This is a repository copy of *Citizenship and the Practice of Governance in South-East Europe*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/88678/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

ANDREW GEDDES[1]
Department of Politics, University of Sheffield, UK

ABSTRACT

The key objective of this Conclusion is to highlight the broader conceptual, empirical and methodological contributions of this edited volume. Reflecting on the paired articles, the conclusion explores the implications of the collection on the interplay between the modes of *governance that constitute citizenship regimes and their effects on 'lived citizenship' that characterise individuals' experiences of this governance.*

KEY WORDS: citizenship, transformative power, Europeanisation, governance

Introduction

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to reflect upon and offer some concluding thoughts on the fascinating collection of articles brought together in this special issue. The articles demonstrate not only the skills and insight of the authors, but also reflect and further enhance the wider contributions made by the The Europeanisation of Citizenship in the Successor States of the Former Yugoslavia (CITSEE) project.

More specifically, the task assigned for this conclusion is to reflect on the broader contributions made by this collection, which has conceptual, empirical and methodological dimensions. By first drawing out some of the conclusions from the articles, or to be more precise, the paired articles, it is then possible to think about the advances that are made and about their contribution to the wider research field. It is suggested, in particular, that this could mean reflecting on the meaning of governance itself, the adaptive (or perhaps maladaptive) behaviour of governance systems and the quotidian practices of governance that play a key role in constituting citizenship. Indeed a focus on practices is central to this collection and that becomes particularly evident in those contributions that address the issue of 'lived citizenship', which directs attention not only to modes or strategies of governance but also to practices and experience of governance and their effects.

One other immediate and introductory point that foregrounds this discussion concerns the wider relevance of these articles. They all contain fine-grained analysis and mobilise an enormous amount of fresh material, but all can be seen to speak to much wider debates in contemporary European politics and also find some echoes outside south east Europe. To take just two examples, whether it be the interplay between visa policy and securitisation explored in Kacarska's contribution or the persistence and effects of clientelistic forms of politics in Croatia assessed by Stubbs and Zrinščak there are clear points of alignment with developments in other parts of Europe. While all the articles demonstrate sensitivity to context, they all also make points that go beyond the intricacies of the particular case studies that are being assessed to speak to wider conceptual and empirical debates. Not least, the

---

[1] Correspondence address: Andrew Geddes, Professor of Politics, University of Sheffield, Elmfield, Northumberland Road, Sheffield S10 2TU, UK. Email: a.geddes@shef.ac.uk

meaning and practice of citizenship play key roles in domestic politics, relations with neighbouring states and actual or potential integration within the EU. The specific cases in this collection all highlight more general issues and for this - and other reasons – make important contributions to their respective research fields.

In terms of their organisation, these concluding remarks look first at the contributions made by the papers, which means thinking in particular about the range of social and political factors that shape lived citizenship in South East Europe. The next section then explores in more detail some of the implications of these papers for understandings of governance and also makes links between the governance, adaptation and practice. A final section then considers the wider implications of this special issue for future research.

Contributions of the articles

Clearly, a key contribution offered by this special issue is to shed new light on the governance of citizenship practices that goes beyond an understanding of citizenship as a formal, legal status to also explore processes of citizenship. While the word 'laboratory' is inadequate, too cold and too clinical to capture the complexities and specificities of developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia, they all do provide fascinating tests of terms and concepts that resonate in debates about the development, consolidation and transformation of the state in south east Europe and more widely. These are necessarily entangled with the meaning and effects of European integration on citizenship and practices of governance, as well as a wider set of influences that emanate from other European and international norms and standards.

The articles also engage with another important theme in the contemporary analysis of the European Union (EU), which is the Union's so-called 'transformative power'. By assessing the range of external and internal influences on social and political change in South-East Europe, the articles provide interesting insight into this idea of the EU as exercising transformative power. This includes both the nature and characteristic features of this power – its normativity - as well as the mediation of this power in the context of social and political processes within the five countries.

Looming large in many of the articles is the centrality of ethno-national identities to citizenship policies and the key role, as Džankić et al note in the Introduction, of citizenship as a pragmatic and symbolic representation of what the state is intended to be. While EU membership necessarily involves the striking of a 'sovereignty bargain' with some ceding or pooling of authority seen as bringing wider benefits, or a 'capacity bargain', such elite level 'bargains' have effects that work their way into the day to day practices of lived citizenship (Mattli, 1999; Geddes and Taylor, 2013).

The articles draw from a broad understanding of citizenship and extend their focus beyond the EU's influence to explore the resonance of a wider range of European and international standards on the meaning and practice of citizenship in South-East Europe. While not necessarily a new insight, the special issue demonstrates that Europeanisation should not be seen as unidirectional. In fact, and again in line with other work on the EU's effects, we see descriptors such as 'contested' added to the word 'Europeanisation' as well as a range of other factors both internal and external that can affect social and political change and interact with EU effects. It is not entirely surprising, as we do see in these articles, to see 'adaptation with national colours' to EU requirements, as this is already a key finding of the

Europeanisation literature (Green Cowles, 2000). But what we also see – and something that is evident more generally across the EU – is the increased contestation of European integration. For example, the articles by Stambolieva and by Stubbs and Zrinščak are framed by the effects of the economic crisis on social citizenship and welfare in Croatia, which unavoidably forms part of the context within which the effects of European integration will be mediated in domestic politics, as well as also influencing the standards and practices associated with adaptation to these EU requirements.

The pairing of the papers also helps to clarify the variation in EU effects. Džankić and Kacarska analyse regulatory issues of extradition, migration and mobility where the EU's impact is direct, strong and transformative with implications not only for state identity and citizen's rights but also for domestic adaptation to these requirements. Džankić's identification of four characteristics of Europeanisation is particularly helpful in specifying the meaning that the EU and its requirements can acquire as a shaper of governing practices. The four characteristics of Europeanisation that Džankić identifies are: initial stabilisation; tensions around sovereignty; the multivalent nature of external influences linked both to the EU influences and to other European and international norms and standards; and, finally, the scope for learning and adaptation and local variations. In short, these four characteristics capture the relationship and potential tensions between external influences and social and political processes within the five countries. This is a point reinforced by Kacarska's analysis that focuses, in particular, on the multivalency of Europeanisation as well as domestic processes of learning and adaptation. This means looking in close detail at the EU's effects at national level and how certain actors may be empowered and others weakened. Kacarska shows an effect of Europeanisation of visa policy has been the empowering of security actors and the establishment of 'securitised' governance practices that run counter to a rights-based discourse. Also highlighted are more informal processes of information sharing and knowledge exchange that, while informal, are clearly an important component of the transmission of ideas and practices within the EU.

The focus then shifts to articles that explore distributive questions of 'who gets what' through analyses that explore welfare, social rights and social citizenship. Again, the richness of the analysis and quality of the empirical contribution is very high. These are also areas where EU effects are less direct as the meaning and organisation of welfare and social rights will reflect established legacies as well as the effects of state transformation. This is not to say that external influences are irrelevant; clearly the EU plays a role as too do the effects of the post-2008 financial crisis, but as Stambolieva shows, the EUs effects are 'uneven'. Stambolieva provides a fine-grained assessment of the specificities of social citizenship as a status and a process in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia and its relationship to the institutions of the welfare state. She highlights the role played by clientelistic forms of politics, which is a point then taken forward by Stubbs and Zrinščak in their detailed assessment of Croatia within which clientelistic forms of politics and associated exchanges are seen as demonstrating the limits to Europeanisation and a rather gloomy prognosis about the future of social citizenship in Croatia. Stubbs and Zrinščak also offer interesting insight into governance, or more particularly into one of the descriptors that is frequently added to the word in EU studies: 'multi-level governance'. At its most basic, multi-level governance implies a conceptual broadening and widening of analysis of political authority and power to take into account the involvement of a wider range of public and private actors within the domestic polity plus the involvement of sub-national and, importantly, supranational actors at EU level in policy shaping and making (Taylor et al,

2013). Stubbs and Zrinščak move beyond a description of the Croatian political system as 'multi-level' - which in some senses is a statement of the obvious - to look much more closely at the captured and categorical distribution effects that arise as a result of clientelistic politics. Connecting thinking back to the first set of paired papers, there is also a link between the analyses of extradition and free movement offered by Džankić and Kacarska as those of welfare and social citizenship provided by Strambolieva and by Stubbs and Zrinščak. All draw our attention to the ways in which practices of governance play a key role in the construction of citizenship both as a status and process in South-East Europe. They also highlight the importance of exploring the adaptive – or maladaptive – features of governance systems. These points about governance, adaptation and practice are picked up again in the section that follows this.

The final two paired articles further enhance the level of insight as the focus shifts to education. Pantić looks at the interplay between education and citizenship to highlight once again the importance of practices of governance when specifying the key role played by governance structures in shaping social and political space and associated discourses of inclusion, exclusion, belonging and entitlement. Pantić also identifies the adaptability of both political systems and governing elites in adopting international norms to advance their own agendas and suggests that compliance with EU requirements might be instrumental or symbolic rather then representative of deeper transformation. The final paper by Hromadžić provides an ethnographic and anthropological perspective on the strike by Croat and Bosniak teachers at the Mostar Gymnasium as a way to articulate their 'profession-shaped citizen-demands'. Hromadžić moves beyond ethno-national understandings and associated 'governmentalities' of 'lived citizenship' to identify professional solidarity as a site of citizenship. Through her assessment of the localisation of power Hromadžić also shows that, even though such power may be weaker, it does have potentially transformative effects rooted in shared experiences and the living of citizenship previous shaped by the 'ethnonational order of things'. While markedly different from the top-down analysis of the EU's transformative power that was evident in other articles, it is possible to identify the importance of practices of governance in both the construction and meaning of citizenship in South-East Europe.

Governance, adaptation and practices
The articles all contribute directly and insightfully to the special issue's core purpose, which is to adopt a broad understanding of the policies that regulate the distribution of rights and thus to understand more about the governance of citizenship. All the papers have interesting and important things to say about citizenship, rights, the meaning of governance, the adaptive behaviour of governance systems as well as about the meaning and effects of practices. This final section now seeks to draw out some points about all three of these terms - governance, adaptation and practice - and to think through some of their implications.

The term governance casts quite a long shadow over the articles in this collection whether it be modes or strategies of governance or the effects of governance understood as illustrative of governmentalities. There is not space here for a comprehensive overview of the meaning of governance. Instead, it might be more helpful to make two points. First, it does seem more common that analyses focus on the descriptor to be added to the term whether it be 'good', 'bad', 'multi-level' or 'sub-optimal'. The term governance also alludes to transformations of the state with a wider range of public and private actors involved in social and political decision-making and a re-scaling of these decision-making processes marked by

a greater involvement by sub-national and supranational actors. Yet, this focus on the supposed changes induced or linked to new or multi-level modes of governance does not help with the meaning of the term itself. The articles in this collection can, in fact, help move towards a more refined understanding of the meaning of governance as a strategy, a process and a practice. The Introduction to the special points to the importance of a broad understanding of the policies and issues that relate to the governance of citizenship while each of the articles does attempt to conceptualise underlying social systems and their adaptive capacities. On this basis it can then be argued that there is a common understanding of the term governance that runs through this collection, which is to see it as involving both the conceptual representation of social systems and the empirical analysis of the capacity of these systems to change or to adapt (Pierre, 2000). This understanding privileges no particular site or location of governance and involves assessments that look both at the European, national and local levels, as well as the interactions between them. The result is that processes of systemic adaptation and change play out across a range of levels and involve very different actors, varying types of power relationship while also having markedly diverse effects. However, the common point that remains across all of the articles is an attempt to conceptualise the underlying dynamics of social systems in each of the five countries and in a variety of policy fields (extradition, visas, social rights, welfare and education) and then to understand more about adaptation, adaptability or perhaps even maladaptation, which may also be another way of thinking about the potential and limits of Europeanisation and governance strategies and practices whether they be 'effective' or 'sub-optimal'.

The sectoral variation that we see through the paired articles highlights the capacity of states to adapt, but also that, as Weiss (1998, p.4) has observed, states are not uniformly effective in what they undertake, which means that any discussion of capacity must account for sectoral variations. Weiss' insights into what she calls the 'cataltyic state' resonate with some of the findings emerging from this special issue. The catalytic potential of a state is associated with the depth and the breadth of links between the state and other actors. To understand the catalytic potential of states, Weiss uses the term 'political crystallization' to explore the ways in which constellations of actors and resources can coalesce into policy networks. This can, for example, provide further insight into what Kacarska sees as both the formal and informal modes of governance linked to visa policy with important implications for citizens' rights because of the particular crystallisations that occur in the field of migration and mobility. These crystallisations also help to bring into the analysis the forms and types of social and political power that might be associated with these constellations and crystallisations. For example, drawing from Mann's work on the sources of state power can allow assessment of how particular crystallisations can promote 'infrastructural power', which can be understood as a state's capacity to penetrate civil society (Mann, 1984). The articles in this collection move beyond and enhance a discussion of infrastructural power as nationally bound by accounting for the multivalent nature of external influences from the EU and other European and international standards and the effects that these can have on the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, resource mobilisations and governed interdependence within a catalytic state. As well as the capacity of a state to act as a catalyst, of course.

Focusing on adaptation means drawing from work on the capacity of social systems to respond to internal and external pressures. While the focus for much work on adaptation is on the effect on ecosystem services of environmental or climate change, there are also clear parallels to the analyses contained within the articles in this special issue many of which do make reference to adaptation and adaptability. It is, therefore, helpful to try to draw out the

meaning of adaptation and to think about the effects of adaptive behaviour. This is particularly relevant to this special issue because one of its core purposes is to explore the effects of the EU on the governance of citizenship practices or, put another way, the adaptive requirements of the EU acquis. Adaptation can be understood as referring to decision-making processes, sets of actions, and associated capacities to deal with future changes to systems (Nelson et al, 2007). A system may be 'resilient' if the effects of change can be absorbed while the same controls on function and structure are maintained while it can be understood as 'vulnerable' to the extent that it is susceptible to and is unable to cope with adverse effects (Nelson et al 2007; Adger, 2006). There can also be 'maladaptation', which refers to the ways in which adaptation actions that might arise as a result of pressure to accord with EU requirements can also have the effect of increasing the vulnerability of other groups and sectors or, in transboundary issue areas, to rebound negatively on other states (Barnett and O'Neill, 2010). Returning to a point made in the previous section, any discussion of adaptation, vulnerability, resilience and maladaptation requires attention to sectoral variation because of the different constellation and crystallisations that can occur. It also requires close attention to the ideological content of adaptive requirements because these will have powerful effects on the ways in which policy networks are constituted, the empowerment of certain actors and the weakening of others. In turn, these translate into an assessment of how, why and with what effects the boundaries of citizenship have adapted to the changes that they have experienced, as well as the effects of these adaptations.

This then leads to a third theme that is central to the contributions in this special issue, which is the practice of governance. Whether the focus is on extradition, visas, social citizenship, welfare or education, there is an attention not only to modes of governance but also how these translate into practices and what these mean for citizenship. The so-called practice turn in international relations highlights the importance of practice understood as the socially recognised competence of practitioners whether these be interior ministry officials or teachers asserting their professional status. The focus for this special issue on both the construction and meaning of citizenship in south east Europe resonates with the insight provided by Adler and Pouliot (2011, p. 3) when they wrote that: 'most political dynamics come to rest on the fixation of meanings – a hard work in which practices play a prominent role'. The practice of governance necessarily amounts to more than simply 'behaviour' or 'action' because it involves 'the patterned nature of deeds in socially organized contexts' (Adler and Pouliot, 2011, p. 3). These socially organised contexts can also be understood as 'communities of practice' that can emerge in a wide variety of social settings but necessarily involve groups of people that interact frequently to create the social fabric of learning. This resonates with Džankić's focus on learning as one of the four characteristics of Europeanisation. In each of the areas that are covered by the articles in this special issue we can see evidence of practice understood as a social process based on a shared sense of joint enterprise, mutual engagement and a shared repertoire of resources (Wenger, 2010, p. 229). This says more about the practice of governance and less about its normative content, but the wider point is that the practice of governance is necessarily a social endeavour and plays a key role in the production of meaning about citizenship as both a status and a process.

Implications for future research
This final section briefly reflects on the implications of this special issue for its research fields as well as for future research and centres on three observations. First, the articles offer a significant development in the understanding of the governance of citizenship practices in South-East Europe. The empirical material and conceptual insight that is brought to bear is an

important contribution to knowledge, which is further strengthened by the coherence of the collection and its attention to a set of key questions and issues that centre on the relationships between governance and citizenship. The broad understanding of citizenship also facilitates new insight into the ways in which boundaries of inclusion and exclusion can be redefined within governance systems from the local to the EU level and what this mean for social and political relations in each of the five countries. Given the broad understanding of citizenship that is used, there is clearly scope for others to follow the path established by this special issue either through exploration of others areas of citizenship policy or to drill down deeper into the particular cases.

Second, the contributions also speak to broader debates. While context is clearly important, the papers offer insight into various debates about the role, purposes and future of the nation state in Europe. While local specificities obviously play a key role and should not be downplayed, we can also extract from the articles in this collection some more general points about issues such as Europeanisation and the idea of Europe's transformative power. The articles caution against assumption about unidirectional flows and also highlight the importance of specifying the ways in which European integration can empower some actors and weaken others with clear implications for rights, for the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion and for citizenship. The article all add something new and distinctive to the roles played by issues such as extradition, migration, mobility, visas, social rights, welfare and education and demonstrates both the impacts of Europeanisation, as well as some of its limits.

Third, the articles all engage with the governance of citizenship practices and encourage reflection on the meaning of the word itself rather than the attachment of various adjectives to it. By doing so, the articles highlight the importance of conceptualising underlying social systems and relationships before then thinking about the adaptive capacities of these systems and recognising the potential for maladaptation to occur that might exacerbate rather than address systemic vulnerabilities. There is rich potential for research in the direction opened by the articles in this collection that place the practices of governance at the heart of their analysis and prompt research that is sensitive to context, but that also engages with concepts and ideas that resonate beyond the borders of south east European countries.

Bibliography

Adger W. N. (2006) Vulnerability, Global Environmental Change, 16 (1), pp. 268–281.

Adler, E. and Pouliot, V. (2011) International practices, International Theory, 3(1), pp. 1-36.

Barnet J. and O'Neill S. (2010) Maladaptation, Global Environmental Change, 20 (1), pp. 211–213

Geddes, A and Taylor, A. (2013) How EU Capacity Bargains Strengthen States: Migration and Border Security in South-East Europe, West European Politics, 36 (1), pp. 51-70

Green-Cowles, M., Caporaso, J. and Risse-Kappen, T. (Eds.) (2001) Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Mattli, W. (1999) The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Mann, M. (1984) The Autonomous Power of the State', European Journal of Sociology, 25 (2), pp. 185–213.

Nelson D., Adger W. N., Brown K., (2007) Adaptation to environmental change: contributions of a resilience framework, Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 32 (2), pp. 395–419.

Pierre, J. (2000) (Ed.) Debating Governance: Authority, Steering, and Democracy (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Taylor, A., Geddes, A. and Lees, C. (2013) Political Change in South East Europe: The Dynamics of Multi-Level Governance and Europeanisation (London: Routledge/UACES).

Weiss, L. (1998) The Myth of the Powerless State (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Wenger, E. (2010), Conceptual tools for CoPs as social learning systems: boundaries, identity, trajectories and participation, in C. Blackmore (Ed.) Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice, pp. 125-43 (Dordrecht: Springer).