012b, for the following).

Refining the existing literature on diffusion,[7] we distinguish between two types of diffusion mechanisms (see *figure 1*): First, ideas, policies, and institutions might diffuse through direct influence mechanisms. An agent of diffusion actively promotes certain policies or institutional models in her interactions with a receiving actor or group of actors by either imposing them (*physical force or legal enforcement*), providing incentives (*negative or positive conditionality and capacity building*), or fostering processes of social learning (*socialization*) and reason-giving (*persuasion*). Second, diffusion also occurs through indirect mechanisms, namely competition and functional and normative emulation. Here, the action starts at the receiving end. Actors need to solve a problem or to overcome a crisis and look around for institutional solutions that serve their needs (*lesson-drawing*) or compete for "best practices" (*competition*). They might also simply "download" an institutional model, because this is the way things are done in a given community to which they want to belong (*mimicry*).[8]

---

[4]   See Youngs 2001; Weber et al. 2007; Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2010; Börzel 2011; Börzel and Langbein 2012.

[5]   See Telò 2001; Grugel 2004; Bicchi 2006; Farrel 2009; Börzel and Risse 2009a.

[6]   See Strang and Meyer 1993; Franzese and Hays 2008; Simmons et al. 2006; Plümper and Schneider 2009; Gilardi 2012. For a more narrow understanding of diffusion, which focuses on the spontaneous and uncoordinated spread of innovations among populations, see Aldrich 1979; Rogers 2003; Meyer et al. 1987; Meyer et al. 1997.

[7]   *Inter alia* DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Simmons, Dobbin, and Garrett 2006; Jahn 2006; 2009; Holzinger and Knill 2005; Meseguer 2005, 2009; Gilardi 2012.

[8]   Our distinction between direct and indirect influence differs from concepts such as leverage versus linkage (Levitsky and Way 2005) or external governance (Lavenex and Schimmelfennig 2010) since these still take the EU as the sender of policies and institutions employing soft or hard mechanisms.

Figure 1: Mechanisms of Diffusion

Underlying theory of social action	Mechanism
	Direct
Coercion	Physical force or legal enforcement
Instrumental rationality	Incentives through positive and negative conditionality and capacity-building
Normative rationality	Socialization by providing an authoritative model (normative pressure)
Communicative rationality	Persuasion by promoting ideas as legitimate or true through reason-giving
	Indirect
Instrumental rationality	Competition (functional emulation)
	Lesson drawing (functional emulation)
Normative rationality	Mimicry (normative emulation)

This analytical framework has served us well through the first three years of our joint endeavor and will also guide our research in the second period of the KFG. We have employed this theoretical framework to investigate the conditions for and processes through which ideas diffuse in, through, and beyond Europe and the EU in three research areas that have been at the core of our work.

Research Area 1: The Differential Diffusion of Identities and Public Spheres in Europe

Research Area 1 dealt with the diffusion of collective identities and the transnationalization of public spheres in Europe. We have asked two basic questions in this context (see Risse 2010; Risse and van de Steeg forthcoming for the following):

1. How can we describe and explain the emergence, the diffusion, as well as the limits of a European sense of community and of transnational European public spheres?

2. How and under what conditions does the diffusion of a European sense of community and a European public sphere affect European integration and turn into political change?

First, we can reject the conventional wisdom that Europeans lack a sense of community: It is true that we do not observe the diffusion of a uniform and shared European identity above and beyond the various national identities. Rather, the available data show the *Europeanization* of collective local, national, gender, and other identities. Europe and the EU are integrated in people's sense of belonging. Empirical analyses document that more than 50 percent of the European citizens hold such Europeanized national identities, if only as a secondary identity. Those who incorporate Europe into their sense of identity tend to support European integration much more than individuals who adhere to exclusively nationalist identities (Hooghe and Marks 2006; see also Fligstein 2008). The Europeanization of collective identities varies widely across old and new EU member states, and the meanings attached to "Europe" are also diverse. In this sense, Europeanized identities have diffused across Europe, but in uneven ways and been adapted, translated, and refracted through the various national and local discourses.

Second, we can also observe the diffusion of public spheres whenever European issues are debated as questions of common concern using similar frames of reference and whenever fellow Europeans participate regularly in these national debates. Such Europeanization of public spheres is still segmented and varies across member states (see Koopmans and Statham 2010; Wessler et al. 2008). We see the gradual emergence of transnational European communities of communication through the inter-connectedness of Europeanized public spheres. At this point, Europeanized identities and Euro-

pean public spheres are linked, since European public discourses constitute spaces where collective identities are constructed, diffused as well as contested. Finally, the increasing politicization of European affairs contributes to the Europeanization of public spheres (Checkel and Katzenstein 2009).

Third, struggles over European identity involve at least two distinct substantive concepts of what "Europe" actually means. On the one hand, there is a modern "EU –Europe" supported by the European elites (Fligstein 2008; Bruter 2005) and embracing modern, democratic, and humanistic enlightenment values against a past of nationalism, militarism, or communism. On the other hand, there is a Europe of white Christian peoples that sees itself as a distinct civilization. This European identity construction is less open to strangers and entails boundaries against Islam as well as Asian or African "cultures." This "nationalist Europe" is increasingly politicized by populist parties particularly on the right who have taken up the European issue against its silencing by the elites.

Fourth, describing the Europeanization of identities and public spheres is one thing, explaining it is more difficult. European integration as such does not diffuse and spread Europeanized identities and public spheres. In this sense, the direct diffusion mechanisms in figure 1 do not work. Yet, engagement in the integration process seems to matter insofar as long-term membership and elite consensus in favor of the EU correlates with Europeanized identities and public spheres. This resembles the functional emulation pathway as identified in *figure 1*. At the same time, identification patterns follow largely national pathways which also explain the variation in the degree of Europeanization of identities and public spheres. The meaning constructions of Europe and the EU diffuse through national and even local discourses in different ways and do not lead to homogeneity and one unified European identity.

Fifth, the Europeanization of identities and public spheres matters hugely for EU politics. Elite identities and public discourses are particularly relevant in policy areas that involve core features of national sovereignty. Identities and public discourses also matter whenever the boundaries of the EU are at stake, be it with regard to membership or with regard to citizenship and immigration. On Eastern enlargement, a public discourse that framed Eastern enlargement in identity terms ("return to Europe"), was instrumental in granting membership to Central and Eastern Europe (Schimmelfennig et al. 2003; Sedelmeier 2005). The ongoing dispute over Turkish membership is about what defines Europe and, consequently, what its boundaries are. The uneasy relationship between European modernity, secularism, and religion assumes center-stage in these debates. Last not least, the current Euro crisis demonstrates at least to some degree that "solidarity among strangers" (Habermas) exists among Europeans (for data see e.g. European Parliament 2011). In this case, interests and identities point in the same direction.

Research Area 2: Compliance, Conditionality, and Beyond

Research Area 2 focused on the mechanisms and scope conditions as well as the institutional outcomes of the diffusion of European policies and institutions in different countries and regions of the world. First, Europeanization studies typically emphasize – at least implicitly – the direct influence model of diffusion (see *figure 1* above). The Europeanization of member states works to a large extent through legal coercion (cf. Börzel 2010b). Compliance with EU Law is a combined effect of little power and high capacity (Börzel et al. 2010). In fact, we find an interaction effect between capacity and power, where capacity conditions the relation between power and compliance. With increasing bureaucratic efficiency, the non-compliance promoting effects of power are reduced.

The supremacy and direct effect of EU Law also provide incentives for compliance, e.g., in form of financial sanctions, and arenas for socialization and persuasion (Panke 2007). For the new member states, EU infringement proceedings and the Control and Verification Mechanism substitute accession conditionality as major incentives for post-accession compliance (Gateva 2010; Sedelmeier 2012; Spendzharova and Vachudova 2012). At the same time, EU pre-accession financial and technical assistance helped the new members build legislative and administrative capacities and facilitate post-accession compliance (Sedelmeier 2008; Schimmelfennig and Trauner 2010). The current candidate countries are even more subject to accession conditionality, although its credibility is declining given the EU's enlargement fatigue (Saatcioglu 2010; Noutcheva and Düzgit 2012; Elbasani 2012; Börzel 2012b).

Second, while incentive-based mechanisms dominate the Europeanization of new member states and accession candidates, the lack of a membership perspective curbs the ability of the EU to influence neighborhood countries whose costs of adaptation are even higher than those of the Western Balkan candidates given their low levels of government effectiveness and democratic quality (Schimmelfennig and Scholtz 2008; Börzel 2011). Nevertheless, we do observe at least selective domestic change

caused by policy-specific conditionality, capacity building, and/or lesson-drawing in the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) (Freyburg et al. 2009; Langbein 2011; Börzel and Langbein 2012).

Third, we have not only specified processes and mechanisms by which European ideas, policies, and institutions diffuse into different countries and regions of the world. We have also identified four scope conditions for institutional change taken from the Europeanization literature and from the larger literature on the inter- or transnational sources of domestic change (Börzel and Risse 2012c):

Domestic Incentives: The EU can induce domestic change if its incentives or socialization and persuasion efforts align with domestic incentives, political preferences, or survival strategies of ruling elites. The latter can use EU ideas, policies, and institutions to push their own political agenda, please their constituencies, and regain or consolidate their power. Despite high costs and weak capacities of accession and neighborhood countries, we find domestic institutional change rather than mere inertia and resistance against the diffusion of EU ideas, policies, and institutions (Börzel and Risse 2012a; Ademmer 2011; Langbein 2011).

Regime Type: Regime type is another important scope condition for the diffusion of EU ideas, policies, and institutons. While adopting EU policies and institutions tend to be more costly, the less democratic countries are, the cases of Turkey and the European Neighborhood Countries show that the EU can empower actors that do not necessarily fall into the pro-Western, liberal camp – even if the EU's liberal policies and institutions impose significant costs (Noutcheva and Düzgit 2012; van Hüllen 2012; Börzel and Pamuk 2012).

(Limited) Statehood: The early Europeanization literature took it for granted that states were able to change their institutions if they only wanted to or if the EU promoted such transformation. Yet, research on "limited statehood" (e.g. Risse 2011) argues that state capacity to enforce decisions and the state monopoly over the means of violence vary, both with regard to parts of a country's territory and policy areas. Everything else being equal, degrees of limited statehood affect both the willingness and the ability of states to change institutions in response to EU pressures for adaptation (Elbasani 2012; van Hüllen 2012; Börzel and van Hüllen 2011).

Power (A)Symmetries: We find – not surprisingly – that the influence of the EU is the more direct, the more asymmetrical a country's relations with the EU are. The EU can use accession conditionality to directly influence institutional change and to overcome domestic opposition. Power asymmetries also correlate with the EU's influence on domestic institutional change in its neighborhood, which does not have an accession perspective (Börzel and Pamuk 2012; van Hüllen 2012; Magen 2012).

Research Area 3: Comparative Regionalism

Research Area 3 investigated the diffusion of institutional models for regional integration which the EU actively seeks to promote.[9] The more the EU engages with far away countries and regions, the more relevant indirect mechanisms become which are driven by the demand for institutional solutions rather than active EU promotion of its model (see *figure 1* above). Adopting EU policies and institutions provides a competitive advantage (Magen 2012), promises to solve specific problems (Alter 2012), or helps ensure and attract foreign aid (Lenz 2012) and foreign direct investments (Jetschke and Murray 2012). Moreover, emulating the EU may not only be strategic but often follows a global script where the EU features as the standard model for regional integration (Lenz 2012; Jetschke and Murray 2012).

We derive four preliminary lessons from our empirical findings so far (cf. Börzel and Risse 2012a). First, we do not come across a single case of sheer copying in the sense of simply "downloading" the EU's institutional models from the EU Treaties without any problem in need to be addressed. Latin American, African, and Asian governments and their regional organizations are not robots waiting for regular "software updates" by the EU. Diffusion requires agency, it is never a passive process.

Second, the functional problems to be solved vary. The explanatory story of European integration according to which economic interdependence leads to regional integration via the rational choices of market participants is not being replicated in other parts of the world. The Asian financial crisis (Jetschke and Murray 2012), the problem of securing foreign aid in the case of the South African Development Community (SADC) (Lenz 2012), and the need to solve trade disputes in Free Trade

---

[9] Bicchi 2006; Börzel and Risse 2012a; Bretherton and Vogler 2006; Farrel 2009; Grugel 2004.

Agreements (Alter 2012) are different economic problems not necessarily related to economic interdependence but still to be solved through regional institution-building.

Third, as mentioned above, there are always various institutional solutions available to fix a particular problem. This is where normative emulation assumes center-stage. Neither Latin American nor African nor Asian countries enter into a rational search mode to seek the regional institutional model best suited to deal with their particular problem. Rather, they look for the EU right away, at least so far. They do not copy and paste the EU Treaties into their regional arrangements, but adapt them selectively. They usually regard the EU as the institutional starting point for solving their problems (Lenz 2012; Jetschke and Murray 2012).

Fourth, interestingly enough, the EU is never a passive by-stander in these diffusion processes. While the diffusion of the EU models for regional integration to other parts of the world has been demand-driven and, thus, emulation mechanisms dominate, direct influence mechanisms are not absent (Grugel 2004; Farrel 2009; Santander 2005). We find many instances in which transnational expert networks of EU officials or lawyers and specialists from the respective regions were instrumental in advising regional organizations on how to adapt EU models (Lenz 2012; Saldías 2010). Agency matters in diffusion processes, a point to which we will come back in the second phase of the KFG.

Overall, our collective research in the three research areas has found that policy ideas and institutions have been diffusing within the EU and beyond. Our approach is decidedly agency-centered by focusing on diffusion mechanism and on scope conditions. As a result, we observe a lot of variation in outcomes, both with regard to institutional change and to behavioral consequences. This allows for a more fine-tuned picture than in the diffusion approaches of conventional social sciences, which often focus on (convergence in) outcomes rather than processes (Elkins and Simmons 2005; Holzinger and Knill 2005; Simmons et al. 2008; Gilardi 2012).

Our 2012 special issue of *West European Politics* represents a first attempt to summarize our findings "from Europeanization to diffusion" (Börzel and Risse 2012a). The second phase of the KFG will focus on diffusion processes beyond Europe in much more detail (see 3.). In particular, explanatory scope conditions for diffusion and transfer processes will assume center-stage.

Finally, our research so far has not yet dealt systematically with our second research question above, namely the EU and Europe as *recipients* of global diffusion processes. We will concentrate on these issues in the KFG's second phase, too. Our third International Conference in December 2011 served as a kick-off meeting and collective brainstorming exercise for this phase of our research.

Process: Fellow Program, Promotion of Junior Researchers, Dissemination, and Visibility

Fellow Program

Senior Fellows

Senior fellows have provided a major intellectual input to the KFG from the very beginning, starting with Fritz W. Scharpf as our first "senior post-doc" (see Annex 3.1). We decided early on not to issue specific calls for senior scholars (unlike in the case of the post-doctoral program), but to solicit their applications. We invited scholars for particular contributions to our research agenda. We made it a rule that senior scholars ought to come for two weeks as a minimum.

Our senior scholars have contributed hugely to the various activities. They also engaged strongly with our junior researchers, be it post-doctoral fellows, be it doctoral students. Finally, they contributed significantly to the publications of the KFG (see Annex 13).

Our efforts to involve senior scholars from Freie Universität Berlin and from other Berlin- and Potsdam-based research institutions on a regular basis have been less successful. We see two major reasons for this. First, the top senior researchers at Freie Universität Berlin and other institutions are themselves very active in various collaborative research projects so that they have little time and energy to engage elsewhere. Second, the KFG's incentive structure – apart from intellectual stimulation – is not particularly conducive for local senior scholars to get involved.

As to the sabbatical program itself, the two co-directors have obviously profited from it (see Annex 4). However, both Tanja Börzel and Thomas Risse already have 50% reductions in their teaching loads granted by Freie Universität Berlin. Since they both enjoy teaching and consider it an important part of our research, there is less need for us to use the sabbatical program for further buy-outs.

Post-doctoral Fellows

Our post-doctoral fellowship program has been another cornerstone of the KFG (see Annex 3.2). We designed this program specifically for junior post-doctoral fellows who have recently completed their PhD in order to allow them to turn their thesis into a publishable book and other major publications and develop a post-doc project.[10] While we have certainly encouraged young scholars to apply, we have not solicited applications, but have issued an international annual call for applications. The number of applications varied from 30 in 2008, 38 in 2009, 66 in 2010, to 52 in 2011, with 79 percent of the applications coming from abroad. Since we only selected four to six post-doctoral fellows per year, our post-doctoral program has been very competitive from the beginning. Post-doctoral fellows are typically staying for a ten-month period (October-July). In exceptional cases, we have awarded an extension of their stay, usually in conjunction with a specific research project to be completed or a grant application to be submitted.

Together with the senior fellows, the post-doctoral fellows have developed into the intellectual core of the KFG. Since our fellowships come with few strings attached, fellows have been extraordinarily engaged in the various activities of the KFG and developed their own ideas for organizing workshops on themes relevant to our research agenda which then resulted in major publications (see 2.2 and Annex 5.3).

Doctoral Students

From the beginning, the KFG has been designed to promote PhD research. We have instituted two venues for this. First, we have issued international calls for "completion grants" of normally three to six months to enable doctoral students in late stages of their dissertations to come to the KFG and to write up their theses (see list in Annex 3.3). This provided us with first-hand knowledge of cutting-edge dissertation research with regard to the topics of the KFG.

Second, we have regularly contributed two to three three-year-stipends for PhD researchers working on KFG-related topics who had been admitted to the Berlin Graduate School for Transnational Studies (BTS), a joint venture of Freie Universität Berlin, the Social Science Center Berlin, and the Hertie School of Governance (www.transnationalstudies.edu; see Annex 3.3). The BTS, which has been instituted in 2008, has quickly become one of the most competitive graduate schools in the social sciences in Germany taking in less than five percent of the applicants. Joining forces with the BTS (both co-directors belong to its core faculty) has, thus, enabled us to tap into an excellent pool of PhD researchers. These junior researchers have to participate in the regular courses, seminars, and workshops of the BTS, but they are also fully integrated in the KFG activities exposing them to cutting edge research of our post-doctoral fellows and senior scholars.

In sum, our PhD researchers, post-doctoral fellows, and senior scholars constitute the intellectual core of the KFG. The substantive research results we reported above would not have been possible without their continuous input. It is their contributions in seminars, workshops, and conferences which have made the KFG such a tremendous success in our view and has inspired our own work all along the way.

Synthesizing Research and Initiating New Projects

Seminars, Workshops, and Conferences

Synthesizing research has been a major purpose of the KFG. From the beginning, we organized a weekly seminar as the gathering point for the fellows and doctoral students which is obligatory for everybody. While some seminars were devoted to guest lectures, the typical KFG Jour Fixe discusses a draft paper presented by one of the fellows with a discussant from the KFG (see Annex 5.2). We also had several temporary reading groups which were coordinated by one of the fellows and which introduced us to the state of the art literature in the particular field of his or her expertise, e.g. institutional design of regional organizations, legal transplants, or regulatory convergence.

The KFG quickly became a venue for workshops and conferences (see Annex 5.3 and 5.4). During the first three years of the KFG, we organized altogether 22 such workshops and conferences. Some were conducted by the KFG co-directors, while others were organized by senior or junior fellows. In some cases, we cooperated with both national and international partners. For instance, in 2011, we held two workshops on Turkey and the EU in cooperation with Sabanci University, Istanbul, one in Berlin and

---

[10] Submission of the doctoral dissertation is a condition to be eligible for a post-doctoral fellowship.

the other one in Istanbul. In each of these cases, we tried to keep the workshops as informal as possible, both with regard to the numbers of participants and concerning the presentations and discussions. Moreover, workshops were designed in such a way that they aimed at producing some tangible results in terms of joint publications or at least contributions to the KFG Working Paper Series.

A particular highlight for intellectual interchange has been the KFG's annual International Conference which we started in 2009 and which has become a regular feature. This major event with about 100 participants has significantly contributed to the KFG's international visibility. For each of these International Conferences, we issued an international "call for papers" which resulted in 104 applications for the opening conference in 2009, 84 for the conference on "Diffusion of Regional Integration" in 2010, and 44 for the conference on "Europe from the Outside In" in 2011 (the decline in numbers of application results primarily from the fact that we narrowed down the topics). From these applications, we chose about 20-25 papers for presentation. The KFG co-directors also used the International Conferences as collective brainstorming venues to generate new ideas inspiring KFG research.

Publications

The activities of the KFG have resulted in numerous and highly visible publications, by the two co-directors as well as by the senior scholars, post-doctoral fellows, and PhD researchers (for the "top list" see 2.2; for a complete list see Annex 13). The two co-directors published a monograph with *Cornell University Press* (Risse 2010), several edited volumes with *Palgrave*, *Asghate* and *Nomos* (Börzel 2009; Magen et al. 2009; Börzel et al. 2012; Börzel and Böttger 2012), a special issue of *West European Politics* (Börzel and Risse 2012a), of *Acta Politica* (Börzel 2010a), and of *Europe-Asia Studies* (Börzel and Langbein 2012). An edited volume is currently under review with *Cambridge University Press* (Risse and van de Steeg forthcoming), another book under review with *Cornell University Press* (Börzel and Fagan in preparation) and a special issue with *Environmental Politics* is in preparation (Börzel and Fagan in preparation). We also initiated our own online Working Paper Series to allow for quick and easy access of research results. So far, 35 KFG Working Papers have been published.

Initiating New Research

Synthesizing the results from our various projects and discussing them with scholars in the field allowed us to extend the empirical and theoretical scope of our findings giving rise to ideas for new research. We have transformed these new research ideas into several theory-guided empirical projects within the framework of collaborative research endeavors, such as the FP 7 Collaborative Project "TransWorld"[11] and the SFB 700 "Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood".[12] We also successfully applied for a Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence "The EU and its Citizens"[13] and are currently preparing a bid for an FP7 collaborative project on "Enlargement and the integration capacity of the EU".[14] Finally, we have helped junior researchers to initiate new research projects by supporting their applications for Marie Curie Fellowships and junior research groups (see below and Annex 12).

Promoting Junior Researchers

The KFG has defined as a major task to promote the research and career opportunities of junior researchers, particularly at the post-doctoral level (see above). Apart from granting fellowships, the KFG has contributed to this goal by, first, awarding travel grants to doctoral students and post-doctoral

---

[11] FP7-SSH-2011-2 Collaborative Project "Redefining the transatlantic relationship and its role in shaping global governance"; coordinated by the Istituto Affari Internazionali in Rome, Work package Nr. 5 "Trends in human rights/democracy and EU-US adjustment policies", coordinated by Thomas Risse and Tanja Börzel.

[12] Project B2 "Governance Export by Regional Organizations", directed by Tanja Börzel (http://www.sfb-governance.de/en/teilprojekte/projektbereich_b/b2/index.html).

[13] Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence "The EU and its Citizens", directed by Tanja Börzel, with the participation of Thomas Risse, Jürgen Gerhards (sociology), Barbara Pfetsch (communication science), and Christian Calliess (law) (http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/en/polwiss/forschung/international/jmce/index.html).

[14] FP7 Call SSH.2012.5.2-1. Enlargement and the integration capacity of the EU: past experience and future prospects, proposal for a collaborative project "Maximizing Europe's integration capacity: lessons and prospects for Enlargement", coordinated by Freie Universität Berlin (Tanja Börzel) and the University of Leiden (Antoaneta Dimitrova/Bernard Steunenberg) with the participation of the London School of Economics (Ulrich Sedelmeier), the ETH Zürich (Frank Schimmelfennig), the Central European University (Dorothee Bohle), the European University Institute (Laszlo Bruszt), and Sabanci University (Meltem Müfteler), to be submitted in February 2012.

fellows for attending international conferences to present their work and to network (see Annex 9.2); second, enabling junior researchers to organize their own research workshops and to invite scholars relevant to their work (see Annex 5.3). Third, we have regularly organized seminars devoted to publication strategies, grant application procedures, and general career coaching (including preparation for job talks, and the like).

In general, the KFG has been very successful in this endeavor (see Annex 9.3). Four of our post-doctoral fellows or junior affiliates have assumed tenured professorships (W2/W3):

- Prof. Dr. Silke Adam at the University of Bern;

- Prof. Dr. Eugenia Conceicao-Heldt at the University of Dresden;

- Prof. Dr. Anja Jetschke at the University of Göttingen;

- Prof. Dr. Cathleen Kantner at the University of Stuttgart.

In addition, Dr. Nicole Dörr has accepted a junior professorship at the John F. Kennedy Institute of Freie Universität Berlin, after being awarded one of the prestigious Marie Curie post-doctoral fellowships of the EU. Another Marie Curie fellowship went to Dr. Marianne van de Steeg who has also been a post-doctoral fellow at the KFG. Among our current fellows, Dr. Katja Biedenkopf was offered the position of Assistant Professor at the University of Amsterdam.

Last but not least, the KFG managed to attract a junior research group (*Nachwuchsgruppe*) funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). Dr. May-Britt Stumbaum leads the research group on "Asian Perceptions of Europe" investigating perceptions of the EU in China and India. We also support the application of Dr. Heike Klüwer for a Schumpeter junior research group funded by the Volkswagen Foundation (VW) on "Die Agendasetzungsmacht der Europäischen Kommission: Der Ursprung europäischer Gesetzgebung", which will also explore the extent to which the European Commission acts as an agent of diffusion of global ideas into the EU.

Teaching

While Freie Universität Berlin has granted us a 50 percent reduction, we consider teaching as an integral part of the KFG activities. Next to giving our junior researchers the opportunity to gain some teaching experience, we have used undergraduate and graduate classes as means to disseminate our research findings, get students interested in diffusion research, and increase the visibility of the KFG in the university (see Annex 10.1). The lecture series "The Transformative Power of Europe" (summer 2010) gave the two directors of the KFG, the post-doctoral fellows, and the senior fellows the opportunity to present their research conducted at the KFG to a broad audience of students, both at Freie Universität Berlin and the other universities in the Berlin-Brandenburg area, from the various disciplines participating in the KFG (political science, history, sociology, communication science, and law). A particular highlight was the two-term research seminar on "Comparative Regionalism", which Tanja Börzel co-taught with Anja Jetschke, post-doctoral fellow at the KFG, in 2009/2010. The research papers the students wrote resulted in an edited volume published by Ashgate in its comparative regionalism series (Börzel et al. 2012).

Dissemination Activities

International Visibility of the KFG

The KFG quickly achieved high international visibility. Our website has been receiving a growing number of hits, starting with 396,000 in 2009 when it was launched, rising to 782,000 in 2010, and reaching 873,000 as to January-October 2011. The website provides access to our Working Paper Series. So far, our Working Papers have been downloaded more than 6,000 times. Users can also access podcasts of lectures and other KFG activities. Next to our website, we use our biannual KFG Newsletter to inform about our activities. Each issue of the newsletter is sent to over 700 recipients worldwide and also helps to advertise our fellow program and international conferences and workshops (see Annex 11). Half of our post-doctoral fellows are foreigners. We are particularly proud of having been able to attract German researchers, who completed their PhDs in the US, the UK, or at the European University Institute in Italy, and who have used the KFG as a stepping stone for pursuing their academic career in Germany.

To further promote the international visibility of the KFG, its researchers and its research agenda-setting, we organized several panels with our fellows at international conferences, including the Euro-

pean Union Studies Association, the Council of European Studies, the American Political Science Association, the International Studies Association, and the Deutsche Vereinigung für Politikwissenschaft (see Annex 6). We have also sponsored individual conference participations of our fellows if they presented a paper related to their research at the KFG (see Annex 7). Finally, Tanja Börzel and Thomas Risse gave a series of presentations on the KFG around the globe, diffusing its research agenda, particularly in the field of comparative regionalism (see Annex 8). The contacts we have been able to establish with researchers in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East will be of major importance for the next phase, which we will dedicate to comparative regionalism.

Knowledge Exchange

Next to disseminating our research to the international scholarly community, we have sought to transfer our findings into the world of policy-makers (see Annex 10.2). The German Institute for International-al and Security Affairs (SWP), the German Council of Foreign Relations (DGAP), and the Institute for European Politics (IEP), three major think tanks in Berlin, have been particularly helpful in organizing a knowledge exchange with practitioners in EU and German politics. During book presentations in Brussels and Berlin, Thomas Risse had his book on the "Community of Europeans" (Risse 2010) discussed by policy-makers. Tanja Börzel edited a book together with Katrin Böttger, deputy director of the IEP, on the Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy of the EU, in which post-doctoral fellows and PhD students of the KFG were asked to tease out the policy implications of their research (Börzel and Böttger 2012). They received a training organized by the IEP on how to write a policy paper. At a workshop, we invited practitioners from the European Commission, the European Parliament, the German Foreign Service, and the DGAP to discuss their papers from a policy perspective. The book will be launched at the EU Representation in Berlin in spring 2012. Finally, we have been invited to bring our expertise on KFG related topics into discussion with German policy-makers, including a meeting with the Federal President, Christian Wulff, on Turkey's role in Europe, and the participation in a working group of the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, on the "Future of Germany". Last not least and because of the Euro crisis, Tanja Börzel has given more than 100 interviews for television, radio broadcasts, and newspapers.

2.2 Verzeichnis projektspezifischer Publikationen

In the following, we only list the major (refereed) publications by the KFG Co-Directors and selected publications by the KFG Fellows. A complete list of all KFG publications can be found in the appendix.

Publications by KFG Co-Directors

Monographs

Risse, Thomas (2010) *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*, Itahaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Edited Volumes

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas, eds. (2012a) *From Europeanization to Diffusion. Special Issue of West European Politics, 35, 1*.

Börzel, Tanja A., Goltermann, Lukas, Lohaus, Mathis, and Striebinger, Kai, eds. (2012) *Roads to Regionalism. Genesis, Design, and Effects of Regional Organizations*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Börzel, Tanja A., ed. (2010) *Civil Society on the Rise? EU Enlargement and Societal Mobilization in Central and Eastern Europe. Special Issue of Acta Politica*.

Börzel, Tanja A., ed. (2009) *Coping with Accession to the European Union. New Modes of Environmental Governance*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Refereed Articles and Book Chapters

Börzel, Tanja A. (2012a) 'Comparative Regionalism: European Integration and Beyond', in W Carlsnaes, T Risse and BA Simmons (eds), 2012a: *Handbook of International Relations,* London: Sage.

Börzel, Tanja A. (2010b) 'European Governance - Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48, 2: 191-219.

Börzel, Tanja A., Hofmann, Tobias, and Panke, Diana (2012) 'Caving in or Sitting it Out? Longitudinal Patterns of Non-Compliance in the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy* 19, 4.

Börzel, Tanja A., Hofmann, Tobias, Panke, Diana, and Sprungk, Carina (2010) 'Obstinate and Inefficient. Why Member States Do Not Comply With European Law', *Comparative Political Studies* 43, 11: 1363-1390.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Pamuk, Yasemin (2012) 'Pathologies of Europeanization. Fighting Corruption in the Southern Caucasus', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 79-97.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2012b) 'From Europeanization to Diffusion: Introduction', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 1-19.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2012c) 'When Europeanization Meets Diffusion. Exploring New Territory', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 192-207.

Major Publications by KFG Fellows

Monographs

Bennett, Lance, and Segerberg, Alexandra (2013) *Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics,* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hooghe, Liesbet, Bauer, Michael, Dehousse, Renaud, Kassim, Hussein, Peterson, John, and Thompson, Andrew (forthcoming) *The European Commission in Question,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaiser, Wolfram, Schot, Johan, and Jajesniak-Quast, Dagmara (2013) *Governing Europe. International Organizations, Experts and Networks,* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Levi-Faur, David (forthcoming) *Regulating Capitalism: Governance and the Global Spread of Regulatory Agencies,* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mulcahy, Suzanne (2011) *Europe's Migrant Policies: Illusions of Integration,* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pfetsch, Barbara (2012) *Political Communication Cultures in Western Europe*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schmidt, Vivien (2012) *Discursive Institutionalism,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edited Volumes

Arolda, Elbasani, ed. (2011) *EU Enlargement and Europeanization in the Western Balkan*, London, New York: Routledge.

Lorenz, Ulrike, and Rempe, Martin, eds. (2012) *Mapping Agency. Comparing Regionalisms in Sub-Saharan Africa,* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Refereed Articles and Book Chapters

Adam, Silke, and Maier, Michaela (2012) 'National Parties as politicizers of EU Integration? Party Campaign Communication in the Up-Run to the 2009 European Parliament Election', *European Union Politics* 12(3).

Diez Medrano, Juan, and Braun, Michael (2011) 'Uninformed Citizens and Support for Free Trade', *Review of International Political Enconomy*.

Dörr, Nicole (forthcoming) 'Multilingual Democracy in The European Social Forum. A Bottom Up Perspective to Civic Participation at the European Level', *European Political Science Review*.

Eckert, Sandra (2010) 'Between Commitment and Control: Varieties of Delegation in the European Postal Sector', *Journal of European Public Policy* 17, 8: 1231-1252.

Gerhards, Jürgen, and Hans, Silke (2011) 'Why not Turkey? Attitudes towards Turkish membership in the EU among citizens in 27 European countries', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49, 4: 741-766.

Heidbreder, Eva (2011) 'Structuring the European Administrative Space: Policy Instruments of Multi-level Administration', *Journal of European Public Policy* 18, 5: 707-727.

Hooghe, Liesbet (forthcoming) 'Images of Europe: How Commission Officials Conceive their Institution's Role in the EU', *Journal of Common Market Studies*.

Howorth, Jolyon (2010) 'The EU as a Global Actor: Grand Strategy for a Global Grand Bargain?', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48, 3: 455-474.

Langbein, Julia, and Wolczuk, Kataryna (forthcoming) 'Convergence without Membership? EU's Impact in the Eastern Neighbourhood: Evidence from Ukraine', *Journal of European Public Policy*.

Levi-Faur, David, Jordana, Jacint, and Fernandez, Xavier (2011) 'The Global Diffusion of Regulatory Agencies & the Restructuring of the State', *Comparative Political Studies* 44, 10: 1343-1369.

Marks, Gary (2012) 'Europe and its Empires: From Rome to the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50, 1: 1-20.

3.   Ziele und Arbeitsprogramm

3.1   Ziele

Research Questions

As discussed in the *Arbeitsbericht* (2.1) above, the first phase of the Kolleg-Forschergruppe was mainly devoted to studying the transnational diffusion and transfer of policies, institutions, collective identities, and public spheres within Europe and the EU, in the candidate countries, and in the European neighborhood. We have also started to examine how and to what extent European policies and institutions have spread to other regions of the world, particularly to Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. It is this aspect of the KFG's overall research program on which we will focus during the second phase. Considering the limited progress in the global harmonization of norms and rules, regions have become a central venue for creating common cross-border rules to facilitate economic and social exchange, dealing with negative externalities of trade liberalization, peacefully settling international conflicts or locking-in democratic reforms. While the KFG continues to focus on the "transformative power of Europe", it is necessary to de-center the EU in this context, since it is not the only game in town with regard to the spread of regionalism across the globe (Katzenstein 2005). Moreover, we will study the EU as *recipient* of global diffusion processes, a question which we have not tackled so far in a systematic way. The KFG's overall research program and its general research questions as outlined above (see 2.1) will be geared toward transfer and diffusion processes between the EU, on the one hand, and other regions of the world, on the other.

The second phase of the KFG is therefore dedicated to answering two inter-related sets of research questions:

1. *Do European and EU policies and institutions diffuse to other regions of the world? How and under what conditions are EU policies and institutions adapted or translated in other regional contexts, under what conditions do they meet rejection and resistance? What are the effects of these diffusion processes with regard to formal and informal regional institutions, behavioral practices, collective identities, and transnational public spheres in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia? How and under what circumstances do other regional cooperation and integration experiences compete with the EU script? What are the effects when the EU is not the only game in town?*

2. *How and under what circumstances do other regional cooperation and integration experiences travel back to Europe and the EU? How and why have they been adapted or translated into European institutional models? What are the reflexive consequences of these diffusion and transfer processes for Europe and the EU?*

Answering these sets of questions will allow us to make three interrelated contributions to the study of transnational diffusion processes, to the emerging field of comparative regionalism, and to knowledge exchange with the policy world. First, our theoretical contribution to diffusion research is dedicated to examining the role of agents of diffusion (as senders, transmitters, and receivers) and the causal mechanisms by which policies and institutions spread from one part of the world to another including processes of adaptation, translation, and resistance. Second, we add to the emerging field of compar-

ative regionalism[15] by focusing on the inter-relatedness, entanglements, and institutional exchange processes between various regions of the world as well as their continuing political, socio-economic, and cultural differences. Finally, our work is policy relevant, since it allows us to address the scope conditions and mechanisms of, e.g., EU efforts at institutional transfers to Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

Our research so far poses some key challenges to the literature and has been reported above. First, while there are competing models of, e.g., regional free trade areas (such as the North American Free Trade Area [NAFTA]), the EU has nevertheless developed into the "gold standard" for regionalisms around the world. We will explore how the current Euro crisis affects this perception of the EU and its "soft" power of attraction (Nye 2004). Europe has deployed transformative power beyond its borders even in regions that are far away. Thus, our findings challenge those who treat regions as political and cultural containers proclaiming a "world of (different) regions" and almost insurmountable cultural differences with little or no interpenetration (Katzenstein 2005; Acharya 2009). Rather than emphasizing the uniqueness of regions and their isolation from each other, we side with the literatures on diffusion, on "legal transplants" (Watson 1974; Berkovitz et al. 2003), and on "transnational history" (Iriye and Saunier 2009; Budde et al. 2006; Werner and Zimmermann 2002).

Mercado Común del Sur (Mercosur), SADC, and – most counter-intuitively given the discussions about the "Asian way" – ASEAN have all incorporated significant parts of EU institutions to foster regional cooperation and integration. In the case of the ECJ as a model for supranational courts and dispute settlement mechanisms, Alter finds that there are now eleven International (including regional) Courts that embody at least two of the three constitutive features of the ECJ which go beyond compulsory jurisdiction (as in the Dispute Settlement System of the World Trade Organization [WTO]; Alter 2012).

Second, however, political, economic, and cultural differences matter, of course. Latin America, Africa, and Asia do not become "European" in the process of diffusion. Nor do we see convergence towards the EU as a model of regional integration. Rather, regional organizations around the globe selectively adopt and adapt some EU policies and institutions while resisting others. None of the above mentioned courts are mere copies of the ECJ – and if they are (such as the Andean Court of Justice; see Alter and Helfer 2010), their judicial practice does not simply follow the ECJ as a promoter of integration (Alter 2012; Saldías 2007). In Mercosur, SADC, and ASEAN, the adoption of EU institutions and policies is even patchier. These regional organizations have not moved much beyond intergovernmentalism, since their members have been reluctant to give up their "Westphalian" sovereignty in favor of supranational institutions or majority voting in the Ministerial Councils (Lenz 2012; Jetschke and Murray 2012).

Regions may be subject to common or uniform factors emanating at the global or transnational level, which are then mediated through regional specificities. Social science research on regionalism emphasizes the importance of functional pressures, power asymmetries, regime type, or identity-building within the region (for an overview see Börzel 2012a). Less attention has been paid to processes of differential adaptation, "localization" (Acharya 2009), cultural translation (Bachmann-Medick 2006), and of resistance, which explain to a large degree the selective diffusion of European models. Scholarship on these processes emphasizes the role of agents in diffusion processes. They conceive of diffusion as active processes of selective adaptation whereby the targets are not passive recipients, but active shapers of institutional change.

Third, while the EU might be the "gold standard" of regional integration, we do not overlook that the EU is an outlier compared to other regional organizations in terms of how it combines policy scope with supranational depth. However, this does not preclude cross-regional comparison. Once we conceptualize the EU as a particular form of multi-level governance, we can compare it to other multilevel polities including federal states (Scharpf 1988; Sbragia 1993; Börzel and Hösli 2003).

In this context, we need to be aware of alternative (European) ideas of regional integration which may inspire and inform the institutional design of regional organizations. Originally, the Caribbean Free Trade Association (CARIFTA) and ASEAN had copied the institutional design of the European Free Trade Area (EFTA) rather than the European Communities (Griffin and Jetschke 2011). More important, institutional models and policies emanating from Europe and the EU compete with institutional solutions and policy ideas from other parts of the world, e.g. NAFTA and the US, but also increasingly from China, India, Brazil, or other regional organizations. In addition, we must distinguish between the

---

[15] Acharya and Johnston 2007; Choi and Caporaso 2002; Farrel et al. 2005; Langenhove 2011; Sbragia 2008; Warleigh-Lack 2006.

diffusion of global ideas and institutional models, on the one hand, and more specific European concepts, on the other. Finally, we need to be careful not to prejudge diffusion processes as the main causes of domestic institutional change.

The literature can at best partially account for the differential diffusion of European ideas about regional integration. Much of the social science research focuses on similarities in institutional and policy outcomes as an indicator for diffusion (Simmons et al. 2008; Holzinger et al. 2007; Gilardi 2012). Convergence, however, should be regarded as a potential outcome of diffusion processes rather than an indicator (Plümper and Schneider 2009). Moreover, the literature tends to neglect the role of actors and mechanisms that could explain variation in outcomes. History, cultural studies, and research on post-colonialism draw attention to local appropriations as an important source of divergence. To the extent that such approaches have informed comparative regionalism, they have a tendency to essentialize regional and cultural differences (Katzenstein 2005; Acharya 2009).

Theoretical Departures

Comparative regionalism as an approach turns differences and similarities between regions into a research question rather than making them the starting assumption of a research agenda. Comparative regionalism not only allows us to explore the extent to which European policies and institutions have diffused to other regions of the world. It also provides a framework to evaluate how far our concepts and theories travel beyond Europe.

It is still an open question whether we need new, less Eurocentric approaches to study regionalism in other parts of the world as it is claimed by the literature on new regionalism.[16] The social science literature on diffusion is only partially helpful to understand and explain processes and mechanisms of transfer, adaptation, and resistance. We, therefore, look to other disciplines and their conceptual approaches to draw theoretical inspiration for our research. In particular, we focus on *transnational* and *transfer studies* in law and history as well as *translation studies* in the humanities.

First, *transfer studies* in history focus on historical, spatial, and cultural "entanglements" across borders (see Conrad and Randeria 2002; Werner and Zimmermann 2002). Early transfer history, which developed out of comparative history, already argued that ideas do not just spread across time and space, but meet specific historical and social contexts in which they are adapted and transformed to fit with local traditions and existing institutional settings (cf. Paulmann 2004; Middell 2000). In a similar vein, legal scholars have stressed that the diffusion of legal norms often entails struggles between domestic receivers and foreign senders regarding the question whose norms count and how (Abel 1982; Schauer 2000). Transplants often work quite differently in the receiving end than in the country of origin (Berkovitz et al. 2003; Middell 2000). However, these literatures still conceived of transfer as movement from one largely self-contained (national) setting to another. In contrast, more recently, transnational and transfer history has emphasized the connected character of different social and political spaces as mutually constitutive. Focusing on transnational phenomena, this research adopts the spatial concepts of boundaries and borderlands pointing at the political, social, and cultural relevance of transcultural spaces situated between or above the territorial confines of the nation-state (see e.g. Pries 2008; Osterhammel 2004).

Empirical research in the field of Modern and Contemporary History has focused on transfers within Europe (e.g. Kaiser 2005b), in colonial and global settings (e.g. Conrad 2010) and from Europe to the United States (e.g. Rodgers 1998) and back to Europe (e.g. Berghahn 2010). These studies have paid particular attention to the role of individuals or social groups and networks as "cultural brokers" in transfer processes who "translate" across different institutional, social, and cultural spaces. More recently, contemporary historians have also conceptualized European integration since 1945 as the transnational history of networks, transfers, and Europeanization processes (Kaiser 2007; Kaiser et al. 2010; Hirschhausen and Patel 2009; Patel 2009). This approach constitutes a crucial direct link to social science research on the EU's role in diffusion processes.

Closely related to historical research on the "negotiated" character of transfers, proponents of *translation studies* examine these spaces as "translational spaces" where relationships, situations, identities, and interactions are shaped through processes of cultural translation.[17] As a consequence, the methodological debate about transfer and translation emphasizes reflexivity. In the social sciences, this

---

[16] Farrell et al. 2005; Hettne et al. 1999; Söderbaum and Shaw 2003; Telò 2001.

[17] Bachmann-Medick 2006, 2009; Renn 2006; Venuti 2008.

argument resonates with the research on "norm localization" that focuses on how local agents reconstruct foreign norms to make them fit with the "cognitive priors" and identities of local actors (Acharya 2004, 2005, 2009).

The translation paradigm is utilized in a range of disciplines and is more and more disassociated from a linguistic and textual concept (Bachmann-Medick 2009; Buden and Nowotny 2009). History, sociology, and cultural studies use translation not only as an analytical concept but consider translation as a transnational cultural practice (for a sociology of translation see Renn 2006). Translation serves as a category for the analysis of meaning transfers which change and transform the understandings of concepts. The starting point of the translation concept is not the assumption of separate, unconnected contexts but their interpenetration and entanglement (Fuchs 2009). For example, translating the "supremacy of European law" from the EU to Latin America (e.g. in the Andean Community) connects the European with a Latin American context. At the same time, however, the meaning of "supremacy" changes in different political and cultural settings (Saldías 2007). Meanings are usually shared only partially across contexts, which points at the rejection and resistance perspective that translation studies open for the analysis of global interaction processes.

Resistance implies that translation as a social practice entails ruptures and is influenced by power asymmetries and disparities. Resistance marks the political awareness that cultural translation is not always a harmonizing or bridge-building affair (Acharya 2004). Actors involved in processes of cultural translation are not interacting in an empty space. The concept of resistance opens our analytical framework to include the power dimension structuring translation processes. Power asymmetries not only stem from political, economic, or coercive power attributed to the actors involved but also from the heterogeneous discourses that frequently characterize the communication between Western actors and local representatives. Resistance and rejection very often result from "failures of communication" and "failures of translation".

In sum, the literatures on transfer and translation conceptualize histories and institutions as intrinsically entangled, on the one hand, and highlight processes of adaptation, adjustment, and resistance, on the other. Yet, they often do not yield generalizable propositions on differential outcomes of diffusion processes, their causal mechanisms and scope conditions. Our theoretical aim for the second phase of the KFG is to integrate the scholarships on transnational and transfer history and cultural translation with the social science literature on diffusion in order to arrive at a more fine-tuned picture of the processes and outcomes of regional cooperation and integration.

Dimensions of Comparisons

Methodologically speaking, the KFG complements its focus on transfer and translation processes with a comparative approach (Collier 1993; Bowen and Petersen 1999; Jahn 2008). We engage in comparisons both across time and across space.

The first phase of the KFG mostly explored the domestic adaptation of and resistance to EU policies and institutions in member states, accession candidates, and the European neighborhood. The second phase of the KFG will focus on the regional level. To use social science jargon, the "dependent variables" of our endeavor are regional policies and formal institutions, transnationally evolving informal meaning structures including collective identities, as well as behavioral practices.

In this context, we distinguish between regional cooperation and regional integration as the opposite ends of a continuum (see Börzel 2012a for the following). The former entails the joint exercise of state-based political authority in intergovernmental institutions to solve collective action problems. The latter involves the setting-up of supranational institutions to which political authority is delegated to make collectively binding decisions. Regional cooperation and integration then mark a continuum with regard to the degree to which political authority is transferred to regional institutions (level or depth of integration). A second dimension concerns the issues to be dealt with at the regional level (scope or breadth of integration). This distinction between cooperation and integration focuses on the political-institutional dimension of regionalism. It allows us to capture the distinctiveness of the EU's policies and institutions as compared to other European models of regionalism, which may or may not diffuse to other regions.

We will compare the processes of transfer, adaptation, and resistance of regional integration and cooperation models from Europe to other regions of the world and back to Europe along the following dimensions:

Contesting Models and Alternative Scripts: What are the major policies and institutions of regional cooperation and integration in the transnational global arena? Is the EU perceived as the only European model? And if so, since when has it been seen in this way? What are the major counter-scripts to the EU model in Europe and beyond, and where do they come from (North America, China, India, Brazil)? How and why do institutions and policies emanating from the EU resonate with contesting scripts stemming from different institutional and cultural settings, and why are others rejected?

Mechanisms: What are the prevailing mechanisms of diffusion and transfer (see *figure 1* above) when European models of regional integration travel to other regions of the world? And how do they interact with the more direct mechanisms of diffusion?

Actors: Who are the agents of diffusion? Which actors function as senders, transmitters, and recipients? Who are the "cultural brokers" serving as agents of translation from one cultural context into another? What kind of transnational networks, e.g. epistemic communities (Haas 1992) or advocacy coalitions (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1999; Keck and Sikkink 1998), emerge in these translation and transfer processes?

Outcomes: What are the outcomes of diffusion and transfer processes across regions with regard to formal institutions and policies, informal meaning systems and collective identities, as well as behavioral practices? What explains the variation between these effects (see below)? Which patterns of convergence, enduring divergence, and resistance emerge when EU and other models travel to other regions of the world? How are these concepts amalgamated with regional traditions, which conflicts emerge, and what is "lost in translation"?

Scope Conditions and Explanatory Factors: What are the scope conditions accounting for the variation in outcomes? During the first phase of the KFG, we have identified the following explanatory factors (see 2.1): domestic incentives; regime type of countries; degrees of (limited) statehood; and economic and other power (a)symmetries. To what extent are these factors suitable to accounting for the variation in outcomes of cooperation and integration at the regional levels? What about cultural differences, what can they actually explain?

While Europe will remain our focus, we will carefully check for alternative sources of diffusion, particularly with regard to other external actors, including international and regional organizations and third countries. Likewise, we will control for domestic sources of regional institutional change, such as regime change and economic development.

3.2   Arbeitsprogramm

Research Areas

During the first phase of the KFG, we instituted research areas to deal with the KFG's research program in a sequential manner. For the second phase, we plan to pursue two research areas simultaneously, namely "Europe and the EU as Recipients of Diffusion" (Research Area 1) and "The EU and Regional Institutions in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia" (Research Area 2). The two Research Areas will work in parallel for the following reasons. First, institutional diffusion processes, collective identities and public spheres, as well as the consequences for Europe and the EU are intimately connected and cannot be dealt with separately. Therefore, we need to fully exploit potential synergies in the two Research Areas. Most senior fellows have cross-research area competences we want to utilize to achieve these synergies. In particular, both Research Areas will profit from a historical perspective. Second, four years are a limited period of time. The study program of the Research Areas in the KFG's second phase requires cutting edge research even more so than the work conducted during the first phase.

In order to maximize the synergies between the two Research Areas, we will adopt the common analytical framework for comparing institutional change across regions developed above. Work in each Research Area will be carried out by a research group composed of the KFG co-directors, two to four senior scholars including "regular fellows" (see below), as well as about two junior post-doctoral fellows and up to two PhD students. These groups will meet regularly, discuss papers, and organize workshops resulting in joint publications.

Research Area 1: Europe and the EU as Recipients of Diffusion

This Research Area deals with a major desideratum of the first phase: First, to what extent, how, and under what conditions has the present-day EU learned from other international (e.g. North Atlantic

Treaty Organization [NATO], International Monetary Fund [IMF]) or national (e.g. United States) settings or, more recently, from other regional integration forms within and outside of Europe with regard to institutional solutions? Second, what are the reflexive consequences for Europe and the EU emanating from the transfer, adaptation, and resistance processes with regard to regional cooperation and integration? To what extent does the gap between the ideas (e.g. regional integration) and the self-image (e.g. as a civilian power) the EU seeks to externally promote, on the one hand, and the resistance of other regions against these ideas and their perception of the EU member states as former colonial powers, on the other, affect the EU's self-understanding, its institutions, and its policies?

Research Area 1 inevitably requires a historical perspective. We need to look back in time and analyze how regional integration in Europe has been influenced by institutional models from other regions of the world or third countries. In its early stages, for example, specific dimensions of European integration, such as the formal institutions of the European Coal and Steel Community and its competition policy, were strongly influenced by transatlantic networks and borrowed from US experiences (e.g. Leucht 2008). Similarly, policy innovations, including environmental protection or research policy, were initiated and diffused to the EU by International Organizations like the United Nations (UN) and the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).To this end, we will particularly focus on three dimensions.

The first of these dimensions concerns long-term continuities before and after World War II. For a long time, the historiography of European integration itself has followed a very "presentist" approach implicitly treating 1945 as Western Europe's "zero hour" (cf. Kaiser 2010; Patel 2011). However, many institutional designs and behavioral norms in regional integration pre-date World War II. The design of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) as well as core tenets of agricultural integration in the EEC were shaped by personal and collective experiences with the secretariats of the League of Nations, of the UN Economic Commission for Europe and the Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC) (Clavin and Patel 2010; Gillingham 1991). Moreover, many features of early Western European integration were influenced by transfers of institutional designs and policy ideas from the United States (Patel 2013). Finally, it would be important to research and understand the consequences of highly violent forms of regional integration (esp. the Nazi Empire) for post-war developments, which helps to explain why some individuals, social groups, or states were reluctant to become part of post-war attempts at European integration (Mazower 2008; Spiering and Wintle 2011).

Alongside exploring the longue durée of transfers into Western European regional integration, the second dimension will focus on the role of diverse (regional) International Organizations in co-shaping European integration. Such a broader focus on regional integration in Europe after 1945 will assist the KFG in de-centering the EU and controlling for the influence of other actors in diffusion or transfer processes. Despite the fact that it became the most economically and politically integrated form of regional organizations, the present-day EU has selectively learned from other regional organizations including EFTA, the Council of Europe, or the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). However, due to the EU-centric character of most literature on the history of European integration, research on such institutional transfer and adaptation processes within and into Europe is so far limited but important for conceptualising and narrating the origins of the present-day EU as well as for analyzing how the EU may have operated as a space for the import and reformulation of policy ideas and institutional solutions and their subsequent transfer to other regions in the world (Patel and Schot 2011).

The third dimension concerns the reflexive consequences for Europe and the EU of the various contemporary efforts at regional cooperation and integration in Latin America, the Arab world, Africa, and Asia. Similar to post-war attempts to diffuse an US "model", or models, to Western Europe, contemporary efforts to export European models and institutional solutions to other parts of the world often meet resistance and are likely to backfire. Take the debate about the "civilian" or "normative" power Europe with regard to the EU's foreign and security policy (Manners 2002; Tews et al. 2003; Whitman 1998). The EU is often blamed for failing to live up to its own values and standards and to betray human rights and democracy in its dealings with the rest of the world (Youngs 2001). Even when the EU tries to export its liberal values, it often meets resistance and is accused of (neo-) colonialism or (neo-) imperialism (Elgström 2008). What are the reflexive consequences of these failures to actively diffuse European ideas and institutions? Does the EU not only adjust its policies, but also its self-understandings and foreign policy identity? Does it learn from its failures?

Moreover, debates about the "rise of China" and the emerging economies in a G20 world and the increasing importance of Trans-Pacific and South-South relations imply that the "West" in general and Europe in particular are increasingly faced with contestation challenging the notion that Europe and

the US constitute the central models of how to organize political, economic, and social order. How do Europe and the EU adjust to these changes in the global order which will inevitably render the world more pluralistic? What are the consequences of these processes for the EU's perception and self-perception as a global power and model of regional integration? The current financial crisis presents a unique opportunity in this regard. Does the EU learn anything from the previous sovereign debt crises in Latin America and in Asia and if so, why does learning and lesson-drawing vary across issue areas and member states? Why is a global institution like the IMF called in to sustain European solutions for liquidity and solvency mechanisms of member countries, while ASEAN in Asia and, to a lesser extent, the Latin American Reserve Fund (FLAR) or the staggering Bank of the South (Banco del Sur) aim at substituting or at least complementing the IMF's role for the member countries due to high criticism of its policies in the past? To what extent has the Chiang Mai Initiative informed the new EU institutions dealing with the crisis such as the European Financial Stability Facility (EFSF) and the European Stability Mechanism (ESM)?[18]

We have invited two eminent historians of European integration as "regular senior fellows" to work with us in this Research Area, Wolfram Kaiser (University of Portsmouth) and Kiran Klaus Patel (Maastricht University). Wolfram Kaiser has extensively worked on global forums of communication such as the world exhibitions, and their role in the political transfer of policy ideas and solutions (Kaiser and Dittrich 2009; Kaiser 2005a) and on transnational networks and transfer processes in European integration broadly conceived (Kaiser et al. 2012; Kaiser et al. 2010; Kaiser and Meyer 2010; Kaiser et al. 2009). Kiran Klaus Patel is an expert on EU and global history who has worked on comparative and transnational approaches to European integration history (Patel and Schot 2011; Patel 2009), the issue of longer continuities in European integration (Patel 2011; Bluche et al. 2009) as well as the history of the North Atlantic region (Patel 2005, 2013). As usual, we will invite further senior fellows and junior postdocs to contribute to the work of this Research Area.

Research Area 2: The EU and Regional Institutions in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia

This Research Area represents the extension of Research Area 3 on comparative regionalism of the KFG's first phase. We will continue to investigate the processes, mechanisms, and behavioral outcomes of institutional transfer between Europe and the EU, on the one hand, and regional cooperation and integration in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, on the other hand. During the first phase, we have concentrated primarily on the extent to which regional organizations have adopted institutional solutions emanating from the EU, particularly with regard to the Andean Community and Mercosur in Latin America, SADC in Africa, and ASEAN in Southeast Asia (see 2.1; e.g. Saldías 2007; Lenz 2012; Jetschke and Murray 2012; on regional courts adopting the model of the ECJ see Alter 2012). We will continue this work, particularly with regard to whether the current financial and economic crisis affects the EU's image as a role model for regional cooperation and integration.

However, as discussed above, we will dig deeper during the second phase of the KFG. First, we aim at more systematic intra- and cross-regional comparisons with regard to contesting models, mechanisms, scope conditions, agents, and outcomes. Second, we will not only look at the (lack of) adoption of EU institutional and policy models, but also at informal understandings and behavioral practices, since we hypothesize that processes of transfer, adaptation, and resistance will not only lead to variation in institutional design, but also to differences with regard to meanings and interpretations as well as to behavioral practices. Sociological institutionalism tells us that we should expect the more "decoupling" between formal institutions on the one hand, and informal understandings and behavioral practices, on the other, the more institutions are simply transferred from one political and cultural context to another (mimicry, see *figure 1* above; DiMaggio and Powell 1991). Finally, we will systematically control for alternative sources of diffusion to the EU, both within and beyond Europe. To what extent do the EFTA, the Council of Europe, NAFTA, or the UN system provide alternative models for regional cooperation and integration?

Most of the existing research on the diffusion of regional institutions uses qualitative methods. In order to facilitate cross-regional comparisons, we seek to tap into macro-quantitative work with large datasets on the institutional design of regional as well as global organizations. To do so, we plan to appoint Liesbet Hooghe, Gary Marks (both University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), and Detlef Jahn (University of Greifswald) as "regular senior fellows" (see below) to

---

[18] The Chiang Mai Initiative is a multilateral currency swap arrangement among the ten members of ASEAN, the People's Republic of China (including Hong Kong), Japan, and South Korea. It draws from a foreign exchange reserves pool worth US$120 billion and was launched on 24 March 2010.

spend three to six months per year at the KFG. Hooghe and Marks have been compiling a unique dataset on the institutional design of regional and global organizations (with an European Research Council Advanced Grant). Complementing their data with information from other macro-quantitative studies (see below), we will systematically map similarities and differences across regional organizations and test for different potential drivers of diffusion processes. Detlef Jahn, who is a leading political scientist working on transnational diffusion, will help us with conceptual, theoretical, and methodological issues, particularly with regard to controlling for alternative sources of diffusion and regional institutional change. He will use the results and methodology from his project "Effects and Dynamics of Globalization: Modeling Diffusion Processes in Highly Industrial Societies" which employs time-series-cross-section analysis in order to give a historical and cross-sectional account of various diffusion processes (Jahn 2009). These results will be used to estimate the effects of the EU in Latin America, Asia, and Africa in comparison to other explanatory variables, particularly diffusion effects of the US and regional powers (Jahn 2006).

While the research of Hooghe, Marks, and Jahn gives us a bird's eye perspective on diffusion, we will draw on the rich regional expertise of the Center of Area Studies (CAS) at Freie Universität Berlin in order to get a deeper insight into the concrete processes and effects of diffusion, transfer, and resistance. The CAS pools the competence that exists in the humanities and social sciences. It covers all major regions, including North America, Latin America, Eastern Europe, East Asia, the Middle East, and Africa (http://www.fu-berlin.de/sites/cas/). Verena Blechinger-Talcott (Political Science and East Asian Studies), Marianne Braig (Political Science and Latin American Studies), and Barbara Fritz (Economics and Latin America Studies) will contribute to Research Area 2 and its emphasis on comparative area studies helping us from their disciplinary perspective to contextualize the regional institutional changes we observe. Verena Blechinger-Talcott has worked on discourses and mechanisms of regional integration in East Asia with a particular focus on domestic actors, especially from the private sector. Her research sheds light on the distinctive processes generating East Asia's own understanding of institutions which is partly congruent, but also partly divergent from the understanding of regional institutions in Europe (Blechinger-Talcott 2000, 2001; Blechinger-Talcott et al. 2006). Marianne Braig has long-standing experience of qualitative research in Latin America and brings her expertise about formal and informal institutions, political culture, and the changing regional and transregional relations and interdependencies, specially the growing importance of the Trans-Pacific for Latin America into the KFG (Braig et al. 2005; Braig et al. 2009). Barbara Fritz contributes her studies of diffusion, adoption and rejection of the concept of standard Optimum Currency Area theory and the analysis of regional monetary cooperation in emerging areas. While this specific theoretical body has been developed with strong reference to the European model of monetary cooperation and integration, regional monetary cooperation schemes especially in Asia and Latin America seem to respond much more to specific needs to cope with the problems of macroeconomic volatility in general, and specifically with liquidity problems in crisis periods (Fritz and Metzger 2006; Fritz and Mühlich 2010). Last not least and with regard to legal transplants, we draw on the expertise of Christian Calliess (European Law, Freie Universität Berlin).

This Research Area will also continue the work on collective identities and public spheres of the KFG's first phase (see 2.1), but will move away from the focus on Europe to other regions of the world. Regions are "imagined communities" (Anderson 1991), but the question is whether we can observe efforts at regional community-building in Latin America, the Arab world (on Pan-Arabism see Barnett 1998), Africa, and Asia comparable to what is happening in Europe. How do processes of region-building and institutional cooperation as well as integration affect the emergence of transnational identities and public spheres? Do we see similar developments as in the European case of dual identity formation (regional identities as secondary identities) and of the emergence of transnational public spheres with regard to issue salience, increasing similarities of frames of reference, and the growing presence of external speakers from the region in national public spheres (Risse 2010)? Alternatively, is the European experience unique in the sense that we cannot observe salient Latin American, African, Arab, or Asian identities or public spheres (for Asia see e.g. Hemmer and Katzenstein 2002)? Moreover, how do citizens and elites view efforts at regional cooperation and integration in the various parts of the world, and how are these attitudes related to other political views? In this context, we need to investigate whether the perception of the European experience has any impact on regionalism in other parts of the globe. There is little evidence that European integration as such exerts strong effects on identity formation, but we know very little about how processes of regional cooperation and integration in Latin America, the Arab world, Africa, and Asia affect transnational identities and the transnationalization of public spheres.

A major difficulty of studying regional identities beyond Europe concerns the problem that data on collective identities and transnational public spheres are hard to come by for Latin America, the Arab

world, Africa, and Asia, even though the Eurobarometer polling operation is now being replicated in other parts of the world (another example of cross-regional diffusion).[19] With regard to public spheres, a huge media content analysis across Asia has been carried out by a consortium directed by a group of scholars at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand (see Holland and Chaban 2005). Preliminary analyses of these data show, however, that they do not tackle issues of collective identities very systematically, let alone regional identities. A first task of this Research Area will, therefore, be to compile the available data on collective identities and public spheres across regions of the world – in cooperation with scholars from the universities in charge of compiling the datasets.

Dr. Marianne van de Steeg, a Marie Curie fellow from the University of Utrecht, will contribute regularly to this research area. So will Dr. May-Britt Stumbaum who heads the Junior Research Group on "Asian Perceptions of Europe" funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

As in Research Area 1, we will invite both senior fellows and junior post-doctoral fellows from the various regions of the world so as to engage in "research with rather than research about" non-European experiences. This is particularly important in the case of Africa where the regional expertise at Freie Universität Berlin is limited. We have already built up a network of scholars at leading universities around the world (see 5.2).

---

[19] See, e.g., http://www.latinobarometro.org/latino/latinobarometro.jsp for Latin America, http://www.arabbarometer.org/ for the Middle East, http://www.afrobarometer.org/ for Africa, and http://www.asianbarometer.org/newenglish/introduction/default.htm as well as https://www.asiabarometer.org/ for Asia.

Annex 1: Bibliography

Abel, Richard L. (1982) 'Law as Lag: Inertia as a Social Theory of Law ', *Michigan Law Review* 80, 4: 785-809.

Acharya, Amitav (2004) 'How Norms Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism', *International Organization* 58, 2: 239-275.

Acharya, Amitav (2005) 'Do Norms and Identity Matter? Community and Power in Southeast Asia's Regional Order', *The Pacific Review* 18, 1: 95-118.

Acharya, Amitav (2009) *Whose Ideas Matter? Agency and Power in Asian Regionalism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Acharya, Amitav, and Johnston, Alastair Ian, eds. (2007) *Crafting Cooperation. Regional International Institutions in Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ademmer, Esther (2011) 'You Make Us Do What We Want! The Usage of External Actors and Policy Conditionality in the European Neighbourhood', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 32.

Aldrich, Howard E. (1979) *Organizations and environments*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Alter, Karen J. (2012) 'The Global Spread of European Style International Courts', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 135-154.

Alter, Karen J., and Helfer, Laurence R. (2010) 'Nature or Nurture? Judicial Lawmaking in the European Court of Justice and the Andean Tribunal of Justice', *International Organization* 64, 4: 563-592.

Anderson, Benedict (1991) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris (2006) 'Meanings of Translation in Cultural Anthropology', in T Hermans (ed), 2006: *Translating Others,* Manchester: St. Jerome, 33-42.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris (2009) 'Introduction: the Translational Turn', *Translation Studies* 2, 1: 2-16.

Barnett, Michael N. (1998) *Dialogues in Arab Politics. Negotiations in Regional Order*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Berghahn, Volker (2010) 'The Debate on "Americanization" among Economic and Cultural Historians', *Cold War History* 10 1: 107-130.

Berkovitz, Daniel, Pistor, Katharina, and Richard, Jean-Francois (2003) 'The Transplant Effect', *American Journal of Comparative Law* 51, 1: 163-204.

Bicchi, Federica (2006) '"Our Size Fits All": Normative Power Europe and the Mediterranean', *Journal of European Public Policy* 13, 2: 286-303.

Blechinger-Talcott, Verena, ed. (2000) *Facing Asia – Japan's Role in the Political and Economic Dynamism of Regional Cooperation*, München: Iudicium.

Blechinger-Talcott, Verena (2001) 'Between Bilateralism and Regionalism: Business and the State in Japan's Relations with Asia', in B Edström (ed), 2001: *Interdependence in Asia Pacific,* Stockholm: Swedish Institute for International Affairs, 71-96.

Blechinger-Talcott, Verena, Frantz, Christiane, and Thompson, Mark, eds. (2006) *Politik in Japan. System, Reformprozesse und Außenpolitik im internationalen Vergleich [Governing Japan. Political System, Reform Processes and International Relations in International Comparison]*, Frankfurt a/M: Campus.

Bluche, Lorraine, Lipphardt, Veronika, and Patel, Kiran K., eds. (2009) *Der Europäer - ein Konstrukt. Wissensbestände, Diskurse, Praktiken*, Göttingen: Wallstein.

Börzel, Tanja A., ed. (2009) *Coping with Accession to the European Union. New Modes of Environmental Governance*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Börzel, Tanja A., ed. (2010a) *Civil Society on the Rise? EU Enlargement and Societal Mobilization in Central and Eastern Europe. Special Issue of Acta Politica*.

Börzel, Tanja A. (2010b) 'European Governance - Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48, 2: 191-219.

Börzel, Tanja A. (2011) 'When Europe Hits … Across its Borders. Europeanization and the Near Abroad', *Comparative European Politics* 9, 4: 394-413.

Börzel, Tanja A. (2012a) 'Comparative Regionalism: European Integration and Beyond', in W Carlsnaes, T Risse and BA Simmons (eds), 2012a: *Handbook of International Relations,* London: Sage,

Börzel, Tanja A. (2012b) 'Europeanization and Turkey. A Case Sui Generis?', in C Nas and Y Özer (eds), 2012b: *Turkey and the EU: Processes of Europeanization,* Aldershot: Ashgate,

Börzel, Tanja A. (2012c) 'Europeanization on the Borderlines. The Western Balkans as a Test Case for the Transformative Power of Europe', in A Elbasani (ed), 2012c: *European Integration and Transformation in the Western Balkans: Europeanization or Business as Usual?,* London: Routledge,

Börzel, Tanja A., and Böttger, Katrin, eds. (2012) *Neighbourhood and Membership Europeanization. A Comparison in Practice*, Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Fagan, Adam (in preparation) 'Environmental Governance in South East Europe and the Western Balkans: The Transformative Power of Europe?', *Environmental Politics.*

Börzel, Tanja A., Goltermann, Lukas, Lohaus, Mathis, and Striebinger, Kai, eds. (2012) *Roads to Regionalism. Genesis, Design, and Effects of Regional Organizations*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Börzel, Tanja A., Hofmann, Tobias, Panke, Diana, and Sprungk, Carina (2010) 'Obstinate and Inefficient. Why Member States Do Not Comply With European Law', *Comparative Political Studies* 43, 11: 1363-1390.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Hösli, Madeleine (2003) 'Brussels between Bern and Berlin. Comparative Federalism Meets the European Union', *Governance* 16, 2: 179-202.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Langbein, Julia, eds. (2012) *Convergence without Accession? Explaining Policy Change in the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood. Special Issue*, Europe-Asia Studies.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Pamuk, Yasemin (2012) 'Pathologies of Europeanization. Fighting Corruption in the Southern Caucasus', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 79-97.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2007) 'Europeanization: The Domestic Impact of EU Politics', in KE Jorgensen, MA Pollack and B Rosamond (eds), 2007: *Handbook of European Union Politics,* London: Sage, 483-504.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2009a) 'The Diffusion of (Inter-)Regionalism. The EU as a Model of Regional Integration', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 7.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2009b) 'The Transformative Power of Europe: The European Union and the Diffusion of Ideas', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 1.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas, eds. (2012a) *From Europeanization to Diffusion. Special Issue of West European Politics, 35, 1*.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2012b) 'From Europeanization to Diffusion: Introduction', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 1-19.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Risse, Thomas (2012c) 'When Europeanization Meets Diffusion. Exploring New Territory', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 192-207.

Börzel, Tanja A., and Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2006) 'The EU Dimension in European Politics', in P Heywood, E Jones, M Rhodes and U Sedelmeier (eds), 2006: *Development in European Politics,* Houndmills Palgrave/Macmillan, 54-70.

Börzel, Tanja A., and van Hüllen, Vera (2011) 'Good Governnce and Bad Neighbours? The Limits of Transformative Power Europe', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 35.

Bowen, John R., and Petersen, Roger, eds. (1999) *Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braig, Marianne, Ette, Ottmar, Ingenschay, Dieter, and Maihold, Günther, eds. (2005) *Grenzen der Macht – Macht der Grenzen. Lateinamerika im globalen Kontext*, Frankfurt a/M: Vervuert.

Braig, Marianne, Göbel, Barbara, and Ette, Ottmar, eds. (2009) *Asia-Americas*, Frankfurt a/M: Vervuert.

Bretherton, Charlotte, and Vogler (2006) *The European Union as a Global Actor*, London: Routledge.

Bruter, Michael (2005) *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*, Houndmills: Palgrave.

Budde, Gunilla, Conrad, Sebastian, and Janz, Olivier, eds. (2006) *Transnationale Geschichte. Themen, Tendenzen und Theorien*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht.

Buden, Boris, and Nowotny, Stefan (2009) 'Translation Studies Forum: Cultural Translation', *Translation Studies* 2, 2: 196-219.

Bulmer, Simon, and Burch, Martin (2005) 'The Europeanization of the UK Government: From Quiet Revolution to Explicit Step-change?', *Public Administration* 83, 4: 861-890.

Checkel, Jeffrey T., and Katzenstein, Peter J., eds. (2009) *European Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choi, Young Jong, and Caporaso, James A. (2002) 'Comparative Regional Integration', in W Carlsnaes, T Risse and BA Simmons (eds), 2002: *Handbook of International Relations,* London: Sage, 480-499.

Clavin, Patricia, and Patel, Kiran K. (2010) 'The Role of International Organizations in Europeanization: The Case of the League of Nations and the European Economic Community', in M Conway and KK Patel (eds), 2010: *Europeanization in the Twentieth Century: Historical Approaches,* New York: Palgrave, 110-131.

Collier, David (1993) 'The Comparative Method', in AW Finifter (ed), 1993: *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II,* Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, 105-119.

Conrad, Sebastian (2010) *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conrad, Sebastian, and Randeria, Shalini (2002) *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, Frankfurt a.M.: Campus.

Cowles, Maria Green, Caporaso, James A., and Risse, Thomas, eds. (2001) *Transforming Europe. Europeanization and Domestic Change*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Powell, Walter W. (1983) 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', *American Sociological Review* 48, 2: 147-160.

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Powell, Walter W. (1991) 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', in WW Powell and PJ DiMaggio (eds), 1991: *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 63-82.

Elbasani, Arolda, ed. (2012) *European Integration and Transformation in the Western Balkans: Europeanization or Business as Usual?*, London: Routledge.

Elgström, Ole (2008) 'Images of the EU in EPA negotiations: Angel, demon - or just human?', *European Integration Online Papers* 12, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/index.php/eiop/article/viewFile/2008_005a/82 (2012-01-04).

Elkins, Zachary, and Simmons, Beth A. (2005) 'On Waves, Clusters, and Diffusion: A Conceptual Framework', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 598, 1: 33-51.

European Parliament (2011) 'Europeans and the Crisis. European Parliament Eurobarometer Summary', Brussels: Directorate General for Communications, Public Opinion Monitoring Unit,

Farrel, Mary (2009) 'EU Policy Towards Other Regions: Policy Learning in the External Promotion of Regional Integration', *Journal of European Public Policy* 16, 8: 1165-1184.

Farrel, Mary, Hettne, Bjorn, and Van Langenhove, Luk, eds. (2005) *Global Politics of Regionalism. Theory and Practice*, London: Pluto Press.

Farrell, Mary, Hettne, Bjorn, and Van Langenhove, Luk, eds. (2005) *Global Politics of Regionalism: Theory and Practice*, London and Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

Featherstone, Keith, and Radaelli, Claudio, eds. (2003) *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fligstein, Neil (2008) *Euroclash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Franzese, Robert J., and Hays, Jude C. (2008) 'Interdependence in Comparative Politics: Substance, Theory, Empirics, Substance', *Comparative Political Studies* 41, 4-5: 742-780.

Freyburg, Tina, Lavenex, Sandra, Schimmelfennig, Frank, Skripka, Tatiana, and Wetzel, Anne (2009) 'EU Promotion of Democratic Governance in the Neighbourhood', *Journal of European Public Policy* 16, 6: 916-934.

Fritz, Barbara, and Metzger, Martina, eds. (2006) *New Issues in Regional Monetary Coordination: Understanding North-South and South-South Arrangements*, London: Palgrave.

Fritz, Barbara, and Mühlich, Laurissa (2010) 'South-South Monetary Integration – The Case for a Research Framework beyond the Theory of Optimum Currency Area', *International Journal of Public Policy* 6, 1-2: 118-135.

Fuchs, Martin (2009) 'Reaching Out; or, Nobody Exists in One Context Only. Society as Translation', *Translation Studies* 2, 1: 21-40.

Gateva, Eli (2010) 'Post-Accession Conditionality: Support Instrument for Continuous Pressure?', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 18.

Gilardi, Fabrizio (2012) 'Transnational Diffusion: Norms, Ideas, and Policies', in W Carlsnaes, T Risse and BA Simmons (eds), 2012: *Handbook of International Relations,* London: Sage,

Gillingham, John (1991) *Coal, Steel, and the Rebirth of Europe, 1945-1955: The Germans and French from Ruhr Conflict to Economic Community*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goetz, Klaus H., and Hix, Simon, eds. (2000) *Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems*, London: Frank Cass.

Griffin, Clifford, and Jetschke, Anja (2011) 'The Reach vs. Grasp of Regional Governance in the Caribbean and in Southeast Asia', *Manuscript*.

Grugel, Jean B. (2004) 'New Regionalism and Modes of Governance. Comparing US and EU Strategies in Latin America', *European Journal of International Relations* 10, 4: 602-626.

Haas, Peter M. (1992) 'Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination', *International Organization* 46, 1: 1-36.

Hemmer, Christopher, and Katzenstein, Peter J. (2002) 'Why There is No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism', *International Organization* 36, 3: 575-607.

Hettne, Bjorn, Inotai, András, and Sunkel, Oswaldo (1999) *Globalism and the New Regionalism*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Hirschhausen, Ulrike, and Patel, Kiran K. (2009) 'Europeanization in History: an Introduction', in M Conway and KK Patel (eds), 2009: *Europeanization in the Twentieth Century. Historical Approaches,* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1-18.

Holland, Martin, and Chaban, Natalie (2005) 'The EU Through the Eyes of the Asia-Pacific: Public Perceptions and Media Representations', Christchurch, NZ: University of Canterbury,

Holzinger, Katharina, Jörgens, Helge, and Knill, Christoph (2007) 'Transfer, Diffusion und Konvergenz: Konzepte und Kausalmechanismen', *Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft* 38, 1: 11-38.

Holzinger, Katharina, and Knill, Christoph (2005) 'Causes and Conditions of Cross-national Policy Convergence', *Journal of European Public Policy* 12, 5: 775-796.

Hooghe, Liesbet, and Marks, Gary (2006) 'The Neofunctionalists Were (almost) Right: Politicization and European Integration', in C Crouch and W Streeck (eds), 2006: *The Diversity of Democracy: Corporatism, Social Order and Political Conflict,* Cheltenham: Edgar Elgar, 205-222.

Iriye, Akira, and Saunier, Pierre-Yves, eds. (2009) *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History*, London: Palgrave.

Jahn, Detlef (2006) 'Globalization as „Galton's Problem": The Missing Link in the Analysis of Diffusion Patterns in Welfare State Development', *International Organization* 60, 2: 401-431.

Jahn, Detlef (2008) 'What is Comparative Politics? Standpoints and Debates in Germany and the United States', *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft* Offener Beitrag http://www.vsjournals.de/pdf/zfvp2007_jahn.pdf (2012-01-04).

Jahn, Detlef (2009) 'Globalisierung als Galtonsproblem: Regionale und temporale Diffusionsschübe ', in S Pickel, G Pickel, H-J Lauth and D Jahn (eds), 2009: *Methoden der vergleichenden Politik- und Sozialwissenschaft. Neue Entwicklungen und Anwendungen,* Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag, 87-112.

Jetschke, Anja, and Murray, Philomena (2012) 'Diffusing Regional Integration: The EU and Southeast Asia', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 174-191.

Kaiser, Wolfram (2005a) 'Cultural Transfer of Free Trade at the World Exhibitions 1851-1862', *Journal of Modern History* 77, 3: 563-590.

Kaiser, Wolfram (2005b) 'Transnational Mobilisation and Cultural Representation: Political Transfer in an Age of Proto-Globalisation, Democratisation and Nationalism, 1848-1914', *European Review of History* 12, 2: 403-424.

Kaiser, Wolfram (2007) *Christian Democracy and the Origins of European Union*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, Wolfram (2010) 'From Isolation to Centrality: Contemporary History Meets European Studies', in W Kaiser and A Varsori (eds), 2010: *European Union History. Themes and Debates,* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 45-65.

Kaiser, Wolfram, and Dittrich, Klaus (2009) 'Political Communication at the World Exhibitions. Transnational Negotiation of Social and Education Policy, 1889-1904', in M Albrecht (ed), 2009: *Transnational Political Spaces. Agents – Structures – Encounters,* Frankfurt a/M, New York: Campus, 162-184.

Kaiser, Wolfram, Krankenhagen, Stefan, and Poehls, Kerstin, eds. (2012) *Europa ausstellen. Das Museum als Praxisfeld der Europäisierung*, Köln: Böhlau.

Kaiser, Wolfram, Leucht, Brigitte, and Gehler, Michael, eds. (2010) *Transnational Networks in Regional Integration. Governing Europe 1945-83*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Kaiser, Wolfram, Leucht, Brigitte, and Rasmussen, Morten, eds. (2009) *The History of the European Union. Origins of a Trans- and Supranational Polity 1950-72*, London: Routledge.

Kaiser, Wolfram, and Meyer, Jan-Henrik, eds. (2010) *Non-State Actors in European Integration in the 1970s. Towards a Polity of Transnational Contestation, Comparativ. Leipziger Beiträge zur Universalgeschichte und vergleichenden Gesellschaftsforschung, 20, 3*.

Katzenstein, Peter J. (2005) *A World of Regions. Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

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

Knill, Christoph, and Lehmkuhl, Dirk (1999) 'How Europe Matters. Different Mechanisms of Europeanization', *European Integration on-line Papers* 3, 7.

Koopmans, Ruud, and Statham, Paul, eds. (2010) *The Making of a European Public Sphere: The Europeanisation of Media Discourse and Political Contention*, Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Langbein, Julia (2011) 'Organizing Regulatory Convergence Outside the EU. Setting Policy-Specific Conditionality and Building Domestic Capacities', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 33.

Langenhove, Luk van (2011) *Building Regions. The Regionalization of World Order*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Lavenex, Sandra, and Schimmelfennig, Frank, eds. (2010) *EU External Governance. Projecting EU Rules Beyond Membership*, London: Routledge.

Lenz, Tobias (2012) 'Spurred Emulation: The EU and Regional Integration in Mercosur and SADC', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 155-173.

Leucht, Brigitte (2008) *Transatlantic policy networks and the formation of core Europe, PhD Thesis*, Portsmouth: University of Portsmouth.

Levitsky, Steven, and Way, Lucan (2005) 'International Linkage and Democratization', *Journal of Democracy* 16, 3: 20-34.

Magen, Amichai (2012) 'Israel and the Many Pathways of Diffusion', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 98-116.

Magen, Amichai, Risse, Thomas, and McFaul, Michael, eds. (2009) *Democracy Promotion in the EU and the US Compared*, Houndmills: Palgrave.

Manners, Ian (2002) 'Normative Power Europe. A Contradiction in Terms?', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40, 2: 235-258.

Mazower, Mark (2008) *Hitler's Empire: Nazi Rule in Occupied Europe*, London: Allan Lane.

Meseguer, Covadonga (2005) 'Policy learning, policy diffusion, and the making of a new order', in D Levi-Faur and J Jordana (eds), 2005: *The rise of regulatory capitalism: The global diffusion of a new order,* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 67-82.

Meseguer, Covadonga (2009) *Learning, Policy making, and Market Reforms*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, John W., Boli, John, George, Thomas M., and Ramirez, Francisco O. (1997) 'World Society and the Nation-State', *American Journal of Sociology* 103, 1: 144-181.

Meyer, John W., Boli, John, and Thomas, George M. (1987) 'Ontology and Rationalization in the Western Cultural Account', in GM Thomas, JW Meyer, F O-Ramirez and J Boli (eds), 1987: *Institutional Structure: Constituting State, Society and the Individual,* Newbury Park: Sage, 12-37.

Middell, Matthias (2000) 'Kulturtransfer und Historische Komparatistik. Thesen zu ihrem Verhältnis', *Comparativ* 10, 1: 7-41.

Noutcheva, Gergana, and Düzgit, Senem Aydin (2012) 'Lost in Europeanization? The Western Balkans and Turkey', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 59-78.

Nye, Joseph S. (2004) *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs.

Osterhammel, Jürgen (2004) 'Europamodelle und imperiale Kontexte', *Journal of Modern European History*, 2: 157-181.

Panke, Diana (2007) 'The European Court of Justice as an Agent of Europeanization. Inducing Compliance With EU Law', *Journal of European Public Policy* 14, 6: 847-866.

Patel, Kiran K. (2005) *Soldiers of Labor: Labor Service in Nazi Germany and New Deal America, 1933-1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patel, Kiran K. (2009) *Europäisierung wider Willen. Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland in der Agrarintegration der EWG 1955-1973*, Munich: Oldenbourg.

Patel, Kiran K. (2011) 'The Paradox of Planning. German Agricultural Policy in a European Perspective, 1920s to 1970s', *Past & Present* 212, 1: 239-269.

Patel, Kiran K. (2013) *The New Deal: A Global History*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Patel, Kiran K., and Schot, Johan (2011) 'Twisted Paths to European Integration: Comparing Agriculture and Transport in a Transnational Perspective', *Journal of Contemporary European History* 20, 383-403.

Paulmann, Johannes (2004) 'Grenzüberschreitungen und Grenzräume. Überlegungen zur Geschichte transnationaler Beziehungen von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die Zeitgeschichte', in E Conze, U Lappenküper and G Müller (eds), 2004: *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen. Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin,* Köln: Böhlau, 169-196.

Plümper, Thomas, and Schneider, Christina (2009) 'The Computation of Convergence, or: How to Chase a Black Cat in a Dark Room', *Journal of European Public Policy* 16, 7: 990-1011.

Pries, Ludger (2008) *Die Transnationalisierung der sozialen Welt: Sozialräume jenseits von Nationalgesellschaften*, Frankfurt a/M: Suhrkamp.

Radaelli, Claudio M. (2000) 'Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change', *European Integration on-line Papers* 4, 8.

Radaelli, Claudio M., and Pasquier, Romain (2006) 'Conceptual Issues', in P Graziano and MP Vink (eds), 2006: *Handbook of Europeanization: New Research Agendas,* Houndmills: Palgrave, 35-45.

Renn, Johannes (2006) *Übersetzungsverhältnisse. Perspektiven einer pragmatischen Gesellschaftstheorie*, Weilerswist: Velbrück.

Risse, Thomas (2010) *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*, Itahaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Risse, Thomas, ed. (2011) *Governance without a State? Policies and Politics in Areas of Limited Statehood*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Risse, Thomas, and van de Steeg, Marianne, eds. (forthcoming) *European Public Spheres. Bringing Politics Back In*, under review with Cambridge University Press.

Rodgers, Daniel T. (1998) *Atlantic Crossings. Social Politics in a Progressive Age*, Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press.

Rogers, Everett M. (2003) *Diffusion of Innovations*, New York: Free Press.

Saatcioglu, Beken (2010) 'Unpacking the Compliance Puzzle. The Case of Turkey's AKP under EU Conditionality', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 14.

Sabatier, Paul A., and Jenkins-Smith, Hank C. (1999) 'The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Assessment', in PA Sabatier (ed), 1999: *Theories of the Policy Process,* Boulder: Westview Press, 117-168.

Saldías, Osvaldo (2007) 'Supranational Courts as Engines of Disintegration. The Case of the Andean Community', *Berliner Arbeitspapier zur Europäischen Integration, Freie Universität Berlin*, 5.

Saldías, Osvaldo (2010) 'Networks, Courts and Regional Integration. Explaining the Establishment of the Andean Court of Justice', *KFG Working Papers. Research College "The Transformative Power of Europe". Freie Universität Berlin*, 20.

Santander, Sebastian (2005) 'The European Partnership with Mercosur: A Relationship Based on Strategic and Neo-liberal Principles', *Journal of European Integration* 27, 3: 285-306.

Sbragia, Alberta (2008) 'Comparative Regionalism: What Might It Be?', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46, Annual Review: 29-49.

Sbragia, Alberta M. (1993) 'The European Community: A Balancing Act', *Publius* 23, 3: 23-38.

Scharpf, Fritz W. (1988) 'The Joint-Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration', *Public Administration* 66, 3: 239-278.

Schauer, Frederick (2000) 'The Politics and Incentives of Legal Transplantation', in JS Nye and JD Donahue (eds), 2000: *Governance in a Globalizing World,* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 253-269.

Schimmelfennig, Frank (2009) 'Europeanization beyond Europe', *Living Reviews in European Governance* 4, 3: 1-28; http://www.livingreviews.org/lreg-2009-3 (2012-01-04).

Schimmelfennig, Frank, Engert, Stefan, and Knobel, Heiko (2003) 'Costs, Commitment and Compliance. The Impact of EU Democratic Conditionality on Latvia, Slovakia and Turkey', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 41, 3: 495-518.

Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Scholtz, Hanno (2008) 'EU Democracy Promotion in the European Neighbourhood. Political Conditionality, Economic Development and Transnational Exchange', *European Union Politics* 9, 2: 187-215.

Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2005) *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schimmelfennig, Frank, and Trauner, Florian, eds. (2010) *Post-accession Compliance in the EU's New Member States*: European Integration Online Papers, Special Issue 2, 1.

Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2005) *Constructing the Path to Eastern Enlargement: The Uneven Policy Impact of EU identity*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2008) 'After Conditionality: Post-accession compliance with EU Law in East Central Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy* 15, 6: 806 - 825.

Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2011) 'Europeanisation in new member and candidate states', *Living Reviews of Eurpean Government* 6, 1: 1-52, http://europeangovernance.livingreviews.org/Articles/lreg-2011-1/ (2012-01-04).

Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2012) 'Is Europeanization Through Conditionality Sustainable? Lock-In of Institutional Change After EU Accession', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 20-38.

Simmons, Beth A., Dobbin, Frank, and Garrett, Geoffrey (2006) 'Symposium: Diffusion of Liberalism', *International Organization* 60, 4: 781-933.

Simmons, Beth A., Dobbin, Frank, and Garrett, Geoffrey, eds. (2008) *The Global Diffusion of Markets and Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Söderbaum, Fredrik, and Shaw, Timothy M. (2003) *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Spendzharova, Aneta, and Vachudova, Milada Anna (2012) 'Catching-Up? Consolidating Liberal Democracy in Bulgaria and Romania', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 39-58.

Spiering, Menno, and Wintle, Michael eds. (2011) *European Identity and the Second World War*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Strang, David, and Meyer, John W. (1993) 'Institutional Conditions for Diffusion', *Theory and Society* 22, 4: 487-512.

Telò, Mario, ed. (2001) *European Union and New Regionalism: Regional Actors and Global Governance in a Post-Hegemonic Era*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Tews, Kerstin, Busch, Per-Olof, and Jörgens, Helge (2003) 'The diffusion of new environmental policy instruments', *European Journal of Political Research* 42, 2: 569-600.

Vachudova, Milada Anna (2005) *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage and Integration After Communism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Hüllen, Vera (2012) 'Europeanization Through Cooperation? EU Democracy Promotion in Morocco and Tunisia', *West European Politics* 35, 1: 117-134.

Venuti, Lawrence (2008) *The Translators' Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London: Routledge.

Warleigh-Lack, Alex (2006) 'Towards a conceptual framework for regionalisation: Bridging 'new regionalism' and 'integration theory'', *Review of International Political Economy* 13, 5: 750-771.

Watson, Alan (1974) *Legal Transplants*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Weber, Katja, Smith, Michael E., and Baun, Michael, eds. (2007) *Governing Europe's Neighbourhood: Partners or Periphery?*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Werner, Michael, and Zimmermann, Bénedicte (2002) 'Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, 4: 607-636.

Wessler, Hartmut, Peters, Bernhard, Brüggemann, Michael, Kleinen von Königslow, Katharina, and Sifft, Stefanie (2008) *Transnationalization of Public Spheres*, Houndmills, Basingstoke - New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Whitman, Richard G. (1998) *From Civilian Power to Superpower? The International Identity of the European Union*, London: Macmillan.

Youngs, Richard (2001) *The European Union and the Promotion of Deomcracy: Europe's Mediterranean and Asian Policies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.