

## DEMOCRATISATION PHASES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

### AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ'NİN DEMOKRATİKLEŞME AŞAMALARI

**Doç. Dr. Mehlika Özlem ULTAN**

Kocaeli Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, Kocaeli/Türkiye



**Article Type** : Review Article / İnceleme Makalesi

**Doi Number** : <http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sss.1042>

**Reference** : Ultan, M.Ö. (2018). "Democratisation Phases Of The European Union", International Social Sciences Studies Journal, 4(26): 5785-5791

### ABSTRACT

The European Union is established for economic purposes and has a sui generis structure. For the European Union, it is not possible to have a democratic level like any nation-state. The Union has been constantly criticized for its democratic deficit. Many steps have been taken to ensure democratic legitimacy. These steps need to be evaluated from two perspectives. The first one is the provision of democratic legitimacy at the level of European citizens. It is seen that especially The European Citizens' Initiative is regulated for this purpose. In the second stage, it is necessary to talk about democracy at the level of institutions. Accordingly, institutions are criticized for the problem of transparency in practice. The issue of legitimacy at the institutional level is also being tried to be overcome by increasing the powers of the European Parliament and by directly participating in the election of European citizens. In this study, the policies that the Union implements in order to prevent from the democratic deficit and how these policies are applied to the democratization process will be evaluated.

**Keywords:** Democratization, Democratic Deficit, the European Parliament, the European Citizens' Initiative

### ÖZ

Avrupa Birliği ekonomik amaçlarla kurulmuştur ve kendine has bir yapısı vardır. Avrupa Birliği'nin digger ulus-devletler gibi bir demokratik yapısı olması beklenmemektedir. Birlik demokrasi açıklığı sebebiyle sürekli eleştirilmektedir. Demokrasi açıklığını kapatabilmek için birçok adım atılmıştır. Bu adımlar iki başlık altında toplamak mümkündür. Bunlardan ilki, Demokratik meşruiyetin Avrupa vatandaşları düzeyinde sağlanmasıdır. Avrupa Vatandaşları Girişimi, özellikle bu amaçla gerçekleştirilen bir uygulamadır. İkinci başlıkta ise, kurumlar düzeyinde demokrasiden söz etmek gerekmektedir. Kurumsal düzeydeki meşruiyetin sağlanması, Avrupa Parlamentosu'nun gücünün artırılması ve Avrupa vatandaşlarının seçimlere direct katılımının sağlanması ile gerçekleşebilecektir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada, Birliğin demokrasi açıklığını kapatmak adına aldığı önlemleri ve bu önlemlerin demokratikleşme sürecinde nasıl işlediği değerlendirilmeye çalışılacaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Demokratikleşme, Demokrasi Açığı, Avrupa Parlamentosu, Avrupa Vatandaşları Girişimi

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The issue, which can be expressed as a democratic deficit or as a democracy deficit, remains one of the most important areas of debate on the agenda of the European Union (EU). This problem stems primarily from the fact that the Union (the European Coal and Steel Community, then the European Economic Community) was founded on economic grounds. It is natural that the democracy of a Union founded for economic purposes is not initially questioned or seen as a matter. But, it is thought that the concept of Europeanization is also important at the root of this problem. The term can be associated with the emergence of new institutions, rules and practices, both at the national level and at the Union level. It is therefore expected that these changes will have an effect on the member and candidate countries. However, although the impact of the EU on its members has grown steadily, the Union has continued to be seen as an elite project away from its citizens. This constitutes one of the biggest obstacles in front of democratic legitimacy of the Union.

The problem of democracy in the European Union can be evaluated in two contexts. The former is the effect of the enlargement process of the Union and the democratization process of countries under the European Neighborhood Policy. However, in the context of this study, the problem of democracy that the Union faces within itself will be examined. In this respect, the reasons behind the debate on the democratic deficit will be tried to be understood and the steps taken by the Union in order to compensate this gap will be examined. As a result, it will be tried to understand how the Union governs the process of compensating for the democratic deficit.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The word “democracy” was firstly used by Greeks as the word *demokratia* which was formed by ‘*demos*’ (meaning people) and ‘*kratos*’ (meaning rule or power) (Azman, 2011: 243). Robert Dahl (1998: 40) expanded the definition of the term and according to him, the fundamental principle for a liberal democracy is; “the right to vote, the right to be elected/eligibility for public office, the right of political leaders to compete for support and votes, free and fair elections, freedom of association, freedom of expression, alternative sources of information, institutions that make government policies actually depend on votes and other forms of (voter) preference”.

Modern democracy is a system of government in which elected representatives choose citizens through competition and cooperation. Competition refers not only to elections, but also to the process by which citizens can influence and shape public policies by means of non-governmental organizations or interest groups. As far as competition among elected representatives is concerned, there is also co-operation, in which public policy is shaped (Gürsoy, 2013: 249). The basis of modern conceptions of democracy is related to the fundamental ideas of sovereignty and to the collective decision making processes. Moreover, there are some other dimensions of conceptions of democracy because of experiences and historical background of states. For example, when the history of democracy in European continent is analyzed, it can be seen that the substantive and social outcomes of democracy are important for individuals. Besides the emphasis on equality of opportunity, the European citizens pay attention to the equality of outcome as well (Landman, 2010: 6).

The democracy issue of the European Union has been the subject of many researches in the literature. There are three views that contribute to the process of assessing whether the Union is democratic or not. The first view defends the notion that democratic standards to be applied to nation states are not valid for the Union because the Union is not a nation state. Therefore, it is thought that the term of democratic legitimacy should be redefined for the Union. The second view is shaped by the fact that there is a democratic deficit for the Union. Accordingly, the institutions of the Union act as institutions of the nation-state. At this point, it is seen as a democratic problem that the European Parliament, compared with the national parliaments, is directly elected, but the legislative power is shared with the Council of Ministers. And finally the third view argues that the European Union is sufficiently democratic. (Yiğit, 2014: 406-407).

The democratic structure and the EU institutions’ effectiveness are often questioned by some researchers, academicians and experts. They generally tend to characterize the EU institutions as suffering from a ‘democratic deficit,’ it means that there is a lack of democratic accountability of the institutions (Crombez, 2003: 102). Historically, when the researches in the literature are examined, it is seen that studies have been done within the framework of these opinions. For example, Karlheinz Neunreither (1999: 299) suggests that the Union's problem of democracy comes from the inadequate participation of national parliaments and the European Parliament in the system. Marcus Horeth (1999: 252) states that before the year 1990 there was no need to discuss the bases of democracy because of the limited jurisdiction of the Community. Fritz Scharpf (1997: 22) indicates that the effectiveness of the European economic integration is related to the ability of Union members to pursue legitimate and democratic welfare state policies. Held (1999: 338) underlines the effects of globalization on the democratic structures of states. According to him, the economic, cultural and ecological problems are crossing the territorial boundaries of nations. Thus, legitimacy of national institutions can have effects for citizens of the another state, because of the globalization. So the European Union’s democratic structure is also related to all of its member states’ national democracy capacity. Decker (2002: 261) criticises the democratic deficit of the institutions in the EU because of the current electoral and party system and also the absence of a European *demos*. Jensen (2009: 1) argues that there are three types of legitimacy such as procedural, efficiency and social legitimacy. And the democratic deficit is discussed with these types of legitimacy.

According to the theoretical analysis, in order to understand the democratic level of the European Union, there should be some important matters. In democratic governments, there should be public control, political equality, right to justification and also citizens or 'a demos' who is aware that authoring their own laws through representatives (Lord, 2008: 316). However, as some academicians underlined, democracy on the European Union should not be seen equal to a democracy in a state. So, the evaluation of democratic phases and democratic structures should be understood.

### **3. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM MAASTRICHT TREATY TO LISBON TREATY**

The democratic deficit of the European Union means the widening gap between the citizens of the European Union the ideas and structures of the Union. This situation can cause the idea that citizens' opinions are not taken into consideration by the supranational bodies of the Union (Quintas, 2015; 63). The term 'democratic deficit' can also be expressed as a set of problems, such as technocratic decision-making processes, lack of transparency of the Union's institutions, insufficient public participation, excessive use of administrative discretion, and inadequate control mechanisms. The lack of democratic notions of the Union can cause some criticisms (Majone, 1998: 14-15). Thus the problem can be seen about the institutional arrangements and also about the political practices of the Union member states (Katz, 2001: 55). In order to understand the main reasons behind the democracy deficit, the historical arrangements should be analyzed.

When the European Economic Community was founded, there were neither economic criteria nor legal and political criteria to be a member of Community. Being a country on the European continent and being ruled by a democratic regime were the main conditions to become a member. So, the membership of Greece (1981), Spain and Portugal (1986) to the Community relied on the will of member states. This political will was generally related to spread democracy in Mediterranean countries (Democratic Progress Institute, 2016: 12).

The first sign about the necessity for the political regime to rely on democratic principles in an EU candidate country can be found in the Birkelbach Report, originally published in 1962. According to this report, countries that rely on truly democratic practices and respect fundamental rights and freedoms can become members of the EU (Usul, 2008: 107). The increase of the Union's competences in the 1990s and the emergence to deepen during the accession process of the new members led to the questioning of the democratic foundations of the Union. This process, which started with the European Single Act, gained even more importance with the Maastricht Treaty (Akgül Açıkmüşe, 2003: 24). In this period, the idea of the compensation of the democratic deficit, which is one of the priority targets of the Union, has officially appeared in the Copenhagen Criteria for the first time (Ercan ve Gürson, 2017: 2238).

The Copenhagen Criteria which were accepted at the European Summit in Copenhagen in 1993, was accepted as the accession criteria and have three parts; economical, political, and legal. These three criteria must be fulfilled by candidate countries if they want to become a member of the EU. The democratic part of the Copenhagen Criteria was in political criteria. According to political criteria, a candidate country must fulfill the conditions which are related to 'stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities'. So this democratic conditionality has helped to the European enlargement process by accelerating the democratic improvements of candidate countries (Democratic Progress Institute, 2016: 9,16).

During the discussions on enlargement and deepening, the European Union began to discuss the institutional gaps, the ineffectiveness of national parliaments in the system, and the reluctance of people to participate in the name of 'democratic deficit'. Some argue that the EU does not have a particular people (demos) so that it can not be mentioned about democratization for these people; another has supported the search for democracy because they advocate that there are people (demos) at European level (Poyraz, 2013: 17). It is thought that the democratic deficit can be ended only by an approach compatible with the democratic traditions of the European societies. Therefore, the attitude of European public opinion and the approach of the European politicians are gaining importance. The European Union has made various treaties and arrangements in order to increase public support, to ensure institutional legitimacy and to solve the democratic deficit problem in the historical process. The most notable of these were the Maastricht, Amsterdam and Lisbon Treaties.

The Maastricht Treaty has taken important steps to solve the problem of democratic deficit in the Union. One of these is shaped by the identity of European citizens (Hamarat Ercan, 2017: 421). According to this, in addition to protecting the national citizenship status of the countries, the European citizenship term, which

means also being a European citizen, is included in the Maastricht Treaty. New symbols such as a common anthem, a European passport, a common currency and a flag have also emerged in this process in order to raise the citizenship idea of the Union. This is a reflection of the desire to give legitimacy to citizens in the Union and the result of the emphasis on the sense of belonging of the citizens (Ayaz, 2018: 216). EU citizenship is not an alternative to national citizenship, but it is complementary. With the EU citizenship, citizens of all member states are entitled to freedom of movement within the EU boundaries, the right to reside, the right to vote and to be elected at the local level. However, these arrangements made with the Maastricht Treaty have not been able to strengthen the bond between the EU and the citizens in practice (Gürsoy, Onursal Beşgöl, 2013: 30-31).

The Amsterdam Treaty, which was signed on 2 October 1997 and entered into force on 1 May 1999, has also taken steps to solve the EU's democratic deficit problem. With the Treaty of Amsterdam, the European Parliament's powers have been increased, and decisions have been made as open and close to citizens as possible. Thus, it was aimed to tighten ties among European peoples. However, it is understood that the democratic legitimacy of the Union is still not ensured, as the European Parliament is insufficient in government and not transparent enough (Ayaz, 2018: 217-218). As a result, the Laeken Summit was held on December 14-15, 2001, where the Union's democracy and enlargement issues were discussed, and the 'Laeken Declaration on the Future of Europe' was published. Accordingly, there are three important issues that need to be addressed by the Union. These problems are; to bring citizens closer to the Union, to organize the European politics in an enlarged Union and to determine the role of the Union in the new, multipolar world (Gürsoy, Onursal Beşgöl, 2013: 30-31). Although the EU bureaucrats have done important work on democratization in the process up to the Lisbon Treaty, the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties emphasize that the EU depends on democratic principles, but concrete steps are not taken to resolve the problems.

#### **4. THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION FROM THE LISBON TREATY**

The 2008 economic crisis in the European Union in the wake of the Lisbon Treaty's entry into force was not merely about economics; in political terms it also has consequences for the weakness and legitimacy of European integration. The economic crisis led to political and social crises, elected governments overthrown, and democratic governments replaced by technocrats. The governments formed by expert technocrats in the field to handle the administration have caused the Union to face the problem of democracy again (Poyraz, 2013: 14). But it seems that the main problem in European public opinion is the lack of formation of a common negotiation field and identity that constitutes the core of democracy (Poyraz, 2013: 15).

The Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force on December 1, 2009, made radical changes in the institutional structure and functioning of the Union. It is also seen that there are important regulations in order to ensure the democracy of the Union. With these regulations, it is aimed that the Union will have a more effective democracy, more transparency and a closer unity with its citizens (Dizman, 2012: 2). With the Lisbon Treaty, the European Union has tried to guarantee democratic equality, democracy and participatory democracy, and aimed at receiving public support in this context. So; it is envisaged that the European institutions will be equal to all European citizens and the European Parliament and national parliaments will have more rights (Poyraz, 2013: 32). By evaluating the steps taken in this process, it will be tried to understand how much they help to solve the democratic deficit problem.

##### **4.1. Changes in Decision Making Mechanism**

According to the Lisbon Treaty the double majority system can be applied from November 2014. Thus, in order to take a decision, it is needed the approval of 55% of member states (72% if the act has not been proposed by the Commission) and at least 65% of the EU's population. This process is called as 'double majority'. Moreover, at least four member states which represent at least 35% of the EU's population can create a blocking minority (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Article 238). With this procedure, it is aimed to increase the democratic side of the taken decisions.

##### **4.2. Increasing the Authority of the EU Parliament in the Legislative Branch**

Throughout the history of integration, the EU Parliament has continuously increased its power, representing the people of Europe. At the Rome Council of Europe meeting held in 1975, parliamentarians were elected directly by the people; the first elections in this direction were held in 1979. Within the framework of the subsequent treaties, the European Parliament's role in legislative action has always been strengthened (Gürsoy, 2013: 33-34). Thus, national parliaments and EU institutions have been brought closer and strengthening parliamentary control over the Union has been targeted. Increasing the competences of the

Parliament in terms of legislative, budgetary and political control is described as strategic steps towards the democratization of the European Union. The convergence of national parliaments to EU decision-making processes is important both for strengthening transparency by increasing parliamentary control over Union institutions and for attracting citizens to issues related to the EU (Dizman, 2012: 2).

### 4.3. Citizen's Initiative

In terms of democratic legitimacy, the "citizen's initiative" is one of the most significant changes which was accepted with the Lisbon Treaty. Accordingly, at least one million citizens from a particular number of member states may take initiative and request that the Commission submit a proposal when it considers that the Union is in need of a legal regulation for the implementation of the treaties. Thus, EU citizens can have the chance to participate in the legislative process and can be able to publicize EU policies. This system aims to bring EU citizens closer to the Union's process (Ayaz, 2018: 222).

Table 1. The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index (Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index)

Countries/Years	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2015	2016	2017
The EU	8,29	8,19	8,01	7,98	7,96	7,97	7,93	7,88
France	8,07	8,07	7,77	7,88	8,04	7,92	7,92	7,80
Germany	8,82	8,82	8,38	8,34	8,64	8,64	8,63	8,61
Italy	7,73	7,98	7,83	7,74	7,85	7,98	7,98	7,98
The Netherlands	9,66	9,53	8,99	8,99	8,92	8,92	8,80	8,89
Belgium	8,15	8,16	8,05	8,05	7,93	7,93	7,77	7,78
Luxembourg	9,10	9,10	8,88	8,88	8,88	8,88	8,81	8,81
Denmark	9,52	9,52	9,52	9,52	9,11	9,11	9,20	9,22
Ireland	9,01	9,01	8,79	8,56	8,72	8,85	9,15	9,15
United Kingdom	8,08	8,15	8,16	8,21	8,31	8,31	8,36	8,53
Greece	8,13	8,13	7,92	7,65	7,45	7,45	7,23	7,29
Portugal	8,16	8,05	8,02	7,92	7,79	7,79	7,86	7,84
Spain	8,34	8,45	8,16	8,02	8,05	8,30	8,30	8,08
Austria	8,69	8,49	8,49	8,62	8,54	8,54	8,41	8,42
Finland	9,25	9,25	9,19	9,06	9,03	9,03	9,03	9,03
Sweden	9,88	9,88	9,50	9,73	9,73	9,45	9,39	9,39
Cyprus	7,60	7,70	7,29	7,29	7,40	7,53	7,65	7,59
Czech Republic	8,17	8,19	8,19	8,19	7,94	7,94	7,82	7,62
Estonia	7,74	7,68	7,68	7,61	7,74	7,85	7,85	7,79
Hungary	7,53	7,44	7,21	6,96	6,90	6,84	6,72	6,64
Latvia	7,37	7,23	7,05	7,05	7,48	7,37	7,31	7,25
Lithuania	7,43	7,36	7,24	7,24	7,54	7,54	7,47	7,41
Malta	8,39	8,39	8,28	8,28	8,39	8,39	8,39	8,15
Poland	7,30	7,30	7,05	7,12	7,47	7,09	6,83	6,67
Slovakia	7,40	7,33	7,35	7,35	7,35	7,29	7,29	7,16
Slovenia	7,96	7,96	7,69	7,88	7,57	7,57	7,51	7,50
Bulgaria	-	7,02	6,84	6,72	6,73	7,14	7,01	7,03
Romania	-	7,06	6,60	6,54	6,68	6,68	6,62	6,44
Croatia	-	-	-	-	6,93	6,93	6,75	6,63

Despite all these arrangements made with the Treaty of Lisbon, it is understood that the Union has not succeeded in solving the democratic deficit problem. The most important indicator of this is the democracy index of the member countries of the Union. When the democracy scores of the member countries are examined, it is seen that the score in the countries which are particularly affected by the economic crisis falls considerably. On the basis of the average of the democracy scores in the member states, the democracy score of the European Union is generally taken into account; It is observed that the score, which was 8.29 out of 10 in 2006, has fallen steadily until 2014, and it has fallen again in 2016 and 2017 despite the increase in 2014 and 2015. This demonstrates that the arrangements made with the Lisbon Treaty are insufficient to solve the democratic deficit problem of the European Union.

## 5. CONCLUSION

At the beginning of the 21st century, The European Union was very crucial during the democratic transformation of the European countries. However, there was also fear of losing the democratic notions of Europe. The Union was generally seen as the guarantor of democratic stability, because of the membership

rules and the other arrangements that were made during the 1990's. But some argues that the European Union itself is not particularly democratic. So the democratic deficit problem of the Union becomes more and more growing concern for both the European citizens and the European politicians.

The democratic deficit is one of the core issues of European studies. In order to solve the democratic deficit problem, the European Union has made some arrangements in its treaties. The most important of them are the European Single Act, the Maastricht Treaty, the Amsterdam Treaty, and the Lisbon Treaty. The term has been on the agenda of the Union since the European Single Act, and still, there is no consensus on solutions to the problem. The 2008 economic crisis and the Lisbon Treaty's entrance into force caused to the renovation of the EU's decision-making process and the increasing of the competences of the European Parliament. The Lisbon Treaty may have the most important regulations about solving the democratic deficit, but it is also not sufficient to bring EU citizens closer to the Union's policies and institutions.

The most important membership criteria of the European Union is a country that is being a democratic country. However, when we look at the democracy indexes, it is seen that the founding countries of the Union and the member states have some troubles in their national democratic rules because of the problems which can arise in times of crisis. But the European Union cannot be able to solve even the democratic troubles of its member countries.

The issue of the Union's democratic deficit is generally considered only as a gap between the Union and its citizens, but the democratic conditions in the member countries of the Union also negatively affect the democracy of the Union. Therefore, it is important for the Union not only to include citizens in the system but also to increase the level of national democracy in order to be able to solve the democratic deficit problem of the Union.

## REFERENCES

- Akgül Açıkmeşe, S.: Avrupa Birliği'nde Demokratik Meşruiyet Sorunu. Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi, Vol. 2. No. 4. (2003) 23-45.
- Ayaz, E.: Avrupa Birliği Anayasalaşma Süreci ve Lizbon Antlaşması'nın Demokrasi Açığı Sorunu Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, Vol. 11. No. 55. (2018) 213-224.
- Azman, K.D.: The Problem of "Democratic Deficit" in the European Union. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, Vol. 1. No. 5. (2011) 242-250.
- Crombez, C.: The Democratic Deficit in the European Union Much Ado about Nothing?. European Union Politics, Vol. 4. No. 1. (2003) 101-120.
- Dahl, A.R.: On Democracy. Yale University Press. (1998).
- Decker, F.: Governance Beyond the Nation-state. Reflections on the Democratic Deficit of the European Union. Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 9. (2002) 256-272.
- Dizman, A.O., Nas Özen, E.: Ekonomik Krizden Siyasi Bunalıma. TEPAV, (2012) 1-6.
- Ercan, A. ve Gürson, A.P.: Avrupa Birliği'nde Demokratik Meşruiyet Sorunu. Social Sciences Studies Journal. Vol. 3. No. 12. (2017) 2237-2242.
- Gürsoy, Y., Onursal Beşgül, Ö.: Avrupa Birliği'nin Tarihsel Gelişimi. [Historical Development of the European Union]. In Kaya, A. (ed.): Avrupa Birliği Hakkında Merak Ettikleriniz, Hiperlink Yayınları. (2013) 21-35.
- Gürsoy, Y.: Katılımcı ve Çoğulcu Demokrasi. Kaya, A. (ed.): Avrupa Birliği Hakkında Merak Ettikleriniz, Hiperlink Yayınları. (2013) 248-259.
- Hamarat Ercan, B.: Avrupa Bütünleşmesinde Sosyal Avrupa Gerekliği ve Avrupa Vatandaşlığı. Social Sciences Studies Journal. Vol. 3. No. 8. (2017) 413-424.
- Held, D.: Models of Democracy. Stanford University Press. (1999).
- Jensen, T.: The Democratic Deficit of the European Union. Center for Comparative and International Studies, Living Reviews in Democracy. Zurich. (2009) 1-8.
- Katz, R.S.: Models of Democracy Elite Attitudes and the Democratic Deficit in the European Union. European Union Politics, Vol. 2. No. 1. (2001) 53-79.

- Landman, T.: Developing Democracy: Shared Experiences and EU Intentions. International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, (2010) 1-14.
- Lord, C.: Does the EU Suffer from a Democratic Deficit?. *Intereconomics*, Vol. 43. No. 6. (2008) 316-340.
- Majone, G.: Europe's 'Democratic Deficit': The Question of Standards. *European Law Journal*, Vol. 4. No. 1. (1998) 5-28.
- Neunreither, K.: The Democratic Deficit of the European Union: Towards Closer Cooperation between the European Parliament and the National Parliaments. *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 29. No. 3. (1999).
- Poyraz, E.: Avrupa Birliđi'nin Sistem Sorunu: Kamuoyu Eksikliđi ve Demokrasi Açıđı. *Uluslararası Hakemli Beşeri ve Akademik Bilimler Dergisi*, Vol. 2. No. 4. (2013) 13-35.
- Quintas, C.C.: Assessing the Democratic Deficit in the EU: towards a Participatory Approach. *RIPS*, Vol. 14, No. 1. (2015) 63-82.
- Scharpf, F.: Economic Integration, Democracy and the Welfare State. *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 4. No. 1. (1997) 18-36.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit's Democracy Index. <https://infographics.economist.com/2018/DemocracyIndex/>, (02.11.2018).
- The Role of European Union Accession in Democratisation Processes. Democratic Progress Institute, United Kingdom, (2016) 1-77.
- Uşul, A.R.: Avrupa Birliđi'nin Demokrasi/Siyasi Şartlılıđında Çekme-İtme Dengesi ve bu Dengenin Bozulması. *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, Vol. 5. No. 17. (2008) 105-125.
- Yiđit, D.: Majone'nin "Düzenleyici Avrupa Devleti" Modeli ve Avrupa Birliđi'nde Demokrasi Açıđı Tartışmalarına Etkisi. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, Vol. 14. No. 3. (2014) 399-412