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This paper discusses how the study of changing discourses in national media can contribute to the study of Europeanization of national foreign policy. The main argument here is that the media should be viewed as an intervening variable in the analysis of the EU's potential to alter its member—and candidate—states' policies and preferences, and can be used as an additional indicator of the breadth of Europeanization effects.

The paper introduces the literature on Europeanization (Featherstone and Radaelli; Olsen; Diez 2000; Checkel 2000, 2005), focusing particularly on the notions of transformation and public discourses. While both these notions are central to the study of Europeanization, there has been too few attempts to combine the two by analyzing the transformative effects of the EU on national public discourses as they have manifested in the media over time. Furthermore, insofar as studies on the media do exist, the overarching majority are concerned with the discourse on Europe and on European integration in national media (Meyer 2005b); the emergence of a European public sphere (Schlussinger; De Vreese) and the top-down diffusion of discourse in areas of low-politics (Meyer 2005a) and not, as in the case examined here, with the role of the media in the Europeanization of national foreign policy.

This analysis introduces an innovative approach to the study of the media within the context of Europeanization. It suggests that by monitoring the adaptation of the discourses in the media to new, more "Europeanized" national policies, and specifically to foreign policy, over time, it is possible to identify their role as an intervening variable in the effectiveness of processes of Europeanization. The following pages introduce the conceptual premises of this hypothesis.
Europeization and Domestic Transformation

The term “Europeization” first appeared in the field of EU studies in the early 1990s (for example in Ludect 1994) in order to describe a process of change related to European integration but differing from European integration per se in its nature and context. Contrary to the concept of European integration, Europeization acknowledged the two-way process of change related to the European Union, both on the level of the EU and on the domestic politics level (Featherstone 2003). Since then it has served increasingly in analyzing, explaining and researching the transformation of policies and politics in the EU members and candidate states.

Despite its popularity, the notion of Europeization remains contested (Olsen 921) due to the range of definitions that have been attributed to it. Very few analyses attempt to establish a comprehensive theory of Europeization and to provide a concise methodological framework for its application. Rather, the concept has often been embedded within wider conceptual frames such as new institutionalism, liberal intergovernmentalism, multi-level governance and policy networks (Featherstone 2003; Bache; Marks). This has spurred considerable skepticism regarding its scientific viability, in line with the usual criticisms of constructivism in European Studies (Moravscik 2001).

Nevertheless, one cannot overlook the fact that the research that has been generated using the concept of Europeization has introduced new issues and the European Studies research agenda that were previously unexplored. Moreover, the potential pitfalls of using a theoretical concept which is broad and generic in its nature may be overcome by defining more precisely in which context the notion is employed each time. The approach developed here draws primarily on the definitions of Radaelli (2003) and Schmidt (2002), enriching them with elements from the idea of foreign policy transformation as put forward by Checchi (2005), Diez (2000), Risse, and Schimmelfennig, among others. Finally, the aim is to examine the particular role of the printed media as a factor in Europeization and domestic transformation, how it benefits from the theoretical observations on the Europeization of the public sphere.

One of the first attempts to classify the various approaches to Europeization that have emerged was that of Johan Olsen. The main point underlying Olsen’s observations is that Europeization describes a process of change in institutions and ideas, and that the nature, reason, and mechanisms of this change vary according to definition. Consequently, he distinguishes five different “uses” of Europeization, which, he maintains, are complimentary rather than mutually exclusive. These five categories are (a) Europeization as changes in external territorial boundaries, (b) Europeization as the development of institutions of governance at the European level, (c) Europeization as central penetration of national and sub-national systems of governance, (d) Europeization as exporting forms of political organization and governance that are typical and distinct for Europe beyond the European territory, and (e) Europeization as a political project aiming at a unified and politically stronger Europe. He also identifies two different levels of institutional change resulting from the Europeization process: change in political organization, on the one hand, and change “in the structure of meaning and in people’s minds,” on the other (Olsen 923).

An equally resourceful typology by Featherstone suggests that the literature on Europeization can be classified in the approaches to Europeization as (a) historical phenomenon, (b) transnational cultural diffusion, (c) institutional adaptation and (d) adaptation of specific policies and policy processes (5). This classification accommodates the concept of Europeization as transformation of normative, cognitive, and ideational formations, beliefs, practices, and identities (a and b), as well as of institutions, policies, mechanisms, instruments, and actors (c and d). In that sense, it does not differ greatly from the Olsen typology, although it is more meticulous in distinguishing the mechanisms of the process, i.e., “export” in the first case, diffusion, and adaptation.

A final categorization, adapted to the study of the Southeast Europe region, is suggested by Diez, Agnantes, and Kaliber in a special issue of South East European Society and Politics. They, in turn, identify four different forms of Europeization, namely (a) Europeization of Policies (“Policy Europeization”), (b) Europeization of Political Processes (“Political Europeization”), (c) Europeization of Identities (“Societal Europeization”), and (d) Europeization of Public Discourse (“Discursive Europeization”). They note that the most common understanding of Europeization focuses on the policy dimension (a) and concentrates on the impact of European integration on policy making, including policy actors, problems, instruments, resources, and styles. Political Europeization (b) refers to the impact of EU membership on domestic institutional structures and political processes; Societal Europeization (c) is a process of change in the “construction of meanings and collective understandings” as defined by Risse et al. (219); and finally, Discursive Europeization (d) analyzes how public claims with reference to the EU, which include elite rhetoric, speeches, and media discourse, have changed over time. The authors point out that the latter provides an interesting new angle; nevertheless, they criticize this approach to Europeization as problematic in accounting for the substantive nature of change (Diez et. al. 7).

In spite of their various differences, all the approaches converge on the idea that Europeization entails change of some form, on the national or EU level, or on both, and that this change is driven by the process of European integration. They also, directly or indirectly, address the complexity of this change, which is not limited to policies or structures but, as is often suggested, affects discursive, ideational, and cognitive social and political spaces. With this in mind, Radaelli’s definition seems to address most, if not all, of the aspects of Europeization in the current literature, as he defines Europeization as referring to:

Processes of (a) construction, (b) diffusion, and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, “ways of doing things,” and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the making of EU public policy and politics and then incorporated into the logic of domestic discourse, identities, political structures, and public policies (30).

Apart from being wide enough to incorporate the numerous facets of Europeization, Radaelli’s definition is useful in that it justifies both a “top-down” (emanating from the EU level) as well as a “bottom-up” (constructed on the national or sub-national level) view of Europeization and, thus, acknowledges the intersubjective nature of the process. This is highlighted even more by Featherstone and Kazamias, who assume Europeization to be “a two way process, between the domestic and the EU levels, involving both top-down and bottom-up pressures” (9).
Central to the understanding of Europeanization as a theory with which to interpret domestic change is the identification of its mechanisms and outcomes. Radaelli identifies four possible outcomes to the process: (a) *inertia*, a situation of lack of change; (b) *absorption*, defined as adaptation, or accommodation of Europe’s policy requirements, while maintaining the national “core”; (c) *transformation*, which indicates “paradigmatic change,” namely “a change in the fundamental logic of political behavior” (Radaelli 30); and, finally, (d) *reaffirmation*, or “negative Europeanization,” whereby national polices become “less European” as a result of interaction with the EU. Borzel and Risse similarly distinguish three degrees of domestic change: absorption, accommodation, and transformation, ranging from a lower to a higher degree of domestic change (Borzel and Risse 69–70). In the final stage of transformation, member states may alter existing policies to the extent that their essential features and/or the underlying collective understandings are fundamentally changed” (Borzel and Risse 70). Thus, transformation leads to both institutional and policy change.

Since, essentially, the EU interacts with its member-states on the basis of the same principles and with the same behavior, it follows that the explanation for varying outcomes can be found in the states themselves. In order to identify the relevant variables in the individual states, scholars of Europeanization developed notions such as “interacting variables,” “veto points” or “veto players,” “goodness of fit” or “misfit,” and “path dependence.” The majority of these notions have been adapted from the new institutionalist research agenda, in particular historical and sociological institutionalism. Historical institutionalists perceive Europeanization as a process of adjustment triggered by the existence of a misfit, an incompatibility, between the trajectory of European and domestic policies and their underlying ideational and normative assumptions (Risse et al. 4; North). At the core of this approach is the acceptance that, in spite of inertia, policy choices change over time, because of changes in the external environment and changes in internal perceptions of the real or perceived performance of institutions in the context of the environment in which they operate. Borzel (1999) and Cowles et al. supplement the new institutionalist framework with the “goodness of fit” argument which holds that Europeanization matters only if there is divergence, incompatibility or “misfit” between European-level institutional process, politics and policies, and the domestic level (Radaelli 44). While the argument does not refer to ideational and normative misfits, it can be generalized to include the whole range of factors in Radaelli’s definition. Thus, we can assume that it is possible to talk of a misfit of discourses and foreign policy principles.

The extent of the misfit, which determines the potential of the change, as well as the resistance to this change, can be explained by the existence of *veto points* or *players*. Veto players are actors whose approval is necessary for bringing about change. Their existence is recognized by all involved, which means that they mold or shape actors’ strategies (Lecours 10). It also follows that without veto player consent, transformation, as defined by Radaelli, is not achievable. Veto players act as mediating factors in bringing about change, along with other factors, such as executive leadership style and scope, influence of bureaucracy on policy-making, timing (Diez et al. 4), as well as the mobilization of agents of change at the domestic level (Radaelli 47; Herrtcher and Knill 288). Herrtcher and Knill maintain that the higher the number of veto points, the less likely it is that adaptation will occur. The degree of resistance to change has also been interpreted through the idea of *path dependence* of the domestic system. The notion of *path dependence* or dependency suggests that established actors will not always adapt quickly to changes in human purposes and external conditions because they will tend to persist on the already established ways of doing things. In the historical institutionalist view, once actors have ventured far down a particular path, they are likely to find it very difficult to change course (Skeoch and Pierson 65–6). This account is reminiscent of the idea of inertia, resulting in a lack of or limited change.

In another attempt to explain the variable outcomes of Europeanization, Schmidt (2002) and Schmidt and Radaelli (2004) introduce a set of five mediating factors, namely economic vulnerability, institutional capacity, policy legacies, policy preferences, and discourse. The latter refers to the ability of agency or institutions to change preferences by altering perceptions of the domestic and international environment. This conception of discourse forms the basis of the definition of discursive Europeanization by Diez et al.

This brief account of the definitions and factors of Europeanization is indicative of the challenge lying ahead for scholars who wish to engage in its study. The concept has been stretched wide enough to cause skepticism on behalf of more rationalist approaches to the study of the EU. In addition, the never-ending additions to the list of factors that should be taken into consideration renders any explanation of change as a Europeanization effect vulnerable to criticism and open to alternative viewpoints. However, as a number of prominent scholars continually point out (see for example Cheekel 2001; Stavridis), the way to overcoming this problem is to further engage in the study of the concept from all possible angles. If nothing else, its value lies in that it offers a unique perspective on how membership and interaction with the EU are experienced differently by states, depending not only on such factors as the specific state formation, the patterns of policy-making, the political culture, but also on the balance of power between state and society, on the one hand, and national and sub-national units on the other (Levkimidis 1). In this way, the concept carries the potential to enable scholars to predict the effects of different states’ membership on a number of actors, contrary to the traditional theories on European unionification, such as Neofunctionalism and Liberal Intergovernmentalism.

**On the Europeanization of National Foreign Policy**

With these theoretical observations in mind, this chapter attempts to deconstruct the role of the media, and in particular that of the press, in the process of Europeanization, and specifically in the Europeanization of foreign policy. Before explaining in detail the methodology employed, it is useful to understand more precisely what the approach adopted towards the Europeanization of foreign policy entails.

Based on the preceding discussion on Europeanization, it is possible to argue that the Europeanization of foreign policy refers to the extent to which the EU can bring about change in national foreign policy. A number of prominent Europeanization scholars have attempted to shed light on this issue, adopting either a rationalist or a constructivist perspective. They argue that the EU can affect foreign policy preferences of its member—and candidate—states in two ways: (a) by shifting their interests or preferences in other directions, and offering benefits, such as international recognition and international legitimacy in return (Diez; Schimmelfennig), or (b) by imposing EU governance, socializing the state and thus altering the dominant discourses on national identity as the constructivist perspective suggests. That, in turn, alters the goals and methods of national foreign policy and leads potential members to conform to the basic foreign policy norms accepted by the EU.
In this latter sense, Europeanization means that the EU acts as a role-model for its member states' foreign policy, and may bring about a reconsideration or transformation of national foreign policy, ultimately rendering it more compatible, more similar, or—to use the Europeanization terminology—a “better fit” with EU-wide principles, norms, and ways of conducting foreign policy. By reforming in order to resemble the EU-model, the states are involved in what Checsei (2005) has referred to as the “transformative dynamics” of the EU. Stavridis suggests that the Europeanization of foreign policy occurs when a state internalizes principles and values set out by the EU in its own foreign policy. Consequently, it is possible to discern the effects of Europeanization in the change in decision-making, as well as in the “style” of national foreign policies, that is to say in the “general approach to issues of national interest” (Stavridis 4). In this respect, one way of measuring the degree to which a state’s national foreign policy has been Europeanized, is by studying the internalization of “Europe” in national identity, and addressing the issue of whether European norms have been applied in national foreign policy as a result of identity reconstruction and what kind of norms are involved (Wong 151). These observations underscore the critical role of the mass media, which constitute agents of identity reconstruction, in the study of the Europeanization of foreign policy.

Europeanization and the Mass Media

As analyzed in the previous section, the Europeanization research agenda has increasingly focused on the domestic politics and societies of the member states, which in turn have the power to affect the formulation of their foreign policy goals. By identifying the various intervening variables and mediating factors involved in Europeanization, the theory suggests that for the Europeanization of foreign policy to occur, an essential condition is that the added effect of these mediating factors must produce a smaller tendency towards inertia and a greater one towards adaptation or transformation.

It can be hypothesized that the press may be involved in the Europeanization of national foreign policy in three different ways:

a. As an agent of change, with the ability to change preferences by altering perceptions of the domestic and international environment, internalizing norms from the EU level to the domestic level and promoting discourses consistent with new identities;
b. As a veto point, whose resistance to promoting new identity discourses, and emphasizing the historically accepted “ways of doing things” as the right path of action, can stall or counteract the effects of Europeanization;
c. As an object of Europeanization in itself, as the continuous interaction with the EU-level and other EU member-states, in the form of topics reported, strategic media partnerships and permanent communication, brings about change in the national media.

The third point in this list is, perhaps, the most frequently encountered in the literature on the Europeanization of the media and the Europeanization of the public sphere. Such Europeanization of national public spheres would occur when nationally-based mass media shift their focus away from the national political arena and towards the European level (Kevel 52). From this perspective, increasing proportions of European issues and actors in the national media and growing references to transnational contexts would be indicative of a Europeanized public sphere, which must be sought within the national public spheres of the various European countries.

According to theories of the public sphere, the mass media are the institutionalized forum of debate, which serves as a central linkage between the public and the institutional structure. In this function, they are conveyors of information about issues and actors according to their professional norms and values. However, the media should not be regarded as merely serving other actors as a channel of communication, a forum for exchange, and a medium of self-observation of society, but should also be seen as political actors in the public sphere that legitimately raise their own voice. They do so in particular by assigning relevance to issues for public debate, by “setting the agenda,” and by expressing their own opinion.

The dual role of the media—as communication channels for political actors and as actors in their own right—is of particular importance to the debate on the Europeanization of public sphere (Koopmans and Pütersch). However, much skepticism exists regarding the methodology that must be followed in studying the Europeanization of the public sphere through media analysis. According to Pfetsch:

Most studies that claim to detect processes of Europeanization in the public sphere on the basis of media analysis... fail to assess whether the presence or absence of Europeanization is the result of the media's own position or of the communication strategies of other political actors (3).

Consequently, there is a need for further empirical insight into the relationship between media and Europeanization.

This analysis diverges from the approach adopted in the debate on the European public sphere and is more concerned with points (a) and (b) on the list of roles of the media in Europeanization. In so doing, it hypothesizes that the terms used predominately in policy Europeanization, including the outcomes of retrenchment, inertia, accommodation and transformation, provide a useful tool for understanding the role of media in the Europeanization process and, to an extent, the Europeanization of the content of the media, which will later be referred to as media discourses.

Contrary to the prevailing tendency to separate the analysis of policy and institutional Europeanization from the more constructivist accounts of discursive, societal and ideational Europeanization, it is suggested here that the two are interlinked through the role of agents of change and veto players, such as the media. This assumption is based on the idea that the media carry significant power to affect policy outcomes in a number of ways, namely (1) agenda-setting, whereby the media affect policy by highlighting certain issues which become priorities and gain salience in the public debate (for example McCombs and Shaw); (2) framing, which refers to shaping the way in which events are transmitted and perceived (for example, Entman); and (3) indexing, which suggests that journalists may " privilege some voices over others," show preference to specific sources of opinion, and thus empower them in the shaping of dominant discourses (for example, Bennett). Therefore, " media power represents the capacity to produce a picture of the world outside which is accepted as true by public audiences" (Hudson and Martin). This suggests that the media hold the power to facilitate changes brought about by Europeanization, by including the Europeanized policies...
in the public agenda, framing them in a positive context, and finally, privileging sources of authority which commend the changes. In this way, these policies become acceptable to the public audiences and, thus, possible options for the executive power, which ultimately relies on public consent in the EU democracies.

National foreign policy is an ideal field for the study of these assumptions, as it is high in ideational content, closely related to discourses of national identity and national interests, and framed within a context of values and guiding principles which are embedded in a society. Therefore, for a foreign policy transformation to occur, the mobilization of the media as an agent of change, promoting a new perception of the world and the state's interests and identity in it, may constitute a necessary precondition.

Constructivists suggest that transnational institutions, such as the EU, once internalized into the domestic sphere, are able to affect the identity of actors, the sense of who "we" are as members of a social community (Risse). The social identities of actors, in turn, define their attitudes and interests. To this effect, supranational institutions hold the power to transform national preferences and interests by altering the domestic dynamics of states, thus bringing about domestic transformation. Checkel (2005) uses the term "transformative dynamics" of supranational institutions to refer to this power. Taking these accounts of transformation into consideration, and keeping in mind the role of the media as agency, it is possible to hypothesize that the constitutive effect of EU institutions will have an impact on national media, and that the transformative dynamics of EU membership may reflect on the content of the mass media.

Because EU membership goes alongside with the acceptance of a defined set of rules, obligations, legislation and political order, it deeply affects "discursive and behavioral practices" as a socialization effect of EU membership (Checkel 1999). For this reason, social constructivist approaches rely to a large extent on communicative and discursive practices. By analyzing discursive practice in conjunction with the relevant theories on discourse analysis and interpretation, constructivists attempt to decipher the norms through which agents perceive the social environment. In studies of the EU, the application of this hypothesis allows theorists of integration to evaluate the change in identities and perceptions that may have been brought about by the introduction of the external institutional factor (EU) into state politics, society and inter-state relations. It also enables understanding of the ways in which the EU influences identities and societal norms through discursive practices as reflected in the media. The hypothesis is that the greater the extent of positive EU coverage in the media, the greater the likelihood that perceptions and attitudes in society will adhere to the wider European discourse on salient issues. In other words, these issues will tend to be "Europeanized."

To recapitulate, the centrality of discourses as tools manipulated by agents of transformation has resulted in a constructivist emphasis on communicative and discursive practices. Words, language, narratives, communication in general, are considered as tools in understanding social and political behaviors and the way in which they might be fundamentally transformed. Consequently, one of the major contributions of the constructivist school to our understanding of the European Union is the application of communication theories and media studies to the field by introducing media analysis in the study of Europeanization.

Discourse Transformation as Europeanization

The study of the media's changing approach to and its participation in the Europeanization of national foreign policy involves detecting trends of change—if any—in attitudes, perceptions, national self-perception, and ideas, all of which are difficult, if not impossible, to quantify. Therefore, the method proposed is that of qualitative discourse analysis based on a selection of data.

Discourse here as understood as "a process of construction of meaning allowing for certain interpretations while excluding others" (Risse 165), as a way of "structuring" the discussion on particular issues. The discourse makes it possible to construct the topic in a certain way and "limits the rest of the ways in which the topic can be constructed" (Hall 291). The approach employed in order to analyze discourse and to trace change in perceptions and attitudes in the media is the "light approach" proposed by Larsen, i.e., that of analyzing broadly-based and frequently recurring themes.

This leads to the methodological issue of how to trace transformation in the discourse. In order to be able to identify changes, a first step is to derive the social and ideational context of the relevant discourses through some type of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis, as frequently employed in the social sciences, is the analysis of the way in which systems of meaning (discourses) shape the way in which people understand their roles in society and influence their political activities (Haworth). It can also refer to the analysis of "categorizations that are produced, reproduced, and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities" (Hajer 4). Moreover, discourse analysis should be able to shed light on how interrelationships are constantly produced, reproduced, challenged and transformed. Consequently, discourses should not be perceived as data to be "coded" or quantitatively assessed, but rather as narratives, or stories illustrating the whole prism of the context in which political issues are discussed.

It is the stories themselves that deserve interpretation, not the "data" that can be inferred by "coding" the stories. Other discourse analysts have shown how the stories are in fact a political mechanism in themselves: without stories, no consensus; without narration, no cognitive shifts (Hajer 3).

By looking at these stories, at "what is said," in order to understand policy, discourse analysis has changed the way that policy-making can be studied. With the emergence of constructivism as a popular way of theorizing International Relations, discourse analysis became a significant part of the IR methodological toolkit. For the particular field of European foreign policy, Larsen identifies two possible ways of analyzing discourses and their significance. The first is a text-oriented approach which, through a detailed analysis of individual texts, shows how the meanings of broader discourses are promoted. The second does not engage in detailed textual analysis but focuses on broadly based discourses which are identified in relevant texts (Larsen 65). Larsen's approach to discourse analysis integrates the study of narrative structures and language (vocabulary, figurative speech), resulting into a deconstruction of the discourse on the level of both form and content. This predominantly qualitative approach to discourse analysis is proposed as a way to understand the relationship between the mass media and foreign policy Europeanization.

The identification of change is obviously linked to comparing discourses over time, once they have been deconstructed and interpreted using some form of discourse analysis.
Any study of Europeanization needs to be longitudinal, as it is a study of change. It is essential, in order to comprehend the internalization of transformation, to examine how the narratives and their connotations change. In order to incorporate the element of time in its findings, the linkage of Europeanization and mass media studies should use a case-study method in conjunction with the analysis of discourses in the media in particular instances which are considered decisive for the research questions investigated.

**Tracing Discourse Transformation in the Greek Press**

The above mentioned hypotheses and research agenda was tested on a study of the role of the Greek press in the Europeanization of Greek foreign policy vis-à-vis Turkey, which by general admission occurred post-1998. Analysis of key texts drawn from the Greek press, beginning roughly from the 1996 Imia crisis, the most critical near-war incident between Greece and Turkey in the 1990s, and ending with the 2003 Greek Presidency and Greece's display of support for Turkish accession, revealed the following:

a. The Greek press functioned as a mediating factor in the realization of Greek foreign policy transformation towards a “softer” approach to Turkey and the promotion of the relevant discourses. While traditional studies of the Greek media portray them as cultivating hostility against the “Other,” most often represented by Turkey as a result of historical and cultural reasons, the picture derived from the cases analyzed in this paper studies is that of an institution promoting discourses of rapprochement, consistent with the “Europeanized” Greek foreign policy of the late 1990s.

b. The discursive transformation in the press seems to have occurred gradually and subtly, more often following than leading government policy change. The way in which the narratives evolved, was subject to the processes taking place on the EU level, both in terms of language and sources. Nowhere was this more visible than in the war-related narrative. In early 1997 matters of military and national defense featured prominently in the press where relations with Turkey were discussed, suggesting a “readiness” on both sides to resort to elements of “hard power” for the resolution of bilateral disputes. These references, coupled with the representation of Turkey as “provocative,” “threatening,” and “uncompromising,” contributed to the treatment of the possibility of war as a justifiable fear. The imposition of conditionality, through the Luxembourg Conclusions, set in motion a process where resolution at the EU level gradually replaced the climate of tension. By the time of the Greek Presidency in 2003, the war discourse had become significantly downplayed and had been replaced by recommendations not to engage in “heated scenarios” which would involve confrontation with the Turkish military establishment. Instead, the press had begun to call for the cultivation of relations with the official Turkish government, and to encourage the government’s support for Ankara’s European orientation.

c. The recognition of Turkey as a candidate state in the European Council’s Helsinki Conclusions in 1999 established an entirely new basis for the reporting on Turkey in the Greek press. The hostility discourses were replaced by what might be described as “assistance discourses”, or, in other words, by discussions on the ways in which the EU, and Greece as a key EU member in the Balkan region, could assist in Turkey’s effort to “import Europe.” The press endorsed the EU-derived discourse of “exporting Europe” to the candidate states by means of promoting democratization, respect for human rights and international law alongside with economic prosperity. Within this context, it promoted a new role, and thus a new identity discourse for Greece and for its foreign policy, whereby the state’s mission was to support the Europeanization of its neighbor, rather than pursue the policy of military antagonism of the past.

d. On a discursive level, the conflict between Greece and Turkey was projected onto a conflict between European principles and the Turkish military order. The conflict was interpreted through the prism of the EU enlargement criteria, thus uploading the Greek-Turkish problems to a “European” level, in other words “Europeanizing” it.

It is, therefore, possible to argue that the Greek press has acted as a mediator for new foreign policy discourses stemming from the European-level approach to the Turkish case and from the Europeanized discourses on national foreign policy adopted by the Greek governments gradually after 1997.

**Conclusions**

This chapter has drawn on the prevalent theories of Europeanization to define the concept as a process of various forms of interaction between the domestic and EU levels, resulting into some form of change. It has then narrowed the focus on the change—or transformation—in national foreign policy resulting from this process, and has argued that the media may either act as agents of change, by introducing new identity discourses and promoting norms and values consistent with the “Europeanized” policy choices, or as veto players, refusing to give their consent to the internalization of the new “Europeanized” foreign policies and the accompanying discourses. Consequently, the outcome of Europeanization, ranging from renunciation to transformation, may be traced in the changes in the media discourses regarding the redirection of particular policies, as well as in the transformation of identity discourses in the media.

In order to trace the transformation of the relevant discourse in the Greek media, the chapter recommends the method of discourse analysis, made popular in the study of International Relations through the emergence of constructivist approaches to foreign policy. It is argued that a discursive approach to Europeanization provides empirical evidence for the arguments made, as well as an understanding of transformation that goes beyond the traditional rational policy approach. Consequently, it provides a tool for a research design which can explore causal relationships between Europeanization processes and agents of communication which are involved in these processes.

Based on these theoretical and methodological observations, the chapter has briefly used the results of the author's study of the Greek media discourses on the Europeanization of Greek foreign policy towards Turkey. The study's findings suggest that, in spite of some initial resistance, the Greek media have acted as a mediating factor promoting new, Europeanized, foreign policy discourses.
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