

5. The Netherlands and Norway: Strong in Governance Research

The Netherlands and Norway are quite different countries in terms of size and in their relation to the EU. The Netherlands is a founding member whereas Norway decided not to join the EU. Nevertheless, both are strong in EU governance research and their scholars are involved in many international academic networks. In order to facilitate a comparative assessment of the reasons for success and their specific profiles the two countries are put together in one chapter though written by different authors.

THE NETHERLANDS RESEARCH ON EU GOVERNANCE

**Nico Groenendijk, Martin Rosema, Jacques Thomassen and
Ramses Wessel**

In this sub-chapter we present an outlook on a decade of Dutch research on EU multi-level governance. Given the wide range of disciplines involved and given the large capacity of the governance concept to absorb different research topics, the outlook presented here is limited by nature. Still, three main characteristics of Dutch research on EU governance can be made out clearly:

- a) multi-disciplinary research cooperation, strongly encouraged by public actors providing research funding;
- b) strong orientation towards empirical research;
- c) strong international orientation.

These characteristics are rooted in the Dutch social sciences in general, which is why we first deal with the broader context of social science research in the Netherlands (section 2). In section 3 the standing of research on the EU in the Netherlands is discussed, including the relationship between the research agenda and the political agenda. Section 4 deals with the 'governance turn' in EU research. Section 5 focuses on the 'Dutch profile' with regard to research content and In section 6 we present our conclusions.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN THE NETHERLANDS

In the Netherlands, throughout all fields of social science (economics, law, political science, public administration, sociology) research is very well-developed and generally of high quality. The Netherlands has a strong tradition of multi-disciplinary cooperation, especially of comparative empirical research. An important element in that regard is that in the Netherlands public administration studies are very well-developed as a multi-disciplinary academic field (and according to some as a discipline in its own right) with its own programmes, institutions and journals.

National research is fairly well accessible to foreign scholars, as the number of publications in international journals by Dutch researchers has always been rather high. Besides, the presence of Dutch scholars at international conferences is very high and always has been. To the extent that this is possible, it is still increasing.

Institutional incentives for social science research at universities

The two main institutional incentives for social science research at universities are (external) funding and the existence of national research schools.

In addition to the basic resources supplied to the universities by central government (largely depending on the numbers of graduates and comprising 70 per cent of total university funding), external research funding is provided by research councils and similar organisations (comprising 9 per cent of total university funding) and through specific funding for research commissioned by government authorities or the private sector (21 per cent of total university funding). Compared to other countries, the basic grant is relatively high and the share of funding by research councils is relatively low (Centraal Planbureau, 2002). However, because the basic grant is to a large extent used to cover teaching costs, external funding is very important for research and is successfully used by funding authorities to promote large-scale national cooperation and multi-disciplinary projects. The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) is the most important organisation in this respect. The competition between social science researchers to attract NWO funding for PhD and/or post-doc positions and for large-scale research projects is rather fierce (approximately 10 per cent of all NWO proposals in this field are successful). Funding is increasingly sought from EU programmes like the EU Framework Programmes for Research & Development.

Besides funding, institutionalisation of research cooperation is important. The Netherlands is a relatively small country in which cooperation in research projects across universities traditionally has been high. Over the last two decades, part of this cooperation has been institutionalised by means of

interuniversity research schools. Based on their performance, these schools are officially accredited by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). Participation as a (senior) fellow in research schools has become a must for social scientists. It also plays an important part in the recurrent national peer review of research and teaching programmes.

PhD-research

The Dutch PhD system is still based on individual supervision. It involves a 4-year period in which PhD students generally follow a limited number of courses offered by a research school or institute in their field. There are no full-time PhD programmes. A PhD position is a hybrid one, as PhD students have the legal status of employees and are expected to participate to a certain extent in teaching and other activities.

Today, most dissertations are written in English. PhD candidates increasingly are encouraged to present papers at international conferences and to publish in international journals. Building a strong track record in (international) research has become extremely important for PhD students in terms of their academic career opportunities.

Non-university social science research

The bulk of social science research is conducted in (fourteen) universities but there are some very strong research institutions as well. These include governmental advisory bodies, three of which have to be mentioned: First, the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid – WRR) is an independent think tank for the Dutch government. The WRR advises the government - asked and unasked - about a variety of themes in a long-term perspective. Secondly, the Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (Central Planbureau - CPB) is an independent research institute within the central government, that is mainly involved in economic analyses. Thirdly, the Social and Cultural Planning Office of the Netherlands (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau - SCP) is a government agency which conducts research of the social aspects of all areas of government policy. Its reports are widely used by the government, civil servants, local authorities and academics.

The value added to university research by these advisory bodies does not only pertain to the (applied) research as such (which generally is of a high academic standard), but also to data collection and dissemination. Moreover, there are strong personal links between universities and these advisory bodies, for instance through joint appointments of research staff. In addition, publications by the WRR and SCP are often based on background studies carried out by universities.

THE STANDING OF EU (GOVERNANCE) RESEARCH

From a historical perspective, research on the EU (and its legal precursors) has always been linked to the actual developments of European integration. For decades, the interest in the Netherlands was clearly infused by the practice of integration and was directed at:

- a. issues of economic integration (conditions for and effects of the establishment of the customs union and –later- the single market);
- b. the emerging European legal system (the relation between EC regulation and national legal systems, importance of European Court of Justice case law);
- c. decision-making processes (the role of various institutions, lobbying), issues of political representation, and the legitimacy of the European Union, mainly from the perspective of political science.

In fact, there is a strong disciplinary focus on economics, political science and law. As in other countries, the interest of the discipline of sociology in the EU and European integration is a fairly recent phenomenon.

Major research institutes on international and European affairs

The strong international tradition in the Netherlands (in economics, in international relations theory and in law) is reflected in renowned international institutes that are also engaged in European research. The most prominent are:

- The Netherlands Institute of International Relations, better known as *Clingendael*, which is a think tank in the field of international and European affairs;
- The *T.M.C. Asser Institute* in The Hague, which is a research institute that focuses on Private and Public International Law, International Commercial Arbitration, and European Law. Academic research is conducted in collaboration with participating organisations which include law faculties from universities, as well as other institutes;
- The *European Institute of Public Administration* (EIPA) in Maastricht, which carries out research on public administration and European policies, but mostly is involved in training specifically aimed at public officials;
- *The Hague Institute for the Internationalisation of Law* (HiiL), which was founded in 2005. HiiL is an international research institute focusing on the internationalisation of law in the context of globalisation. HiiL is both a research organisation in its own right and a funding body for (multi-disciplinary) university research projects.

Obviously, EU (governance) research is not only linked to actual developments in terms of European integration but also to teaching activities and to specific issues on the national public and political agendas.

Research and teaching

In the Netherlands, there are two full-fledged multi-disciplinary programmes in European Studies that focus on governance issues. These (English-language) programmes are currently offered in *Twente* and in *Maastricht* (both at the BA and MA level). These two universities also have specialised institutes (Centres for European Studies). Besides these two programmes, the University of Groningen offers a Dutch BA programme and an English MA programme in international affairs, and other universities offer numerous possibilities to specialise in European Studies as part of their regular curricula in economics, law, political science or public administration.

The research agenda and the public and political agendas

There is a striking similarity between the major themes on the academic research agenda and the development of the political and public agenda. This similarity is largely due to the high level of interaction (through seminars, guest lectures, advisory work) between academics, politicians and government officials, made possible by the relatively small scale of Dutch society.

On all three agendas the legitimacy and the democratic quality of EU institutions and decision-making processes seem to be the most prominent issues. To some extent the major research questions with regard to these issues are very classical ones and developed from traditional state-oriented normative views on democracy. From this perspective the relationship between the several institutions of the Union in terms of accountability and democratic control is an important topic, in particular the relationship between politics and administration. Equally important are issues in the broad context of political representation, like the development of a European party system, the representativeness of the European parliament, and the involvement of citizens across Europe in European politics. Ever since the debate on the draft constitution and the rejection of it by a referendum the legitimacy of the Union has become a major item both in the public debate and in academics.

A second major theme is the relationship between the EU and 'lower' levels of government, i.e. not only the national level but also the regional and local levels of government. The increasing academic interest in this relationship parallels with an increasing public concern about a shift of power towards 'Brussels'. In law and public administration, the relationship between national and European law is a major research theme, encompassing issues like the enforcement of European rules and the transposition of European Union directives into national law. In political science there is an increasing interest in the question to what extent Europeanisation has an

impact on national political systems. In economics, the theoretical perspective of fiscal federalism is an important source of inspiration.

Equally important is the developing academic interest in the patterns of influence in the other direction: to what extent can and do Dutch policy-makers influence European decision making? To what extent can and does the Dutch parliament scrutinize the input of the Dutch government in EU decision making?

GOVERNANCE, GOVERNANCE EVERYWHERE

Over the last decade, EU governance has become a major research theme in the Netherlands in both, political science and public administration. A similar development can be observed in economics and law, although in these disciplines the *term* governance, and especially the term multi-level governance, might be less common.

To a large extent this development is the result of the interests of individual researchers and research groups in these topical issues, triggered by actual developments in European governance. For instance, the establishment of the multi-level European System of Central Banks has sparked a huge interest among Dutch economists into issues of independence and accountability of central bankers within the EU. Similarly, within the science of law, new EU modes of governance (like the open method of coordination) have led to an increased interest in the (de)merits of soft law. We would argue that in the Dutch case, in all disciplines involved, the actual changes regarding the location of governing capacities within the EU system and regarding the modes of governance have led researchers to go beyond the traditional analysis of EU integration mentioned in section 3. Actual developments in terms of upward, downward and vertical shifts in governance, and new problems of efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and legitimacy have spurred the governance turn in research rather than path-breaking theoretical developments or paradigm shifts within the various disciplines. Interestingly enough, because the different disciplines have been dealing with the same empirical phenomenon, the governance turn in research has clearly contributed to a stronger multi-disciplinary orientation.

Besides that, there has been a *strong institutional impetus* in which the *Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research* (NWO) played an important part. The Social Science Research Council (MAGW) of NWO developed and funded a special research programme called *Shifts in Governance: Problems of Legitimacy and Accountability*, which started in 2001. One of the most important themes of this multi-disciplinary programme was the development of multi-level governance, its causes and consequences for the legitimacy of national and European governance.

The governance turn was also present at the level of *national research schools*. The *Netherlands Institute of Government* (NIG) is a national research school in which all departments of public administration and political science but one cooperate. In the period from 2000 - 2005, one of the school's five research programmes was entitled 'Governance in the European Union'. Approximately 70 researchers were involved in that programme. In the current research programme (2006-2010), two of the main themes are citizenship and governance, and the future of the nation state. Both themes have sub-programmes that deal with EU governance issues.

A focus on the legal dimension of multi-level governance may be found in the research programme of the *Ius Commune* research school, in which the Law Faculties of Amsterdam, Leuven, Maastricht and Utrecht participate. This programme focuses, *inter alia*, on constitutionalization processes at the national, regional (EU) and global level and the interaction between these processes.

In the field of economics, the *Tinbergen Institute* is one of the main inter-university networks for economic research. The better part of the research programme of this institute deals with the analysis of markets (esp. financial and labour markets) and governance structures at various levels (global, European, regional).

Among the research programmes that are directed at (*single*) *universities or institutions*, several can be identified that focus more or less explicitly on multi-level governance in Europe. One of them is 'Multi-layered governance in Europe and beyond', directed by Hans Keman from the Free University in Amsterdam (Keman, 2001-2005). The research programme directed by Jacques Thomassen of the University of Twente, entitled 'Governance in a complex society' (Thomassen, 2003-2005), stands out as one of the few in which researchers from the same university but from different disciplinary backgrounds participate (political science, law, economics). This programme is one of the research programmes of the Institute for Government Studies (IGS) of the University of Twente. In 2001, at the Radboud University, Nijmegen, the research programme 'Governance and Places' (GaP) has been introduced. This programme deals with multi-level governance issues of spatial planning and the environment, involving different spatial units (cities, regions, nations, transboundary units, and Europe). Harry Garretsen from the Utrecht School of Economic together with Wil Hout (Institute for Social Studies, The Hague) has conducted a programme entitled 'Between adjustment and rigidity: an international political-economic analysis of internationalisation, institutions and economic performance', in collaboration with the Radboud University, Nijmegen (Bob Lieshout) and the Free University, Amsterdam (Kees van Kersbergen). Frans Stokman (University of Groningen) has coordinated a project on 'Explaining EU Decision Making' in cooperation with the universities of Leyden and Nijmegen. The increased attention for non-state actors as well as for the blurring of

boundaries between legal orders has resulted in a stronger focus on the interplay between global, European and national legal orders in the research programmes of almost all law faculties. A prime example can be found in the research programmes of the Amsterdam Center for International Law.

All these programmes have provided the organisational framework for the emergence of numerous PhD thesis and research projects gathering one or several scholars around related topics. On a meta-level, such national or collaborative programmes instigate fruitful intellectual debates between scholars from different universities, departments and disciplinary backgrounds and contribute to the emergence of a vivid community dedicated to EU governance research.

A DUTCH PROFILE?

Due to the traditionally strong international orientation of Dutch researchers, it is difficult to distinguish a Dutch research agenda from an international one. Still, when looking at the Dutch projects in the CONNEX GOVDATA database and at the publications of Netherlands-based researchers, as recorded in the CONNEX GOVLIT database (1995-2005), two themes seem to stand out. First, the *legal framework* is addressed in many projects. These projects concern the effect of EU rules on national law (including transposition issues), as well as the division of competences between the EU and its Member States. Strikingly, this is true not only for projects conducted in the field of law, but also for those conducted in fields like public administration, political science and economics, which clearly shows the strong impetus the governance turn has given to multi-disciplinary research. A second theme, discussed in political science and to a lesser extent within economics, concerns *legitimacy and accountability*. Within these two broad themes, some more specific topics are repeatedly dealt with:

- a) the general concept of (multi-level) governance (Hooghe, 1996; Marks, 1996a, 1996b; Hooghe and Marks, 2000, 2003; Van Kersbergen and Van Waarden, 2001, 2004; Keman, 2001-2005), governance, integration theory and Europeanization (Hosli and Börzel, 2003; Aalberts, 2004; Haverland and Holzacker, 2006), the subsidiarity principle (Verbeek and Van Kersbergen, 2004) and fiscal federalism theory (Groenendijk, 2003);
- b) issues of political representation, accountability, and legitimacy (Schmitt and Thomassen, 1999, 2000; Thomassen, Noury, and Voeten, 2004; Bovens, 2006, Bovens, 2005-2010; Curtin and Nollkaemper, 2006; Laver, Mair and Gallagher, 2001; Mair, 2005), including issues of political contestation (Marks and Steenbergen, 2004), and electoral behaviour, both in European elections (Van der Eijk and Franklin, 1996;

- Van der Brug and Van der Eijk, 2007) and referenda (Aarts and Van der Kolk, 2006);
- c) the establishment, functioning and legitimacy of the (multi-layered) European System of Central Banks (see Van der Crujisen and Eijffinger, 2007 for a survey);
 - d) the development of a European Public Sphere (e.g. De Vreese et al, 2006; Semetko et al, 2000; Koopmans, 2001-2004);
 - e) lobbying, interest groups and access to European policy-making (Beyers, 2002, 2004; Van Schendelen, 2002);
 - f) EU decision-making (Steunenberg, 2002, 2003; Stokman and Thomson, 2004; Thomson, Boerefijn and Stokman, 2004; Stokman et al, 2006; Princen, 2003-2007), more specifically voting and decision rules in the Council (Hosli, 1996; Hosli and Nurmi, 2003; Hosli and Thomson, 2006), and the role of committees and comitology (Christiansen, 1996; Christiansen and Kirchner, 2000; Steunenberg c.s., 2000);
 - g) the role of the administration, especially the European Commission, in EU affairs and integration (Hooghe, 2001; Curtin and Wille, 2004-2006), agencies (Curtin, 2005-2009), administrative governance and the CFSP (Vanhoonaeker and Duke, 2006) and informal governance (Christiansen et al, 2006);
 - h) the constitutional relation between the EU and the domestic legal order, including transposition of EU directives (Steunenberg, 2004-2008, 2005-2006; Berglund, 2002-2006; Mastebroek, 2001-2005), and the constitutional interplay between the global and the domestic legal orders (see Heere, 2003; Nollkaemper and De Wet, 2004; De Wet, 2006; Wessel, Follesdal and Wouters, 2007).

Not surprisingly, recently the Convention, the IGC and the Constitutional Treaty have been subjects of research, as well (Crum, 2005; Groenendijk, 2007; Hosli et al, 2005; Marks and Hooghe, 2006).

Obviously, even though some specific thematic foci can be observed, the range of topics covered by researchers in the Netherlands is very broad and there are only few aspects of the EU as a multilevel system of governance that remain unexplored. In terms of research approach, the variety is large. It is hard to establish a favoured theoretical approach or favoured methodology. In other words, the impressive number of large collaborative programme and projects does not flourish at the expense of diversity and pluralism. The main common feature is that most research done in the Netherlands in the field of EU multi-level governance has a large empirical content and is policy-oriented.

CONCLUSION

Dutch research on EU multi-level governance is well on track. In all relevant disciplines multi-level governance and the EU in general have become an important research topic. Dutch academics in this area of research are strongly internationally oriented and are involved in many international academic networks. Because of this international orientation, Dutch academics contribute largely to the European scientific debate. As far as possible, this international orientation will become even stronger rather than weaker in the future. To some extent, this is the predictable consequence of the institutional context of Dutch universities and major research institutes. They are subject to an intensive external review system. Failing to meet the high standards review committees are using can have very negative consequences for research groups. One of the major criteria is excellence according to international standards, which is mainly operationalized as publishing in high quality English language journals. 'Publish (in English) or perish' has become a fact of life at Dutch universities. Therefore, in addition to their intrinsic motivation to work in an international environment, Dutch academics simply have no choice if they want to be professionally acclaimed. If this sounds like a negative incentive, there are strong positive motivations, as well. As mentioned above, both the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research and national research schools, as well as local university research institutes have taken a strong interest in research on governance in general and EU multi-level governance in particular.

NORWEGIAN GOVERNANCE RESEARCH

Ulf Sverdrup

During the last decade we have seen a strong increase in governance research in Norway, and this research has also received attention in other countries. This sub-chapter gives some ideas that might explain why we have seen this remarkable shift, and why the governance research has developed in this specific direction. My starting point is the observation that scientific activity is not a borderless activity, and that scientific perspectives and approaches to a given object are often shaped by the cognitive features of the dominant paradigm, by the social organization of the science system, and by external or contextual factors (Mayntz 2005).

Before turning to the discussion, I will make a few conceptual clarifications. By the term Norwegian research governance, I mean research

and research projects that have been conducted primarily in Norway, or financed primarily by Norwegian authorities. By the term European governance, I mean research on the EU governance system, as well as the impact of EU institutions and policies on national institutions and governance structures. Moreover, I focus particularly on governance research in the field of political science.¹

The chapter is organized in the following way: Firstly, I provide the political backdrop for EU governance research in Norway. Secondly, I examine how traditional approaches and distinct scientific traditions in the Norwegian social sciences have impacted on Norwegian EU governance research. I argue that the academic roots, more so than national political interests, have affected the research questions that have been asked, the concepts in use, the theories and approaches that have been applied, as well as the methods and research designs that have been employed. Finally, I briefly discuss the organization of research on EU governance in Norway.

A DRAMATIC POLITICAL BACKDROP

It is difficult to understand the development and dynamics of Norwegian research on EU governance without taking into account its dramatic political backdrop. Norway has applied for membership three times, and two referendums have been held on the issue. A clear majority voted “No” to membership both in 1972 and 1994. The issue of membership is still unsettled, and it remains one of the most contested issues in the political debate, it has created deep cleavages in most political parties and it has represented a destabilising force for every Norwegian government since 1994.

However, Norwegian non-membership does not mean that Norway is unaffected by the transformation of governance that is taking place in Europe. Rather the contrary. Over time Norway has developed wide ranging agreements with the EU linking Norway and its society closely to the European Union and the member states. The most important elements in the rather complex web of formal and informal co-operative arrangements between the EU and Norway is the European Economic Area Agreement (EEA) and the Norwegian participation in the Schengen Agreement. There is also some degree of co-operation with the EU in the field of foreign and security policy. Norway is also a full member of EU’s research programmes and numerous other programme activities of the EU.

It is easy to imagine that this rather remarkable political context could have impacted on the organization and operation of Norwegian research on European governance. For instance, the strong political contestation and the deep political and ideological divisions could have led to limited interest in funding studies of European integration and EU governance. Alternatively,

the attention could primarily have been centred on issues of special interest for Norway and Norwegian interests in relation to the EU, such as fishery and energy, instead of general European issues. A third foreseeable option is that the deep political polarization of the Norwegian membership issue could have led to a politicization and contestation of the research on EU governance, challenging its legitimacy, and possibly creating instability regarding its financial and organizational foundation.

None of these three “options” have manifested themselves. During the last decade we have seen a considerable growth in EU governance research in Norway. Rather than being concerned with issues closely related to Norwegian political or economic interests, the Norwegian researchers have addressed theoretical, methodological and conceptual issues that has been on the general European and international research agenda. Finally, rather than having to cope with instable and shifting financial frameworks, the Norwegian research environment on EU governance has benefited from a relatively stable and long term financial framework.

This development in Norwegian EU governance research is to a large extent a result of key factors in the political context in Norway. The strong and numerous formal and informal linkages between Norway and the EU have created a functional demand for research on EU governance. Since the Norwegian society, economy and political space is so closely interlinked with the EU, research based knowledge has been regarded as important for improving the Norwegian policy towards the EU. In addition, the contested political situation with limited trust has also increased the need for independent, systematic and autonomous production of knowledge and meaning about the developments in Europe and its consequences. One could even argue that the deep political contestation regarding the membership issue has played a sobering function on the researchers and has increased the efforts among scholars to focus on scholarly activities, distance themselves from EU clichés and deliberately avoid normative biases. In short we might say that the political contestation and the distinct political backdrop have provided a push for, and a space for, scientific and academic autonomy. Of course, this gradual ‘scientification’ of EU governance studies is not unique to Norway. This is part of a trend in all European countries and across a variety of disciplines in the same time period. However, in the Norwegian case it seems particularly obvious that this shift was not only a result of internal academic and scholarly developments, but also to a large extent a result of changing political environments.

INCREASED ATTENTION TO EU GOVERNANCE

Compared to other European countries the Norwegian universities and research milieus were slow in establishing centres of European research and

providing teaching and doctoral courses on European integration and governance. In the period from the 1970s until the early 1990s European integration and EU governance was a neglected topic in Norwegian political science. Few worked on the issue, hardly any wrote a PhD in this field, and the libraries did not hold key journals and reference books (Olsen et al 1997).

During the mid 1990s this situation changed. Research picked up in quality and quantity. There was a rapid increase in the number of publications dealing with issues related to European integration. Compared to earlier days, the research was increasingly aimed at a larger audience. Nevertheless, even in the mid 1990s the Norwegian research on European governance was still situational and primarily concerned with the political and social situation in Norway. The key element of the research reflected issues related to the referendum on Norwegian membership in the EU in 1994, as well as being concerned with specific policy effects of a possible Norwegian membership or non-membership in the EU.

At this time there were still some signs indicating a further development of the Norwegian EU governance research. One of the key indicators was that the field of European integration and EU governance started to attract attention from researchers from a variety of political science sub-fields, not only the international relation scholars. Students from public administration, comparative politics as well as sociology and industrial relations were increasingly turning their eyes to the issues of European integration and governance.

Ten years later, there is no doubt that there has been a significant increase of research on EU governance. The CONNEX GOVDATA lists 36 projects on various governance issues in Norway. In the period from 1996 until 2005, researchers at just one, though prominent institution, namely ARENA published 239 academic articles and book chapters, in addition to numerous books. Approximately 80 percent of these publications were published in English or in another non-Nordic language, and most of them dealt with issues related to EU governance in one way or another. In addition, numerous research results and ideas related to EU governance have been published and disseminated through the ARENA working paper series.

During the same period we have also seen a significant increase in the number of doctoral students working in the field of EU governance. Approximately ten PhDs have been completed in political science at the University of Oslo addressing various issues related to European integration and governance. The number is of course marginal compared to other European countries, but it still accounts for about one fourth of the total of doctoral degrees awarded in the period.²

ARENA has been the largest research centre and the one that most consistently has focused on issues related to EU governance, but other institutions have also made significant contributions.³ For instance, researchers at The Norwegian School of Management BI have contributed in

particular on issues related to regulatory politics, lobbying and interest representation (Andersen & Eliassen 2001; Eliassen 1998). The Norwegian Institute for International Studies (NUPI) has worked on issues related to the governance of EU's foreign policy (Rieker 2006). The industrial relations research institute FAFO have worked on the changing role of trade unions and labour market policies in the EU (Dølvik 1997). Researches at the University of Bergen have contributed to the fields of regulatory politics and administrative adaptations to the emerging multi-level governance system in Europe (Jacobsson et al 2003). In addition, studies at the Centre for European Law at the University of Oslo have contributed with studies of compliance with EU legalisation and governance of the internal market as well as with the legal developments of the EEA institutions.

Measuring the quality of Norwegian research on EU governance goes beyond the scope of this article. In 1999 Phillippe Schmitter argued that the "works of Johan P. Olsen and (...) the ARENA project have been of major importance in the identification and the analysis of the impact of "Europeanization""(Schmitter 1999). Whether other scholars agree with his impression is of course unclear. But a bibliographical data search reveals that researchers, such as Svein Andersen, Jeff Checkel, Morten Egeberg, Erik Oddvar Eriksen, Jon Erik Fossum, Andreas Føllesdal, Johan P. Olsen, and Helen Sjursen, to mention some, have had a significant production, and that their work has attracted considerable attention and has been frequently cited. For instance, an article by Johan P. Olsen (Olsen 2002a) on the concept of Europeanization, as well as an article by Andreas Føllesdal and Simon Hix (Follesdal & Hix 2006) on the democratic deficit have both ranked high on the list of the most cited articles in the *Journal of Common Market Studies*.⁴

Although this development has been rather remarkable in a Norwegian setting, we should of course keep in mind that the scale and volume of the Norwegian research is still limited and the milieu is vulnerable.

THE ACADEMIC ROOTS AND ROUTES

As an integrated part of the international research community, Norwegian scholars have to a large extent related themselves to the major intellectual discussions in Europe, but there are at least two roots or traditions that have yielded a particularly strong influence on the development of the Norwegian research on EU governance.

The first tradition is represented by the legacy from Stein Rokkan and his colleagues on the emergence of the nation state system in Europe.⁵ This work dealt with key questions related to processes of state-building, nation-building, democratization and redistribution. In this perspective, the European nation states were seen as a result of a special configuration of political, administrative, cultural and religious boundaries. The works of

Stein Rokkan on the emergence of the European political map have had significant impact on the Norwegian political science community, and it has been important in influencing both the research questions that were asked, as well as the conceptual and empirical approaches to dynamics of European integration and the transformation of the nation state.

There is a strong linkage between the works of Rokkan, and the related project on small states by Robert Dahl, and the recent Norwegian research on EU governance. Much of the research has been concerned about examining how, and to what extent, and through which processes, the stages of state-building and nation-building, which Rokkan identified as crucial in the development of the European nation state, could be rediscovered or identified in the current European transformation. The link is obvious in the concepts and problem formulation that characterised the research profile of ARENA published in 1997.

Partly as a result of this academic legacy, and partly as a result of the Norwegian political history, the Norwegian research on European governance has always been strongly related to question of the future of the nation state, its “retreat” or “rescue”. Much of the research has dealt with the validity of such claims. Since Norway is a small and fairly unitary state with an open economy competing in the world markets and a state with a high degree of redistribution, such issues has always been regarded as critical. In addition, since Norway is not a member of the EU, the issue related to the significance of formal membership and formal ties to the EU has continuously been a limited, but still important element of the research focus. However, in spite of these important element of continuity regarding concepts and research questions, it is noteworthy that the recent Norwegian governance research have never been much occupied with the long historical comparisons, and the large-n studies that was typical and played such a prominent role in the Rokkanian approach.

The second key tradition for Norwegian EU governance research has been the strong link to research on organizational theory and the organizational basis of politics. The works by Herbert Simon and James G. March (March & Simon 1993) have inspired research on the role of organizations in political life and how organizational factors affect decision making, learning, and the conditions for design and change. During a period of more than thirty years, Norwegian political scientists have developed and advanced theories of organizations within this tradition and have developed strong ties across the Atlantic. It is therefore not surprising that the EU governance research has been strongly influenced by this tradition. In fact, a key motivation behind much of the Norwegian EU governance research have been to explore and exploit the possibilities of bringing concepts, theories and methods from the general public administration and organizational theory to the case of European governance. European integration has therefore to a large extent been seen as an experiment for, on the one hand, to study the creation and

evolution of a new multi-layered and poly-centric governing system, and on the other hand a laboratory for studying how domestic institutions adapt to changes in their tasks and environments.

The linkage to organizational and institutional theory can be easily traced in general and encompassing approaches to the EU (Egeberg 2006; Olsen 2007).⁶ It can also be traced in specific studies of the roles and behaviour in EU committees (Trondal 2001; 2004; Trondal & Veggeland 2003)⁷, in studies examining the prevalence and implications of different organizational principles in the EU (Egeberg 2006)⁸, in works regarding the possibilities for institutional design in the EU, in for instance treaty revisions, as well as in the developments of a European administrative space (Olsen 2002b), in relationship to the importance of political labelling and institutional fit in EU decision making (Ugland 2003)⁹, as well in studies of national adaptation and implementation of EU policies (Sverdrup 2003).¹⁰

These roots have played an important role in skewing the Norwegian research into empirical research focusing primarily on explaining and interpreting the creation, developments and change of institutions and political orders. We find a clear pattern of path-dependency in the approaches and concepts that have been used, but at the same time the transfer of lessons from these traditions into the study of EU governance have also provided an opportunity for critical assessments and new innovations.

There is one significant exception to this path-dependency, namely the more recent research on political theory and the focus on evaluations and justification of the emerging EU governance system. Historically, such normative political theory has played second fiddle to empirically based studies in Norwegian political science. Parts of the normative political theory research has been strongly inspired by the works of Jürgen Habermas, and it has focused in particular on the role of formal legal rights, legal constitutions, and the particular role of deliberation in the emerging European order (Eriksen & Fossum 2000).¹¹ Some of this research is theoretical, but there are some studies showing how specific norms and ideas have influenced the governance of EU's policies in the field of external affairs, and in its decision to expand and to include new member states (Sjursen 2006).¹² Others have approached issues related to the democratic qualities of the EU governance system from a different analytical approach and angle (Føllesdal 2006).

ORGANIZING KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

One of the key factors for creating a strong research milieu on EU governance was the decision in the early 1990s to develop a long-term research programme on European integration and its effects on the nation state. This initiative came from a group of researchers in political science, who argued that Norwegian social science was not adapted to the new

political situation, and recommended that the Norwegian Research Council initiated a research programme focused on basic research aimed at improving the understandings of the basic dynamics of the current changes in Europe. This initiative later led to the creation of the ARENA programme.

A large part of the dynamics created by ARENA was also caused by the leadership of the centre. Johan P. Olsen, who was already a well established scholar in public administration and organizational theory, and an experienced leader of research programmes, played a key role in setting up the research centre, designing its research profile, and not least, played a key role in implementing it.

Since 1994 ARENA has had a budget of approximately 1 million Euro per year. Compared with the money spent on EU governance research in other countries this budget is very small. But by the standards of social science research in Norway this amount was generous and significant. Perhaps equally important as the size of the budget, was the time-horizon. The programme had a long term horizon (ten years), which meant that it was possible to set up research groups, recruit researchers (several of them from universities abroad), and to develop a genuine research centre which could attract most of its attention to conducting research. The decision in Norway to set up a research programme focusing on European integration and EU governance was also noticed with interest in other European countries. The creation of the "Regieren in Europa" programme in Germany and the UK programme "One Europe or Several" eased the communication and exchanges between governance scholars and increased the internationalization of the Norwegian research.

CONCLUSIONS

In this brief examination of the Norwegian case, I have highlighted three distinct features that have been particularly influential.

Firstly, the political contestation of the issue of Norway's formal relationship to the EU, and the importance of the EU to the Norwegian government and society, created a functional demand for research and knowledge on European integration in the Norwegian society. The polarized political setting created a window of opportunity for academic research that was autonomous and neutral, and it also contributed to skew the research towards the international research agenda.

Secondly, Norwegian research on EU governance have been influenced and inspired by its legacy. Both the state- and nation building literature stemming from the Rokkan tradition, and the organizational theory approach, have influenced the research questions that have been asked, the theories and concepts applied, as well as the methods that have been used. However, the EU governance research is not just a passive replication of former findings;

instead some of the previous findings have been put to a test in a new international and European political order. With such strong path-dependencies, it is not unexpected that approaches related to for instance formal game-theory have experienced harsher growth conditions.

Thirdly, I have pointed to some elements related to the significance of the organization of knowledge production for Norwegian research on EU governance. The creation of a research programme, with a long term financing arrangement, combined with a strong and ambitious academic and administrative leadership has been important to shape the development of Norwegian EU governance research.

Although there are some Norwegian particularities, it is also important to note that the extensive growth of EU governance research is part of larger Pan-European development. A large part of the success of the Norwegian initiatives during the beginning of the 1990s was caused by the fact that it coincided with initiatives and developments that were taken in other countries. Involvement in the large EU financed networks and programmes related to EU governance, like CIDEL and CONNEX and to some extent NEWGOV, have contributed to link the Norwegian governance research to the larger European research environment. It follows from this contextual approach that the issue of sustainability of the Norwegian research on EU governance is left open. It is beyond doubt that the Norwegian research milieu is limited and vulnerable, compared to the research that is going on in other countries. Although there have been significant improvements in terms of quantity and quality during the last decade, it remains to be seen how robust this research milieu is to changes in its political environment, its financial arrangements, as well as to its leadership and organization.

NOTES

1. I have decided to focus primarily on the EU governance research that has been conducted at ARENA (Advanced Research on The Europeanization of the Nation State), now the ARENA Centre for European Studies at the University of Oslo. It follows from this that the picture I paint is not the complete picture of Norwegian EU governance research. However, I still believe that this delimitation can be justified by the fact that ARENA has been the largest research centre on European governance in Norway during the last decade, and that it has served as a node for European research in Norway. In addition, during the time of ARENA there has been considerable turnover and exchange of ideas, persons, and research projects between ARENA and other research groups in Norway. Finally, and more pragmatically, since I have been attached to ARENA for quite some time myself, I found it most convenient to focus on the research activity that I know the best.
2. For an overview of the number of PhDs and research themes see: <http://www.statsvitenskap.uio.no/fag/polit/disputas/>
3. This listing below is just meant as an illustration and could of course be made longer.
4. See here for the list which is continuously changing <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/action/showMostCitedArticles?journalCode=jcms&cookieSet=1>
5. For an overview of the works of Rokkan see the book edited by Peter Flora, which was also

- partly financed by ARENA Flora P. 1999. *State Formation, Nation-Building, and Mass Politics in Europe: The Theory of Stein Rokkan*. London: Oxford University Press.
6. Project in GOVDATA: "ARENA".
 7. Project in GOVDATA: "Integration through Participation in EU committees".
 8. Project in GOVDATA: "Role behaviour in the College of the European Commission" and "Role behaviour in the European Commission services".
 9. Project in GOVDATA: "Europeanization of Nordic Alcohol Control Policies".
 10. Project in GOVDATA: "Compliance with EU norms – comparing the EU and EEA".
 11. Project in GOVDATA: "(CIDEL) Constitution Making and Legitimacy".
 12. Project in GOVDATA: "(CIDEL) External Security", and "(CIDEL) Justifying Enlargement".

REFERENCES

- Aalberts, Tanja E. (2004), 'The future of sovereignty in multilevel governance Europe – A constructivist reading', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, **42** (1), 23–46.
- Aarts, Kees and Henk van der Kolk (2006), 'Understanding the Dutch "No": The Euro, the East, and the Elite', *Political Science and Politics* **39** (2), 243–246.
- Andersen, Svein S. and Kjell A. Eliassen (2001), *Making Policy In Europe*, London: Sage.
- Beyers, Jan (2002), 'Gaining and seeking access: the European adaptation of domestic interest associations', *European Journal of Political Research* **41** (5), 585–612.
- Beyers, Jan (2004), 'Voice and access: political practices of European interest associations', *European Union Politics* **5** (20), 211–240.
- Bovens, Mark (2006), 'Analysing and Assessing Public Accountability. A Conceptual Framework', *European Governance Papers (EUROGOV)*, No. C-06-01.
- Brug, Wouter van der and Cees van der Eijk (2007), *European Elections and Domestic Politics: Lessons from the Past and Scenarios for the Future*, Paris: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Centraal Planbureau (2002), 'Financiering van wetenschappelijk onderzoek in internationaal perspectief', *CPB Memorandum 28*, The Hague: CPB.
- Christiansen, Thomas (1996), 'Second thoughts on Europe's "third level": the European Union's Committee of the Regions', *Publius* **26** (1), 93–116.
- Christiansen, Thomas and Emil Kirchner (2000), *Committee governance in the European Union*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Christiansen, Thomas, Andreas Follesdal and Simona Piattoni (eds) (2006), *Informal governance in the European Union*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Cruijsen, Carin van der and Sylvester Eijffinger (2007), 'The economic impact of central bank transparency: a survey', *CentER Discussion paper 2007-06*, Tilburg: CentER, Tilburg University.
- Crum, Ben (2005), 'Tailoring representative democracy to the European Union: does the European constitution reduce the democratic deficit?', *European Law Journal* **11** (94), 452–467.
- Curtin, Deirdre and André Nollkaemper (2006), 'Conceptualising Accountability in International and European Law', *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, **36**, 3–20.

- Dølvik, Jon E. (1997), 'Redrawing boundaries of solidarity? ETUC, social dialogue and the Europeanisation of trade unions in the 1990s', *ARENA Report 5/97/FAFO* (report no. 238), Oslo: ARENA.
- Egeberg Morten (ed.) (2006), *Multilevel Union Administration - The transformation of Executive Politics in Europe*, London: Palgrave.
- Eijk, Cees van der and Mark Franklin (1996), *Choosing Europe? The European Electorate and National Politics in the Face of Union*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Eliassen, Kjell A. (ed.) (1998), *Foreign and Security Policy in the European Union*, London: Sage.
- Eriksen, Erik O. and John E. Fossum (eds) (2000), *Democracy in the European Union - Integration through deliberation?*, London: Routledge.
- Flora, Peter (1999), *State Formation, Nation-Building, and Mass Politics in Europe: The Theory of Stein Rokkan*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Føllesdal, Andreas and Simon Hix (2006), 'Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44, 533-62.
- Føllesdal, Andreas (2006), 'Survey Article: The Legitimacy Deficits of the European Union', *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 14, 441-68.
- Groenendijk, Nico (2003), 'Multi-level Governance, Network Governance, and Fiscal Federalism Theory', in Ari Salminen (ed.), *Governing networks*, Amsterdam: IIAS/IOS Press, pp. 349-370.
- Groenendijk, Nico (2007), 'Enhanced cooperation: the way-out or a non-starter?', in Nanette Neuwahl and Stefan Haack (eds), *Unresolved Issues of the European Constitution - Rethinking the Crisis*, Montreal: Éditions Thémis, pp. 263-290.
- Haverland, Markus and Ronald Holzhaacker (2006), *European research reloaded: Cooperation and integration among Europeanized states*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heere, Wybo P. (ed.) (2003), *From Government to Governance. The Growing Impact of Non-State Actors on the International and European Legal System*, Proceedings of the Sixth Hague Joint Conference held in The Hague, The Netherlands, The Hague: T.M.C. Asser Press.
- Hooghe, Liesbeth (2001), *The European Commission and the integration of Europe: images of governance*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooghe, Liesbeth (ed.) (1996), *Cohesion, policy and European integration: building multi-level governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hooghe, Liesbeth and Gary Marks (2000), 'Optimality and authority: a critique of neoclassical theory', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38 (5), 795-815.
- Hooghe, Liesbeth and Gary Marks (2003), 'Unraveling the Central State, but How? Types of Multi-level Governance', *American Political Science Review*, 97, 233-243.
- Hosli, Madeleine (1996), 'Coalitions and power: effects of qualified majority voting on the Council of the European Union', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (20), 255-274.
- Hosli, Madeleine and Hannu Nurmi (2003), 'Which decision rule for the future Council?', *European Union Politics*, 4 (1), 37-50.
- Hosli, Madeleine and Robert Thompson (2006), 'Who has power in the EU? The Commission, Council and Parliament in legislative decisionmaking', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44 (2), 391-417.

- Hosli, Madeleine and Tanja Börzel (2003), 'Brussels between Bern and Berlin: comparative federalism meets the European Union', *Governance*, **16** (2), 179–202.
- Hosli, Madeleine, Christine Arnold, Michael Laver and Kenneth Benoit (2005), 'Measuring national delegate positions at the convention on the future of Europe using computerized word scoring', *European Union Politics*, **6** (3), 291–313.
- Jacobsson Bengt, Per Læg Reid and Ove K. Pedersen (2003), *Europeanization and Transnational States: Comparing Nordic Central Government*, London: Routledge.
- Kersbergen, Kees van and Frans van Waarden (2001), *Shifts in Governance: Problems of Legitimacy and Accountability*, Background Study on the Theme 'Shifts in Governance' as Part of the Strategic Plan 2002-2005 of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), The Hague: NWO-MAGW; Social Science Research Council.
- Kersbergen, Kees van and Frans van Waarden (2004), "'Governance" as a bridge between disciplines: Cross-disciplinary inspiration regarding shifts in governance and problems of governability, accountability and legitimacy', *European Journal of Political Research*, **43**, 143–171.
- Mair, Peter (2005), 'Popular Democracy and the European Union Polity', *European Governance Papers (EUROGOV)*, No. C-05-03.
- March James G. and Herbert A. Simon (1993), *Organizations*, Cambridge MA: Blackwell.
- Marks, Gary (1996a), *Governance in the European Union*, London: Thousand Oaks CA/Sage.
- Marks, Gary (1996b), 'An actor-centred approach to multilevel governance', *Regional and federal studies*, **6** (2), 20–40.
- Marks, Gary and Liesbeth Hooghe (2006), 'Europe's blues: Theoretical soul-searching after the rejection of the European constitution', *Political science & politics*, **39** (2), 247–250.
- Marks, Gary and Marco R. Steenbergen (eds) (2004), *European Integration and Political Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayntz Renate (2005), 'Embedded Theorizing - Perspectives on Globalization and Global Governance', *MPIfG Discussion paper* 05.
- Nollkaemper, André and Erika de Wet (2004), 'The application of customary international law by national courts: Introduction', *Non-State Actors and International Law*, **4**, 1–2.
- Olsen, Johan P., Ulf Sverdrup and Frode Vegge land (1997), 'A Survey of Norwegian Political Science Research on European Integration and Co-operation: 1994-1997', *Rep. Working paper No 12/1997*. [A shorter version was published in G. Ciavarini Azzi (ed.), *Survey of Current Political Science Research on European Integration Worldwide: 1994-97*, published by International Political Science Association., Oslo: ARENA].
- Olsen, Johan P. (2002a), 'The Many Faces of Europeanization', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, **40**, 921–52.
- Olsen, Johan P. (2002b), 'Towards a European Administrative Space?', *Journal of European Public Policy*, **10**, 506–31.
- Olsen, Johan P. (2007), *Europe in Search of Political Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rieker Pernille (2006), *Europeanization of national security identity: The EU and the changing security identities of the Nordic states*, London: Routledge.

- Schendelen, Rinus Van (2002), *Machiavelli in Brussels: the art of lobbying the EU*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Schmitt, Hermann and Jacques J. A. Thomassen (eds) (1999), *Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, Hermann and Jacques J. A. Thomassen (2000), 'Dynamic Representation: the Case of European Integration', *European Union Politics*, **1** (3), 318–339.
- Schmitter Philippe C. (1999), 'Reflections on the Impact of the European Union upon "Domestic" Democracy in its Member States', in Morten Egeberg and Per Lægveid (eds), *Organizing Political Institutions - Essays for Johan P. Olsen*, Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, pp. 289-98.
- Semetko, Holli A., Claes H. de Vreese and Jochen Peter (2000), 'Europeanised politics – Europeanised media? European integration and political communication', *West European Politics*, **23** (4), 121–141.
- Sjursen Helene (ed.) (2006), *Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Steunenberg, Bernard (2003), 'Deciding among equals: The sectoral Councils of the European Union and their reform', in M.J. Holler, H. Kliemt, D. Schmidtchen and M. E. Streit (eds), *European Governance*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Steunenberg, Bernard (ed.) (2002), *Widening the European Union: The politics of institutional change and reform*, London: Routledge.
- Steunenberg, Bernard, Christian Koboldt and Dieter Schmidtchen (2000), 'Beyond comitology: A comparative analysis of implementation procedures with parliamentary involvement', in Peter Moser, Gerald Schneider and Gebhard Kirchgässner (eds), *Decision rules in the European Union: A rational choice perspective*, Houndsmills/Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Stokman, Frans and Robert Thomson (2004), 'Winners and Losers in the European Union', *European Union Politics*, **5** (1), 5–23.
- Stokman, Frans, Robert Thompson, Christopher H. Achen and Thomas Koenig (eds) (2006), *The European Union decides*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sverdrup Ulf (2003), 'Compliance and Conflict Management in the European Union: Nordic Exceptionalism', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, **27**, 23–43.
- Thomassen, Jacques J.A., Abdul G. Noury and Erik Voeten (2004), 'Political Competition in the European Parliament: Evidence from Roll Call and Survey Analysis', in Gary Marks and Marco R. Steenbergen (eds), *European Integration and Political Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomson, Robert, Jovanka Boerefijn and Frans Stokman (2004), 'Actor alignments in European Union decision-making', *European Journal of Political Research*, **43** (2), 273–261.
- Trondal, Jarle and Frode Veggeland (2003), 'Access, Voice and Loyalty. The Representation of Domestic Civil Servants in EU Committees', *Journal of European Public Policy*, **10**, 65–83.
- Trondal, Jarle (2001), *Administrative integration across levels of governance: integration through participation in EU committees*, Oslo: ARENA report.
- Trondal, Jarle (2004), 'Re-socializing Civil Servants. The Transformative Powers of EU Institutions', *Acta Politica*, **39**, 4–30.
- Ugland Trygve (2003), 'Adaptation and Integration through Policy Re-categorization', *Journal of Public Policy*, **23**, 157–70.

- Vanhoonacker, Sophie and Simon Duke (2006), 'Administrative governance in CFSP: development and practice', *European foreign affairs review*, 11 (2), 163–182.
- Verbeek, Bertjan and Kees van Kersbergen (2004), 'Subsidiarity as a principle of governance in the European Union', *Comparative European Politics*, 2 (2), 142–162.
- Vreese, Claes H. de, Susan A. Banducci, Holli A. Semetko and Hajo G. Boomgaarden (2006), 'The news coverage of the 2004 European Parliamentary election campaign in 25 countries', *European Union Politics*, 7 (4), 477–504.
- Wessel, Ramses, Andreas Follesdal and Jan Wouters (eds.) (2007), *Multilevel Regulation and the EU: The Interplay between Global, European and National Normative Processes*, Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Wet, Erika de (2006), 'The International Constitutional Order', *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 55 (1), 51–76.