Transnational Perspectives on Transformations in State and Society | 3

Schneiker | Henrich-Franke | Kaiser | Lahusen [eds.]

Transnational Expertise

Internal Cohesion and External Recognition of Expert Groups

Nomos

Transnational Perspectives on Transformations in State and Society

edited by

Prof. Dr. Robert Kaiser, University of Siegen
Prof. Dr. Christian Lahusen, University of Siegen
Prof. Dr. Andrea Schneiker, University of Siegen

Volume 3

Andrea Schneiker | Christian Henrich-Franke
Robert Kaiser | Christian Lahusen [eds.]

Transnational Expertise

Internal Cohesion and External Recognition of Expert Groups

Nomos

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

ISBN 978-3-8487-4914-0 (Print)
978-3-8452-9127-7 (ePDF)

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-3-8487-4914-0 (Print)
978-3-8452-9127-7 (ePDF)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Schneiker, Andrea / Henrich-Franke, Christian / Kaiser, Robert / Lahusen, Christian
Transnational Expertise
Internal Cohesion and External Recognition of Expert Groups
Andrea Schneiker / Christian Henrich-Franke / Robert Kaiser / Christian Lahusen (eds.)
220 p.
Includes bibliographic references.

ISBN 978-3-8487-4914-0 (Print)
978-3-8452-9127-7 (ePDF)

1st Edition 2018

Foreword & Acknowledgements

The idea for this edited volume grew out of a conference at the University of Siegen in November 2014 that we organized with the financial support of the University's School of Arts and Humanities. The papers that were presented at the conference referred to several concepts to make sense of expert groups in different policy fields. Although they dealt with expert groups during different time periods, a similar set of questions was asked throughout the conference relating to the inner workings of expert groups and their recognition as such by external actors. The chapters gathered in this edited volume do not aim at establishing a new concept for dealing with expert groups, but rather seek to shed light on some blind spots in the analysis of expertise and expert groups.

There are many colleagues who commented on papers that were presented at the conference and that form the basis of this book. We would like to thank, amongst others, Sebastian Büttner, Aron Buzogany, Mai'a K. Davis Cross, Åse Gornitzka, Stefanie van de Kerkhof, Lucia Leopold, Frank Schipper, Arno Simons, and Jan-Peter Voß for their valuable feedback. We owe special thanks to our colleagues and research assistants who have supported this project and without whose commitment we would not have been able to edit this book: Magnus Dau, Stefanie Schmidt, Tobias Verter, and Alexandra Weber. We hope that those who read this collection will find it inspiring and that the volume will provide ground for further academic debate on expert groups.

Christian Henrich-Franke, Robert Kaiser, Christian Lahusen,
Andrea Schneiker
Siegen

Contents

Contributors

Ingvild Bode is Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Kent, UK. She is the author of Individual Agency and Policy Change at the United Nations (Routledge, 2015), the co-author of Governing the Use-of-Force in International Relations (Palgrave, 2014) and has published in journals such as the European Journal of International Relations, Review of International Studies, and Global Governance. Her research agenda covers the broad area of international peace and security at the United Nations, with a theoretical focus on practice theories and questions of agency.

Christian Henrich-Franke is scientific researcher in the Collaborative Research Centre 'Media of Cooperation' at the University of Siegen. He has published widely on international relations, economic integration and political integration. His most recent books include (with G. Thiemeyer) Mosaik Europäische Geschichte (4 volumes 2018 - forthcoming); (with G. Ambrosius), Integration of Infrastructures in Europe in Comparison (2016); (with G. Ambrosius and C. Neutsch, eds.), Föderalismus in historisch-komparativer Perspektive: Föderale Systeme: Kaiserreich – Donaumonarchie – Europäische Union (2015); (with A. Badenoch and A. Fickers), Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War (2013).

Robert Kaiser holds a Chair for Comparative Politics and Political Theory at the University of Siegen. He studied Political Science, Modern History and Media Sciences in Bonn and Düsseldorf. He received his PhD from the University of Düsseldorf and obtained his habilitation from the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich. His main fields of research are European integration, comparative politics, innovation policy studies as well as regionalism and federalism.

Christian Lahusen holds a Chair of Sociology at the Faculty of Arts at Siegen University. He studied sociology in Düsseldorf and Madrid, received his PhD from the European University Institute in Florence, and obtained his habilitation from the University of Bamberg. His research interests include the sociology of European societies and European integration, social movements, political participation, and social theory.

Alexander Reinfeldt is Research Associate in the DFG-funded research project on the Europeanization of foreign policies ("'To speak with one voice'? Europäisierung in intergouvernementalen Politikbereichen am Beispiel der Europäischen Politischen Zusammenarbeit (EPZ), 1970-1981"). He is the author of various publications on European integration history. In his doctoral thesis he dealt with supranational information policies in the formative years of European integration ("Unter Ausschluss der Öffentlichkeit? Akteure und Strategien supranationaler Informationspolitik in der Gründungsphase der europäischen Integration (1952-1972)", Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014). He is also co-author of the textbook "Geschichte der europäischen Integration. Ein Lehrbuch", Paderborn 2008 (with Gabriele Clemens and Gerhard Wille).

Lukas Schemper is a historian and lecturer at the Humanitarian Conflict and Response Institute (HCRI), University of Manchester. His interests are the history of international governance in general and the history of disaster and international humanitarian organisations in particular. His doctoral thesis, defended at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies in 2016, dealt with the emergence of international mechanisms in the field of disaster management from the inter-war period to the late 1980s. He has most recently published the article "La prévention des catastrophes naturelles et les organisations internationales du temps de la sdn au lendemain de la guerre froide. Quelle place pour l'environnement?" in the journal Revue études internationales (2016).

Andrea Schneiker is Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen, Germany. She is the author of Humanitarian NGOs, (In)Security and Identity: Epistemic Communities and Security Governance (Routledge, 2015) and co-editor (together with Andreas Kruck) of Researching Non-State Actors in International Security: Theory and Practice (Routledge, 2017). Her research has been published in numerous refereed international journals such as International Studies Review, International Studies Perspectives, Disasters, Millennium, Security Dialogue, Global Policy, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations and Comparative European Politics.

Carola Westermeier is a researcher at the Institute for Sociology at Justus Liebig University Giessen and is a member of the Collaborative Research Centre 'Dynamics of Security' at the universities of Giessen and Marburg. Her research focusses on Economic Sociology and International Political Economy, in particular on the intersections of the Social Studies of Finance and Critical Security Studies. Westermeier's PhD thesis is titled 'Financial Stability and Political Security following the Crisis – Actors and Epistemologies of Financial Regulation'. She is the co-editor (with Horst Carl) of a volume on Security Actors in a historical perspective (published by Nomos 2018, in German). Westermeier and Hannah Broecker contributed a paper on 'Securitization and Hegemony' to Regina Kreide and Andreas Langenohl (eds.), Conceptualizing Power in Dynamics of Securitization: Beyond State and System, published by Nomos in 2018.

Introduction

Andrea Schneiker, Christian Henrich-Franke, Robert Kaiser, Christian Lahusen

This edited volume is devoted to the analysis of transnational expertise, a topic that has received considerable attention in the social and historical sciences, especially in research on transnational professional networks and associations,[1] epistemic communities,[2] and communities of practice.[3] Yet more knowledge about transnational expertise is needed, given the growing importance of expertise in an ever more complex world in which interdependencies between different types of actors—states, international organizations, businesses—are increasing and in which these actors often have to cooperate to address transnational issues. While studies regarding the above-mentioned concepts generally involve empirical cases of expertise in the context of transnational governance since the end of the Cold War—with the exception of those focusing on the European Union—transnational expertise played an important role long before 1990.[4] Therefore, this volume takes an interdisciplinary approach that includes perspectives from history, sociology, and political science.

Expertise plays a role in the formulation, implementation, evaluation, and monitoring of, as well as in the decision-making on, policies and

---

1 e.g., S. Quack (2006) "Who Fills the Legal 'Black Holes' in Transnational Governance? Lawyers, Law Firms and Professional Associations as Border-Brossing Regulatory Actors." In G. F. Schuppert (ed.), *Global Governance and the Role of Non-State Actors*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 81–100; L. Seabrookee (2014) "Epistemic Arbitrage: Transnational Professional Knowledge in Action." *Journal of Professions and Organization* 1 (1): 49–64.

2 e.g., M. K. D. Cross (2013) "Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later." *Review of International Studies* 39 (1): 137–60; P. M. Haas (1992) "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 (1): 1–35.

3 E. Wenger, R. McDermott, and W. M. Snyder (2002) *A Guide to Managing Knowledge: Cultivating Communities of Practice* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press).

4 M. Kohlrausch, and H. Trischler (2014) *Building Europe on Expertise: Innovators, Organizers, Networkers* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan).

standards in various policy fields, such as environmental protection, health, the economy, human rights, and telecommunication, and it can have a variety of functions. Political decision-makers may turn to experts and expertise to *legitimize* their decisions, stressing the experts' knowledge concerning a particular issue. Because expertise often has a technical or scientific nature, it also often has an exclusive character and a *gatekeeping function* that regulates access to decision-making processes and decision-makers. In addition, decisions that are unpopular with the public may be *hidden* behind a veil of expertise to avoid in-depth discussions of policies, standards, and regulations. But expertise can have an inclusive character as well, in that it can help to *translate* ideas and preferences that exist at the national level to the transnational level, and vice versa, or to translate knowledge across sectoral and institutional boundaries, thereby feeding ideas and preferences into relevant decision-making processes. Expertise of a technical or scientific nature can also translate abstract knowledge into concrete figures and indicators. As a result, it can contribute to *depoliticization*, in that it makes it possible to formulate claims based on criteria that are deemed objective. Thus, a closer look at transnational expert groups can reveal when and how knowledge is, or is translated into, power.[5]

Regardless of which conceptual framework is used to analyze transnational expertise, the central questions of research in this area concern how expertise and experts can influence political decision-makers and decision-making processes, and the strategies that experts use to do so. These questions boil down to the issue of (private) authority and democratic legitimacy in transnational politics[6] in terms of "uncoerced consent or recognition […] on the part of the regulated or governed"[7], i.e. on the part of those who have not participated in the formulation of the relevant poli-

---

5 Cross, *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*, p. 137.

6 e.g., A. C. Cutler, V. Haufler, and T. Porter (eds.) (1999) *Private Authority and International Affairs* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press,); R. B. Hall, and T. J. Biersteker (eds.) (2002) *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

7 Hall, R. B., and T. J. Biersteker (2002) "The Emergence of Private Authority in the International System." In R. B. Hall and T. J. Biersteker (eds.), *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 3–22, p. 5.

cies or standards.[8] On this basis, we assume that recognizing someone and being recognized by others as an expert and, thus, as an authority in the transnational realm is a social process[9] and, hence, intersubjective. Such recognition requires acceptance both by other experts and by those who are expected to follow the experts' policy recommendations.

I. A Multitude of Concepts: Existing Knowledge and Blind Spots

Experts and expertise have been addressed by a wide variety of studies. This is not the place to go into detail about every single concept from historical and social science research that deals with transnational expertise. However, in the following, we would like to present three concepts that have, either directly or indirectly, inspired the editors and contributors—*epistemic communities*, *communities of practice*, and *technocratic internationalism*. In this volume, we do not privilege any particular concept or theory of transnational expertise, so we do not consider some concepts to be more useful than others for analyzing transnational experts and expertise.

a) Epistemic Communities

The concept of *epistemic communities* as used in social science, which was introduced most notably by Peter Haas (1992s), is currently being revisited by a variety of scholars in political science, especially in its sub-

---

8 J.-C. Graz, and A. Nölke (2008) "Introduction: Beyond the Fragmented Debate on Transnational Private Governance." In J.-C. Granz and A. Nölke (eds.), *Transnational Private Governance and Its Limits* (London, Routledge), pp. 1–26, p. 2.

9 A. Antoniades (2003) "Epistemic Communities, Epistemes and the Construction of (World) Politics." *Global Society* 17 (1): 21–38, p. 26.

field of International Relations[10], as well as in history.[11] According to Peter Haas' seminal work, an epistemic community can be defined as "a network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area".[12] These professionals

> have (1) a shared set of normative and principled beliefs, which provide a value-based rationale for the social action of community members; (2) shared causal beliefs, which are derived from their analysis of practices leading or contributing to a central set of problems in their domain and which then serve as the basis for elucidating the multiple linkages between possible policy actions and desired outcomes; (3) shared notions of validity—that is, intersubjective, internally defined criteria for weighing and validating knowledge in the domain of their expertise; and (4) a common policy enterprise—that is, a set of common practices associated with a set of problems to which their professional competence is directed, presumably out of the conviction that human welfare will be enhanced as a consequence.[13]

Following this understanding, scholars have shown how epistemic communities managed to influence political decision-makers, and governments in particular. Although the concept as Haas proposed it recognizes that "an epistemic community may consist of professionals from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds",[14] the majority of studies from what one

---

10 e.g., A. Antoniades, *Epistemic Communities, Epistemes and the Construction of (World) Politics*; C. Dunlop (2010) "Epistemic Communities and Two Goals of Delegation: Hormone Growth Promoters in the European Union." *Science and Public Policy* 37 (3): 205–17; C. Dunlop (2014) "The Possible Experts: How Epistemic Communities Negotiate Barriers to Knowledge Use in Ecosystems Services Policy." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 32 (2): 208–28; G. Faleg (2012) "Between Knowledge and Power: Epistemic Communities and the Emergence of Security Sector Reform in the EU Security Architecture." *European Security* 21 (2): 161–84; D. J. Galbreath, and J. McEvoy (2013) "How Epistemic Communities Drive International Regimes: The Case of Minority Rights in Europe." *European Integration* 35 (2): 169–86.

11 e.g., C. Henrich-Franke (2017) "'Epistemic Communities' of Radio Regulators: Gametes of a Europeanization of National Foreign Radio Policies." In G. Clemens (ed.), *The Quest for Europeanization* (Stuttgart, Steiner), pp. 237-248; J. Schot, and F. Schipper (2011) "Experts and European Transport Integration, 1945–1958." *Journal of European Public Policy* 18 (2): 274–93.

12 Haas, *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, p. 3.

13 Haas, *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, p. 3.

14 Haas, *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, p. 3.

might regard as the "first generation" focused on scientists and scientific expertise.[15] In the current debate, more attention has been given to the idea that epistemic communities may also be composed of individuals from different professional backgrounds.[16] From such an understanding of epistemic communities, coalitions of individuals from different sectors (e.g., state, private)—i.e. heterogeneous groups—can be viewed as political actors with a "common policy enterprise".[17] However, this poses some conceptual challenges. Given that the members of an epistemic community may have different professional backgrounds, one must first determine which individuals with which professional backgrounds belong to that community. It is also crucial to identify what holds these individuals together and regulates inclusion to and exclusion from the community besides their shared expertise; that is, one must analyze where their normative and principled beliefs originate. More recent research on epistemic communities suggests that these beliefs result from a shared socialization[18] that fosters a "shared worldview"[19], including a specific professional self-understanding that guides the actions of the members of an epistemic community, holds them together, and distinguishes them from other actors.[20] What has yet to be studied is where such joint socialization can take place in the transnational realm, and how exactly it allows for shared ideas to be built.

---

15 E. Adler (1992) "The Emergence of Cooperation: National Epistemic Communities and the International Evolution of the Idea of Nuclear Arms Control." *International Organization* 46 (1): 101–45; J. G. Ikenberry (1992) "A World Economy Restored: Expert Consensus and the Anglo-American Postwar Settlement." *International Organization* 46 (1): 289–321.

16 Cross, *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*; Drake, W. J., and K. Nicolaïdis (1992) "Ideas, Interests, and Institutionalization: 'Trade in Services' and the Uruguay Round." *International Organization* 46 (1): 37–100; D. J. Galbreath, and J. McEvoy, *How Epistemic Communities Drive International Regimes: The Case of Minority Rights in Europe.*

17 Haas, *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, p. 3.

18 Antoniades, *Epistemic Communities, Epistemes and the Construction of (World) Politics*; Cross: *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*, p. 137; Faleg, *Between Knowledge and Power: Epistemic Communities and the Emergence of Security Sector Reform in the EU Security Architecture*, p. 165.

19 Cross, *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*, p. 147.

20 Cross, *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later.*

b) Communities of Practice

Communities of practice[21] "consist of people who are informally as well as contextually bound by a shared interest in learning and applying a common practice".[22] This concept has the merit of taking into account that expertise does not have to have a scientific character, but that it can be based on practices. However, communities of practice are even broader than epistemic communities in terms of the possible range of participating actors, because "their main purpose is to introduce newcomers to the practices of the field".[23] For this reason, this concept is also applied to larger communities that are not involved in the formulation of transnational policies, such as the users of IT technologies. This conceptual openness makes it even more difficult to determine the boundaries of a community and to define who does and who does not belong to it. In addition, the concept of communities of practices does not fully take into account the factors that ensure internal cohesion in an expert group beyond common practices, because it does not require a "common policy enterprise"[24] and, hence, is less oriented toward a particular political outcome. In fact, it

> tends to prioritise identifying the practices over understanding the community of actors itself, the internal dynamics that characterise the community, and the great variety of actions—beyond practices—its members take individually or collectively to impact policy outcomes. In so doing, it tends to imbue a path-dependent quality to practices, and underplays the role of human agency.[25]

Common practices may be a major factor in determining why individual members of a community are bound to one another, but the question is how common practices are established in the transnational arena in the

---

21 Wenger, McDermott and Snyder, *A Guide to Managing Knowledge: Cultivating Communities of Practice.*

22 W. M. Snyder (1997) "Communities of Practice: Combining Organizational Learning and Strategy Insights to Create a Bridge to the 21st Century." http://www.co-i-l.com/coil/knowledge-garden/cop/cols.shtml (accessed August 6, 2012).

23 M.-L. Djelic, and S. Quack (2010) "Transnational Communities and Governance." In M.-L. Djelic, and S. Quack (eds.), *Transnational Communities: Shaping Global Economic Governance* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), pp. 3–36, p. 21.

24 Haas, *Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination*, p. 3.

25 Cross, *Rethinking Epistemic Communities Twenty Years Later*, pp. 146–147.

first place. Thus, the concept directly or indirectly suggests a historical perspective on common practices as a consequence of past actions.

c) Technocratic Internationalism

The concept of *technocratic internationalism*, originally developed by historians of technology,[26] puts strong emphasis on historical developments and trajectories in the evolution and cohesion of expert groups, particularly in technology-driven areas. It does not contradict the first two concepts but, rather, underlines the importance of the path-dependent development of rules of social interaction among experts. Starting in the 19th century, when the international regulation of transborder connectivities began to take shape, experts developed a specific technocratic practice in matters related to technology. By negotiating material infrastructures within international committees, they shaped new ways of thinking (shared worldview) about transnational cooperation as a depoliticized expert matter (technification). In addition to normative concepts of thinking, they developed new routines of interaction (practices) that excluded political authorities. Subsequently, the institutional arrangements on the transnational level in which the experts met developed along the lines of this type of thinking and practice. Key to the concept is viewing expert communities from a long-term perspective on their coming into being and on their effects. Expert communities are historically grown phenomena that must be analyzed accordingly.

However, as useful as each of these three concepts may be in a specific context, none of them allows for a comprehensive and consistent explanation of the internal composition of expert groups and why other actors who are affected by the formulation, implementation, evaluation, or monitoring of a policy or standard carried out by these communities accept

---

26 W. Kaiser, and J. Schot (2016) *Writing Rules for Europe* (Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan); V. Lagendijk, and J. Schot (2008) "Technocratic Internationalism in the Interwar Years: Building Europe on Motorways and Electricity Networks." *Journal of Modern European History* 6 (2): 196-217.

their authority, given the absence of hierarchy and, hence, of coercion.[27] What, then, can explain transnational expert groups' "ability to influence"?[28]

As noted earlier, we do not prioritize a particular concept in this edited volume, so in the following we will use the term "*expert group*," because it does not imply any assumptions regarding what matters most to a group (an episteme or a practice) nor does it imply any assumptions regarding the structure of that group (network, community, etc.).

II. Dimensions of Analysis

To contribute to the literature on transnational expertise, the volume specifically considers two dimensions—the internal dimension and the external dimension of expert groups. These two dimensions cannot be studied separately, because they are intertwined. The question we must ask is what influence changes in one dimension have on the other.

a) The *Internal* Dimension of Transnational Expert Groups

Scholarly research thus far has often neglected or underestimated the theoretical value of the internal life of transnational expert groups (regardless of whether they are regarded as networks or communities) and of the dynamics of these groups. In this volume, we seek to look into the black box of transnational expert groups, which the social sciences have not yet opened and which historical research has not yet theorized. If we consider transnational expert groups as being "held together by shared understandings of how issues should be governed, tasks allocated, and who knows

---

27 Graz, and Nölke, *Introduction: Beyond the Fragmented Debate on Transnational Private Governance*, p. 2; R. B. Hall, and T. J. Biersteker, "The Emergence of Private Authority in the International System", p. 5; A. Nölke (2004) "Transnational Private Authority and Corporate Governance." In S. A. Schirm (ed.), *New Rules for Global Markets: Public and Private Governance in the World Economy* (Houndmills, Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 155–75, p. 155.

28 E. Adler, and P. M. Haas (1992) "Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program." *International Organization* 46 (1): 367–90, p. 380.

well enough to do to the work",[29] we must ask where such shared understandings come from at the transnational level. While at the national level, shared understandings are said to result from a common education and/or to be accredited through state-controlled certification,[30] such institutions are often lacking at the transnational level, so the question is what factors bind experts from different countries together.

To answer this question, the authors in this volume discuss the explanatory power of different factors that have occasionally been offered in the literature, such as socialization,[31] trust,[32] or friendship. We must also ask who belongs to a transnational expert group and on what mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion membership of such a group is based. To better understand how transnational expert groups emerge and evolve over time, a series of related questions must also be answered, including: When, how, and why are some individuals excluded from a group? For example, are there any rules of membership that must be followed in order to remain a member of a transnational expert group? How, when, and why can new members join an expert group? Is it possible to identify gatekeepers[33] who play a crucial role in admitting or excluding members? Have there been "lock-in" situations in history when experts agreed on a particular pattern of norms and practices that later reinforced itself? In addition, it is important to investigate the degree of institutionalization of expert groups and to examine whether this has any influence on internal cohesion within these groups. Experts may choose to share knowledge within informal structures, or they may decide to work together in a formalized context. Not much is known about the factors that influence experts' preferences for either type of cooperative structure.

---

29 L. Seabrooke (2014) "Epistemic Arbitrage: Transnational Professional Knowledge in Action." *Journal of Professions and Organization* 1 (1): 49–64, p. 50.

30 A. Abbott (1998) *The System of Professions* (Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press); K. L. Petersen (2013) "The Corporate Security Professional: A Hybrid Agent Between Corporate and National Security." *Security Journal* 26 (3): 222–235, p. 224.

31 J. Checkel (ed.) (2009) *International Institutions and Socialization in Europe,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

32 M. Tanis (2005) "A social identity approach to trust: interpersonal perception, group membership and trusting behavior." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 35 (3): 413-423.

33 R.C. Carpenter (2007) "Studying Issue (Non-) Adoption in Transnational Advocacy Networks." *International Organization* 61 (3): 643–67.

This perspective may explain why an expert is recognized as such by other experts, but it cannot explain why particular experts and expert groups are recognized by non-experts who are expected to follow the experts' advice, and it is for this reason that we must study the external dimension of transnational expert groups; that is, the factors that lead others to recognize them as experts.

b) The External Dimension of Transnational Expert Groups

Expert groups do not exist in a vacuum. They are surrounded by the institutional environment in their field, non-professional actors, professionals outside the expert group, or political authorities, among others, all of whom must recognize the experts' ability to resolve transnational issues for the expert group to have influence. Some theoretical approaches, such as regime theory and new institutional economics, have focused more specifically on the institutional environments, but the rules, behaviors, and practices that ensure that experts and expert groups are recognized as such outside their group are generally not analyzed in a systematic way. Why are experts and expert groups considered to have relevant knowledge and expertise? How do they access and interact with decision-makers? Why do political authorities (and the public) sometimes accept them as de facto decision-makers on the transnational level? How do political opportunity structures facilitate the recognition of experts and of their expertise? And to what extent do changes in the geopolitical environment (e.g., the end of the Cold War) or in the institutional environment (e.g., the institutional setup of international organizations) influence whether or not expert groups are recognized by external actors?

In addition, we must take into account the complex interdependencies between the internal dimension and the external dimension. What influence do changes in the environment have on a group's internal dimension? Are the individual experts trying to shape the external dimension? These questions also concern the evolution of expert groups. Here, we must ask what the different concepts that exist—including those outlined above—can or cannot tell us about the factors that contribute to the emergence, maintenance, and stabilization or destabilization of transnational experts and expert groups.

The type of expertise seems to be a key element for both the internal dimension and the external dimension of expert groups. Given that various bodies of expertise in a particular issue area might exist that involve, for