

**ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ ЖОҒАРЫ БІЛІМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ**

**«Л.Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ» КЕАҚ**

**Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың  
«GYLYM JÁNE BILIM - 2023»  
XVIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының  
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ  
XVIII Международной научной конференции  
студентов и молодых ученых  
«GYLYM JÁNE BILIM - 2023»**

**PROCEEDINGS  
of the XVIII International Scientific Conference  
for students and young scholars  
«GYLYM JÁNE BILIM - 2023»**

**2023  
Астана**

**УДК 001+37**  
**ББК 72+74**  
**G99**

**«GYLYM JÁNE BILIM – 2023» студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың XVIII Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы = XVIII Международная научная конференция студентов и молодых ученых «GYLYM JÁNE BILIM – 2023» = The XVIII International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «GYLYM JÁNE BILIM – 2023». – Астана: – 6865 б. - қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша.**

**ISBN 978-601-337-871-8**

Жинаққа студенттердің, магистранттардың, докторанттардың және жас ғалымдардың жаратылыстану-техникалық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардың өзекті мәселелері бойынша баяндамалары енгізілген.

The proceedings are the papers of students, undergraduates, doctoral students and young researchers on topical issues of natural and technical sciences and humanities.

В сборник вошли доклады студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и молодых ученых по актуальным вопросам естественно-технических и гуманитарных наук.

**УДК 001+37**  
**ББК 72+74**

**ISBN 978-601-337-871-8**

**©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия  
ұлттық университеті, 2023**

конфигурацияның пайда болу мүмкіндігін жоққа шығаруға болмайды. Қазақстанда Түркиямен өзара іс-қимылдың маңыздылығын оның АҚШ, Еуропалық Одақ және НАТО-мен саяси өзара іс-қимылы тұрғысынан да түсінеді. Өз тарапынан Анкара Қазақстанның ТМД мен Орталық Азиядағы ықпалы мен беделін бағалайды және оларды өзінің сыртқы саясаты үшін қосымша ресурс ретінде қарастырады. Екі мемлекет те Еуропаға ұмтылады. Егер Түркияның ЕО-ға кіруі орын алса, бұл ҚР-ның ЕО-ға жақындауына қосымша мүмкіндік береді, оны Анкара табиғи түрде құптайды және қолдайды. Қазақстан үшін бірден-бір маңызды мәселе түрік саяси жүйесінің исламдану бағытындағы одан әрі эволюциясының бұлыңғырлығы болып қала береді. Исламистердің жеңісі және Ататүрік құрған жүйені бөлшектеу Түркия ішінде де, халықаралық деңгейде де жаңа саяси шындықты тудырады.

#### **Қолданылған әдебиеттер тізімі**

- 1 Надеин-Раевский В., Сковорода В. Бизнес без зеленого знамени // Интербизнес/Деловые люди. М. Апрель, 1992. № 4(22).
- 2 Коммерсантъ-daily. 03.11.1992.
- 3 Пантюркизм живет и побеждает //nomad.su. 19.09.2006. — URL: Nomad.su/?a=3-200609190106
4. Catherine Putz, “Kazakhstan’s Nazarbayev First World Leader to Visit Post-Coup Turkey,” The Diplomat, August 6, 2016, <https://thediplomat.com/2016/08/kazakhstans-nazarbayev-first-world-leader-to-visit-postcoup-turkey>

UDC 327.7

### **THE ROLE OF POLICY NETWORKS IN SUPRANATIONAL GOVERNANCE PROCESSES IN THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Imandossova A.M.**

[aig.imandoss@gmail.com](mailto:aig.imandoss@gmail.com)

Master of Arts (International Relations)

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

The concept of policy networks in recent years has become one of new methodological approaches to the study of supranational governance as part of the global and regional policy. At regional level (the most prominent example is the European Union) policy networks have become an integral part of the functioning of the political-administrative mechanism and can be considered as part of a unified system of supranational governance that have been operating for a long time [1, p. 577-600].

Due to the difficulties in the process of making and the implementation of decisions in the European Union in the scientific environment, there is a certain emphasis on the informal mechanisms of this process, as well as on a complex multilevel nature of governance. Some of the authors go further and point out the network feature of the institutionalized system, or even talk about network form of governance in the EU [2, p. 233-243].

At the same time professor of Munich University Paul Thurner indicates, that from the point of view of the concept of political networks there is no need to make differences between formal

and informal practices and governance mechanisms, as well as institutes involved in these processes and actors [3, p. 591], which helps to reveal the nature of the EU beast [4, p. 53]

The issue of institutional structures' impact on activities of the policy networks deserves special attention. According to the research by M. Fisher and E. Ostrom, institutions influence the structure of the policy networks since they are able to both provide and limit the possibilities of participants in the negotiation process or cooperation [5, p.8], moreover, this phenomenon is most noticeable in the European Union, and apparently it is considered to be its "cultural feature" [6, p. 234-237].

It is appropriate to start reviewing the functioning of the policy networks in the European Union with designation of the main features of decision-making processes, as well as overview of the environment in which those networks are functioning, since this specificity defines key features of political process, which impacts the reason of their participation in political process at the EU level.

The most obvious peculiarity is the fact that the European Union is a supranational organization, comprising 27 member states, which voluntarily transferred half of their power.

According to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) there are three main types of competences:

1. Exclusive competences of the EU. Areas in which the EU alone is able to legislate and adopt binding acts. Member States are able to do so themselves only if given the powers by the EU to implement these acts.

2. Shared competences. The EU and its Member States are able to legislate and adopt legally binding acts. Member States exercise their own competence where the EU does not exercise, or has decided not to exercise, its own competence.

3. Supporting competences. The EU can only intervene to support, coordinate or complement the action of its Member States. Legally binding EU acts must not require the harmonisation of the laws or regulations of the Member States [7, p. 245-278].

Policy networks, due to the peculiarities of their functioning, are able to ensure the development of a more effective and, according to a number of researchers, more legitimate policies, since they do not rely on the resources of one institution and are not limited, unlike state and supranational institutions, in terms of authority or competence [8, p. 97].

Firstly, according to J. Kuiman, this is due to the fact that the network form of organizing the political process, which involves a wide variety of stakeholders, provides an opportunity to make it more inclusive and active, to identify possible problems and find solutions for them at earlier stages before they arise. In addition, the network form of organization has a higher degree of adaptability and flexibility, which is important in conditions of a high probability of changing the initial conditions [9, p. 37]. Secondly, political actors at the EU level often resort to a network form of interaction with existing contacts in order to avoid or mitigate the costs associated with collective actions in various policy areas [10, p. 632]. Thirdly, policy networks create conditions for the formation of a decision based on consensus, which helps to reduce the likelihood of possible dissatisfaction with the decision and impede its implementation. Fourth, policy networks are an effective tool for gaining access to resources (such as information or expertise) that are otherwise difficult or impossible to access [11, p. 29].

However, informal interactions at the EU level are largely limited and asymmetric and, therefore, do not meet the criteria of network governance, which implies an almost complete rejection of hierarchical structures, and that's why, in this case, it is more correct to name it as governance with the use of networks. In other words, considering high complexity of political

process in the European Union and the needs of its institutions in expert opinion for building a more effective policy and legislation, policy networks support the functioning of multilevel governance and operate in the shadow of hierarchy [12, p. 108].

The significant part of the work with groups of interest and a large proportion of network interactions in the EU falls on the European Commission. In this regard, it is necessary to mention the report of the working group of the European Commission Networking People for a Good Governance in Europe, which, in particular, stated that political networks are already part of the real practice of governance in the European Union, with a large number of stakeholders from a wide variety of areas involved [13, p. 249-250]. They have the necessary flexibility to solve complex problems affecting a wide range of actors belonging to different political cultures, which means that their balanced, rational usage can positively affect the legitimacy of the political process as a whole.

After examining fifty policy networks operating in the European Union and twenty of those which are in close contact with the European Commission, the working group identified four main types of them, based on the functions they perform:

1. Networks providing support and information to EU citizens and organizations about the Commission's programs or policies.
2. Networks created for consultations within elaboration or revision of a policy or program.
3. Networks created for implementation of decisions made.
4. Networks created for policy making.

A key advantage of such networks for the European Commission, is that its policies are presented and promoted by authoritative local representatives.

At the same time there are some disadvantages. Firstly, there may be differences in pan-European and local priorities, which can negatively affect the overall network efficiency in the context of relatively low influence of the European Commission and a lack of accountability and direct contacts. Secondly, the Commission does not have the ability to replace inactive or incompetent network members, which is important because these networks also lack a common identity and working practices [14, p. 251].

Unlike many conventional scientific concepts, which sometimes no longer fully adequately reflect the current practice of the decision-making process, the concept of policy networks provides scientists and analysts with tools for studying the informal sphere of functioning and interaction of social and managerial actors. At the same time, the concept of policy networks is not isolated, but, on the contrary, is successfully combined with other relatively new areas in political science, such as the concepts of global and multi-level governance, and some of its provisions are in many ways similar to the theory of pluralism and the theory of elites [15, p. 328-339].

At the moment, the concept of policy networks is becoming more and more widespread in relation to the study of the global level. The main lines of influence of policy networks on the processes of supranational regulation at the global level are primarily that they can become a kind of "safety net" that supports the activities of official bodies in cases where they are not able to quickly adapt to changes taking place in their environment.

Policy networks facilitate the development of a common position on various issues, i.e. contribute to the formation of global public opinion on the main agenda items. In addition, policy networks operating at the global level facilitate the first steps towards the institutionalization of formal mechanisms for global governance, "buying time" for necessary reforms in hierarchical structures.

Thus, with a high degree of probability, policy networks will play an increasingly significant role both in modern and future world politics, and the concept of policy networks will become an increasingly important methodological tool in understanding the processes of supranational governance.

### **Literature**

1. Farrell H., Héritier, A. Formal and Informal Institutions under Codecision: Continuous Constitution Building in Europe // *Governance*. 2003. Vol. 16(4). P. 577–600.
2. Hooghe L., Marks G. Unraveling the Central State. But How? Types of Multi-level Governance // *American Political Science Review*. 2003. Vol. 97(2). P. 233–243
3. Thurner Paul W. Networks and European Union Politics // *The Oxford Handbook of Political Networks* / J. N. Victor, A. H. Montgomery, M. Lubell (eds.). Oxford University press, 2017. P. 591.
4. Risse-Kappen T. Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union // *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 1996. Vol. 34. Is. 1. P. 53
5. Fischer M. Institutions and Policy Networks in Europe // *The Oxford Handbook of Political Networks* / J. N. Victor, A. H. Montgomery, and M. Lubell (eds.). Oxford University press, 2017. P. 8
6. Ostrom E. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Actors*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990; Ostrom, E. *Understanding Institutional Diversity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005. P. 234-237
7. Report of Working Group, Networking People for a Good Governance in Europe, May 2001 // *European governance – Preparatory work for the White Paper*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2002. P. 245–278.
8. Besussi E. Policy networks: conceptual developments and their European applications // *Center for Advanced Spatial Analysis. Working paper series (102)*. London: University College London, 2006. P.97
9. Kooiman J. *Societal Governance: Levels, Models and Orders of Social-Political Interactions* // *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy* / J. Pierre (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. P. 37
10. Berardo R., Scholz J.T. Self-Organizing Policy Networks: Risk, Partner Selection and Cooperation in Estuaries // *American Journal of Political Science*. 2010. Vol. 54 (3). P. 632.
11. *Policy Networks: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations* / B. Marin, R. Mayntz (eds.). Frankfurt, Boulder, Campus: Westview, 1991. P. 29
12. Börzel T. A. *European Governance: Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy* // Paper prepared for the European Union Studies Association meeting. Montreal, 2007. P. 108
13. Report of Working Group, Networking People for a Good Governance in Europe, May 2001. P. 249–250.
14. *Ibid.* p. 251
15. Klijn E.-H. Designing and Managing Networks: Possibilities and Limitations for Network Management // *European Political Science*. Vol. 4. P. 328–339.