

CONFERENCE OF THE RESEARCH UNIT "HORIZONTAL EUROPEANIZATION"



BERLIN, NOVEMBER 2-3, 2017

Organized by Jürgen Gerhards & Steffen Mau

The Research Unit "Horizontal Europeanization" is funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). The research group examines processes of European Integration that occur in the interaction between administrations, organizations and individuals. We work in seven research fields and together generate more general knowledge on the scale and scope of Horizontal Europeanization. Our team is composed of eleven researchers based in Germany and Austria.

Location

Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)
Reichpietschufer 50 | 10785 Berlin | Room A 300

Aim of the Conference

The aim of the conference is to present preliminary findings from the research unit "Horizontal Europeanization" to colleagues working on the sociology of Europe in Germany and abroad, and to discuss our empirical results with them. The conference will have the character of a workshop. It strives to intensify informal relations among the European-sociological research community.

Registration

Please register via the mail adress: [**horizontal-eu-conference@hu-berlin.de**](mailto:horizontal-eu-conference@hu-berlin.de)

Researchers who are not members of the Research Unit "Horizontal Europeanization" may also attend the workshop. They should also register with the organizers beforehand. The panel discussion on Thursday evening is open to the general public and does not require registration.

	PROJECT	DISCUSSANT
THURSDAY, November 2		
1.30 – 2 pm	Introduction and Conceptual Framework of the Research Unit: The Europeanization of Social Space and Social Fields <i>Martin Heidenreich & Jenny Preunkert</i>	
2 – 3.15 pm	Academic Capitalism and the Europeanization of the Academic Field: Transnational Research and Career Paths between Symbolic Integration and Social Closure <i>Richard Münch, Stephanie Beyer, Christian Baier & Vincent Gengnagel</i>	Niilo Kauppi, <i>Université de Strasbourg</i>
3.15 – 4.30 pm	Asylum Administrations in Europe: Transnational Practices between Cooperation and Conflict <i>Christian Lahusen, Karin Schittenhelm, Carolin Nieswandt & Marius Wacker</i>	Virginie Guiraudon, <i>Sciences Po Paris</i>
4.30 – 5 pm	BREAK	
5 – 6.30 pm	Panel discussion: "The Growing Divide between the People and the Elites in Europe: Causes and Prospective Solutions"	Jürgen Gerhards, <i>Free University Berlin</i> Virginie Guiraudon, <i>Sciences Po Paris</i> Andreas Nölke, <i>Goethe University Frankfurt</i> Michael Zürn, <i>WZB Berlin</i> Chair: Steffen Mau, <i>Humboldt Universität zu Berlin</i>
7 – 11 pm	DINNER	

	PROJECT	DISCUSSANT
FRIDAY, November 3		
9 – 10.15 am	<p>Programming and Practice of EU Funding – A Comparative View on the Social World of EU Funding</p> <p><i>Sebastian M. Büttner, Lucia Leopold, Steffen Mau & Katharina Zimmermann</i></p>	<p>Antoine Vauchez, <i>Centre national de la recherche scientifique / Université Paris 1-Sorbonne</i></p>
10.15 – 11.30 am	<p>How Strong is Solidarity among European Citizens and the Member States of the European Union?</p> <p><i>Jürgen Gerhards, Holger Lengfeld, Zsófia S. Ignácz, Florian K. Kley & Maximilian Priem</i></p>	<p>Juan Díez Medrano, <i>Universidad Carlos III de Madrid</i></p>
11.30 – 11.45 am	BREAK	
11.45 am – 1 pm	<p>Europe as an Emerging, yet Unequal Social Space</p> <p><i>Jan Delhey, Emanuel Deutschmann, Auke Aplowski & Monika Verbalyte</i></p>	<p>Theresa Kuhn, <i>University of Amsterdam</i></p>
1 – 2 pm	LUNCH	
2.15 – 3.30 pm	<p>The Dualization of Labor Markets in the Eurozone</p> <p><i>Martin Heidenreich, Sven Broschinski & Matthias Pohlig</i></p>	<p>Tim Goedemé, <i>University of Antwerp</i></p>
3.30 – 4 pm	FINAL DISCUSSION	
4.15 – 6 pm	Internal meeting of the members of the research unit	

Abstracts

The Europeanization of Social Space and Social Fields

Martin Heidenreich & Jenny Preunkert

Sub-Project Z: Central Tasks of the Research Groups

The economic, legal and political integration of Europe is at the core of the process of European integration. However, in particular since the 1990s, European integration has given rise to a fundamental transformation of social relations and the life worlds of people. While in the post-war period, daily life primarily took place in the framework of nation-states, the opening up of hitherto largely nationally regulated and limited social fields and the national space of everyday life has fostered increasing cross-border contacts and a stronger transnationalization of social interactions, attitudes and interpretations. This transnationalization of the social space and social fields as a result of European integration is analyzed for the academic, bureaucratic, professional and associational fields, also taking into account on the related conflicts and bargaining relations and their impact on patterns of social inequality. As to the Europeanization of social space, we focus on the examples of the transnationalization of human interactions and of reference groups for perceptions of social inequalities. This raises the question of the relationship between field-specific and space-specific Europeanization processes.

Academic Capitalism and the Europeanization of the Academic Field: Transnational Research and Career Paths between Symbolic Integration and Social Closure

Richard Münch, Stephanie Beyer, Christian Baier & Vincent Gengnagel

Sub-Project 1: Europeanization of Higher Education: Between Global Knowledge Society and National Traditions

Academic capitalism as the dominant paradigm of scientific knowledge production is a global phenomenon that accelerates since the 1990s. In the wake of this development, a worldwide competition for academic prestige has been established. According to the prevalent neoliberal conceptualization of science, national regulations across Europe shift toward funding policies focused on market-like competition, global visibility, and output-oriented evaluation. These developments in the national spheres are paralleled by current EU science policy: the establishment of a "European Research Area" (ERA). The ERA is designed to act as a core catalyst of the restructuring of academia in Europe, thereby enhancing the status of "European science" in the global competition for academic prestige. This policy of academic capitalism entails various factors and trends: On the one hand, EU research funding in the so-called *Framework Programmes* aims to foster applied research in order to directly impact political challenges and economic developments in the EU. On the other hand, the complete academic spectrum is supposed to integrate into the ERA – including "pure" basic research and disciplines from the social sciences and humanities. To this end, the European Research Council (ERC), charged with funding academic "excellence" and creating a "European Champions League of Research", was established in 2007. The advance of academic capitalism in the EU has complex effects on established national academic fields, career trajectories and notions of academic autonomy.

In our presentation, we focus on three main aspects of the establishment of the ERC in order to trace the effects of academic capitalism and uncover its degrees of symbolic integration and social closure.

1) *Europeanization as standardization of academic competition*: European research policy operates with output-based and disciplinary non-specific concepts of scientific excellence. European funding institutions guided by such a one-dimensional conceptualization of excellence tend to favor already dominant national fields, disciplines, universities and researchers, and

increase the already considerable adaptation pressures in peripheral positions. As a result, European science policy might become a threat to the major strength of the European scientific landscape – its pluralism and diversity.

2) *Europeanization through career-paths and networks*: Programmatically, ERC funding aims at increasing the mobility of European academics, among European countries as well as world-wide. The idea is that mobility leads to the dissolution of boundaries between national academic traditions in Europe, which are viewed by EU science policy as largely inefficient. Furthermore, increased global mobility is supposed to enhance the visibility of European science in the world and strengthen Europe's connection to the global centers of academic prestige (in the US). In practice, however, the consecration of "excellent" young researchers ("starting grantees") does not seem to create more academic mobility, but instead privileges already-dominant national mobile elites, who tend to be quite mobile transnationally in the early years of their academic careers.

3) *Europeanization of research topics and rhetoric*: Historically, the Social Sciences and the Humanities (SSH) have had a difficult position in the context of European science policy. While these fields have been afforded their own funding category in the ERC scheme, their integration is precarious at best, and their integrity is threatened by the intrusion of relatively alien elements such as a rather dominant "cultural neuroscience", applied research, and a marketization and projectification of the research rhetoric. As a response, SSH projects within the ERC competition tend to still claim academic autonomy, while at the same time adopting various strategies of self-representation and legitimization of their research interest in the light of European policy imperatives.

Asylum Administrations in Europe: Transnational Practices between Cooperation and Conflict

Christian Lahusen, Karin Schittenhelm, Carolin Nieswandt & Marius Wacker

Sub-Project 2: Europeanization of Asylum Administrative Practice?

The mass influx of forced migrants in the past years has put the European Union and the "Common European Asylum System" (CEAS) under a particular strain. Research has analyzed closely the political conflicts and negotiations within this policy field, but largely ignored the practical work of public administrations in its member states, and the cross-national cooperation between asylum granting authorities. Our presentation will take a closer look at the CEAS and show that the EU has established gradually a transnational bureaucratic field with common practices, instruments and discourses. It is true that asylum politics remain a core task of sovereign state action, and that the European field of asylum administration is still marked by considerable national differences and path-dependencies. Instead of convergence, we see ongoing conflicts between member states. At the same time, however, it is true that cross-national coordination and cooperation between asylum administrations are well developed and firmly rooted in a series of instruments and organizational structures (e.g., the "European Asylum Support Office", the CEAS's legal framework, electronic platforms, joint learning programs, the exchange of personnel).

Our project has two aims. On a descriptive level, we will unveil the cross-national structures of cooperation within this bureaucratic field. With reference to the Dublin system and available data about the number of asylum applications and the amount of inter-agency contacts per country, we will show that the European field of public administration is patterned by core-periphery structures with some degree of continuity. On an explanatory level, we will dig into the inherent rationale structuring transnational coordination and cooperation. We will argue that the European asylum field cannot be properly understood if we look only at political agendas and conflicts. The patterns of this field and its development over time are also determined by a purely bureaucratic rationale that seems to become ever more prominent in times of crisis.

Programming and Practice of EU Funding – A Comparative View on the Social World of EU Funding

Sebastian M. Büttner, Lucia Leopold, Steffen Mau & Katharina Zimmermann

Sub-Project 5: EU-Professionalism: A Sociological Study of the Professionalization of EU Expertise

The allocation of resources for implementing EU-specific policy objectives represents a central element of EU policymaking. The overall effectiveness of EU policies, however, is not clear at all and there is some evidence that “spending money is not so easy”. In this contribution, we focus on practices of EU funding in Germany, Poland and Spain, all three representing different socio-economic positions and different histories of EU funding. We shift the usual focus of implementation research, however, from questions of “compliance” and “administrative adjustment” to an analysis of the particular professional universe of EU policy implementation. We argue that EU policy implementation is a highly structured field of professional practice requiring a great deal of special knowledge and expertise on numerous different bits and pieces of EU funding. Consequently, EU funding and EU policy implementation go hand in hand with increasing expertise and specialization. Moreover, it is strongly embedded in an entire web of professional supportive services raising the awareness for funding opportunities, explaining highly specified and codified funding guidelines to potential beneficiaries and accompanying beneficiaries at different stages of EU policy implementation. Hence, EU funding not only depends on “administrative capacity”, what is usually put forward as a major factor or obstacle of successful policy implementation, but on specialization and professional practices of policy translation. We argue that EU policy implementation in EU member states is fundamentally shaped by the supportive services and by the professional infrastructure that is linked with it.

How Strong is Solidarity among European Citizens and the Member States of the European Union?

Jürgen Gerhards, Holger Lengfeld, Zsófia S. Ignácz, Florian K. Kley & Maximilian Priem

Sub-Project 3: How Strong is Solidarity among European Citizens and the Member States of the European Union?

The various crises affecting the European Union (i.e. the Euro crisis, the debt crisis, the economic crisis, the refugee crisis and the looming Brexit) have challenged the bond of European solidarity between European citizens and between the member states of the EU. We distinguish four dimensions of European solidarity: (a) Fiscal solidarity means citizens’ willingness to support indebted European countries financially. (b) Territorial solidarity can be considered as the willingness to reduce inequality between poor and rich EU countries. (c) European welfare state solidarity is defined as citizens’ strong agreement to support those in need – the unemployed, sick, elderly, or poor – regardless of where they live in the EU. Finally, the refugee crisis has raised the question (d) how to distribute refugees among the member states (internal solidarity) and whether the EU should allow refugees to enter Europe at all (humanitarian or external solidarity).

Based on a survey conducted in 13 EU countries in 2016, we determine the strength of European solidarity in the four different dimensions. We further analyze to what extent differences between citizens and countries shape attitudes towards European solidarity and whether these differences constitute a basis for political cleavages on the EU policy level. Our presentation summarizes the central findings of our study. Although we find significant differences between the 13 countries, the results show that overall and on the aggregate level, European solidarity is much stronger than several scholars previously suggested. The majority of citizens demonstrate fiscal, territorial, and European welfare solidarity. They are generally willing to help refugees in need and would share the costs of the refugee crisis. Furthermore, the influence of the respondents’ socio-structural characteristics on attitudes towards European solidarity is very low and the influence of cultural characteristics is rather moderate, while in some cases, there are noticeable cross-cultural differences.

Europe as an Emerging, yet Unequal Social Space

Jan Delhey, Emanuel Deutschmann, Auke Apłowski & Monika Verbalyte

Sub-Project 4: Cross-border Interactions and Transnational Identities

The current crisis of the European Union seems to confirm that Europe “does not work”. Since long, scholars have highlighted the deficits of the European project: the lack of a truly European public sphere as well as a strong European identity; the elite-driven top-down approach in which the citizens have little say; the lack of positive integration and the missing “social” dimension of the integration project. While these issues are undeniable, it is equally undeniable that scholars often judge the European project against an extremely demanding yardstick: the modern nation state with its fully-fledged set of institutions that has homogenized its population socio-economically and culturally. Europe, many observers conclude, exists only as a political entity, not as a social entity.

This “nation state writ large” perspective, however, might overlook the extent to which Europe today does form “an ever closer union of people”, as it is the declared goal of the EU. In this contribution, we provide evidence for Europe having emerged as a distinct social space by tracking Europeans’ regional focus of transnational human activities (mobility and communication) over half a century – from 1960 to 2010. Combining classical ideas from regional integration studies in the tradition of Karl W. Deutsch with cutting-edge social network analysis, we argue that an increasing density of specifically “European” transnational human activities indicates the emergence of a European social space as a distinct layer of association between the nation state and world society.

Our empirical evidence is based on data on international migration and communication for 37 European countries and 179 countries worldwide. We employ community detection algorithms to explore to which extent a European social space has emerged as a distinct cluster within the worldwide network(s) of migration and communication.

Our results provide compelling evidence that a European social space emerged over the 50-year-period covered. Concerning migration, for example, a distinct European cluster emerged during the 1970s that did not exist before. Up to that time, most European countries were either part of a huge, multi-continental network (typically, the Western European countries) or of the Communist bloc network (the Eastern European countries). Over time, this emerging European cluster incorporated more and more European countries. This suggests that the dual political process of deepening and enlarging the European Union facilitated the emergence and growth of Europe as a distinguishable social space of transnational human activity.

Zooming in into the group of highly mobile and “transnational” Europeans, however, reveals that there are major social gradients in transnational activity. Although it seems exaggerated to speak of horizontal Europeanization as a “class project”, those citizens with a better socio-economic standing are clearly more involved in the emerging transnational space. Further, social gradients in transnational activity are systematically larger, not smaller, in more affluent European countries, which suggests that transnational experiences are used strategically as a new form of distinction.

Our contribution closes with a reflection of potentially related conflicts. Somewhat paradoxically, the very success in generating a European social space might have fueled, though not caused, the current crisis of the EU.

The Dualization of Labor Markets in the Eurozone

Martin Heidenreich, Sven Broschinski & Matthias Pohlig

Sub-Project 7: Europeanization and Social Inequalities

19 EU member states are currently part of the European Monetary Union (EMU), which is characterized by a Europeanization of monetary policies and national competencies for fiscal and economic policies. This "deficient institutionalization" has limited the scope for buffering financially asymmetric shocks, putting all the adaptation pressures on the labor market. For the countries most strongly affected by the Eurozone crisis since 2010, this implies that they can react to economic challenges by either lower wages, lower employment levels or higher job insecurity. The central thesis of our presentation is that the usage of these three macroeconomic buffers is shaped by insider-outsider-relations. Therefore, the politicization of structural change in a monetary union might have contributed to deeper cleavages. This is demonstrated by a detailed analysis of country-specific and group-specific wage, employment and job insecurity risks on the basis of EU-SILC-data for 2005-2015. In contrast to devaluations in flexible exchange rate systems that would equally affect all groups, it can be shown that the risks of unemployment, low wages and precarity risks are particularly high for labor market outsiders in the EMU. This supports an even stronger segmentation of the European labor markets between men and women, native and foreign individuals, and skilled and unskilled persons. In conclusion, inequalities concerning unemployment risks, earning opportunities and job security increased especially in the countries most affected by the crisis. Thus, the Eurozone crisis has contributed to an increasing segmentation of the European labor markets and societies, especially in Southern Europe.