

**The Centre for  
European  
and Asian Studies**

**REPORT**

**1/2012**

**ISSN 1500-2683**

***THE STUDY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION  
FROM OUTSIDE: EUROPEAN  
INTEGRATION STUDIES IN NORWAY  
AND ICELAND 1990-2010***

**KJELL A. ELIASSEN,  
MARIT SJØVAAG MARINO  
EIRIKUR BERGMANN**

A publication from:  
**Centre for European and Asian Studies at  
BI Norwegian Business School**  
0442, Oslo  
Norway

This is a working paper version of a paper written for SENT – The Network of European Studies. One of SENT's core objectives is the mapping of European studies and the comprehensive review of the evolution of European studies over the last decades in the different disciplines and countries (<http://www.sent-net.uniroma2.it>). The final version will be published in an edited volume by F. Bindi & K. A. Eliassen on the Development of European Integration Studies in Political Science

KJELL A. ELIASSEN, MARIT SJØVAAG MARINO  
AND EIRIKUR BERGMANN

THE STUDY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM  
OUTSIDE: EUROPEAN INTEGRATION STUDIES IN  
NORWAY AND ICELAND 1990-2010

The aim of this chapter<sup>1</sup> is to map the research on European integration carried out by Norwegian and Icelandic researchers and research institutions in the period 1990–2010. This study covers research of central aspects of the European Union itself: institutions, decision-making processes, policies, actors and the relationship to other countries, global and regional institutions and local and regional governments. In addition, we investigate studies on the relationship between Norway and/or Iceland and the European Union.

This chapter deals with both Norway and Iceland. The history of their relationship to the European Union is in many ways similar, but there are several differences in both the amount and direction of EU research. For each section, we will first present the Norwegian case and then the Icelandic situation on the same issues.

As for most European countries, even if there has been an extensive literature on the EU and European integration in general, only two studies have been made about the EU integration studies in Norway [Sverdrup, Olsen and Veggeland 1997; Sverdrup 2009]. The first study focused on the period 1994 – 1997 and the second mainly on European

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Catherine Børve Arnesen and Ulf Sverdrup for their valuable input and constructive comments throughout this process. We would also like to thank Pavlina Peneva for assistance in writing an early version of the Norwegian part of this chapter.

integration studies on governance and partly from a constructivist perspective. The SENT project has therefore given us a welcome opportunity to provide a more comprehensive and broader overview of Norwegian and Icelandic political science research on EU integration.

The distinguishing elements of Norwegian and Icelandic research on European integration are:

1. Norwegian research on EU integration took off when the EU issue regained actuality with the European Economic Agreement (EEA) agreement, and from the first half of the 1990s a large amount of research was published, both in absolute terms and relative to other countries.

2. The focus in Norway was from the early 1990s more on the EU as a political system than as an international organization and therefore, earlier than in many other countries, research placed less emphasis on the explanatory power of international relations theories and focused on comparative politics traditions, organisational theory, institutionalism and constructivism.

3. For several reasons the research in Norway focused on the EU – institutions, decision-making, policy areas, democracy and governance, more than on the relationship between Norway and the EU. The strong traditions of both comparative politics and organisational studies in Norway have created the bases for several major contributions in the study of the functioning of the EU institutions and decision-making processes.

4. In Iceland the volume of academic studies on European integration is significantly smaller and more limited than in Norway, as one might expect taking into account that the population of Norway is more than tenfold that of Iceland. Contrary to the

Norwegian case, the main focus of Icelandic scholars of European integration has been on the role of small states, and Iceland's relationship in the European integration process. In recent years there has been a focused interest in analysing how participation in the European project relates to domestic politics in Iceland, especially how the idea of supranational cooperation within the European Union relates to the traditional national discourse in Iceland.

Let us first take a look at the development of the relationship between EC/EU and Norway and Iceland from the first discussions of membership in the early 1960s.

### *1. The quiet Europeans: Norway, Iceland and the EU*

Claes and Tranøy [1999] give a comprehensive description of the dilemmas of Norwegian politics on European co-operation in the early years of European institutional history from the late 1940s to the 1960s. Some of the most prioritized economical goals would only be fulfilled through membership in the European Community, while other could best be secured domestically. Since the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC), the discussion on which path to follow in order to best secure Norwegian interests has been ongoing, and at times harsh. Two governments have lost office over the years over disputes concerning Norway's relationship to the EU. In the 1950s, the dilemmas were temporarily solved, with Norway joining a North Atlantic cooperation agreement, which agreed to keep distance from continental Europe. The Norwegian strategy for the first fifteen years after the launching of the Marshall plan can therefore best be

described as somewhat hesitant and sceptical towards regional agreements and organization [Claes and Tranøy 1999, 15-16].

In Iceland, debates on foreign relations have been among the most vicious in domestic politics since Iceland gained full independence from Danish rule in 1944—after more than a hundred year-long struggle. Ever since the Treaty of Rome was signed in 1957 Icelanders have debated their place in Europe. The issue first appeared on the agenda at the end of 1957, when leaders in Western Europe were preparing to create a joint forum for the six states in the EEC and the other members of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC), of which Iceland was a member. After talks broke down in 1959 the UK government led a group of seven states (Austria, Denmark, Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Portugal) establishing the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) in 1960. EFTA was intended as an intergovernmental counterweight to the supranational characteristics of the EEC. Western Europe was now split into two competing economical establishments [Claes and Tranøy 1999, 15-26; Bergmann 2009a, 187-189].

At the time Iceland's economy was mostly based on food production: fisheries and farming. Iceland's main interests in foreign trade were to insure access for its fish products to European markets, of which the UK was vital. As EFTA was mainly formed around free trade with industrial goods, Iceland stayed out of the association in the beginning.

After the UK applied for membership in the EEC in 1961 the newly formed progressive coalition in Iceland seriously contemplated applying for membership in the EEC rather than joining EFTA [Gíslason 1993, 199]. The Icelandic government only abandoned the plan of seeking membership in the EEC after the French leader Charles de

Gaulle vetoed the UK's application. [Gíslason 1993, 200-201]. Consequently, Iceland applied for membership in EFTA and joined in 1970, accompanying rapid industrialisation in the Icelandic economy.

De Gaulle's veto had consequences also for Norwegian foreign policy. Although the country had considered following the lead of two of their central trading partners (Denmark and the UK), this option was abandoned with de Gaulle's veto. With that firm «no», the reason for Norwegian membership this time was gone.

In the beginning of the 1970s membership was again on the political agenda in Norway. There had been broad agreement among the politicians to apply for membership in the EEC, but the discussions became very harsh. In the September 1972 referendum on Norwegian membership, 53.5 percent voted no. Britain, Ireland and Denmark joined the EC, and, to secure Norwegian export interests, Norway established a free trade agreement with the EC.

The reason why the Norwegian people voted against EC membership was a combination of different interests between the center and the periphery – a central cleavage line in Norwegian politics, evident since the establishment of the Norwegian constitution and Parliament in 1814. The periphery strongly defended their interests, particularly in areas such as agriculture, fishing and industry. During the EC debate in the early 1970s the farmers and fishermen were particularly worried about potential competition with continental Europe. More generally one could say that the Norwegian population didn't understand urban culture, and is still basically having an egalitarian and euroskeptic political culture.

There was another Norwegian referendum 22 years later, in 1994, and once again the outcome of the referendum was «no» [Claes and Førland 2004, 205-212]. The 1994 referendum has been described as a «blueprint» of the 1972

election. Roughly speaking, the «no» districts in 1972 were the «no» districts in 1994. Similarly, the most important arguments against membership again centered around the right to self-determination and the future of Norway as a sovereign state, with the power to decide on central sector policies such as agriculture and fishing. Moreover, similarly to the 1972 situation, the Norwegian government sought access to the newly established internal market through the European Economic Area (EEA), without being a member.

Even though arguments in the EFTA-debate in Iceland were mostly based on the economy, the discourse on the independence struggle and the conservative ideas about the nation and its sovereignty were also quite clear and formed a base for the economic arguments. For example, many parliamentarians referred to the undisputed distinctiveness of the Icelandic nation and there was a clear consensus in the parliamentary discussions that the Icelandic nation was unique and had to be protected when it came to international co-operation [Bergmann 2009a].

The accession to EFTA in 1970 started the still ongoing process of Europeanization of the Icelandic society. The main aim of EFTA was to encourage free trade in industry between its members, for example by ending import limitations, import tax and other trade restrictions. In that way it hoped to promote free trade in all of Western Europe. However, each EFTA member reserved the right to complete freedom in regard to trade agreements with third countries, adhering only to regulations stipulated by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organisation. After accession the Icelandic economy rapidly adapted to the European market and saw the effects immediately, with the lowering of prices on imported goods and easier access to European consumers. Consequently, Icelandic industry also felt the effects of increased competition from European manufacturers, and

some industries (e.g., the furniture making industry), suffered.

In 1972, Iceland followed the path of the other EFTA members by signing a free trade agreement with the European Community, which increased trade in goods and positively influenced business relations between Iceland and the European Communities (EC) members. The cooperation subsequently spilled over into other areas (for example, regulation within the field of environmental issues, transport and research). It also resulted in the quadrupling of business transactions between the EC and the EFTA states.

Although participation in EFTA and the signing of the free trade agreement greatly increased Iceland's and Norway's trade with the EC, pressure soon started to build for cooperation in other areas of the economy. The agreement between the two was after all only pertinent to a restricted area of trade between EFTA and the EC members. The EFTA states were also concerned with lack of influence, and only functioning as junior partner to the EC, who was clearly holding the initiative in the ever-increasing regulatory trade regime. The EFTA states were further worried that increased cooperation within the EC leading up to the signing of the Single European Act in 1986 would increase the gap between the two institutions and leave EFTA lagging behind in the process.

Interest in closer cooperation between the two institutions arose soon after the free trade agreements came into force in the 1970s, widening it to areas such as education, science and culture. With a joint declaration in Luxembourg in 1984 the aim was set to create a unified and vibrant new European economic area which would promote free trade amongst all partners and increase competition as well as harmonise regulations and join forces against barriers to trade with wide scope measures. On January 17, 1989 the president of the European Commission, Jacques

Delors, proposed such an initiative in his famous speech to the European Parliament. The European Economic area agreement was then signed in Oporto in Portugal in May 1992 and entered into force on January 1, 1994.

The EEA agreement is by far the most comprehensive agreement ever signed by both Norway and Iceland. With the signing of the EEA agreement, Norway and Iceland joined the EU's internal market, with an exemption on fish and agricultural goods. The EEA agreement further led to a harmonization and adaptation of rules concerning health, health, safety and environmental (HSE issues, further joint competition directives and directives concerning government subsidies. Cooperation in areas like education, science, environment and culture were also part of this agreement. Furthermore, the EFTA/EEA countries must follow directives, rules and regulations agreed upon in the EU that affect areas in the EEA agreement. The Norwegian and Icelandic governments can no longer independently implement constraints on the movement of capital, people, goods and services in and out of Norway and Iceland, and they are not allowed to introduce legislation or other regulation that discriminate citizens of the EU. With the signing of the EEA agreement, and with the consent of the internal market of the EU, Norway and Iceland effectively became highly integrated with the EU, but without being a member [Claes and Førland 2004, 205-224]. Even though Norway has chosen to not be part of the union, it has been active in constructing new institutional processes and frameworks, and as a result, the EFTA countries, through the EEA, are allowed to participate in key areas of the union.

Shifting Norwegian governments have taken the lead in developing what may be called a «Norwegian method» of European integration [Eliassen and Sitter 2003], which consists of indirect participation in European integration short of full formal membership. It can be traced back to

efforts on the parts of the EC and the remaining EFTA states to adjust to the accession of the UK, Denmark and Ireland in 1973, but it developed into a more or less coherent strategy after Sweden, Austria and Finland joined the EU in 1995. The cornerstone of this quasi-membership is the European Economic Area, which in 1994 secured access to most of the Single European Market (SEA) for six of the then seven EFTA states (the Swiss government having seen its proposed EEA option defeated in a referendum).

As the expectation that most of the EFTA states would join the EU very soon strengthened during the EEA negotiations, the EEA arrangement came to be seen by most participants as primarily a temporary measure. As it turned out, it has become a more long-term arrangement for Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein. The relationship between the EU and Norway and Iceland rests on three pillars: an extension of the Single Market through the EEA; *ad hoc* arrangements for Norwegian and Icelandic participation in a range of other EU initiatives; and periodical adjustments and adaptations of this relationship to accommodate EU Treaty or constitutional change.

The dynamic nature of the relationship between the European Union and non-member states such as Norway and Iceland reflects the fact that the EU has evolved faster and more extensively than the other European organizations. In this process, it has absorbed several initiatives that were originally designed and operated outside the EU to the extent that one may speak of the «EU-isolation» of other European organisations [Sitter 2003]. To the extent that Norway has participated in such arrangements, *ad hoc* solutions have been required in order to render existing institutional arrangements compatible with the new arrangements. The Schengen initiative to abolish border controls, launched in 1985 when the Benelux (i.e. Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) states decided to join a

Franco-German initiative, had been linked to the Nordic Passport Union before it was incorporated into the EU in the treaty of Amsterdam [Ahnfelt and From 1996]. Norway and Iceland were therefore accorded considerable access to part of the EU system through Schengen. Most of the West European Union, apart from collective defence (Article 5), the WEU Secretariat, the Assembly and West European Armaments Groups, was incorporated into the EU at the Treaty of Nice and new EU political and military institutions have been developed. Again, Norway's and Iceland's status raises some awkward questions.

The EEA agreement has clearly and greatly influenced the development of the Icelandic society. Its impact is not only measured through the legal acts Iceland has had to adopt but also through increased and more informal trans-border cooperation which has followed. The EEA opened up the closed-off Icelandic society and provided for a transformation of the economy, which became much more diversified and increasingly internationalized. One could even claim that the agreement has in fact been Iceland's lifeline in international relations. Iceland has enjoyed increased access to the EU market and its many cross-border co-operations programmes, including scientific, educational and cultural affairs, bringing with it extra capital and knowledge, much to the benefit of Icelandic society. Icelandic entrepreneurs have been given the opportunity within in the European market and Icelandic scientists have created stronger ties with international colleagues. Participation in the EU programs has dramatically boosted turnover in the area of research and has strengthened relations between Icelandic businesses and institutions, and their European counterparts.

However, after the collapse of the financial system in autumn 2008 the Icelandic government decided to apply for full EU membership. After fierce dispute in the parliament

and in society at large, the new left-wing coalition government handed in the application in July 2009.

## *2. European integration research in Norway: The early years (pre-1997)*

The first interesting observation about Norwegian and Icelandic political science research on European integration is its all-but-complete disinterest in the EC before the SEA. The little research that was done, mainly took place within an international relations (IR) framework and in international law. However, after the mid-1990s, there have been an impressive number of publications by Norwegian researchers in international journals.

Norway and Iceland are by far the non-member countries with the closest links to the EU, both to the internal market through the European Economic Area (EEA), as a full member of Schengen and with different mechanisms and as full payment-for-participation member of a long series of EU programs and initiatives. This strange combination of much integration but no membership has been characterised as a «quasi membership» of the European Union [Eliassen and Sitter 2004].

We have chosen to focus on literature published between 1990 and 2009. Prior to this period there was very little research on the EC in Norway (less than five publications per year) and among these publications there were a very limited number of analyses of the potential impact of EC on Norway, the majority being done by the Norwegian Institute of International Relations (NUPI – *Norsk utenrikspolitisk institutt*) under the leadership of the influential IR scholar Martin Sæther. We see this low production as a result of the outcome of the 1972 referendum and the serious impact it had on the political

landscape in Norway, leaving huge scars in all political parties and in society itself. The campaigning and political debates prior to the 1972 referendum and the resulting «no» did not simply entail that Norway remained outside of the EC; it effectively buried any public debate on European integration for the best part of 15 years.

Therefore, until the late 1980s, the EC was not given any particular attention in higher education. The first master program in European studies (MSc in Euromanagement) was established at Norwegian School of Business only in 1991, and it combined studies of European integration with management studies. However, Norway's lack of educational programmes directed specifically towards the EU was not exceptional. Indeed, the Euromanagement MSc was one of two of its kind in Europe at that time. The first comprehensive Norwegian textbook on European integration was published in 1992 [Andersen and Eliassen 1992].

The volume of Norwegian political science research on European integration started to increase rapidly from 1994. This was the year of the second referendum on EC membership, and it had also become increasingly clear that Norway had to relate to EU regulation regardless of the referendum outcome. The rapid increase in the research interest for European integration in Norway had started with the Single European Act and the Internal Market, just as interest in political circles and among business people were stimulated by the success of the SEA and the possibility for EFTA countries to join. With the new momentum in European economic and with the political integration there was a renewed interest in Norway in studying and understanding this institution and its impact on various parts of Norwegian society. The Maastricht treaty represented a further expansion of the scope of EU policies. The EEA agreement ensured that the EU was a significant factor in

Norwegian policy-making and had to be taken into account on many levels of political analysis.

Initially, this renewed European interest was manifest only in a limited number of political science institutions and research organizations. First of all, NUPI increased its interest in and work on European integration. Secondly, the Norwegian School of Business created its Center for European (and, later, also Asian) Studies in 1989. In the universities (of which there were four at the time) there was only a limited interest in European integration and EEC studies, despite the University of Bergen's strong Comparative Politics Department and despite the very active International Relations section at the Department of Political Science at the University of Oslo. The regional colleges created in the 1970s and 1980s were also not very active in this field. Some state-owned applied-research institutions focused on the EU in their research within their normal fields of interest, but mostly more with EU as a prefix or suffix to their normal research activity.

When the amount of European integration research in Norway started increasing rapidly in the mid-1990s, the dominating theoretical frameworks were comparative politics, political sociology and administrative studies. The salience of the first two of these frameworks in Norwegian research can be traced back to one of the influential founders of political science in Norway, Stein Rokkan. Administrative studies have traditionally been very strong in Norwegian political science, particularly at the University of Oslo with the scholar Knut Dahl Jacobsen, and in Bergen when he moved there in the late 1960s. The trend wherein the EU is seen as a political system rather than an international organisation is corroborated by the general international trend in studies of the European Union [Keeler 2005, 567]. The political developments, with the EU as «an ever closer union» lent credibility to the view that it should

be seen as a political system in its own right, and not longer simply an arena of co-operation between nation states.

We can identify three different foci for these early studies. Firstly, a majority of the studies had the EU itself as research focus, including its institutions and functioning. This was of course the case for the IR scholars [Sæter 1993; 1995; 1997]. In addition, many Norwegian researchers have been interested in ways in which the policy-making process in the EU differed from that in the well-researched and well-known nation-states (the EU as political system), and linked to this theme, to the democratic aspects of the EU. This gave rise to publications on lobbying and policy-making in the EU [Andersen and Eliassen 1991, 1993 and 1995], on democracy [Andersen and Eliassen 1996] and on voting systems [Lane and Mæland 1995]. These themes have continued to occupy Norwegian researchers up until the present.

An early seminal work was Andersen and Eliassen's *Making policy in Europe* [1993]. Here the EU was seen as an emerging political system rather than an international organisation. The book was used as a textbook in several EU-related courses both in the Norwegian School of Business (BI) and elsewhere, and dominated much of the research on lobbying in the EU in the subsequent years.

The relationship between Norway and the EC was another favoured research theme for Norwegian political scientists in this early period of European integration studies. Despite its narrow focus, this literature has contributed to the general study of European integration by giving attention to the specificities of small countries [Listhaug and Sciarini 1997; Jensen, Pesonen and Giljam 1998; Bjørklund 1996; Udgaard and Nilsson 1993].

Thirdly, many researchers studied the relationship between Norwegian and European policies, and about the impact of EU policies and integration for Norway. These

themes were to a large degree dealt with through what we call «pre- and suffix EU studies» which focused on a «traditional» topic (e.g., the labor market, agriculture, education) but included an EU dimension. Energy policy [Andersen 2009] and foreign and security policy [Peterson and Sjørusen 1998] are among the sectors that have attracted most attention from researchers. This is not surprising, given the importance of energy production for the Norwegian economy (although one might have expected this to spur even more research in this field), and Norway's particular defence and security situation as a member of NATO but not of the EU. More surprising, however, is the fact that there has been a negligible amount of political science literature on fisheries policy, or indeed any other policies linked to marine conservation.

During the latter half of the 1990s the number of research institutions focusing on European integration in Norway increased significantly. Most important was the establishment of the government-sponsored research programme ARENA.

### *3. The formative years of European integration research (1995-2003)*

Whereas the early years of EU research in Norway was close to a monopolistic undertaking by NUPI, and some early activities at Norwegian School of Business (BI), the field saw several new entrants in the mid-1990s. One could assume that the frustrated relationship to the EU as most recently documented in the «no» to membership vote in the autumn of 1994 could lead to little interest in this organization in the late 1990s, or at least only focus on our two main interests in relation to the EU: energy and fisheries, or at least that the willingness to fund this type of

research was limited [Sverdrup 2009]. None of these potential developments took place. The volume of Norwegian EU research increased rapidly after 1994 and perhaps the most important reason for this is the realization in Norway that the EEA treaty had an impact in the economic field nearly similar to membership. The focus was not on our main interest in the EU, there were some research on energy, but very few if any major systematic academic studies on EU fishing policy and the consequences for Norway. Instead the leading centres were focusing on core EU questions like variable geometry [Sæther 1997], democracy [Eriksen and Fossum 2000], international norms and domestic politics in a rationalistic vs. constructivist perspective [Checkel 1997 ], the charter of fundamental rights [Eriksen, Fossum and Menedez 2003] or euro-skepticism [Sitter 2003]. Finally, the funding was also there – especially from the research council for the new ARENA program.

By far the most important change in the mid-1990s was the establishment of ARENA (Advanced Research on the Europeanization of the Nation-State) in 1994. This was a large, state-funded programme aimed at building basic competence on European integration and networks, and «to link Norwegian research on European integration to the best European and international scholarly networks» [Olsen, Sverdrup and Veggeland 1997, 5]. Central to the programme was also to address the normative aspects of integration, using normative political theory and democratic theory.

ARENA was a well-funded programme for Norwegian research standards, operating with 8-10 million NOK annually. The centre employed scholars from different disciplines, but a majority were political scientists [Olsen, Sverdrup and Veggeland 1997]. Some additional funding could be obtained from other sources, but in the first 10

years it was mainly funded from this original source and some funding through EU research programs.

From 2004 and up to the present ARENA has been a research institute at the University of Oslo. From that time the funding has been from different sources including a grant from the University, some funding still from the research council, Norwegian ministries and EU projects.

The ARENA research profile was for several reasons linked to the impact of the European integration efforts on the European nation states, the concepts of «Europeanization» and «governance» could be seen as headlines of a large proportion of this research. This was in line with the Norwegian research traditions from Stein Rokkan, both the centre–periphery perspective and the role of the state in the state and nation-building process, and the unfinished large comparative project on small states in Europe. But it was also a rather obvious focus given the competence of some of the first employees at ARENA, most notably Johan P. Olsen and his interests in national public administration and organisational theory.

Both because of the need to study the European integration project from different perspectives and due to the fact that the ARENA project was seen from the start as a multi-discipline project, other topics like democracy, identity, norms and citizenship – and some core EU issues like foreign policy and justice and home affairs were also included.

The volume of ARENA research in the years 1996 – 2005 was substantial. The research center produced 239 academic articles and book chapters plus numerous books. Approximately 80 percent were written in English or in another non-Norwegian language [Sverdrup 2009]. Phillippe Schmitter assessed as early as 1999 that already Johan P. Olsen and the ARENA was a project of major importance in the analysis of the impact of Europeanization [Sverdrup

2009]. Both the article of Olsen [2002] on Europeanization and Hix and Føllesdal [2006] on democratic deficit are among the most cited articles in the «Journal of Common Market Studies». ARENA has become a core member in different European networks for European integration research and has a strong reputation as a very valuable network participant.

The theoretical traditions addressed in the ARENA program was linked to both organizational theory and administrative science, but also different traditions in new institutionalism, governance and where the concepts, theories and paradigms from these traditions were deliberately implemented into the field of European integration studies [Sverdrup 2009]. Inside ARENA there were also major contributions in other theoretical transitions like constructivism, normative theory and democratic theory.

The other main research center which occupied itself with European integration after 1995 was the Center for European and Asian studies at the Norwegian School of Business. In addition to running the MSc programme, the Center worked on mainly externally funded programmes on various EU policies (e.g., telecommunications regulation, defense policy, security policy, armament policy and financial services, but also on major EU institution issues like lobbying, legislative processes and the EU democratic deficit.).

As a conclusion we see two main reasons for the high academic interest and production in relation to European integration in Norway. Firstly, the EU's importance for Norway both economically and culturally has resulted in several debates about membership, and Norway shows a high interest in participating in various EU programmes. The awareness about the EU is therefore high, and the political complexities make EU integration a natural field of

interest for Norwegian researchers. Secondly, there has been a high level of public funding for political science research in general and for European and EU integration research in particular compared to many EU countries. However, the most ambiguous EU and nation-state research program has been the ARENA program.

#### *4. The institutionalization of European integration studies (post-2003)*

The third distinctive period we have identified in the development of European integration studies is characterized by the higher number of Norwegian institutions undertaking research on European integration in some way or another. Many of them focus more on their prime area of research and add an EU dimension. It is also evident that the traditional university institutes of political science become more active in this field.

The number of publications increases a little bit in the middle of this period, but then seems to go down again. After the turn of the century Norwegian EU integration research became more similar to research carried out in other European countries, both with regard to focus and theoretical traditions. We witness also a marked variation in theoretical approaches and links to other topics, to the extent that «EU studies» becomes a less precise term.

With the size and wide range of social science research activities in Norway in general and more applied research in particular, it could be expected that the increased interest for EU during the 1990s resulted in several reports and studies linking an EU dimension to studies of a wide variety of different national policies. In particular the internal market and the Norwegian link to the EU policies both through the EEA and through Norway buying into other flanking policies around the internal market made EU policies became more and more relevant for an increasing number of

areas of Norwegian politics and sectors of the Norwegian society. This was to some extent true in the late 1990s, but in the period after 2003 the main focus, at least in the major contributions we have identified, was on traditional topics of the institutions and functioning of the EU, in particular comparative politics, and organizational and administrative sciences.

The wider research agenda in these years among important contributions includes topics like democracy, legitimacy, identity and policy issues like energy [Andersen 2009], enlargement [Sjursen 2006] and foreign policy [Carlsnæs and Sjursen 2004]. There were also a large number of similar research reports, books and articles on a large variety of aspects of the European polity under development. In these studies the focus was on the emerging state likeness of the EU political system as such seen from different political, geographical and theoretical perspectives. This focus is also related to the second dimension of the studies in this later period of investigation, organizational and administrative studies.

Even in this period, several of the most important, and often most cited contributions, come from the traditional centers for European integration research and in particular ARENA. The role and influence of ARENA led to this focus on the organizational bases for European governance as an important characteristic of the Norwegian European integration research in the last part of the first decade of this century. Sverdrup [2007] argues that there existed a strong link between the work of Stein Rokkan and the more recent research on EU governance, focusing on the role and the future of the nation state in the current European transformation. The initial mandate for ARENA was written within this logic and several of the other researchers working within the field of European studies come from this tradition. More important, however, especially in this recent

period, was the importance of organizational theory and the March and Simon tradition of which Johan P Olsen, the first director of ARENA was a part. As Sverdrup argues that «the linkage to organizational and institutional theory can be easily traced in general and encompassing approaches to the EU» [Sventrup 2007, 100; see Egeberg 2004; Olsen 2007]. Sverdrup continues that it can be traced in studies of EU committees, institutional design, decision-making and national adaptation from different researchers coming out of the ARENA environment. Some of these studies have also led to more comprehensive studies of political organisation at the EU level [Olsen 2007].

Some of the studies employ the EU and the relationship between the EU and the member states as empirical bases to test and to refine theories of organizational mechanisms or to develop new insight in this type of aspects of the EU system. They seem, however, to become somewhat narrow in scope and without references to the broader development of the EU as a whole.

Several of the studies from the organizational and administrative paradigms of investigation, and also the other ARENA studies, were linked to similar research efforts within other major European research centers in Germany and Britain. During this period (2003 to 2009), the European integration research in Norway in general become both more integrated into pan-European research efforts and at the same time reflected the current theoretical trends within this field of research.

##### *5. European integration research in Iceland (1994-2010)*

Apart from few general books and reports on different aspects of European cooperation, not much research had been published on Iceland and the European project prior to

1994. Leading up to the EEA, several commissioned reports on the agreement were produced, mainly dealing with its economical and legal effect. None of those writings can be considered an important contribution in European studies. Icelandic academics did not really become interested in European integration until after the EEA came into effect.

Research on Europe started mainly within the Political Science department of the *University* of Iceland, by far the largest higher education institution in the country. With the establishment of the Centre for Small State Studies in 2001 and subsequently the revitalization of the then dormant Institute for International Affairs, the two institutions under the leadership of Dr. Baldur Thorhallsson became influential in the general discussion in Iceland on the EU and internationally within small states studies. The young private Reykjavik University established a European Law institute in 2002. In 2005 the small but long established Bifröst University founded the Centre for European studies in Iceland. Its main area of research has been Europeanization and Iceland's role in the European project. The Centre for European studies is part of the EC Thematic network for European studies, *SENT*, and the EC Thematic network for European law studies, *Menu for Justice*.

Only a handful of scholars in Iceland have dedicated themselves to European studies. Political science professor Baldur Thorhallsson has mainly focused on small state studies and how the Icelandic administration has dealt with ever-increasing Europeanization. Political science associate professor Eiríkur Bergmann has written extensively on Iceland and the EU, and also focused on how national sentiments have influenced Iceland's European policy. Political scientists, Birgir Hermannsson, Mangús Árni Magnússon and history professor Guðmundur Hálfðanarson have also focused on Icelandic nationalism and how it affects perceptions on Europe. Gunnhildur Lily

Magnúsdóttir has focused on small states and EU's environmental policy, Úlfar Hauksson has focused on EU's fisheries policy and Audunn Arnórsson has contributed to studies on the application process. Jóhanna Jónsdóttir has contributed to the study of Europeanization in Iceland. Within legal studies professor Stefán Már Stefánsson and Professor Davíð Þór Björgvinsson have been the most influential.

The limited space here only allows for mentioning the most influential writings within the field. In 1994 ambassador Einar Benediktson co-authored a book with Ketill Sigurjónsson and Sturla Pálsson on the early years of Iceland's participation in European integration. In 1996 Ólafur Þ. Stephensen published his book on the EEA negotiation which he referred to as a milestone for Iceland on its European voyage. In 1999 economist Jón Sigursson published a book on the Euro.

In 2000 the foreign ministry produced the first overall assessment on the EEA and Iceland's position in Europe, in a wide scope report which became the basis for the debate on Europe in the coming years. The same year former ambassador Einar Benediktsson published his book, *Iceland and European Development*.

In 2002 Úlfar Hauksson published his influential book on EU's fisheries policy and its impact on Iceland in membership negotiations. In 2003 the International affairs institute at the University of Iceland published a joint research with NUPI in Norway on possibilities for the two countries within Europe, *Iceland and the EU: EEA, EU-membership or a "Swiss-solution"*. Together with the main report an influential appendix on possible solutions on the fisheries policy was published: *Iceland, Norway and the EC Common Fisheries policy. The potential of the reform – a springboard for Iceland and Norway*. Also in 2003 Dr. Eiríkur Bergmann published one of the first textbooks on

Iceland and the EU: *European integration and Iceland – Guide to European integration and Iceland’s involvement in the European project.*

In 2004 Routledge published, within its series on «Europe and the Nation State», a book called *Iceland and the European Integration: On the edge*. The collection of articles was edited by Baldur Thorhallsson and dealt with several aspects of Iceland’s relations with the EU. In 2007 a prime minister appointed committee of all political parties published its findings after a three year long overall study on Iceland’s relationship with the EU. The report served as a basis for the debate on Europe in the period leading up to the crash in autumn 2008. Countless reports have been produced on the impact of European cooperation and possible EU membership on different policy areas, such as fisheries, agriculture, regional policy and monetary policy.

In early 2008, before the financial crash, Eiríkur Bergmann co-authored a book on the effects of adopting the Euro together with economic associate professor, Jon Thor Sturluson. In 2009 Audunn Arnórsson published his book on the application process: *In or out – negotiating with the EU*. Later the same year, Eiríkur Bergmann published a new textbook on Iceland and the EU called: *From Eurovision to Euro – all about the European Union*.

Only a few PhD’s have been written about Iceland and the EU: Baldur Thorhallsson wrote on the role of small states in the European Union [1999], Eiríkur Bergmann on how national sentiments have influenced Iceland’s European policy [2009], Gunnhildur Lily Magnúsdóttir on small states and EU’s environmental policy [2009], Jóhanna Jónsdóttir on Europeanization in Iceland [2010] and Magnús Árni Magnússon comparing Iceland and Malta [2010]. A large number of political debate books and articles have also been published on Iceland and the European question.

## *6. Some concluding remarks*

The empirical evidence has been presented according to a time scale. By identifying three relatively distinct time periods coinciding with varying levels of academic output and also with the institutionalization (in the strict sense) of the research field, we have provided an implicit link between research output and «extra-academic» events (both economic and political).

If we go back to our introductory statements, we are able to make the link with scholarly traditions in Norway and Iceland, and also to identify some interesting differences between the Norwegian and Icelandic cases.

Our first statement was that Norwegian research on EU integration took off when the EU issue regained actuality with the EEA agreement. A large amount of research was produced from the mid-1990s, both in absolute terms and relative to other countries. The same pattern is found in Iceland, albeit in a more modest fashion. In the period after the establishment of the EEA agreement, EU and EEA policies become much more important for both countries, for regional and local authorities, companies and interest organisations.

Our second statement concerned the theoretical traditions in Norwegian research. As we have seen, from the early 1990s the focus was more on the EU as a political system than on the EU as an international organization. Only a very limited number of scholars were studying European integration from an IR perspective. The main exception has been and partly is NUPI. Two points are of interest here. Firstly, the Norwegian emphasis on the EU as a political system can be traced back to the influence of the comparative politics researcher Stein Rokkan (who taught several of the contemporary scholars on European

integration) and, more recently, to Johan P. Olsen who is an important scholar within institutionalism and organisational theory.

Secondly, Norwegian scholars were not alone in approaching the EU as a political system. Rather, they were part of a Europe-wide trend which used approaches and theories from comparative politics and organisational studies to better understand the complexity of the EU and European integration. And in that Europe-wide trend, Norwegian scholars have not only followed, they have made important contributions.

Our third statement concerned the extent to which Norwegian scholars have written on the EU *per se*, rather than on the relationship between Norway and the EU. Two points stand out here. Firstly, this interest in the EU itself (in a small, non-member country with relatively limited research funding and only limited influence in the EU decision-making system) becomes even more remarkable when compared with Iceland, where the situation was radically different. Icelandic researchers have mainly followed the track of constructivist and, to a degree, post-structuralist methods and have been much more interested in the relationship between Iceland and the EU, consequences for Iceland of various EU policies, programs, and forms of attachment, and also how it influences national political discourse. In the same vein, it is interesting to note that whereas Norwegian researchers have been interested in topics that are central to the EU, they have not at all been interested in fisheries policies and only to a limited extent in energy policy. In contrast, Icelandic researchers have been focusing on fisheries policy and the importance of this industry in relation to European integration. Secondly, Norwegian researchers have produced a large amount of normative studies. These writings can also be linked to the strong interest among Norwegian researcher in the field in

governance and also to some extent to Rokkan's project on state and nation-building.

The attempt has been to paint a picture of the Norwegian and Icelandic research on EU and EU integration in terms of development on both quantity and not least areas of interest and theoretical framework used. Iceland only has 330,000 inhabitants and Norway is not a big country either, and with only 4.5 million inhabitants it is pretty evident that the research society is not as big as in other European countries. As a consequence of this, there are few research institutions, and the researcher tends to appear in the same forums. However, as small countries, and as non-members of the EU, the quality of assessment is vast and of quality to match any other European research institution. In this research on the development in given period, there was a steady increase in publications on EU integration matter, as well as a shift to comparative and institutional approach giving more notice to the actual complexity of the European Union and European Integration. If we dare draw a conclusion about the research community in Norway, we will say it is small, but very efficient and quality-centered, and very much linked to research contributed on the continental Europe. The European integration research in Iceland is much more limited and mainly focusing on the role of small states within the EU and especially on the relationship between Iceland and the European Union.

### *References*

- Ahnfelt, E. and From, J.  
1996 *Politisamarbeid og europeisk integrasjon. Fremveksten av justis- og innenrikssamarbeid i EU, Europol og Schengen*, Oslo, Ad Notam/Gyldendal
- Andersen, S. S. and. Elisassen, K. A. (eds)

- 1992 *Det Nye Europa. Den europeiske unions institusjoner og politikk*, Oslo, Tano
- 1993 *Making Policy in Europe. The Europeification of National Policy-making*, London, SAGE
- 1995 *EU-lobbying: The New Research Agenda*, in «*European Journal of Political Research*» Vol. 27, n. 4, pp. 427-441
- 1996 *The European Union: How Democratic Is It?*, London, Sage
- 2003 *Lobbying in the age of uncertainty*, in *New Activism and the Corporate Response*, edited by S. John, London, Palgrave MacMillan
- Andersen, S. S. and Sitter, N.
- 2006 *Differentiated Integration: What is it and How Much can the EU Accommodate?*, in «*Journal of European Integration*» Vol. 28, n. 4, pp. 313-330.
- Andersen, S. S.
- 2009 *The Emergence of an EU Energy Policy Paradigm*, in *Public Policy: Theory and Practice of Paradigm Shifts in the EU*, edited by M. Carson, T. R. Burns and D. Calvo, Oxford, Peter Lang.
- Arnórsson, A., Barth Eide, E., Harald Claes, D., Hanne Ulrichsen og Asle Toje
- 2003 *Ísland og Evrópusambandið: EES, ESB-aðild eða „svissnesk lausn“?*, Reykjavík, Alþjóðamálastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Arnórsson, A.
- 2009 *Inni eða úti – aðildarviðræður við Evrópusambandið (In or out – negotiating with the EU.)*, International affairs institute, University of Iceland.
- Benediktsson, E.
- 2000 *Iceland and European Development. A historical view from a personal perspective*, Reykjavík, Almenna bókafélagið.
- Bergmann, E.
- 2009a *Sense of Sovereignty - how national sentiments have influenced Iceland's European policy. (Hið huglæga*

- sjálfstæði þjóðarinnar*). [Ph.D. dissertation]. Reykjavík, Department of political science, University of Iceland.
- 2009b *From Eurovision to the Euro* (i. Frá Evróvisjón til evru), Reykjavík, Verold.
- Bergmann, E. and Sturluson, J. T
- 2008 *How about the euro? (i. Hvað með evruna?)*, Bifröst University Press.
- Bergmann, E.
- 2007 *Open land - Iceland's place in the word society.* (i. *Opið land*), Skrudda.
- 2003 *European integration and Iceland – Guide to European integration and Iceland's involvement in the European project.* (i. *Evrópusamruninn og Ísland*), Reykjavík, University of Iceland University Press.
- 2001 *Iceland in Europe.* (Ed.). (i. *Ísland í Evrópu.*), Reykjavík, Social democratic Alliance.
- Björgvinsson, D.
- 2006 *EES-réttur og landsréttur*, Reykjavík, Codex.
- Carlsnæs, W. E., Sjørnsen, H. and White, N.
- 2004 *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*, London, Sage
- Checkel, J. T
- 1997 *International Norms and Domestic Politics: Bridging the Rationalist-Constructivist Divide*, in «European Journal of International Relations» Vol. 3, n. 4, pp. 473-495
- 1999 *Social Construction and Integration*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol. 6, n. 4, pp. 545-560.
- 2007 *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Checkel, J. T. and Moravcsik, A.
- 2001 *Forum Section: A Constructivist Research Program in EU Studies*, in «European Union Politics» Vol. 2, n. 2, pp. 219-249
- Claes, D.H. and Førland, T.E.
- 2004 *Europeisk integrasjon*, Oslo, Gyldendal Akademisk
- Claes, D. H. and Tranøy, B. S. (eds)
- 1999 *Utenfor, Annerledes og Suveren? Norge under EØS-avtalen*, Bergen, Fagbokforlaget

- Egeberg, M. and Trondal, J.  
1999 *Differentiated Integration in Europe: The Case of EEA Country, Norway*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 37, n. 1, pp.133-142
- Egeberg, M.  
1999 *Transcending intergovernmentalism? Identity and role perceptions of national officials in EU decision-making*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol. 6, n. 3, pp. 456-474  
2004 *An organisational approach to European integration: Outline of a complementary perspective*, in «European Journal of Political Research» Vol. 43, n. 2, pp.199-219.  
2005 *EU institutions and the transformation of European-level politics: How to understand profound change (if it occurs)*, in «Comparative European Politics» Vol. 3, pp.102-117
- Eliassen, K.A. and Sitter, N.  
2003 *Ever Closer Cooperation: The Limits of the “Norwegian Method” of European Integration*, in «Scandinavian Political Studies» Vol. 26, n. 2, pp. 125-144  
2004 *The Quiet European: Norway’s Quasi-Membership of the European Union*, in *La Grande Europe*, edited by P. Magnette, Bruxelles, Éditions de l’Université de Bruxelles
- Eriksen, E. O. and Fossum, J.E.  
2000 *Democracy in the European Union- Integration through deliberation?*, London, Routledge
- Eriksen, E.O., Fossum, J.E. and Menéndez, A.J.  
2003 *The Chartering of Europe. The European Charter of Fundamental Rights and its Constitutional Implications*, Baden-Baden, Nomos  
2004 *Developing a Constitution for Europe*, London, Routledge
- Eriksen, E.O.  
2005 *An Emerging European Public Sphere*, in «European Journal of Social Theory» Vol. 8, n. 3, pp. 341-363

- 2006 *The EU – a cosmopolitan polity?*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol 13, n. 2, pp. 252-269.
- Føllesdal, A. and Hix, S.
- 2006 *Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 44, n. 3, pp. 533-562
- Hauksson, Ú.
- 2002 *Gert út frá Brussel: Íslenskur sjávarútvegur og Evrópusambandið: Sjávarútvegsstefna ESB rannsókuð út frá hugsanlegri aðild Íslands að sambandinu*, Reykjavík, Háskólaútgáfan.
- Hálfðanarson, G.
- 2001 *Íslenska þjóðríkið: Uppruni og endimörk*, Reykjavík, Hið íslenska bókmenntafélag and Reykjavíkúráðgjafan.
- Hermannsson, B.
- 2005 *Understanding Nationalism: Studies in Icelandic Nationalism, 1800–2000*. Stockholm, Stockholm University.
- Jenssen, A. T., Pesonen, P. and Gilljam, M. (eds)
- 1998 *To join or not to join: three Nordic referendums on membership in the European Union*, Oslo, Scandinavian University Press
- Lane, J. E and Mæland, R.
- 1995 *Voting Power under the EU Constitution*, in «Journal of Theoretical Politics» Vol. 7, n. 2, pp. 223-230
- Larsson, T. and Trondal, J.
- 2006 *Agenda Setting in the European Commission: how the European Commission structure and influence the EU Agenda*, in *EU Administrative Governance*, edited by H.C.H. Hofman and A.H. Türk, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Listhaug, O. and Sciarini, P.
- 1997 *Single Cases or a Unique Pair? The Swiss and Norwegian “No” to Europe*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 35, n. 3, pp. 407-438
- Matlary, J.H.

- 1993 *Beyond Intergovernmentalism: The Quest for a Comprehensive Framework for the Study of Integration*, in «Cooperation and Conflict» Vol. 28, n. 2, pp. 181-208
- Olsen, J.P.
- 2002a *Reforming European Institutions of Governance*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 40, n. 4, pp. 581-602.
- 2002b *The Many Faces of Europeanization*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 40, n. 5, pp. 921-952.
- 2003 *Towards a European Administrative Space?*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol. 10, n. 4, pp. 506-531
- 2007 *Europe in Search of Political Order. An Institutional Perspective on Unity/Diversity, Citizens/their Helpers, Democratic Design/Historical Drift, and the Co-Existence of Orders*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Peterson, J and Sjurson, H. (eds)
- 1998 *A Common Foreign Policy of Europe? Competing Visions of the CFSP*, London, Routledge
- Sigurðsson, J.
- 1999 *Evra – aðdragandi og afleiðingar*, Reykiavk, Hið íslenska bókmenntafélag.
- Sitter, N.
- 2001 *The Politics of Opposition and European Integration in Scandinavia: Is Euroscepticism a Government-Opposition Dynamic?*, in «West European Politics» Vol. 24, n. 4, pp. 22-39.
- 2003 *Euro-scepticism as Party Strategy: Persistence and Change in Party-Based Opposition to European Integration*, in «Austrian Journal of Political Science» Vol. 23, n. 3, pp. 239-352.
- 2008 *The European Question and the Norwegian Party System since 1961. The Freezing of a Modern Cleavage or Contingent Opposition?*, in *Opposing Europe? The Comparative Party Politics of Euroscepticism*, edited by A. Szczerbiak and P. Taggart, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Sjurson, H. (ed.)

- 2006 *Questioning EU Enlargement: Europe in Search of Identity*, London, Routledge
- Sverdrup, U., Olsen, J.P. and Veggeland, F.
- 1997 *A Survey of Current Research in Norwegian Political Science Research on European Integration and Co-operation: 1994-97*, «Working paper no. 12», Oslo, ARENA
- Sverdrup, U. and Gornitzka, A.
- 2008 *Who consults? The configuration of expert groups in the European union*, in «West European Politics» Vol.31, n. 4, pp. 725–750
- Sverdrup, U.
- 2009 *The Netherlands and Norway: Strong in Governance Research*, in *European Multi-Level Governance*, edited by B. Kohler-Koch and F. Larat, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar
- Stefánsson, S.M.
- 2000 *Evrópusambandið og Evrópska efnahagssvæðið*, Reykjavík, Bókaútgáfa Orators.
- Stephensen, O.P.
- 1996 *Áfangi á Evrópuför: Evrópskt efnahagssvæði og íslensk stjórnsmál*, Reykjavík, Alþjóðamálastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Sæter, M.
- 1993 *Det Europeiske Fellesskap. Institusjoner og Politikk*, Oslo, Universitetsforlaget
- 1995 *Traktatkonferansen og de store lands interesser (IGC 1996 and the interests of the large countries)*, in «Internasjonal Politikk» Vol. 53, n. 4, pp. 441-70
- 1997 *Europeisk æter Integrasjon i flere 'hastigheter'*, in «Internasjonal Politikk» Vol. 55, n. 1, pp. 3-17
- Thorhallsson, B.
- 2000 *The role of small states in the European Union*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Thorhallsson, B. (ed)
- 2004 *Iceland and European Integration: On the edge*, London and New York, Routledge.

Trondal, J.

2007 *Contending Decision-making Dynamics within the European Commission*, in «Comparative European Politics» Vol. 5, n. 2, pp. 158-178

2007 *The Public Administration Turn in Integration Research*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol. 14, n. 6, pp. 960-972

2007 *Is the European Commission a “Hothouse” for Supranationalism? Exploring Actor-level Supranationalism*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 45, n. 5, pp. 1111-1133.

Udgaard, N.M. and Nilsson, H.

1993 *Norge og Norden i fremtidens Europa*, Oslo, Schibsteds forlag.