

Chapter 4

FACTORS EXPLAINING SWEDISH CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS' EUROPEANIZATION

Roberto Scaramuzzino and Magnus Wennerhag

This chapter explores which factors contribute to whether Swedish civil society organizations (CSOs) become involved in regulatory, organizational, and financial Europeanization. We will focus on factors that previous literature has deemed important for CSOs' Europeanization—their availability of resources (number of members and paid staff) and their position in the organizational hierarchy (national, regional, or local)—but we will also analyze the relative impact of CSO type (i.e., the types of interests that the organizations represents) and whether CSOs perceive the EU to be a relevant political arena for solving the problems or issues they work with. We will also scrutinize whether CSOs' involvement in one type of Europeanization is correlated with their involvement in other types of Europeanization. Overall, the results show that resources, position in organizational hierarchy, CSO type, and perceived relevance all affect the likelihood of CSOs becoming Europeanized, but that these factors impact differently depending on the type of Europeanization considered. The analysis is based on data from a national survey among Swedish CSOs conducted in 2012–13 as part of the EUROCIIV program.

In chapter 3 we used the same survey data to explore the ways in which contemporary Swedish CSOs are regulatory, organizationally, and financially Europeanized. The analysis revealed that some CSO types were in general more Europeanized, whereas others were less so, but also that some

types of Europeanization were more common among specific CSO types. In this chapter we will go one step farther in the analysis. First, we will scrutinize whether the CSOs' involvement in one type of Europeanization leads to a similar degree of involvement in another type of Europeanization (i.e., if one finds correlations between different types of Europeanization). Second, we will make more complex statistical analyses in order to explain which factors contribute to whether Swedish CSOs become Europeanized. In order to see if different types of Europeanization are furthered by similar or different factors, we will perform the same type of analysis for regulatory, organizational, and financial Europeanization separately, but in these analyses we will also investigate how the different types of Europeanization affect each other.

In a previous study built on the EURO CIV survey (Scaramuzzino and Wennerhag 2015) we analyzed the degree to which Swedish CSOs that are active in the social welfare policy area carried out their activities at the European level and which factors most strongly contributed to such activities. The analysis showed that the strongest factor contributing to Swedish CSOs' degree of activity at the European level was the perceived relevance of this level for solving the problems or issues that they worked with. The availability of resources furthermore proved to be crucial, and CSOs that represented many members and had access to employed staff were more likely to be Europeanized. The analysis in that study was based on the CSOs' assessment of how often they had engaged in activities on the European level, which is a very general measure of the organizations' degree of Europeanization. In this chapter we will instead be more precise and look at the three types of Europeanization we discussed at length in chapter 3 in order to see whether the same factors are relevant for regulatory, organizational, and financial Europeanization. We are here foremost interested in CSOs' overall involvement in different types of Europeanization, and not the frequency or extensiveness of their involvement. We will analyze dichotomized variables that show whether the CSOs are at all involved in what can be regarded as different types of Europeanization.

We interpret and operationalize these three types of Europeanization in the following way.

- Regulatory Europeanization is when Swedish CSOs engage with public institutions at the EU level for the purpose of influencing policy; this is something that research on Europeanization of domestic interest groups has focused on (see Kanol 2016 for an overview). In the analysis we use the following question from the survey: "How often do you try to influence politicians or officials at the European level regarding issues that are central for your organization?" (to which the response

alternatives were “often,” “sometimes,” “rarely,” or “never”; the three former alternatives have been merged into a single value, to be contrasted to “never”).

- Organizational Europeanization is when Swedish CSOs are members of umbrella organizations or networks at the European level. The increase of EU-based CSOs has been highlighted in research (Johansson and Lee 2014) as has been the participation of domestic CSOs in such networks as a form of Europeanization (Karlberg and Jacobsson 2015). In the analysis we use the following question from the survey: “Was the CSO a direct member of networks or federations at the EU or European level?” (to which the response alternatives were “yes” or “no”).
- Financial Europeanization is when Swedish CSOs mobilize financial resources from EU institutions. The importance of EU funding for domestic CSOs has been highlighted by previous research (e.g., Sánchez-Salgado 2010; Scaramuzzino et al. 2010). To measure the level of Europeanization from this perspective, we use the following question from our survey: “How important is economic support from EU bodies for the budget of your organization?” (to which the response alternatives were “very,” “somewhat,” “not very,” or “this is not a source of funding for us”; response alternatives one to three have been merged into a single value, and is in the analysis contrasted to the fourth response alternative).

When it comes to regulatory and financial Europeanization, our analysis is focused on the CSOs that sometimes have tried to influence politicians or officials at the European level (irrespective of how often) or have received some kind of economic support from EU bodies (irrespective of how important this is for the CSO’s budget). This makes it possible to analyze these types of Europeanization in binary terms in the same way that we can analyze organizational Europeanization as a binary variable.

Chapter 3 contained bivariate analyses for all these three variables, and showed how the degree of Europeanization varied between different types of CSOs. In this chapter we will use a binary logistic regression to analyze whether other factors than CSO type affect the organizations’ involvement in different types of Europeanization. As mentioned above, we will in particular analyze whether the CSOs’ availability of resources, their organizational level, and the perceived political importance of the EU affect their likelihood of being Europeanized. These variables were introduced in chapter 3, for instance in connection to the bivariate analyses in table 3.1 (the availability of resources and organizational level) and table 3.4 (the perceived political importance of the European level). Our use of binary logistic regression

models to analyze whether these different factors make CSOs more or less likely to be Europeanized will allow us to see these factors' relative impact when they are all taken into account in the analysis. In particular, this will show whether the variation we saw between different CSO types' degrees of Europeanization in chapter 3 (in tables 3.5 and 3.8, regarding regulatory and organizational Europeanization) can be seen as reflecting other types of differences between the CSO types. By controlling for factors such as the CSOs' availability of resources or their organizational level, we will be able to see how much the CSO types—which are more or less related to specific policy areas and interests—explain in the end. All in all, this analysis will help us to give a more nuanced explanation of why only a minority of Swedish CSOs are Europeanized.

Previous research on the Europeanization of interest groups and social movements has shown that both organizational and institutional factors are important for whether and how CSOs come into contact with EU institutions and organizational networks at the European level. These theories will be considered later in this chapter when we discuss possible explanations for the different patterns of Europeanization that can be found among Swedish CSOs. In our analysis, we will explore the role of organizational factors in terms of the type of interests represented (e.g., Beyers 2004; Chalmers 2013; Dür and Mateo 2012), the CSOs' availability of resources such as membership and staff (e.g., Klüver 2010), and their dependency on resources such as public funds (e.g., Beyers and Kerremans 2007). Among institutional factors (e.g., Beyers 2008; Beyers and Kerremans 2007) we will take into account the CSOs' position in the organizational hierarchy (whether they are local, regional, or national organizations) and the main policy area they are involved in. In line with our previous findings (Scaramuzzino and Wennerhag 2015), we will also focus on how the organizations perceive the political context in which they work, especially how relevant they deem the European level and the EU institutions for their own activities and goals.

Do Different Types of Europeanization Correlate?

Before presenting the results of the regression analyses, we want to discuss how one can understand the relationship between the three types of Europeanization. How closely related are these different types of Europeanization? Is it, for instance, more likely that organizationally Europeanized CSOs are simultaneously more financially Europeanized? Or, on the contrary, does involvement in one type of Europeanization lead to less involvement in another type?

In chapter 1 Jacobsson and Johansson argued that different types of Europeanization need to be analytically separated because they concern different types of influence that are characterized by specific mechanisms that place CSOs in different subject positions or roles. In chapter 3 our analysis showed that some types of CSOs tend to be more Europeanized than others in many ways, but it also showed that some types of CSOs were more Europeanized in some ways and less in others. However, we did not explicitly analyze to what degree various types of Europeanization correlate with each other.

Table 4.1 shows the degree to which the three types of Europeanization are statistically correlated. There are positive correlations between all three variables, which means that involvement in one type of Europeanization makes it more likely for a CSO to also be involved in other types of Europeanization. The strongest correlation is between regulatory and organizational Europeanization. This suggests that being active in networks at the EU level is partly based on motives of gaining access to and influencing policymaking processes at the European level. However, even though the correlations are positive, they are not extremely strong, and they account for only around 20–30 percent of the covariation between the variables. This shows that, in general, the three different types of Europeanization analyzed here do not follow exactly the same pattern. Whether these differences can be explained by other factors will now be examined in the remaining part of this chapter.

Explaining Europeanization

We will now analyze the impact of various factors on whether Swedish CSOs are Europeanized according to the three types of Europeanization discussed above. The statistical method used is binary logistic regression. This type of regression plots so-called odds ratios for each factor (in table 4.2 these are labeled $\text{Exp}(B)$); in other words, a figure for how the probability of having a specific quality (here, being Europeanized) is affected by other characteristics (e.g., resources) when the effects of many variables are analyzed simultaneously. This will allow us to see the relative impact of various factors on CSOs' Europeanization.

The three (binary) dependent variables are the ones we presented earlier in this chapter: regulatory, organizational, and financial Europeanization. These will be analyzed in three separate regression models. The independent variables include CSO type (the same types that were discussed in chapter 3; see also appendixes A and B), and the control variables include the CSOs' position in the organizational hierarchy (whether they are local,

Table 4.1. Correlations between Different Forms of Europeanization

		1. Regulatory	2. Organizational	3. Financial
1. Regulatory Europeanization: Have sometimes tried to influence politicians or officials at the European level.	Pearson Correlation Observations (N)	1 1,699		
2. Organizational Europeanization: Is a member of networks or federations at the EU or European level.	Pearson Correlation Observations (N)	.321** 1,565	1 1,645	
3. Financial Europeanization: Has economic support from EU bodies.	Pearson Correlation Observations (N)	.203** 1,649	.205** 1,589	1 1,766

Note: All correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: EURO CIV survey.

Table 4.2. The Most Important Factors for the CSOs' Different Types of Europeanization (Binary Logistic Regression)

Variable	Model 1A <i>Have contacted politicians or public officials on the European level</i>			Model 1B <i>Affiliated with a network, federation, or umbrella organization on the European level</i>			Model 1C <i>Receive public funding from EU institutions</i>		
	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)
CSO type (Disability org. = ref.)	0.228	0.518	1.256	0.849	0.532	2.337	0.194	0.517	1.214
Temperance and drug abusers' org.	-0.161	0.420	0.851	0.473	0.469	1.605	-1.119	0.536	0.327
Victim support org.	-1.616 †	0.838	0.199	-1.664	1.169	0.189	0.304	0.572	1.355
Women's org.	1.140 **	0.439	3.128	-0.759	0.659	0.468	-0.648	0.582	0.523
Other interest org. for social groups	-0.059	0.428	0.943	-0.185	0.506	0.831	-2.246 **	0.786	0.106
Humanitarian org.	-0.174	0.362	0.840	0.551	0.400	1.734	-0.302	0.373	0.739
Social service org.	0.312	0.550	1.366	-0.594	0.729	0.552	0.133	0.522	1.142
Religious associations and congregations	0.190	0.381	1.209	0.307	0.424	1.360	-0.191	0.387	0.826
Political parties	1.691 ***	0.413	5.426	0.857 †	0.472	2.356	-0.091	0.483	0.913
Control variables									
Organizational level (local organization = ref.)									
Regional organization	0.439	0.316	1.551	-0.245	0.378	0.782	-0.081	0.387	0.922
National organization	1.167 ***	0.310	3.212	1.320 ***	0.306	3.743	0.761 *	0.330	2.141
No. of members (1-99 = ref.)									
100-999 members	0.593 *	0.253	1.809	0.061	0.281	1.063	0.321	0.277	1.378
> 1000 members	0.650 *	0.330	1.915	0.497	0.348	1.643	0.411	0.353	1.509
Meta-organization	0.474	0.441	1.607	0.186	0.470	1.204	0.334	0.455	1.397
Employed staff (0 = ref.)									
<5	0.450 *	0.225	1.569	0.240	0.259	1.272	0.634 *	0.262	1.886
5 or more	0.072	0.310	1.075	1.091 ***	0.314	2.978	1.260 ***	0.319	3.526
Other types of Europeanization									
Have contacted politicians or public officials on the European level				1.023 ***	0.216	2.783	0.301	0.235	1.351

Affiliated with a network, federation, or umbrella organization on the European level	0.970 ***	0.216	2.638			0.435	†	0.233	1.545
Receive public funding from EU institutions	0.339	0.233	1.404	0.479 *	0.232	1.615			
Perceived importance of the European level	2.397 ***	0.202	10.992	0.996 ***	0.211	2.706	***	0.211	2.144
The European level is perceived as very, somewhat, or not very important for solving the problems or issues the CSO works with									
Constant	-3.976 ***	0.385	0.019	-3.710 ***	0.418	0.024	***	-3.166	0.042
Observations	1,258			1,258				1,258	
Nagelkerke's pseudo R ²	0.436			0.319				0.201	

Note: Binary logistic regression. Standardized beta-coefficients are shown in the columns. † 10% significance. * 5% significance. ** 1% significance. *** 0.1% significance. Source: EUROCIV survey.

regional, or national organizations), the type of organization (whether they have individual members or are umbrella organizations), and their available resources (in terms of members and paid staff). For each model we have also included the other two types of Europeanization as independent variables to see whether they also impact the specific type of Europeanization being analyzed. The final independent variable is the CSOs' perceived relevance of the European level—in other words, whether they perceive this level as being at all important for solving the problems or issues that their organization works with.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, we have previously shown that the perceived importance of the European level was the strongest factor for explaining why Swedish CSOs were active at the European level (Scaramuzzino and Wennerhag 2015). The same analysis also showed that CSOs with greater numbers of members were slightly more active on the European level. In this sense, we argued that one could find both a cognitive threshold (the perceived relevance of the European level) and an organizational threshold (the availability of resources, in terms of members) affecting Swedish CSOs' degree of Europeanization.

The perceived relevance of the European level should here be understood as whether CSOs perceive opportunities at the European level as being relevant. This makes it possible to assess not only the CSOs' actual opportunities (for influencing EU policies, receiving EU funding, or seeking organizational cooperation on the European level), but also if they deem it relevant to consider taking these opportunities. Opportunities are not only structural and embedded in institutions—they are also framed and understood within a specific cultural and political context and can thus be understood differently by different actors (Gamson and Meyer 1996). In the following regression models we will test the hypothesis that the perceived relevance of the European level explains whether Swedish CSOs are Europeanized concerning all three types of Europeanization discussed in this chapter.

Table 4.2 presents three regression models, one for each type of Europeanization. The effect of CSO type for organizations' likelihood to be Europeanized differs in the three models. Disability organizations have been chosen as the reference in all regression models because this type of CSO seemed to display an average pattern of Europeanization in the bivariate analysis presented in chapter 3. The significant differences thereby show whether other CSO types are more or less Europeanized than disability organizations.

When it comes to regulatory Europeanization, political parties and women's organizations are more likely to be Europeanized. The fact that political parties are more likely to make contacts with politicians or public officials on the European level illustrates their central role in the political

system, and supposedly much of these contacts are made within the parties themselves and through the EU-level party structures that they are often a part of. In chapter 3 we showed that the most frequent form of advocacy Swedish CSOs use to influence EU policies is to contact domestic political parties or domestic authorities. The fact that Swedish political parties are much more Europeanized than other Swedish CSOs suggests that they play an important role as an intermediary link between domestic CSOs and EU institutions. Political parties are also slightly more likely than other CSOs to be members of European networks or organizations. However, when it comes to financial Europeanization—in other words, whether one receives economic funding from EU institutions—the political parties do not differ from other CSOs. The trade unions do differ from the other organizations in this respect, and thus seem to be less likely than other CSOs to be financially Europeanized. It is important, however, to acknowledge that trade unions in general are much less dependent on public funding compared to other types of CSOs, even when it comes to funding from the state and local municipalities (see table 3.9 in chapter 3).

National organizations are more likely to be Europeanized than are local and regional organizations regarding all three types of Europeanization. This difference is most marked when it comes to organizational Europeanization. National organizations are 3.7 times more likely to be affiliated with a network, federation, or umbrella organization on the European level. This is most probably an effect of the predominant way in which organizational networks on the European level function, which is primarily to link national organizations to each other. Considering the fact that a large majority of CSOs (74 percent) are members of national umbrella organizations or federations, it seems reasonable to assume that such national organizations function as representatives for local CSOs in the European organizations and networks.

A large membership base is an important factor for explaining CSOs' likelihood of being regulatory Europeanized. Our analysis shows that CSOs that can claim strong representativeness by having many individual members are more likely to get access to the European political level in terms of having contacted politicians or public officials. Also, the availability of employed staff is shown here to be important for explaining why CSOs become Europeanized. This is particularly the case when it comes to their affiliation to networks and organizations at the European level and their access to funding from EU institutions. In chapter 3 we showed that a large share of the CSOs participating in European networks experienced this as both time and resource consuming and that they perceived the complexity of EU-level issues as a further obstacle in this work (see table 3.3 in chapter 3). In the previous chapter, we also discussed how almost all CSOs that

had applied for EU funding experienced this as creating large administrative burdens. For CSOs having employed staff, such obstacles would most probably be smaller, which helps us to better understand why the availability of employed staff is an important factor for whether CSOs become Europeanized.

The importance of resources has also been highlighted in previous research on interest groups' Europeanization. Klüver (2010) mentions three types of resources that are relevant for meeting the demands of the EU: financial resources, personnel resources, and interest group representativeness. Because EU institutions are often understaffed, they need the interest organizations they interact with to compensate for their own lack of expertise. The democratic deficit of EU institutions might furthermore be compensated by the CSOs with which they interact if the CSOs can claim strong representativeness and thereby strengthen the legitimacy of the EU-level political processes in which they take part. Our study confirms that resources such as membership and employed staff play a decisive role in whether CSOs become Europeanized, but at the same time we show that these types of resources are more or less crucial depending on which type of Europeanization is being considered.

In line with the correlations that were shown in table 4.1, the three different types of Europeanization are also shown to strengthen each other in most of the regression models in table 4.2. It is especially regulatory Europeanization and organizational Europeanization that strengthen each other.

Finally, our hypothesis that the extent to which the CSOs see the European level as relevant for them is crucial for their involvement in Europeanization finds strong support from the results of all regression models. This is particularly the case for regulatory Europeanization. CSOs that perceive the European level as important for solving the problems or issues they work with are almost eleven times more likely to contact politicians or public officials on the European level compared to CSOs that do not see the EU level as important. This is the single most important factor for explaining CSOs' likelihood of being regulatory Europeanized. This factor should be seen as measuring whether the CSOs perceive the EU institutions as providing them with new political opportunities that they potentially can make use of (cf. Gamson and Meyer 1996). Behind this perceived opportunity one might of course find a lot of other factors, such as whether the EU actually has a say in the policy areas that the CSOs are engaged in, whether the CSOs have knowledge about the competencies of the EU in such policy areas, or whether the CSOs believe that the EU is capable of solving their most central issues. Even though this factor has the strongest impact on the CSOs' regulatory Europeanization, it also to some degree explains their organizational

Europeanization (odds ratio 2.7) and financial Europeanization (odds ratio 2.1). This shows that for being connected to the European level—whether for seeking political influence, having an organizational affiliation, or receiving economic resources—it is more or less crucial that Swedish CSOs perceive the European level as relevant for them.

Conclusion

In this chapter we analyzed the relative impact of various factors that might contribute to CSOs' likelihood to become Europeanized. In line with previous literature, our analysis showed that CSOs' availability of resources (in particular paid staff) and their position in the organizational hierarchy (in particular those operating on the national level) were important factors for CSOs to become involved in different types of Europeanization. Our analysis also showed that some types of CSOs, working within specific policy areas, were more likely to become Europeanized. The single most important factor was, however, whether the CSOs perceived the EU to be a relevant political arena for solving the problems or issues they work with, which indicates that the CSOs' perception of the new political opportunities that the EU institutions provide them with are crucial for their actual use of such opportunities. Moreover, our analysis showed that the impact of these factors varied between different types of Europeanization—regulatory, organizational, and financial—and that involvement in one type of Europeanization tends to strengthen CSOs' involvement in other types of Europeanization.

Roberto Scaramuzzino is Researcher at Lund University, Sweden. His research interests include changes in the welfare and integration systems and the role of CSOs in different countries. He has been engaged in comparative studies of mobilization in the migration and prostitution policy fields in Sweden and Italy, and at the EU level. He is currently working in a research program on civil society elites in Europe.

Magnus Wennerhag is Associate Professor of Sociology at the School of Social Sciences, Södertörn University, Sweden. He has a PhD in sociology from Lund University. His research mainly concerns social movements, political participation, social stratification, and theories of modernity. His latest book is *Radical Left Movements in Europe*, coedited with Christian Fröhlich and Grzegorz Piotrowski (Routledge, 2018).

References

- Beyers, Jan. 2004. "Voice and Access—Political Practices of European Interest Associations." *European Union Politics* 5, no. 2: 211–40.
- . 2008. "Policy Issues, Organisational Format and the Political Strategies of Interest Organisations." *West European Politics* 31, no. 6: 1188–211.
- Beyers, Jan, and Bart Kerremans. 2007. "Critical Resource Dependencies and the Europeanization of Domestic Interest Groups." *Journal of European Public Policy* 14, no. 3: 460–81.
- Chalmers, Adam William. 2013. "Trading Information for Access: Informational Lobbying Strategies and Interest Group Access to the European Union." *Journal of European Public Policy* 20, no. 1: 39–58.
- Dür, Adam, and Gemma Mateo González. 2012. "Who Lobbies the European Union? National Interest Groups in a Multilevel Polity." *Journal of European Public Policy* 19, no. 7: 969–87.
- Gamson, William A., and David S. Meyer. 1996. "Framing Political Opportunity." In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, 275–90. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Johansson, Håkan, and Jayeon Lee. 2014. "Bridging the Gap: How Do EU-Based Civil Society Organisations Acquire Their Internal Representation?" *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 25, no. 2: 405–24.
- Kanol, Direnç. 2016. "Europeanization of Domestic Interest Groups." *Interest Groups & Advocacy* 5, no. 2: 165–71.
- Karlberg, Eva, and Kerstin Jacobsson. 2015. "A Meta-organizational Perspective on the Europeanization of Civil Society: The Case of the Swedish Women's Lobby." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 26, no. 4: 1438–59.
- Klüver, Heike. 2010. "Europeanization of Lobbying Activities: When National Interest Groups Spill Over to the European Level." *Journal of European Integration* 32, no. 2: 175–91.
- Sánchez-Salgado, Rosa. 2010. "NGO Structural Adaptation to Funding Requirements and Prospects for Democracy: The Case of the European Union." *Global Society*, 24, no. 4: 507–27.
- Scaramuzzino, Roberto, Cecilia Heule, Håkan Johansson, and Anna Meeuwisse. 2010. *EU och den ideella sektorn—En studie av det svenska Equalprogrammet*. FoU-rapport 2010: 2. Malmö, Sweden: Malmö University.
- Scaramuzzino, Roberto, and Magnus Wennerhag. 2015. "Civil Society Organizations Going European?: The Europeanization of Swedish CSOs." *SAGE Open* 5, no. 2: 1–14.