



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Agenda dynamics in the European Union : the interaction between the European Council and the European Commission in the policy domain of organized crime

Elias Carrillo, I.L.

Citation

Elias Carrillo, I. L. (2019, September 26). *Agenda dynamics in the European Union : the interaction between the European Council and the European Commission in the policy domain of organized crime*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/78558>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/78558>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/78558> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Elias Carrillo, I.L.

Title: Agenda dynamics in the European Union : the interaction between the European Council and the European Commission in the policy domain of organized crime

Issue Date: 2019-09-26

Agenda dynamics in the European Union:

The interaction between the European Council
and the European Commission
in the policy domain of organized crime

Leticia Elias

Agenda Dynamics in the European Union: The interaction between the European Council and the European Commission in the policy domain of organized crime

ISBN: 978-94-6182-969-6

©Leticia Elias, The Netherlands, 2019 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means without permission from the author.

Cover design: Lili Baumgärtel

Layout & printing: Off Page

This research was in part financed by the National Council of Science and Technology of Mexico.

Agenda dynamics in the European Union:

**The interaction between the European Council
and the European Commission
in the policy domain of organized crime**

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 26 september 2019
klokke 15:00 uur

door

Irma Leticia Elías Carrillo

geboren te Mexico
in 1976

Supervisor	Prof. Dr. Madeleine Hosli
Co-supervisor	Dr. Anchrit Wille
Doctorate Committee	Prof. Dr. Amy Verdun Prof. Dr. Francesca Longo (University of Catania) Prof. Mr. Dr. Erwin Muller Dr. Petya Alexandrova (European Asylum Support Office) Dr. Sebastiaan Princen (Utrecht University)

*To the memory of my father,
the liveliness of my mother,
and the caring embrace of my husband*

*A la memoria de padre,
a la energía incesante de mi madre
y al tierno cuidado de mi esposo*

Table of Contents

List of Tables		xi
List of Figures		xii
List of Abbreviations		xiii
Acknowledgments		xiv
Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	The European Council and the Commission at the core of the agenda-setting process	15
Chapter 3	The Agenda Dynamics Approach	31
Chapter 4	The policy problem of organized crime	51
Chapter 5	Methodological strategy	67
Chapter 6	Intra-agenda dynamics of the European Council	87
Chapter 7	Intra-agenda dynamics of the Commission	109
Chapter 8	Inter-agenda dynamics of the European Council and the Commission	141
Chapter 9	Conclusions on EU agenda setting	157
References		179
Appendixes		191
Summary		233
Samenvatting		239
Propositions to the doctoral dissertation		245
Curriculum vitae		247

Table of Contents [detailed]

List of Tables	xi
List of Figures	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Acknowledgments	xiv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1. The Agenda Dynamics Approach: addressing a big puzzle in EU agenda setting.	5
1.1.1. Placing the research in context.	5
1.1.2. Solving the puzzle: an overview of the theoretical framework and methods of analysis	8
1.2. Towards a better understanding of agenda setting in the EU.	12
1.3. Structure of the dissertation.	13
Chapter 2 The European Council and the Commission at the core of the agenda-setting process.	15
2.1. Features of agenda setting in the European Union	15
2.2. The role of the European Council and the Commission	18
2.2.1. The European Council: providing political guidance	20
2.2.2. The Commission: generating policy proposals.	21
2.2.3. The roles in a comparative perspective	22
2.3. Institutional designs	23
2.3.1. The European Council: a high political arena with small processing capacities.	22
2.3.2. The Commission: a low political arena with large processing capacities	26
2.3.3. The institutional designs in a comparative perspective	28
2.4. Summary.	29
Chapter 3 The Agenda Dynamics Approach	31
3.1. Preparing the ground: theoretical foundations	31
3.1.1. Attention: Issues evolving on the political agenda	31
3.1.2. The Processing Model and the Routes Framework: explaining agenda setting	33
3.2. Building the theoretical framework.	36
3.2.1. Types of EU agenda dynamics	36
3.2.2. Intra-agenda dynamics	38
3.2.3. Inter-agenda dynamics	42
3.3. Summary and the way forward for the analysis.	49
Chapter 4 The policy problem of organized crime	51
4.1. The subject of study.	51
4.2. Organized crime as an EU policy theme	52
4.2.1. A comparable policy domain	53
4.2.2. A mid-range policy domain	56

4.3. Debates on the definition of organized crime	60
4.3.1. Implications for a better measurement	62
4.4. Summary	65

Chapter 5 Methodological strategy 67

5.1. The data: European Council and Commission agendas on organized crime	67
5.2. Methods to study Intra-agenda dynamics	72
5.3. Methods to study Inter-agenda dynamics	80
5.4. Summary	86

Chapter 6 Intra-agenda dynamics of the European Council 87

6.1. Expectations	87
6.2. How does the attention of the European Council move in time?	88
6.3. What factors generate the attention of the European Council?	94
6.4. All together now: explaining dynamics in the European Council agenda	97
6.5. Conclusions	106

Chapter 7 Intra-agenda dynamics of the Commission 109

7.1. Expectations	109
7.2. How does the attention of the Commission move in time?	110
7.3. What factors generate the attention of the Commission?	122
7.4. All together now: explaining dynamics in the Commission agenda	126
7.5. Conclusions	138

Chapter 8 Inter-agenda dynamics of the European Council and the Commission 141

8.1. Much speculation, little evidence: analytical implications.	141
8.2. How do the institutions relate to each other in agenda setting?	143
8.2.1. The European Council: the leading institution in agenda setting	146
8.2.2. The Commission: digesting the new impulses	151
8.2.3. Implications of the European Council's leadership for the Commission's role	154
8.3. Conclusions	155

Chapter 9 Conclusions on EU agenda setting 157

9.1. Similar roles, distinct designs: the European Council and the Commission	157
9.2. Contributing to a better understanding of EU agenda dynamics	158
9.2.1. A theoretical framework for the study of the institutions in agenda setting.	158
9.2.2. Fostering empirical and theoretical knowledge on the dynamics of the institutions.	160
9.2.3. Discovering 'blind spots' in agenda-setting theories	170
9.2.4. The 'uniqueness' of the EU political system.	173

9.2.5. Practical implications	174
9.3. Limitations of this research	176
9.4. Avenues for further work.	176
References	179
Appendixes	191
Appendix 1: Catalogue on organized crime issues.	192
Appendix 2: Codebook on organized crime issues	193
Appendix 3: Data: Conclusions on organized crime	196
Appendix 4: Data: COM docs on organized crime.	198
Appendix 5: Codebook on factors of attention	224
Appendix 6: Allocation of attention across all OC issues on the agendas	226
Appendix 7: Vector Autoregressions (methods part)	228
Summary	233
Samenvatting	239
Propositions to the doctoral dissertation.	245
Curriculum vitae	247

List of Tables¹

2.1. A comparative perspective of the role of the institutions in agenda setting	22
2.2. A comparative perspective of the designs of the institutions	29
3.1. The Processing Model and the Routes Framework: general characteristics	35
3.2. Types of EU agenda dynamics	37
3.3. The institutions, according to their information-processing capacities	40
3.4. The institutions, according to their political attributes	41
6.1. Content of the European Council agenda on organized crime (1983–2013)	88
6.2. Allocation of attention across OC issues on the European Council agenda	89
6.3. Summary of factors when the European Council's attention punctuated . . .	105
7.1. Content of the Commission agenda on organized crime (1984–2013) . . .	110
7.2. Allocation of attention across OC issues on the Commission agenda	111
7.3. Factors that generate the attention of the Commission and the European Council	124
7.4. Summary of factors when the Commission's attention punctuated	136
8.1. Granger causality	143
8.2. Impulse response function values	146
Appendix 6. A. Allocation of attention across all OC issues on both agendas	226
Appendix 7. A. Structure of the data	228
Appendix 7. B. Lag length selection	228
Appendix 7. C. Autocorrelation of VAR	229
Appendix 7. D. Impulse Response Functions values	231

¹ All tables in the dissertation are my authorship, unless otherwise specified.

List of Figures²

3.1. Outline of the Agenda Dynamics Approach	37
6.1. Allocation of attention across OC issues on the European Council agenda	90
6.2. Scope of the European Council agenda on organized crime	91
6.3. Diversity of the European Council agenda on organized crime	92
6.4. Distribution of attention changes on the European Council agenda	93
6.5. Factors generating the European Council's attention (1983–2013)	95
6.6. Development of the European Council's attention	97
7.1. Allocation of attention across OC issues on the Commission agenda	112
7.2. Scope of the Commission agenda on organized crime	113
7.3. Scope of the OC agendas of the institutions	114
7.4. Diversity of the Commission agenda on organized crime	115
7.5. Diversity of the OC agendas of the institutions	117
7.6. Distribution of attention changes on the Commission agenda	119
7.7. Factors generating the Commission's attention (1984–2013)	123
7.8. Development of the Commission's and European Council's attention	127
8.1. Impulse response functions	144
Appendix 6. A. Allocation of attention across all OC issues on the European Council agenda	226
Appendix 6. B. Allocation of attention across all OC issues on the Commission agenda	227
Appendix 7. A. Stability of VAR.	229
Appendix 7. B. Impulse response functions	230

² All figures in the dissertation are my own authorship, unless otherwise specified.

List of Abbreviations

ADA	Agenda Dynamics Approach
ADF	Augmented Dickey-Fuller
AFSJ	Area of Freedom, Security and Justice
CCEE	Countries from Central and Eastern Europe
DG	Directorate General
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EU	European Union
Europol	European Police Office
IGC	Intergovernmental Conference
IRF	Impulse Response Function
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs
LM	Lagrange Multiplier
LR	Likelihood Ratio
MFF	Multiannual Financial Framework
OC	Organized crime
OLAF	European Anti-Fraud Office
SEA	Single European Act
SEQ	Structural Equation model
TEU	Treaty of the European Union
TFEU	Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union
TREVI	<i>Terrorism, radicalisme, extrémisme et violence internationale</i>
US	United States
VAR	Vector Autoregression

Acknowledgments

Here I am, looking back at how it was to develop my PhD. A song comes to my mind: “Life is a rollercoaster, just gotta ride it”. The singer expresses in simple words my experience. I don’t remember having so many ups and downs, often one after another, as during my PhD. Like in a rollercoaster —or, in more scientific terms, a ‘punctuated equilibrium’ kind of feeling... In some occasions I felt discouraged and asked myself whether I wanted —and was even able— to finish. This feeling was due to several research dilemmas arising on the way, together with personal problems that led to pivotal changes in my personal life. Too much at the same time. But with patience and the encouragement from my family and friends, I realized that I just needed to ‘ride’ the moments, regardless of how difficult or easy they were. Life is an instant. Today I can simply say that doing a PhD was one of the most demanding, yet enjoyable experiences ever in my life.

I am extremely happy I finished successfully this enterprise. This was possible thanks to diverse institutions and many people. All my gratitude to Leiden University, Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs, in particular to my supervisors Madeleine Hosli and Anchrit Wille. Thank you very much for your patience. Your support was absolutely invaluable. Without it, my dissertation could have never been materialized. I would like to thank the National Council of Science and Technology of Mexico that also believed in my research project and sponsored it. I am also grateful to the Montesquieu Institute in The Hague, Leiden University, for hosting me during the first part of my research and introducing me to the Dutch punctual way of processing information! Thanks, Sandra, Gerdien, Nicole, Kevin and Kees.

Thanks to my colleagues in the faculty for their comments on my work and nice coffees together, specially to Arco, Petya, Jarek, Anouk, Stef, Elke, Daphne, Carina, Carola, Wout and Edward. I also thank the Secretariat of the Institute of Security and Global Affairs, particularly Caroline, Astrid and Noëlle, for facilitating me the resources to work. I would like to make a special mention to my colleagues outside Leiden University, Anne Rasmussen, Sebastiaan Princen, Xiana Barros-Garcia, Helena Carrapico and Rebecca Eissler. All of you contributed in different ways and phases during my PhD.

Gorgeous were the plenty of talks and times of fun with my friends in the Netherlands and Mexico. How to forget the powerful stimulus that each of you gave to my soul, chatting nicely during evenings of tequila, wine and music —often via WhatsApp! Muchas gracias, Jessica Trave Puyal (chica!) and Marco, Arlinda Rrustemi (nymph!), Mortiz Baumgärtel, Zeny Linares and Sean and Lau (primos!), Eduardo Ibarrola

(crayola!) and Fabiola, César Casiano and Vera, Natasa Stevanovic, Martha Montero-Sieburth and Carlos, Ileana Wolters and Henry, Lorena Gonzalez (amiga!) and Emilio, Aldo Aranda and Sarah, José Barojas (Josecito!), Edgar Martínez (ese mai!), Armando Carrillo, Marco Ordoñez (LIA!), Sergio Rodriguez, Wendy Pimentel, Mariana Carmona and Ericka Durán (naquis!). Also impossible not to remember when, after a long research day, a time of relaxation came with lessons of salsa: Safa and Ahmet, thanks for the great tropical moments together that helped me cope with stress at work and homesickness. Thanks, Lili Baumgärtel for helping me patiently design and make the cover of this book, and Sean Husen for supporting me in the translation of the summary.

The picture would not be complete without my family ☺. I could have never made it without you! In one way or another, directly and indirectly, you were all present. Pa, allá en el cielo, y Ma, acá cerquitita en mi corazón, infinitas gracias a los dos por su incondicional apoyo. Cada uno de ustedes hace que mi vida tenga luz y mucho amor con su muy cálida manera de ser conmigo y de impulsarme en todo momento! Ustedes son pilares en mi vida y este trabajo de doctorado es indudable y absolutamente suyo. Herm y Yolanda, yo sé bien que ustedes han estado, están y estarán ahí. Gracias a las dos. Mijn ‘cadeau’ familie in Nederland —mijn dochters Noury en Ozra, Mama Connie, Papa Arie, Zussie Janelle en Broertje René—, van harte bedankt voor jullie steun en altijd positieve energie!

Finally, corazón, sabes una cosa? Bedanktisimo for being my parter in crime, sometimes organized, mostly nicely disorganized, but always partners. Inderdaad: tú eres mi arco y yo soy tu flecha — como dice Eduardo! You are my anchor point. In this ‘rollercoaster’ adventure, you made me retake the calm and find the balance again after times of frustration. Thanks also for being my lovely cook and serving me delicious dinners as a sort of reward for a hard work day, especially at the final stage. Your caring embrace is central in all I do, including of course this PhD.

Lety

