

The Development of European Integration Studies in Political Science: The Netherlands

Citation for published version (APA):

Dijkstra, H., & Vink, M. (2012). The Development of European Integration Studies in Political Science: The Netherlands. In F. Bindi, & K. Eliassen (Eds.), *Analyzing European Union Politics* (pp. 355-380). Il Mulino.

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2012

Document Version:

Early version submitted to journal

Document license:

Unspecified

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

The Development of European Integration Studies in Political Science: The Netherlands

This is a pre-print of a chapter forthcoming in: Frederiga Bindi and Kjell Eliassen (eds)
The Development of European Integration Studies in Political Science: An Introduction

Hylke Dijkstra and Maarten Vink
Maastricht University, The Netherlands

September 2010

Abstract. The study of European integration in the Netherlands is closely intertwined with the international research agenda on governance, with a focus on formal and informal policy-making, the role of the European institutions, and important accountability issues. The number of scholars at Dutch universities and think-tanks working on European integration issues, from a perspective of political science, public administration, or law, is substantial, with a very high output in terms of publications in international peer-reviewed journals. This is partially the result of an open and competitive recruitment process, leading to a substantial amount of foreign scholars working at Dutch universities. Political science and public administration, although relatively young disciplines in comparison with law, are well-established in the Netherlands as independent academic disciplines, with traditionally the emphasis in political science on comparative studies and electoral behaviour, and in public administration on organizational theory, policy processes, and behavioural studies. International relations, as a sub-field of political science, has traditionally focused more on Atlanticism and multilateralism, in line with the general political outlook in the Netherlands, but it is at least since the mid-1990s increasingly focusing on developments within the European Union.

About the authors

Hylke Dijkstra is a PhD candidate and a junior lecturer at the Department of Political Science of Maastricht University, The Netherlands. His research focuses on the role of the Council Secretariat and the European Commission in the Common Foreign and Security Policy. He is the co-editor of a special issue of the *European Integration Online Papers* on the role of bureaucracy in the European Security and Defence Policy. He has published articles in the *Journal of European Public Policy*, *European Foreign Affairs Review* and *International Peacekeeping*.

Maarten Vink is an Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science of Maastricht University, the Netherlands. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Leiden (2003) and was a Jean Monnet Fellow at the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute and FCT Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon, Portugal. Vink is co-editor of *Europeanization: New Research Agendas* (Palgrave Macmillan 2007, 2008) and author of *Limits of European Citizenship* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005). He has published papers in international journals such as *Acta Politica*, *Citizenship Studies*, *European Integration Online Papers*, *European Political Science*, *Field Methods*, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *Political Studies Review*, and *West European Politics*.

X.1. MAPPING EU INTEGRATION LITERATURE IN THE NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands has always played a prominent role in the process of European integration. It was a founding member of various regional organizations and several Dutch cities lend their names to milestones in the history of the European Union. It is therefore surprising that the study of EU integration by scholars with a background in political science or public administration is a rather recent phenomenon. Atlanticism and multilateralism – two constants of Dutch foreign policy – have topped the research agenda for a long time. Moreover, given a strong emphasis on international law in The Netherlands, lawyers had the upper hand. Since the mid-1990s, however, the study of EU integration has become a core topic in many political science and public administration departments and the quality of current Dutch scholarship on the European Union is very high. Competitive recruitment and open competition have led to an inflow of scholars with many different nationalities. The research tradition is analytical and scholars are encouraged to publish in international leading peer-reviewed journals.

The study of EU integration in The Netherlands is strongly intertwined with the international research agendas. It is therefore difficult to identify distinct Dutch approaches. This chapter instead lists four topics of research, where scholars have made notable contributions in understanding the process of European integration:

- The study of multi-level governance by Gary Marks and Liesbet Hooghe (Free University of Amsterdam, Political Science).
- The role of institutions. Particularly the group around Bernard Steunenberg (Leiden University, Public Administration) has studied decision-making rules, committees, agencies and compliance from an empirical perspective, with a strong focus on quantitative methods and formal models. The EU institutions are also widely studied at other universities, albeit with more pluralism in terms methods and theories. The more classical comparative work on parties and parliaments by Rudy Andeweg (Leiden University, Political Science) and Peter Mair (formerly Leiden, now at European University Institute), as well as the constructivist work of Thomas Christiansen (Maastricht University, Political Science) can be highlighted in this regard.
- The accountability of the process of European integration has been addressed by Mark Bovens and Deidre Curtin (Utrecht University).
- A strong Dutch empirical political science tradition on electoral studies and the public sphere has spilled over to the study of the European integration issues. Key scholars are, in this respect, Jos de Beus (University of Amsterdam, Political Science), Jacques Thomassen (University of Twente, Political Science) and Claes de Vreese (University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam School of Communication Research).

This chapter commences with an introduction into Dutch foreign policy and its approach to the process of European integration. Subsequently, it will discuss the political science and public administration traditions in The Netherlands from an historical angle. The four important topics in EU integration studies that are mentioned above are discussed and we will highlight in particular the quality of the Dutch academic contribution. Finally, in this chapter we also aim to present scholarly developments in a temporal context and we locate the development of scholarly approaches in The Netherlands in the broader European studies literature.

X.2. DUTCH FOREIGN POLICY AND EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

The Netherlands has historically been a small state with many international economic interests. As it did not have the physical resources to sustain a land army over long periods of time, it naturally became a strong proponent of international law, which tends to protect the status quo and the weaker states in the international arena. The Netherlands was famously the country of Grotius and The Hague became, during the course of the twentieth century, the host city of many international courts and tribunals. Support for international law was combined with a policy of neutrality, which only came to an end as a result of the German occupation in 1940 (e.g. Heldring, 1978; Voorhoeve, 1979). After the Second World War, multilateralism remained a cornerstone of Dutch foreign policy through support for the activities of the United Nations. Yet the years of war also created a sense of realism in that American friendship was to be sustained at all costs. This was partially a matter of appreciation for the liberation as well as Cold War necessity (Van Staden, 1989). The Netherlands thus became one of the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty and it contributed troops to the United

Nations Security Council-authorized, and American-led, Korean War (1950-1953).

In the regional context, The Netherlands has been a supporter of multilateralism as well. It hosted the The Hague Congress (1948), which resulted in the Council of Europe. It was furthermore a founding member of the Brussels Treaty Organization (1948 – later the Western European Union), the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC, 1952), and the European Economic Community (EEC, 1957). The Netherlands, however, never pursued an outright federalist ideology (Pijpers, 2006). It generally acted on pragmatic grounds. An often mentioned example is that when the High Authority of the ECSC was created, The Netherlands feared Franco-German domination in this autonomous supranational body. It therefore demanded the creation of a Council of Ministers with veto rights to create a balance of powers (Wellenstein, 2006; Nugent, 2006).¹ The Netherlands supported regional integration, because it felt this would serve its economic recovery. One scholar notes that it became a well-known saying in Brussels that “the Dutch speak of supranationalism but what they really mean is cheese” (quoted in Van Keulen, 2006: 97). The preference for regional integration, of course, fitted with the Europe-policy of the United States and thus with Dutch Atlanticism (Wellenstein, 2006).

Evidence of the pragmatic, functionalist, approach of The Netherlands is that it envisaged for each issue a different international organization. It was the role of the United Nations to provide collective security and legitimacy. The Atlantic Alliance was taking the lead as regards collective defence. The European Community dealt with economic integration. Such neat separation across issues was rigidly enforced during most of the Cold War. When President de Gaulle, for example, tabled his Fouchet Plans for a European Political Union (1959-1962), he immediately ran into a Dutch veto. His proposals were considered as anti-Atlanticist and anti-Commission, because they could potentially undermine NATO as well as the recently established Community (Nuttall, 1992). When a limited form of cooperation in the field of foreign policy was eventually established (European Political Cooperation, 1970-1993), The Netherlands spent much of its political capital to promote its 'communitarization' through the inclusion of the European Commission. Its rationale was a long-standing pragmatic fear that the large member states would use such mechanisms to bypass the Community and thus undermine trade liberalisation on the continent.

The Netherlands promoting the communitarization of European foreign policy reached its summit in the run up to the Intergovernmental Conference in Maastricht (1991). Having the rotating Presidency, the Dutch negotiators ignored an earlier compromise proposal by Luxembourg in favour of their own federalist blueprint for Europe. On 30 September, which became known as “Black Monday”, the other member states rejected the proposal to the complete surprise of the Dutch foreign and prime minister (van den Bos, 2008). This led to a more modest Europe-policy throughout the 1990s. The fear for the domination by the large member states continued nonetheless. Supported by many small states, The Netherlands tried to resist the creation of the position of President of the European Council in the Convention (“Sun King”), just as it had opposed the European Council from the start.

Since multilateralism and international law play such a crucial role in Dutch foreign policy, it is hardly surprising that the diplomatic service traditionally consisted of lawyers. Consequentially, the study of Dutch foreign policy, international relations and European integration was also mainly a legalistic affair. Laurens Jan Brinkhorst (1962, 1971), for example, published about European law, but also about the rules of procedure of the European Court of Justice. In the fields of political science (and public administration), the academic community was only to a limited extent interested in international relations and their emphasis was squarely on Dutch foreign policy in relationship to Atlanticism (e.g. Van Staden, 1974, 1989; Heldring, 1978; Voorhoeve, 1979; Baehr, 1980). The study of EU integration was originally not a major topic in political science research in The Netherlands.

X.3. DISCIPLINARY TRADITIONS IN THE NETHERLANDS

One of the typical features of the Dutch social science landscape is the historical division between political science and public administration as separate disciplines. Public administration is significantly bigger than political science in The Netherlands in terms of education and research. There are, for example, only four political science bachelor programmes (Free University of Amsterdam, Leiden, Nijmegen, University of Amsterdam), while there are eight public administration programmes (Delft, Free University of Amsterdam, Leiden, Nijmegen, Rotterdam, Tilburg, Twente, Utrecht).² As the number of students roughly correlates with

1 This proposal was picked up by Germany, which was coincidentally afraid of too much supranational (French) interference in the Ruhr region (Gillingham, 2006).

2 Apart from political science and public administration degrees, there are a number of interdisciplinary programmes in The Netherlands. Particularly European Studies in Maastricht and International Relations and Organizations in

the number of staff members at these universities (due to proportional governmental funding), research in public administration clearly has had the upper hand. Since both disciplines have developed in parallel, it is necessary to discuss them separately.

With regard to public administration and its relevance for EU integration studies, we can be rather short. As the international research agenda on EU integration did not extensively consider comparative politics, or let alone public administration, until the mid-1990s, Dutch public administration scholars spent little time on the European Union. Instead they focussed on typical public administration topics from public values and water management to the efficiency and legitimacy of the process of agencification. Only with the advent of the 'governance or public administration turn' in the study of EU integration (Kohler-Koch and Rittberger, 2006; Trondal, 2007), Dutch public administration scholars increasingly became more interested in the European Union and they currently dominate the study of EU integration in The Netherlands (see also below). The speed with which public administration has started focusing on the European Union remains somewhat puzzling.

For political science, we have to go back to the *postbellum* period. Robert Lieshout and Bob Reinalda (2001) note that the foundation of the discipline of political science in The Netherlands in the late 1940s and 1950s was very much an international initiative sponsored by UNESCO and the International Political Science Association (IPSA). They therefore argue that "most Dutch political scientists followed the example of their American and British colleagues by embracing behaviouralism and focusing on electoral studies". Dutch scholars made also important contributions, in this respect, on the international scene – not only through their publications, but also their service to the discipline. Jan Barents, for example, was one of the co-founders of IPSA. Hans Daalder was one of the co-founders of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), while Arend Lijphart was the founding editor of the European Journal for Political Research (EJPR). This increased, needless to say, the internationalisation of the discipline and made it even more intertwined with the Anglo-Saxon research agenda.

Despite a further consolidation of political science in The Netherlands in 1960s, the period between the end of the 1960s and the 1980s saw severe budget cuts and (personal) animosities in the political science departments, which resulted in a further split between the disciplines of political science and public administration (see Daalder 1991). The main result was that the discipline for political science became much smaller over time. Political science in The Netherlands remained strong in electoral studies, studies of political parties and parliaments and its comparative dimension (e.g. Rudy Andeweg; Peter Mair; Jacques Thomassen). However, just as the governance turn in EU studies has affected the discipline of public administration, the increasing interest in the concept of Europeanization and the comparative politics approach to the EU (Hix, 1994) has influenced scholars in the Dutch political science departments.

International relations never really developed in The Netherlands as a separate discipline, yet it not an integral part of the political science discipline either. Lieshout and Reinalda (2001) interestingly note that at the time that the Dutch Political Science Association was founded (1950), scholars with an interest in international relations established the parallel Society for International Affairs (1947). International lawyers, in particular, could not easily identify with the new discipline of political science. The Netherlands Institute for International Relations, Clingendael did play a big role in promoting the debate on international relations in The Netherlands. Yet as a think tank, its focus clearly favoured practical questions over research questions. International relations did not become positivist unlike much of political science and public administration in The Netherlands. Its research topics were mainly Atlanticism and multilateralism. EU integration research was limited.

X.4. THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO EU INTEGRATION STUDIES

Due to the open and competitive recruitment policies at Dutch universities, at least 50-60% of the scholars working on EU integration in The Netherlands are foreign nationals. As a result the English language is omnipresent in the departments, mobility of scholars is high, and the research agenda in The Netherlands is strongly intertwined with the international research agendas. It is thus difficult to identify a distinct Dutch approach to the study of EU integration. That having been said, there are a number of specific strengths and topics, which are intensively analysed. In particular, it is notable that most of the research concerns the 'meso' and 'micro' level of EU integration rather than the so-called history-making decisions (Peterson, 1995; see also introduction).³ Furthermore, the emphasis is on empirical rather than normative questions. Overall, this

Groningen are worth mentioning.

3 Some of the work of Thomas Christiansen on Treaty reform (e.g. Christiansen, 2002; Christiansen, Falkner and Joergensen, 2002; Beach and Christiansen, 2007; Christiansen and Reh, 2009) forms the major exception, although

chapter discusses Dutch scholarship on (1) multi-level governance, (2) the role of the EU institutions, (3) the accountability of European integration and (4) electoral studies and sphere.

Probably the most prominent international research on EU integration in The Netherlands is done by Gary Marks and Liesbet Hooghe. Their work on *multi-level governance in the European Union* (Marks, Hooghe and Blank, 1996; Hooghe and Marks, 2001) has been trendsetting and is amongst the most cited in the study of EU integration (see also below). There is, however, one important caveat. Both scholars only hold a part-time position at the Free University of Amsterdam, spending the other part of their time at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Moreover, they have only been in Amsterdam since 2004, which was after the publication of their keynote work. As a result of their limited time in Amsterdam, they have not been able to establish a coherent research group on multi-level governance in The Netherlands. However, this may change in the near future as a result of a very substantial Advanced Research Grant of the European Research Council.

One of the most coherent research groups on the study of EU integration is undoubtedly in Leiden and led by Bernard Steunenberg. It focuses on the *role of institutions* and employs a distinctive quantitative-empirical approach. The initial emphasis of this research group was on EU decision-making (Steunenberg, 1994; Hosli, 1993, 1996; Golub and Steunenberg, 2007), but they have recently also focused on transposition and compliance and on the role of committees (Mastenbroek, 2005; Keading, 2006; Toshkov, 2007, 2008; Steunenberg, 2006; Steunenberg and Keading, 2009; Steunenberg and Toshkov, 2009; Häge, 2007, 2008). At other Dutch universities, there is much related work on similar public administration topics, but the approach is generally more pluralistic in terms of methods. One can think of implementation and compliance studies, and work on 'Europeanization' more generally (Haverland, 1998; Vink, 2001, 2003; Versluis, 2004) and the study of European agencies (Versluis, 2004, 2007; Groenleer, Keading and Versluis, 2010; Groenleer, 2009; Christiansen and Kirchner, 2000).

Closely related is an emphasis on formal EU institutions. While this is not necessarily distinctive for The Netherlands, the European Commission, the Parliament, the rotating Presidency, the Council Secretariat have been researched in detail (Hooghe, 2002, 2005; Settembri and Neuhold, 2009; Schout and Vanhoonacker, 2006; Warntjen, 2007, 2008; Dijkstra, 2010). Thomas Christiansen *et al.* stand out internationally for their constructivist approach to institutional development and policy-making (Christiansen, Joergensen, Wiener, 1999; Christiansen, 1997, 2002; Christiansen and Vanhoonacker, 2008; Christiansen and Reh, 2009). Scholars have furthermore not limited themselves to first pillar policies. In Maastricht a research group is developing, which looks at the role of EU institutions in foreign policy (Duke and Vanhoonacker, 2006; Vanhoonacker, Dijkstra and Maurer, 2010; Vanhoonacker and Reslow, 2010; Juncos and Pomorska, 2006, 2008; Dijkstra, 2008, 2010).

Another typical public administration topic concerns the *accountability* of the process of European integration. Particularly in Utrecht, there is a strong research group of studying accountability in the European Union led by Mark Bovens and Deidre Curtin. They have studied accountability more generally (Bovens, 2007a, 2007b; Curtin, 2009; Bovens, Curtin and 't Hart, 2010; Curtin, Mair and Papadopoulos, 2010), but they have also specifically looked at the European Council, committees and agencies (Van de Steeg, 2009; Brandsma, 2007, 2010; Brandsma, Curtin and Meijer, 2008; Busuioc, 2009). While accountability is, of course, a normative topic, scholars in Utrecht have tried to approach it from an empirical angle rather than to spend too much time on normative theory.

More classical comparative work on political institutions such as parliaments and parties, in relation to the European integration process, has been produced by scholars (previously) affiliated to the political science department at Leiden University, which has a reputation to uphold in the field of comparative politics following internationally recognized scholars such as Hans Daalder and Arend Lijphart. See for example work on parliaments by Andeweg (Andeweg and Thomassen, 2005; Andeweg *et al.*, 2008) and on political parties and party systems by Peter Mair, formerly in Leiden but now at the European University Institute (e.g. Mair, 2000). Outside Leiden, important work on parliamentary scrutiny of EU affairs is done by, for example, Ron Holzhaecker (2002) and Christine Neuhold (2001).

Apart from the empirical study of political institutions, the Netherlands also has a long standing tradition of the study of political behaviour, particularly with regard to electoral politics, referendums and public sphere. The work by Jacques Thomassen on issues of legitimacy and political representation should be mentioned (Thomassen, 2009; Mair and Thomassen, 2010). Moving from political science to communication research, the best know work by scholars in the Netherlands comes from the Amsterdam School for Communication Research, particularly Claes de Vreese (de Vreese, 2001; de Vreese and Boomgaarden, 2005; Semetko *et al.*, 2000; Vliementhart *et al.*, 2009).

he did much of this work before he came to The Netherlands.

X.5. QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF EU INTEGRATION STUDIES

It has been established above that the majority of scholarship on EU integration in The Netherlands is done by foreign nationals, as a result of the competitive and open recruitment process. The fact that so many foreign scholars have recently joined Dutch political science and public administration departments (and that many have stayed there) is in itself a sign of quality. The conditions for doing academic research are attractive and this has led to the inflow of many talents. Merit is, however, not only a criterion when departments are filling vacancies, it also plays a major role in academic promotions and the disbursement of research funding by, for example, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). What has become increasingly important, in this respect, is the number of international peer-reviewed – preferably social science citation indexed – journal articles. Publications in leading journals are regarded as the main indicator of research quality. As a result, scholars in The Netherlands prioritize these peer-reviewed articles (at the cost of monographs, edited volumes and professional publications) and the output at many departments is very high (see also table 1).

Table 1. Total number of articles with at least one (co-)author based in The Netherlands (2005-2009).

	Articles published	Total articles	Percentage
Journal of European Public Policy	27	322	8.40%
Journal of Common Market Studies	18	282	6.40%
European Union Politics	23	115	20.00%
Dutch GDP / EU GDP			5.00%
Dutch population / EU population			3.30%

While the number of publications by scholars at Dutch universities in leading international journals is impressive, one can add some footnotes about what these publications have really contributed to the key debates in EU integration. When looking, for example, at the number of actual citations in journals listed in the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) over the last decade (see table 2), one has to conclude that they are relatively low. Particularly when Gary Marks, Liesbet Hooghe and Thomas Christiansen are excluded, because they only recently joined Dutch universities, the picture becomes rather sobering. In effect, only the work by Claes de Vreese is widely cited internationally. Other scholars have not produced keynote articles in the time period 2000-2009, which have become reference works. One has to acknowledge, of course, the limits of the Social Science Citation Index, which for example does not include monographs or book chapters in edited volumes. Yet given the emphasis at Dutch universities on SSCI-listed journals, it is problematic. Quantity seems to prevail over the quality of publications. It, however, still needs to be said that scholars at Dutch university do publish extensively in leading international journals. Scholars in many other EU member states do not publish in these journals (see other chapters).

Table 2. Most cited scholars at Dutch universities, working primarily on EU integration, according to Social Science Citation Index (accessed: 25 May 2010). Number of articles between brackets. It includes articles in SSCI journals, which were published and cited in the period 2000-2009. Cf. Andrew Moravcsik (466) and Simon Hix (344).

Gary Marks	417 (18)	Adriaan Schout	36 (5)
Liesbet Hooghe	379 (19)	Markus Haverland	31 (6)
Claes de Vreese	254 (41)	Michael Kaeding	22 (9)
Thomas Christiansen	80 (9)	Sebastian Princen	20 (4)
Hajo Boomgaarden	66 (12)	Deidre Curtin	20 (6)
Ellen Mastenbroek	49 (4)	Anne Rasmussen	19 (5)
Bernard Steunenber	47 (10)	Wolfgang Wagner	17 (5)

Mark Bovens	43 (7)	Andreas Warntjen	16 (5)
Antoaneta Dimitrova	42 (5)	Dimiter Toshkov	16 (6)
Madeleine Hosli	36 (7)	Christine Arnold	10 (2)

There are, of course, many possible explanations for the lack of keynote publications by the Dutch academic community, including the lack of research time for senior scholars. Yet probably one of the main reasons is that scholars deal mostly with niche topics and not with the big questions in the study of EU integration (cf. Daalder 1991). This is for a large part the result of (a) the particular research focus, which prioritizes everyday policy-making over history-making decisions, and (b) the research method, which is highly empirical (surveys/case studies). It is easy to see how this works out. An empirical case study about the impact of an agency, a comparative analysis of compliance in several member states or the accountability of a committee might make for a good journal article, but the audience is needless to say limited. Such studies are, of course, the building blocks for thinking about the big questions in the study of EU integration, yet such big thinking does not seem to happen extensively in The Netherlands.

One important qualification is, however, in place. As mentioned above, many scholars joined Dutch departments only relatively recently and many are still at the start of their careers. One could thus argue that it is only a matter of time before scholars at Dutch universities will publish keynote publications. It is, in this respect, worthwhile to point at the quality of the various PhD programmes (Anderson, Haverland and Nölke, 2006). Contrary to many countries, PhD candidates have a four year contract, are part of the Faculty and have intensive supervision. The Dutch universities have collectively created a training programme for PhD candidates in the field of political science and public administration through the Netherlands Institute of Government. Moreover, publishing in leading international journals is strongly encouraged during the PhD project. Several recent graduates had already published 3-4 articles in SSCI journals, which is quite exceptional in contrast to many other countries (including the United States and the United Kingdom).

While scholars at Dutch universities thus extensively contribute to the international research agenda on the study of EU integration, their impact on actual policy debates in The Netherlands is limited. We think there are two reasons for the lack of interaction between academics, practitioners and politicians. Firstly, the Netherlands has a strong Weberian tradition with regard to its civil service. Bureaucrats are selected on the basis of their merit, professionalism and political neutrality. Ministries therefore have a lot of 'in house' expertise. When it comes to using outside expertise in the policy process, there are various semi-autonomous think tanks and advisory bodies, notably Clingendael, the Netherlands Defence Academy, the Scientific Council for Government Policy, which operate quite separately from the Dutch academic community. Secondly, scholars in The Netherlands focus predominantly on analytical explanatory research questions and are not overly interested in practical questions or policy recommendations. There is thus a real disconnect between the academic community and policy makers. *Ad hoc* consultations do take place, such as a large scale evaluation of the performance of rotating Dutch Presidency in the REACH directive (Maastricht; Rotterdam; Clingendael), but it is by no means systematic.

X.6. TIME DIMENSIONS

In terms of the development of the study of EU integration in The Netherlands over time, this chapter has so far shown that the developments in the political science and public administration disciplines as well as the evolution of the international research agenda have had an important impact on the analysis of the European Union. The increasing focus on comparative politics, public administration, and in particular governance and Europeanization, affected the Dutch academic landscape. Real-world developments in Dutch foreign policy or the position of The Netherlands in the European Union, in contrast, have had little effect on the analytical study of the EU compared to many other countries – e.g. many of the accession states, where before entry to European Union sparked a lot of the academic interest (see other chapters). Given that The Netherlands was a founding EU member state and that Dutch foreign policy has been relatively stable over, this is not completely surprising.

That having been said, the recent events in domestic Dutch politics since the beginning of the new century have had some effect on the study of EU integration. The increasing populism in domestic politics, the political murders of Pim Fortuyn and Theo van Gogh in 2002 and 2004, and the EU referendum in 2005 have sparked an academic interest in Euroscepticism and the 'losers' of European integration and globalization more generally (e.g. Vollaard and Boer 2005; Hooghe and Marks 2007; Van der Brug and Fennema 2003, 2009; Van Kersbergen and Krouwel 2008; Van den Brug and Van Spanje 2009; de Vreese 2007; de Vreese

and Boomgaarden 2005). Moreover, the EU referendum gave scholars the opportunity (to continue) to do research on referendums and publish several articles (Lubbers 2008; Baden and de Vreese 2008; Schuck and de Vreese 2008). It remains to be seen, however, whether these events in Dutch politics have really triggered new lines of research, which will become permanent in the future.

In terms of Dutch foreign policy – and the possible consequences for the study of international relations and EU studies – it is worthwhile to note that The Netherlands may currently be standing on a critical juncture. Atlanticism in The Netherlands was strong throughout the Cold War and has remained strong ever since. Since the 1990s, The Netherlands has contributed troops to NATO in the Western Balkans, despite the national trauma over its earlier participation in the United Nations Protection Force in former Yugoslavia. Importantly, The Netherlands has furthermore made sizeable contributions to the United States-led operation in Iraq and the NATO mission in Afghanistan. The withdrawal of The Netherlands from Afghanistan in August 2010, in this respect, at the time that other NATO allies were sending reinforcements, presents a possible break in Dutch foreign policy. A potential effect may be that The Netherlands will spend more attention on the European Union now that its relations with Washington have deteriorated and its position in NATO has become marginal. It remains, however, too early to come to conclusions about what this means for academia.

X.7. COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT

This chapter has given an overview of the study of EU integration in The Netherlands. It has shown that the recent emphasis on European governance and Europeanization has had an effect on the disciplines of public administration and political science. It has significantly increased the interest of scholars working at Dutch universities in the European Union. Currently, there are at many academics with a keen interest in the process of European integration. The majority of them interestingly hold foreign passports, which makes Dutch departments very internationalized indeed. The open competition also has led to a high number of quality publications in the leading international journals. These have been written by (younger) scholars, whose research entirely focuses on the European Union, as well as a number of established professors, who use traditional insights from comparative politics and public administration when analysing the EU. The combined quantitative output is impressive. After the United Kingdom and Germany, no other country produces as many publications on the European Union as The Netherlands (see quantitative chapter by Matti Wiberg).

In analysing the European Union, scholars at Dutch universities have predominantly focused on day-to-day policy-making rather than the history-making decisions. Moreover, their analysis is mainly empirical. Even in Utrecht, where scholars study accountability of European governance, they approach this normative subject from an empirical angle. While this specific focus in The Netherlands leads to high quality research – we have identified four areas of research – we have also suggested that these niche subjects may be one of the reasons for the relatively low number of citations of scholars at Dutch universities – or in other words, why keynote publications do not originate in The Netherlands. Another reason is that many scholars at Dutch universities are still in the early stages of their careers. They contribute to the major journals, but their work still has to mature into bigger ideas. It is therefore only a question of time before these scholars flourish at the international stage.

Finally, we have tried to highlight some of the major particularities of EU integration research in The Netherlands. The strong tradition of international law is important, in this respect. While this discipline has been important for the standing of The Netherlands in academia as well as the real-world, it has at the same time 'undermined' the development of a serious analytical international relations discipline. The few scholars that focused on international relations mainly dealt with (Dutch) foreign policy analysis, Atlanticism and multilateralism. This helps to explain why the study of the European Union, despite The Netherlands being a founding member states, did not fully mature until the mid-1990s. Given, however, the developments in the last decade, the future for EU integration research in The Netherlands looks very bright. Scholars at the Dutch universities are high in number and make important contributions to the international research agenda. This is unlikely to change.

References

- Anderson, K., Haverland, M. and Nölke, A. (2006), *Making a political science career in an internationalised environment: a perspective from the Netherlands*, *European Political Science*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 271-279.
- Andeweg, R., de Winter, L. and Müller, W. (2008), *Parliamentary opposition in post-consociational democracies: Austria, Belgium and The Netherlands*, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, Vol. 14 No. 1-2, pp. 77-112.
- Andeweg, R. and Thomassen, J. (2005), *Modes of political representation: Toward a new typology*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 507-528.
- Baden, C. and de Vreese, C. (2008), *Making sense: A reconstruction of people's understandings of the European Constitutional Referendum in the Netherlands*, *Communications*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 117-145.
- Baehr, P. (1980), *The Dutch Foreign Policy Elite*, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 223-261.
- Beach, D. and Christiansen, T. (eds) (2007), *Political agency in the constitutional politics of the European Union*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 14 No. 8.
- Bovens, M. (2007a), *Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework*, *European Law Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 447-468.
- Bovens, M. (2007b), *New forms of accountability and EU-governance*, *Comparative European Politics*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 104-120.
- Bovens, M., Curtin, D. and 't Hart, P. (eds) (2010), *The Real World of EU Accountability: What Deficit?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Brandsma, G. (2007), *Accountability deficits in European 'Comitology' decision-making*, *European Integration online Papers*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 1-15.
- Brandsma, G., Curtin, D. and Meijer, A. (2008), *How Transparent are EU 'Comitology' Committees in Practice?*, *European Law Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 819-838.
- Brandsma, G. (2010), *Backstage Europe: Comitology, accountability and democracy in the European Union*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Utrecht University, Utrecht.
- Brinkhorst, L. (1962), *The rules of procedure of the Court of Justice of the European Communities*, Sijthoff, Leiden.
- Brinkhorst, L. (1971), *Grondlijnen van het Europees Recht*, Tjeenk Willink, Groningen.
- Busuioac, M. (2009), *Accountability, Control and Independence: The Case of European Agencies*, *European Law Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 599-615.
- Christiansen, T. (1997), *Tensions of European governance: politicized bureaucracy and multiple accountability in the European Commission*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 73-90.
- Christiansen, T. (2002), *The role of supranational actors in EU treaty reform*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 33-53.
- Christiansen, T., Falkner, G. and Jörgensen, K. (2002), *Theorizing EU treaty reform: beyond diplomacy and bargaining*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 12-32.
- Christiansen, T., Jörgensen, K. and Wiener, A. (eds) (1999), *The social construction of Europe*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 6 No. 4.
- Christiansen, T. and Kirchner, E. (eds) (2000), *Committee Governance in the European Union*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Christiansen, T. and Vanhoonaeker, S. (2008), *At a critical juncture? Change and continuity in the institutional development of the council secretariat*, *West European Politics*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 751-770.

- Christiansen, T. and Reh, C. (2009), *Constitutionalizing the European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Curtin, D. (2009), *Executive Power of the European Union: Law, Practices and the Living Constitution*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Curtin, D., Mair, P. and Papadopoulos, Y. (eds) (2010), *Accountability and European Union Governance*, West European Politics, Vol. 33 No. 5.
- Daalder, H. (1991), *Political Science in The Netherlands*, European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 20 No. 3-4, pp. 279-300.
- Dijkstra, H. (2008), *The Council Secretariat's Role in the Common Foreign and Security Policy*, European Foreign Affairs Review, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 149-166.
- Dijkstra, H. (2010), *Explaining Variation in the Role of the EU Council Secretariat in First and Second Pillar Policy-Making*, Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 529-546.
- Duke, S. and Vanhoonacker, S. (2006), *Administrative governance in the CFSP: Theory and Practice*, European Foreign Affairs Review, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 143-162.
- Gillingham, J. (2006), *The German Problem and European Integration*, in Dinan, D. (ed.), "Origins and Evolution of the European Union", Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 55-81.
- Golub, J. and Steunenberg, B. (2007), *How time affects EU decision making*, European Union Politics, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 555-66.
- Groenleer, M. (2009), *The Autonomy of European Union Agencies: A Comparative Study of Institutional Development*, Eburon, Delft.
- Groenleer, M., Keading, M. and Versluis, E. (2010), *Regulatory Governance through EU Agencies? The Role of the European Agencies for Maritime and Aviation Safety in the Implementation of European Transport Legislation*, Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 17 No. 8, forthcoming.
- Häge, F. (2007), *Committee Decision-making in the Council of the European Union*, European Union Politics, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 299-328.
- Häge, F. (2008), *Who Decides in the Council of the European Union?*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 533-558.
- Haverland, M. (1998), *National Autonomy. European Integration and the Politics of Packaging Waste*, Thela Thesis, Amsterdam.
- Heldring, J. (1978), *The Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek na 1945*, in van der Beugel, E. et al. (eds), "Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek: Heden en Verleden", Anthos, Baarn.
- Hix, S. (1994), *The Study of the European Community: The Challenge to Comparative Politics*, West European Politics, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 1-30.
- Hooghe, L. (2002), *The European Commission and The Integration of Europe: Images of Governance*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hooghe, L. (2005), *Many Roads Lead To International Norms, But Few Via International Socialization: A Case Study of the European Commission*, International Organization, Vol. 59 No. 4, pp. 861-898.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2001), *Multi-level governance and European integration*, Rowan and Littlefield, Oxford.
- Hooghe, L. and Marks, G. (2007), *Sources of Euroscepticism*, Acta Politica, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 112-127.
- Holzhaecker, R. (2002), *National Parliamentary Scrutiny Over EU Issues: Comparing the Goals and Methods of Governing and Opposition Parties*, European Union Politics, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 459-479.
- Hosli, M. (1993), *Admission of European Free Trade Association States to the European Community: Effects on Voting*

Power in the European Community Council of Ministers, International Organization, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 629-643.

Hosli, M. (1996), *Coalitions and Power: Effects of Qualified Majority Voting on the Council of the European Union*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 255-274.

Juncos, A. and Pomorska, K. (2006), *Playing the Brussels game: Strategic socialisation in the CFSP Council Working Groups*, European Integration online Papers, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 1-17.

Juncos, A. and Pomorska, K. (2008), *Does Size Matter? CFSP Committees after Enlargement*, Journal of European Integration, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 493-509.

Kaeding, M. (2006), *Determinants of transposition delay in the European Union*, Journal of Public Policy, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 229-253.

Kohler-Koch, B. and Rittberger, B. (2006), *Review Article: The 'Governance Turn' in EU Studies*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 27-49.

Lieshout, R. and Rienalda, B. (2001), *The Dutch PSA 1950-2000*, European Political Science, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 60-65.

Lubbers, M. (2008), *Regarding the Dutch 'Nee' to the European Constitution: A Test of Identity, Utilitarian and Political Approaches to Voting 'No'*, European Union Politics, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 59-86.

Mair, P. (2000), *The Limited Impact of Europe on National Party Systems*, West European Politics, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 27-51.

Mair, P. and Thomassen, J. (eds) (2010), *Political Representation and European Union Governance*, Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 17 No. 1.

Marks, G., Hooghe, L. and Blank, K. (1996), *European Integration from the 1980s: State-Centric v. Multi-level Governance*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 341-378.

Mastenbroek, E. (2005), *EU compliance: Still a 'black hole'?*, Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 12 No. 6, pp. 1103-1120.

Neuhold, C. (2001), *The 'Legislative Backbone' keeping the Institution upright? The Role of European Parliament Committees in the EU Policy-Making Process*, European Integration online Papers, Vol. 5 No. 10, pp. 1-29.

Nugent, N. (2006), *The Government and Politics of the European Union*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Nuttall, S. (1992), *European Political Cooperation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Peterson, J. (1995), *Decision-making in the European Union: towards a framework for analysis*, Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 69-93.

Pijpers, A. (2006), *Europese finaliteit en Nederlandse buitenlandse politiek*, Internationale Spectator, Vol. 60 No. 9, pp. 435-440.

Schout, A. and Vanhoonacker, S. (2006), *Evaluating Presidencies of the Council of the EU: Revisiting Nice*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 1051-1077.

Semetko, H., de Vreese, C. and Peter, J. (2000), *Europeanised politics – Europeanised media? European integration and political communication*, West European Politics, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 121-141.

Settembri, P. and Neuhold, C. (2009), *Achieving Consensus through Committees: Does the European Parliament Manage?*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 127-151.

Steunenberg, B. (1994), *Decision making under different institutional arrangements: Legislation by the European Community*, Journal of Theoretical and Institutional Economics, Vol. 150 No. 4, pp. 642-669.

Steunenberg, B. (2006), *Turning swift policymaking into deadlock and delay: National policy coordination and the transposition of EU directives*, European Union Politics, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 293-319.

- Steunenberg, B. and Kaeding, M. (2009), *'As time goes by': Explaining the transposition of maritime directives*, *European Journal for Political Research*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 432-454.
- Steunenberg, B. and Toshkov, D. (2009), *Comparing transposition in 27 member states of the EU: the impact of discretion and legal fit*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 951-970.
- Schuck, A. and de Vreese, C. (2008), *The Dutch No to the EU Constitution: Assessing the Role of EU Skepticism and the Campaign*. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion & Parties*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 101-128.
- Thomassen, J. (ed.) (2009), *The Legitimacy of the European Union after Enlargement*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Toshkov, D. (2007), *In search of the worlds of compliance: culture and transposition performance in the European Union*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 933-959.
- Toshkov, D. (2008), *Embracing European Law: Compliance with EU Directives in Central and Eastern Europe*, *European Union Politics*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 379-402.
- Trondal, J. (2007), *The Public Administration turn in Integration Research*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 14 No. 6, pp. 960-972.
- Van de Steeg, M. (2009), *Public Accountability in the European Union: Is the European Parliament able to hold the European Council accountable?*, *European Integration online Papers*, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 1-27.
- Van den Bos, B. (2008), *Mirakel en Debacle: Nederlandse Besluitvorming over de Politieke Unie in het Verdrag van Maastricht*, Van Gorcum, Assen.
- Van der Brug, W. and Fennema, M. (2003), *Protest or mainstream? How the European anti-immigrant parties have developed into two separate groups by 1999*, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 55-76.
- Van der Brug, W. and Fennema, M. (2009), *The Support Base of Radical Right Parties in the Enlarged European Union*, *Journal of European Integration*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 589-608.
- Van der Brug, W. and van Spanje, J. (2009), *Immigration, Europe and the 'New' Cultural Cleavage*, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 309-334.
- Van Kersbergen, K. and Krouwel, A. (2008), *A double-edged sword! The Dutch centre-right and the 'foreigners issue'*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 398-414.
- Van Keulen, M. (2006), *Going Europe of Going Dutch: How the Dutch Government Shapes European Union Policy*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Van Staden, A. (1974), *Een trouwe bondgenoot: Nederland en het Atlantisch Bondgenootschap (1960-1971)*, In den Toeren, Baarn.
- Van Staden, A. (1989), *The changing role of the Netherlands in the Atlantic Alliance*, *West European Politics*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 99-111.
- Vanhoonacker, S., Dijkstra, H. and Maurer, H. (eds) (2010), *Understanding the Role of Bureaucracy in the European Security and Defence Policy*, *European Integration online Papers*, Vol. 14 special issue 1.
- Vanhoonacker, S. and Reslow, R. (2010), *The European External Action Service: Living Forwards by Understanding Backwards*, *European Foreign Affairs Review*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Versluis, E. (2004), *Explaining Variations in Implementation of EU Directives*, *European Integration online Papers*, Vol. 8 No. 19, pp. 1-21.
- Versluis, E. (2007), *Even rules, uneven practices: Opening the 'black box' of EU law in action*, *West European Politics*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 50-67.
- Vink, M. (2003), *What is Europeanisation? And other questions on a new research agenda*, *European Political Science*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 63-74.

- Vink, M. (2001), *The Limited Europeanization of Domestic Citizenship Policy: Evidence from the Netherlands*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 875-896.
- Vollaard, H. and Boer, B. (eds) (2005), *Eurosceptis in Nederland*, Lemma, Utrecht.
- Voorhoeve, J. (1979), *Peace, profits and principles: A Study of Dutch Foreign Policy*, Nijhoff, The Hague.
- Vliegthart, R., Schuck, A., Boomgaarden, H. and de Vreese, C. (2009), *News coverage and support for European integration 1990-2006*, International Journal of Public Opinion Research, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 415-439.
- de Vreese, C. (2001), *Europe in the News: A cross-national comparative study of the news coverage of key EU events*, European Union Politics, Vol. 2 No. 3, 283-307.
- de Vreese, C. (2007), *A spiral of Euro-skepticism: The media's fault?*, Acta Politica, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 271-286
- de Vreese, C. and Boomgaarden, H. (2005), *Projecting EU referendums: Fear of immigration and support for European integration*, European Union Politics, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 59-82.
- Warntjen, A. (2007), *Steering the Union. The Impact of the EU Presidency on Legislative Activity in the Council*, Journal of Common Market Studies, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp. 1137-1155.
- Warntjen, A. (2008), *The Council Presidency: Power Broker or Burden? An Empirical Analysis*, European Union Politics, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 316-338.
- Wellenstein, E. (2006), *Nederlands rol in Europese integratie: van Founding Father tot Verloren Zoon*, Internationale Spectator, Vol. 60 No. 11, pp. 561-567.