Dejana VUKČEVIĆ, Ph.D.[1]

EFFECTS OF THE SOCIALIZATION PROCESS ON EUROPEANIZATION OF EU MEMBER STATES' NATIONAL IDENTITIES

Abstract: The author of this article seeks to explain Europeanization of EU Member States' national identities in the European integration process from a perspective of social constructivism. According to this approach, interests are not exogenous and immutable, but endogenous ones, because they are product of ideational structure and social interaction. Social constructivism insists on the importance of socialization process, which gradually changes identity and interests of member states. The article is divided into two parts. In the first part, the author discusses basic features of social constructivism, and clarifies the concept of socialization, which is understood as a process of inducting actors into the norms and rules of the community. In the second part, the author explains the Europeanization of EU Member states' identity under the influence of socialization process. The author concludes that through the process of interaction and practice structures are formed that influence behaviour and create identities.

Key words: socialization, European identity, national identity, social constructivism, the European Union.

INTRODUCTION

Europe is "our laboratory for getting at some bigger issues concerning the relation of institutions, states and individuals. When do international institutions create senses of community and belonging? If and when this happens, what does it mean for individual and state allegiances, interests and identities? What processes underlie such

---

transformative dynamics?"[2] In this article, we will try to answer these questions pointed out by Jeffrey Checkel, one of leading representatives of social constructivism. Our objective will be to explain how the European integration process affects the identity of EU Member States, their interests and their behaviour. This issue will be considered from a perspective of social constructivism, which considers European integration process as a product of actors' socialization and identity change, and is based on the logic of action that is guided by "appropriateness" and not by "consequences". Social constructivism is based on transformative ontology, because it considers that international system is not anarchic and immutable, but that it can be transformed through a process of institutionalization and identity change. The actors' interests are not exogenous and immutable, but endogenous ones, because they are product of ideational structure and social interaction. Through the process of interaction and practice, there are formed structures that influence behaviour and create identities. From this perspective, the EU is seen as a collective entity, which is a result of interaction between states. The European integration process has affected the change of interests and behaviour and consequently the identity of the participants in the process. The analysis of the Europeanization of identity from the perspective of social constructivism allows the perception of the EU as an expression of common ideas, and not exclusively as a product of material structure of international system.

Our analysis in this article will be limited to conventional constructivism, which explores the role of norms and identities in international politics.[3] This approach is focused on social ontology, i.e. the question how ideational or normative structures constitute agents and their interests. The article will be divided into two parts. In the first part, the author presents basic features of social constructivism, and clarifies the concept of socialization as a process of inducting actors into the norms and rules of the community. In the second part, the author explains the influence of socialization process on the change, i.e. Europeanization of EU Member states' identities and interests, which also affects the outcome of certain results.

1. SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIVISM AND THE SOCIALIZATION PROCESS

Thinking about social constructivism leads to a certain confusion. For example, Charles-Philippe David wonders whether constructivism, strictly speaking, is the theory

---

[2] Jeffrey Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: introduction and framework", in: Jeffrey Checkel (ed.), *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007, p. 3.

[3] On division of constructivism on conventional, interpretative and critical constructivism see: Jeffrey Checkel, "Social constructivism in global and European politics: a review essay", *Review of International Studies*, vol. 30, 2004, p. 231.

[4] Charles-Philippe David, *La guerre et la paix. Approches contemporaines de la sécurité et de la stratégie*, Presses de sciences politiques, Paris, 2000, p. 43.

of international politics, and emphasizes that it is very difficult to define this approach.[4] He is not alone in this opinion. Thomas Christiansen, Antje Wiener and Knud Eric Jorgensen believe that constructivism is "a philosophical position"[5], while John Gerard Ruggie points out that "constructivism is not itself a theory of international relations", but "a theoretically informed approach to the study of international relations".[6] Some scholars consider constructivism as a "progressive research program"[7], while other point out that constructivism is a "meta-paradigmatic alternative", which forms the basis of new approaches, and whose goal is to offer the radical critical alternatives in various scientific fields.[8]

How to define social constructivism? Emanuel Adler, one of leading representatives of this approach, says that constructivism "is the view that the manner in which the material world shapes and is shaped by human action and interaction depends on dynamic normative and epistemic interpretations of the material world".[9] Based on this definition, we can conclude that constructivism pays close attention to the study of normative and ideational structures that shape the social identity of political actors.

It is difficult to perceive the clarity and identity of the constructivist approach due to the large differences among his supporters in the analysis of international politics. Some authors underline a difference between so-called "systemic" constructivism, which studies the relations between states in the international system, while neglecting non-systemic factors of state identity, and so-called "holistic" constructivism, which seeks to integrate domestic and international factors.[10] There are also differences in the field of methodology. Some representatives of constructivism explore the role of ideas, norms and culture, while others are focused on concrete empirical analysis. However, despite these differences, we will point out basic features of this approach. First, social constructivism considers that the international system is not static and immutable, but socially constructed. Therefore, the structures are not determinants

---

[5] Thomas Christiansen, Knud Erik Jørgensen, Antje Wiener, "The Social construction of Europe", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 6, n° 4, 1999, p. 529.

[6] John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge", *International Organization*, vol. 52, n° 3, 1998, pp. 879–880.

[7] Theo Farrell, "Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of a Research Program", *International Studies Review*, vol. 4, n° 1, 2002, pp. 49-72.

[8] Dusan Marinkovic, "Социологија и конструктивистичка перспектива: социолошка теорија и конструктивистичка метатеорија", *Зборник Матице српске за друштвене науке*, n° 114–115, 2003, стр. 111.

[9] Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 3, n° 3, 1997, p. 322.

[10] Richard Price, Christian Reus-Smith, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 4, n° 3, 1998, p. 268.

[11] Keith Krause, "Approche critique et constructiviste des études de sécurité", *Annuaire français de relations internationales*, vol. 4, 2003, p. 603.

for actors, because they are social constructions.[11] In contrast to rationalism, which argues that the world is material, concrete and measurable and that the final goal is a research of material structure, social constructivism emphasizes that the material world exists, but that it is also necessary to explore its connection with the social world that is a product of human consciousness, which includes concepts, ideas, beliefs and symbols. Thus, normative or conceptual structures are equally important as the material structure. According to Alexander Wendt, "a fundamental principle of constructivist social theory is that people act towards objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them".[12] It is intersubjective understanding and expectations that constitute the actors' conceptions of self and other. In other words, ideas and meanings determine the actors' behaviour, and their change leads to the change of structure, which is their product.[13] The interaction between the structure and the actors is very important, and they are mutually constituted.

On the basis of this premise, social constructivism considers that the interests are not static and exogenous, but endogenous, i.e. they are changeable, because they are product of ideational structure and social interaction. Essential to constructivism is how the actors develop interests, and in order to explain the formation of interest, it is necessary to explain a formation of identity. For constructivism, identity is a basis of interests[14], which is necessary in order to ensure predictable patterns of behaviour.[15] A world without identities is "a world of chaos, a world of pervasive and irremediable uncertainty, a world much more dangerous that anarchy".[16] Identities tell you and others who you are and who others are. In telling you who you are, „identities imply a particular set of interests or preferences with respect to choices of action in particular domains, and with respect to particular actors".[17] Therefore, normative or ideational structures shape the actors' identity. Thus, the institutionalized norms of the EU shape the identity of Member states and their citizens. States do not possess interests *a priori*; their identities are constructed through norms, which define the interests of the state. Norms "construct" identities that lead to changes in state interests, and hence their politics. Therefore, structures and agents (actors) co-constitute and co-determine each other. Structures constitute actors in terms of their interests and identities, but

---

[12] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics", *International Organization*, vol. 46, n° 2, 1992, pp. 396–397.

[13] Dragan Simić, *Nauka o bezbednosti. Savremeni pristupi bezbednosti*, Službeni list SRJ, Fakultet političkih nauka, Beograd, 2002, str. 73.

[14] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics", *op. cit.,* p. 398.

[15] Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, vol. 23, n° 1, 1998, p. 174.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 175.

[17] *Ibid.*

structures are produced by the discursive practices of actors.[18] Thus, the structures exist through reciprocal interaction of actors, and this means that the actors can change structures.[19] We can conclude that social constructivism, unlike rationalism, underlines normative structures and the role of identity in the process of interest formation.

In order to connect the social structures and actors, social constructivism emphasizes the role of the socialization process. What is the process of socialization? Some authors underline that there are different definitions of socialization, but this term can be defined as a process by which actors acquire different identities leading to new interests through regular and sustained interaction within broader social contexts and structures.[20] In social constructivism, the notion of socialization is related to the norms internalization. Jeffrey Checkel defines socialization "as a process of inducting actors into norms and rules of a given community".[21] In adopting the community rules, socialization implies that an actor "switches" from logic of consequences to logic of appropriateness.[22] According to Checkel, there are two ways in which actors follow the logic of appropriateness. On the one hand, the actors may behave appropriately by learning the role and acquiring the knowledge that enables them to act in accordance with expectations. The key is that the actors know what is socially accepted in a given community. According to Checkel, this is type I socialization/internalization. On the other hand, there is type II socialization/internalization, and it implies that actors adopt the interests and even identity of a community of which they are a part. The logic of appropriateness goes beyond the role playing and implies that the actors accept the community norms as "the right thing to do".[23] The main difference between type I and type II of socialization/internalization is that in the type I the actors acquire new roles by learning, while the type II imply change in values and interests, and therefore identity.

When do actors switch from the logic of consequences to logic of appropriateness? How the socialization process occurs? Checkel identifies three main mechanisms leading to socialization: strategic calculation, role playing and normative suasion.[24] As regards strategic calculation, this mechanism, when operates alone, cannot lead to socialization.

---

[18] Joseph Jupille, James A. Caporaso, Jeffrey Checkel, "Integrating Institutions: Rationalism, Constructivism and the Study of the European Union", *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 36, n° 1/2, 2003, p. 14.

[19] Dale Copeland, "The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A review Essay", *International Security*, vol. 25, n° 2, 2000, pp. 190–191.

[20] David H. Bearce, Stacy Bondanella, "Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization and Member-State Interest Convergence", *International Organization*, vol. 61, n° 4, 2007, p. 706.

[21] Jeffrey Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005, p. 804.

[22] See: Djordje Stojanovic, Petar Matic, "Концепт стратешке културе: случај ЕУ", *Политичка ревија*, vol. 25, n° 3, 2010, стр. 314–315.

[23] Jeffrey Checkel, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework", *op.cit.,* p. 804.

[24] *Ibid.,* p. 805.

Actors are rational; they calculate and seek to maximize interests, adapting their behaviour to the norms and rules favoured by international community. However, this behavioural adaptation may be followed by compliance that is strongly suggestive of internalization and preference change.[25] For example, an international community offers the government of a state, positive incentives- rewards (aid or membership), on the condition that it adopts and complies with the community norms. That is the case, for example, with the EU enlargement process. Regarding the role playing, actor switches the logic of consequence to logic of appropriateness that involves non-calculative behavioural adaptation. Actors adopt certain roles because they are appropriate in particular setting and this is why this mechanism implies a certain degree of automaticity in individual behaviour. The socialization/internalization is more likely to occur when agents are in settings where contact is long, sustained and intense.[26] Finally, normative suasion takes place when actors actively and reflectively internalize new understanding of appropriateness.[27]

Actors are "internalized" though the socialization process. Norms are constitutive for an actor's identity by way of specifying that they are internalized by an actor in the form of becoming linked to the duties and obligations that define the actor's identity.[28]

2. SOCIALIZATION PROCESS AND EUROPEANIZATION OF EU MEMBER STATES NATIONAL IDENTITIES

According to the social constructivism, institutions include not only formal rules but also informal norms that constitute actors, i.e. shape their preferences and identities. Constructivists argue that EU institutions shape not only the behaviour but also the preferences and identities of individuals and member governments.[29] Actors (agents) do not exist separately from the social environment that „constitutes" them in relation to others. Unlike liberal institutionalism, who considers that institutions drive States to adopt certain strategies, constructivism emphasizes the importance of intersubjective understanding as well as formal rules, which constitute actors and shape their identity.[30] The main reason, which forces States to join the community, is their desire to belong to a given community and to transform it through norms and identities that are formed on a collective basis. These norms and identities have been institutionalized over the years and contribute to maintaining and deepening of a sense of community. Social integration

---

[25] *Ibid.,* p. 809.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 811.

[27] *Ibid.,* p. 812.

[28] Ole Jacob Sending, "Constitution, Choice and Change: Problems with the 'Logic of Appropriateness' and its Use in Constructivist Theory", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 8, n° 4, 2002, p. 456.

[29] Mark Pollack, "Theorizing the European Union: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance?" *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 8, 2005, p. 365.

[30] Mark A. Pollack, "International Relations Theory and European Integration", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 39, n° 2, 2001, p. 234.

is thus emerging as a "natural" product of everyday political practice of EU member states. The European Union is, therefore, created by the gradual establishment of common rules and standards. Like Member states, the European Union should also be a subject of theoretical considerations as a willing actor, which influences and is influenced by external processes, an actor that is constitutive of realities around it, an actor that creates a new meaning of its global actorness in the dynamic process of external interaction.[31]

Social constructivists believe that the process of European integration has a "transformative" impact on the European state system and its constituent units. In other words, the process of European integration has influenced the change of identity, and subsequently the interests and behaviour of the participants in the process.[32] This has led to the process of "Europeanization" of State's identity. The "Europeanization" is, however, post-national, and does not mean the abolition of national identity. Europeanization of identities occurs through the process of socialization. Therefore, we discuss to what extent the interaction with the European institutions and within them socialize actors and change their behaviour. What is the process of Europeanization? Robert Ladrech defines Europeanization as "an incremental process re-orienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making"[33] This definition emphasizes the role of organizational adaptation, learning and policy change. Drawing upon Ladrech's definition, Claudio Radaelli argues that Europeanization refers to "a processes of construction, diffusion and institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, "ways of doing things" and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures and public policies".[34] This definition includes informal rules, paradigms, ideology and culture in the process of Europeanization, and underlines the importance of identity change in the logic of behaviour. Europeanization should be seen as an interactive, mutually constitutive process of change linking the European and national level, where the reactions of Member states are oriented towards European institutions and politics and vice versa. Two-way process of Europeanization involves changes in national politics and decision-making procedures, as

---

[31] Anastasia Chebakova, "Theorizing the EU as a global actor : a constructivist approach", ECSA-Canada Biennial Conference, "The Maturing European Union", 25–27 September 2008, Edmonton, Alberta, p. 5.

[32] Thomas Christiansen, Erik Knud Jørgensen, Antje Wiener, "The Social construction of Europe", *op. cit.,* p. 529.

[33] Robert Ladrech, "Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 32, n° 1, 1994, p. 69.

[34] Claudio Radaelli, " Whither Europeanization ? Concept stretching and substantive change", *European Integration online Papers*, vol. 4, n° 8, 2000, p. 4. Available at: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-008a.htm, (Accessed 20 April 2012).

well as projection of national preferences and outcomes to the EU level, with the creation of new structures at this level.[35]

Through a process of interaction, international norms imply socialization at national level: States adopt norms, perceive them as their own, and they are embedded in a country's political culture.[36] For example, the EU enlargement process, from this perspective, can be explained by the "commitment" to widen to other democratic states in Europe. Namely, this commitment is embodied in the *acquis communautaire*, that is, the legal provisions, procedures and rules of the Treaty of European Union. The EU enlargement is thus part of shared norms of the EU, and these norms have a stronger pull than "objective" interests.[37] In other words, the Member States do not calculate their particular interests in the relation with third countries in the process of enlargement. Rather, this process is a reflection of what the Member states and EU institutions consider appropriate (and binding) behaviour for the role that they play in relation with third countries, and the behavioural obligations their identity entails for this relationship.[38] Therefore, conventional constructivism underlines "transformative" impact of the norms on actors. A state behaviour is defined by identity and interest defined by international norms, which are transmitted to the states through international organizations, shaping national politics by "teaching" them what their interests should be.[39]

Conventional constructivism insists on persuasion and learning as mechanisms that define the power of socialization of EU institutions and lead to the changes in interests or behaviour of states. However, a main critique of this approach is that it rarely provides empirical evidence of the causes of the change of interests and identities of the Member states in the process of "Europeanization" as a result of social interaction (socialization).[40] Hence, in recent years there has been a tendency to empirically justify the socialization process. When analysing the activity of the EU institutions some authors seek to explain the degree of socialization i.e. powers of the EU institutions to change the identity and interests of the states and elites. For example, Jeffrey Lewis analysed the activity of COREPER (European Union's Committee of Permanent Representatives) in order to

---

[35] Dejana M. Vukčević, "Evropeizacija nacionalnih spoljnih politika - idejni okvir", *Национални интерес*, вол. 11, бр. 2, 2011, стр. 16.

[36] Martin Marcussen, Thomas Risse, Daniela Engelmann-Martin, Hans Joachim Knopf, Klaus Roscher, "Constructing Europe? The Evolution of Nation-State Identities", in Thomas Christiansen, Knud Eric Jorgensen, Antje Wiener (eds), *The Social Construction of Europe*, SAGE Publications, London, 2001, p. 104.

[37] K. M. Fierke, Antje Wiener, "Constructing Institutional Interests: EU and NATO Enlargement", in: Thomas Christiansen, Knud Eric Jorgensen, Antje Wiener (eds), *The Social Construction of Europe*, SAGE Publications, London, 2001, p. 124.

[38] Ulrich Sedelmeier, "EU Enlargement, Identity and the Analysis of European Foreign Policy", *EUI Working Papers*, n° 13, 2003, p. 4.

[39] Robert Jackson, Georg Sørensen, *Introduction to International Relations. Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007, p. 169.

[40] Janne Haaland Matlary, *European Union Security Dynamics*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2009, p. 82.

explore the causal effects of norms through persuasion and learning role. The author finds some standards of "appropriate behaviour" (logic of appropriateness) of national representatives in COREPER, such as a duty "to find solutions" and keep the legislative agenda of the Council moving forward, or obligations to practice mutual responsiveness, including appropriateness standards for dropping arguments that fail to convince the group, but this "collective culture" does not trigger shifts of loyalty or transfer of allegiance from national to European level.[41] According to the author, the socialization is most likely when national representatives are in the settings where the contact is intense and sustained and with a high degree of domestic insulation. The pattern of socialization in COREPER does not lead to a creation of a new supranational identity, but rather to a more complex configuration of national and European identity. This configuration is close to the "marble cake" model of multiple identities developed by Thomas Risse.[42] Like Jeffrey Lewis, Jan Beyers analyses the socialization though activity of national bureaucrats in the working groups of the Council of the EU. This author considers that appropriate behaviour (role playing) can be found in the Council of the EU and its working groups and that it fits category of type I socialization.[43] However, the author rejects the "strong socialization" hypothesis (supranational role playing) and is sceptical about transformative effects of the European institutions on individual state agents (actors). Beyers underlines that the level of the EU socialization depends on domestic factors, but that individual (national) socialization should not be seen as exclusive in relation to the socialization at the EU level.[44] It is also important to mention Liesbet Hooghe, which explores the socialization and identity change in the European Commission and finds that socialization at the state level reduces the socialization at the EU level, because it precedes it. This, however, does not mean that it undermines the internalization of European norms, which can "flow" into national or subnational level through the adoption of European ideas, or the development of the identity concept that includes a commitment to national and European.[45] However, the author concludes that the socialization process is primarily produced at the national and subnational level (internalization of national identities that support the European norms).[46]

---

[41] Jeffrey Lewis, "The Janus Face of Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decision Making in the European Union", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005, p. 939.

[41] Jeffrey Lewis, "The Janus Face of Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decision Making in the European Union", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005, p. 939.

[42] Thomas Risse, "Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 12, n° 2, 2005, pp. 295–296.

[43] Jan Beyers, "Multiple Embeddedness and Socialization in Europe: The Case of Council Officials", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005, p. 932.

[44] *Ibid.,* p. 933.

[45] Liesbet Hooghe, "Several Road Lead to International Norms, but Few via International Socialization: A Case Study of the European Commission", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005, pp. 868–869.

[46] *Ibid.,* p. 888.

Some social constructivists seek to analyse socialization mechanisms in the field of European security and defence policy (ESDP). For example, Christophe Meyer considers that the process of institutional socialization in this field has led to rejection of distrust of new Member states over the question whether the EU is an appropriate framework for wide-reaching defence cooperation in general and on issues such as the solidarity clause, battle groups of the European Defence Agency.[47] Jolyon Howorth analysed the activity of the Political and Security Committee of the EU (PSC), and he pointed out that the dominant mode of interaction was consensus seeking rather than bargaining around fixed national positions. This author underlines the importance of the "duty and role to help" of PSC Members in order to reconcile their differences.[48] Pernille Rieker underlines the existence of the "gap" between the security identity of the EU and those of its Member states, which can be overcome by the socialization process of the Member States' foreign policies.[49] There is "European" and "national" level, which are characterized by specific norms and a specific culture. According to this author, there are several phases of the socialization process. In the first phase, traditional security concerns remain dominant. In the second phase, a new political discourse emerges, which try to lobby this view with the national authorities, but the traditional politics prevails among the elites. In the third phase, domestic political leadership realizes that it is important to adopt the new way of thinking in order to obtain influence and to safeguard traditional national interests in a changed international environment. This phase is characterized by "instrumental adaptation" which is a two-way process and comprises of the pressure of domestic groups for compliance with international norms and of the EU for conviction of the Member states to comply with the community norms. In the fourth phase, governments are being persuaded that the norm compliance is the "right thing", and the instrumental adaptation is gradually being replaced by a change in the national security identities of Member states. Finally, in the fifth phase of institutionalization, the international norms are "taken for granted" and institutionalized in the national security policies.[50]

Thus, the process of social interaction in the process of integration leads to mutual understanding and implies the redefinition of existing roles of the Member states in the institutional system of the EU. Hence, the constructivist approach of the change of

---

[47] Christophe Meyer, "Convergence Towards a European Strategic Culture? A Constructivist Framework for Explaining Changing Norms", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 11, n° 4, 2005, p. 538. According to the author, one frequent form of persuasion is when influential members of the Political and Security Committee (especially form the United Kingdom) convince NATO-oriented states that ESDP missions are compatible with NATO. The effects of this activity are visible in states, which were initially very skeptical of attempts to pursue European security and defence policy.

[48] Jolyon Howorth, "The Political and Security Committee: A Case Study in "Supranational Intergovernmentalism", *Les Cahiers européens de Sciences Po*, n° 1, 2010, p. 16.

[49] Pernille Rieker, *Europeanization of National Security Identity. The EU and the changing security identities of the Nordic states*, Routledge, New York, 2006, p. 53.

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 59–61.

identities and interests through a process of interaction is very valuable. Understood as a conceptual structure, the EU has a constitutive effect on the states; it makes them to redefine their interests and identities. Thus, social constructivism emphasizes the endogenous nature and social construction of political institutions. The EU political institutions are not seen as instruments to effectively solve problems through a collective action. According to constructivism, their goals, institutional structure and procedures are, primarily an expression of collective norms, values and common identity.

Conclusion

We cannot deny the importance of constructivist ideas on changing identity and interests through the process of interaction, which implies the redefinition of the existing roles of the Member states in the EU institutional system. According to constructivism, Europeanization of identity is, post-national and does not mean the abolition of national identity. In other words, the socialization process does not mean an adoption of supranational role to a detriment of national interests, but the Member states perceive interests of other countries through the participation to the process of creation and development of the European institutions, and express the willingness to compromise. However, some weaknesses are visible in the constructivist approach. As the representatives of constructivism underline, this approach fails to explore in a systematic manner the mechanisms through which international norms reach the domestic arena and so its analysis is reduced to the study of the state-level practice in order to prove the change of behaviour in ways consistent with international norms.[51] Also, the constructivists often neglect that ideational structures and actors are mutually constituted and that structures constitute actors regarding their interests and identities and also that the structures exist through reciprocal interaction of actors, which means that the actors can change the structures. The constructivist analysis of the EU shows that this approach is focused on the impact of structures, which enables actors/states to understand their interests. However, this approach overemphasizes the influence of international norms, while it neglects the impact of internal norms. Still, the analysis of Europeanization of identity by social constructivism permits us to see the EU as an expression of common ideas and not only as a product of material structure of international system.

Bibliography

• Adler, Emanuel, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 3, n° 3, 1997.

---

[51] Jeffrey Checkel, "Norms, Institutions and National Identity in Contemporary Europe", *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 43, n° 1, 1999, p. 85.

- Bearce, David H., Bondanella, Stacy, "Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization and Member-State Interest Convergence", *International Organization*, vol. 61, n° 4, 2007.

- Beyers, Jan, "Multiple Embeddedness and Socialization in Europe: The Case of Council Officials", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005.

- Chebakova, Anastasia, "Theorizing the EU as a global actor : a constructivist approach", ECSA-Canada Biennial Conference, "The Maturing European Union", 25-27 September 2008, Edmonton, Alberta.

- Checkel, Jeffrey, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: Introduction and Framework", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005.

- Checkel, Jeffrey, "International Institutions and Socialization in Europe: introduction and framework", in Jeffrey Checkel (ed.), *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

- Checkel, Jeffrey, "Norms, Institutions and National Identity in Contemporary Europe", *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 43, n° 1, 1999.

- Checkel, Jeffrey, "Why Comply? Social Learning and European Identity Change", International *Organization*, vol. 55, n° 3, 2001.

- Checkel, Jeffrey, "Social constructivism in global and European politics: a review essay", *Review of International Studies*, vol. 30, 2004.

- Christiansen, Thomas, Jørgensen, Knud Erik, Wiener, Antje, "The Social construction of Europe", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 6, n° 4, 1999.

- Copeland, Dale, "The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A review Essay", *International Security*, vol. 25, n° 2, 2000.

- David, Charles-Philippe, *La guerre et la paix. Approches contemporaines de la sécurité et de la stratégie*, Presses de sciences politiques, Paris, 2000.

- Farrell, Theo, "Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of a Research Program", *International Studies Review*, vol. 4, n° 1 2002.

- Fierke, K. M., Wiener, Antje, "Constructing Institutional Interests: EU and NATO Enlargement", in: Thomas Christiansen, Knud Eric Jorgensen, Antje Wiener (eds), *The Social Construction of Europe*, SAGE Publications, London, 2001.

- Hooghe, Liesbet, "Several Road Lead to International Norms, but Few via International Socialization: A Case Study of the European Commission", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005.

- Hopf, Ted, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory", *International Security*, vol. 23, n° 1, 1998.

- Howorth, Jolyon, "The Political and Security Committee: A Case Study in "Supranational Intergovernmentalism", *Les Cahiers européens de Sciences Po*, n° 1, 2010.

- Jackson, Robert, Sørensen, Georg, *Introduction to International Relations. Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.

- Jupille, Joseph, Caporaso, James A., Checkel, Jeffrey, "Integrating Institutions: Rationalism, Constructivism and the Study of the European Union", *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 36, n° 1/2, 2003.

- Krause, Keith, "Approche critique et constructiviste des études de sécurité", *Annuaire français de relations internationales*, vol. 4, 2003.

- Ladrech, Robert, "Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 32, n° 1, 1994.

- Lewis, Jeffrey, "The Janus Face of Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decision Making in the European Union", *International Organization*, vol. 59, n° 4, 2005.

- Marcussen, Martin, Risse, Thomas, Engelmann-Martin, Daniela, Knopf, Hans Joachim, Roscher, Klaus, "Constructing Europe? The Evolution of Nation-State Identities", in: Thomas Christiansen, Knud Eric Jorgensen, Antje Wiener (eds), *The Social Construction of Europe*, SAGE Publications, London, 2001.

- Marinkovic, Dusan, "Sociologija i konstruktivisticka perspektiva: socioloska teorija i konstruktivisticka metateorija", *Зборник Матице српске за друштвене науке*, n° 114–115, 2003.

- Matlary, Janne Haaland, *European Union Security Dynamics*, Palgrave MacMillan, New York, 2009.

- Meyer, Christophe, "Convergence Towards a European Strategic Culture? A Constructivist Framework for Explaining Changing Norms", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 11, n° 4, 2005.

- Pollack, Mark, "International Relations Theory and European Integration", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 39, n° 2, 2001.

- Pollack, Mark, "Theorizing the European Union: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance?" *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 8, 2005.

- Price, Richard, Reus-Smith, Christian, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 4, n° 3, 1998.

- Radaelli, Claudio, " Whither Europeanization ? Concept stretching and substantive change", *European Integration online Papers*, vol. 4, n° 8, 2000, http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-008a.htm (Accessed 20 April 2012).

- Rieker, Pernille*, Europeanization of National Security Identity. The EU and the changing security identities of the Nordic states*, Routledge, New York, 2006.

- Risse, Thomas, "Neofunctionalism, European identity, and the puzzles of European integration", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 12, n° 2, 2005.

- Ruggie, John Gerard, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge", *International Organization*, vol. 52, n° 3, 1998.

- Sedelmeier, Ulrich, "EU Enlargement, Identity and the Analysis of European Foreign Policy", *EUI Working Papers*, n° 13, 2003.

• Sending, Ole Jacob, "Constitution, Choice and Change: Problems with the 'Logic of Appropriateness' and its Use in Constructivist Theory", *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 8, n° 4, 2002.

• Simić, Dragan, *Nauka o bezbednosti. Savremeni pristupi bezbednosti*, Službeni list SRJ, Fakultet političkih nauka, Beograd, 2002.

• Stojanovic, Djordje, Matic, Petar, "Koncept strateske kulture: slucaj EU", *Политичка ревија*, vol. 25, n° 3, 2010.

• Vukcevic, Dejana M., "Evropeizacija nacionalnih spoljnih politika - idejni okvir", *Национални интерес*, vol. 11, n° 2, 2011.

• Wendt, Alexander, "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics", *International Organization*, vol. 46, n° 2, 1992.