The Role of the EU Education Policy within the Process of European Integration: Old Discourse in a New Battle

Resul Umit Yazici

Abstract

As the decreasing turnout rates at the European Parliamentary elections and the increasing number of failures in the European referenda lay bare, there is a gap between the Union and the citizens. This indicates a relative underdevelopment of the integration in social and political spheres compared to the fascinating success story in the economy. However, an economically driven process of integration needs and leads changes in these spheres to advance. In the face of a similar challenge, education was given the role of collective identity construction during the battle for national integration. This research focuses on the education policy of the Union. It aims to advance an understanding of whether the education policy is attributed to the role of supporting the process of European integration through the construction of a collective European identity. The relative lack of academic interest in the education policy in the process of European integration makes the conduct of this research timely. The limited competence of the Union and thus the inadequacy of the available data about the education policy form a high barrier to academic research. In order to overcome the barrier, this research adopts an interdisciplinary approach. Following the discourse-historical school, it critically analyses the discourse of the Union on education. The findings underline that the Union has been employing the old discourse of nationalism in a new battle for European integration. Therefore, the role of the education policy is not free from the function of the collective identity construction in the process of European integration.

Keywords: education, identity, integration, European integration.

Acknowledgements

Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

The relationship between the European Union[1] and the citizens of the Union is hardly an intimate one. The European integration started as a project of the politicians and civil servants rather than the peoples of Europe. The history of the European integration betrays a similar pattern throughout. It includes processes that have been developed far from and sometimes in spite of the people. This way of development eases the formulation and implementation of policies but comes at a cost of alienating the public from the whole process. As a result, European citizens have difficulties in identifying themselves with the process of European integration. This inevitably opens a gap between the Union and its citizens.

The gap becomes ever more unbearable with the decreasing turnout rates at the European Parliamentary elections and the increasing number of failures in the European referenda. The voter turnout rates at the European elections have been in constant decline since the first elections in 1979. This was recently seen earlier this year when the 2009 European elections reached at a record low turnout rate of 43 per cent (European Parliament [EP], 2009). This is an alarmingly low figure of voter interest for any polity based on democratic principles and legitimacy. What is even more alarming is the disapproval of those who voted in the recent European referenda. The Union failed to find acceptance for political constitutions with the referenda in France and the Netherlands in 2005 and in Ireland in 2008.

The low turnouts and failures indicate an asymmetrical development of integration. In this sense, besides the one between the Union and its citizens, there exists a second but relevant gap between different spheres of integration. The European integration is relatively

---

[1] The polity under analysis was first founded as the European Economic Community in 1957, then transformed into the European Community in 1967, and finally became the European Union in 1993. For the sake of simplicity, this thesis constantly uses the term *European Union*, simply the *Union* or shortly the *EU*, to refer to the polity in all these phases.

underdeveloped in social and political respects. The economy, however, is a completely different story. Since the very beginning, the integration has been more about economics than anything else. For instance, it was first called as the European Economic Community, which it was known as for a decade. Such an unbalanced focus inevitably brings an asymmetrical development as the economic transformation leads the way ahead. The European Single Market is the prime result of efforts to decouple the economic policies, where the integration is the most developed, from the other spheres falling behind.

Economic, social, and political spheres exist interdependently in a polity. It is not possible or desirable to exclude any of these spheres completely from a transformation process. A transformation in one of these spheres needs and leads corresponding alterations in the other spheres to advance. In this sense, the decoupling of the economic policies is not sustainable forever. As economics cannot be excluded from society, the Single Market requires more than decoupling to function adequately. This is where politics comes into the picture. Politics is the mechanism to resolve interactions between economics and society. Therefore, the Union is expected to develop strategies to deal with the two gaps defined above through the formulation of policies.

Having identified the problem in many documents, the EU works increasingly hard in order to close these gaps. Traces of the hard work can potentially be found in any policy area. Still, some policy areas are more apt to involving such EU strategies than others. Due to the characteristics of the gaps, these policy areas are the ones that have an effect on the ways people perceive, evaluate what they have perceived, and behave. The experience of nation-building proves that education has such an effect on perceptions, evaluations, and behaviour, or more precisely on collective identities. The characteristics of education, which are compatible with those of the gaps, make the education policy a potential area where the EU could formulate preventive courses of action. Moving from this idea, the thesis continues by defining the research focus, describing the overall aim and individual objectives, as well as highlighting the value of conducting such a study in the remainder of this chapter.

1.2. Research Focus

A major part of this research concentrates on the politics of education in the EU. To begin with, education is one of the agents of socialisation. Socialisation is a process that shapes identities in a society. Although there are various agents in this process, education stands out for being formal, standardised, and compulsory. Each member of a contemporary society has to come together in schools to learn through the standardised rules of formal life. As the socialisation process turns into something that is formal, standardised, and compulsory for everyone, the end results of the process, i.e. identities, tend to converge into something uniform. A common collective identity is the ultimate uniform structure that education contributes to a large extent. It is an important contribution since a collective identity holds a society together.

The term politics of education refers to the principles governed in order to achieve political goals through the use of education (Dale, 1989, p. 24). The fact that education is more than simply teaching things such as knowledge, skills, or technical matters, turns education into a policy area through which states can pursue political goals. If it is education that is shaping a collective identity, it is politics that decides what the shape of the collective identity should look like. The shape is expected to be in harmony with the wider political interests of the state. Education is just another policy area of the state and thus is subjected to the same political will as any other area (Cohen, 1971, p. 41). Historical experiences show that education is frequently associated with the aims of political socialisation during times of integration and polity-building.

All these characteristics of education and politics of education in particular give rise to interest in the education policy in the EU, which is itself a polity in making. Specifically, the gaps defined above create a further source of interest, as politics of education is capable of filling them with social constructs. The cooperation in education at the EU level, which started at the beginning of the 1970s, verifies the EU's interest in education. Building, developing, and executing a polity like that of the Union necessitates the transformation of *the peoples* living within its territories into *a community*, as in the case of any other polity. In meeting such a challenge, education policy is too crucial for the Union to be left out of the

process of European integration. This is the pivotal idea in this research, which has been used to formulate the overall research aim and individual objectives.

1.3. Overall Research Aim and Individual Objectives

The overall aim of this research is to advance an understanding of whether the education policy is given the role of supporting the process of European integration by the construction of a collective European identity. The education policy has been an important mechanism for states in the process of the formation of their own nations. Whatever the specific policy and programmes are, it is evident that the tools of such a policy have to deal with the socialisation process through which peoples turns into a community by developing a sense of belonging among the peoples. As an essential agent of socialisation with exclusive characteristics, education stands out as a possible policy tool that the EU may employ.

In order to achieve the overall research aim, this thesis intends to meet the following objectives:

- To discover the concepts of identity, integration, and education as well as the relationship between them;
- To theoretically discuss the role of education in the process of social and political integration;
- To explore the dynamics in the process of the European integration that could lead the education policy to have a similar role;
- To critically analyse the discourse of the EU on education.

All the individual objectives are crucial for achieving the overall aim of the research. To begin from the last one, discourses both determine and represent social realities. In the sense of the latter, the discourse of the EU on education is understood as an instrument, which represents the policy of the Union with regards to the role of education in the process of integration. However, in order to analyse a discourse, it is necessary to gain an insight into the context of the discourse under analysis. An exploration of the European integration,

which is set as the third objective, will make the linguistic codes of texts meaningful. Yet, neither an analysis nor a contextualisation can be solid without a theoretical base. A theoretical discussion of the role of education in the process of social and political integration will provide such a base for the analysis, synthesis, and finally the evaluation in this thesis. The first individual objective, discovering the basic concepts, is rather straightforward but still necessary to set the scene in the main body of work.

1.4. Research Worth

A study on the politics of education in the EU is worthwhile for a number of reasons. Firstly, education is a largely neglected field in political science in general. It seems that this field is mainly left to sociologists. Any analysis of education from the perspective of political science is a positive step towards the construction of a political science view on how education politics works. This neglect is even more noticeable in the context of the EU. Academic life is not independent from life outside universities, as the developments in these two worlds are closely related. Parallel to the relative underdevelopment of the European integration with respect to education, the education policy of the EU is somewhat under-researched. Therefore, there is scope for conducting research in this field. In this sense, this research is an attempt to dwell on an aspect which students of political science are not usually keen on.

The attempt to look beyond the ostensible makes the value of this research even more apparent. Students of political science have valid reasons for their lack of enthusiasm for the politics of education in the EU. First of all, education systems appear to be more rational, objective, and technical than ever. Education as a political tool of collective identity construction tends to be seen as bygone as the nineteenth century. More specific to the case of the EU, the Union legally has a restricted competence in the area of education policy. Even the restricted competence has been introduced relatively recently. Before the *Treaty of Maastricht* of 1993[2], there was not an explicit legal basis in this field. Such superficial factors impose limits on the understanding of education as an identity construction mechanism and on the ability of the Union to give the education policy a pertinent role in the process of

---

[2] The Treaty was signed in 1992 but entered into force in 1993.

European integration. The research deals with the challenge of these ostensible factors by critically analysing the official EU discourse on education. Critical discourse analysis is a powerful methodology because it gives a researcher the opportunity to look beyond the tip of the iceberg. Power relations may well be hidden. The assumptions of the critical discourse analysis are crucial in making some interconnectedness visible, which otherwise could easily remain under the guise of formal facts.

Finally, there is a rather personal value attached to this research. The researcher was educated under the Turkish education system, which is an extreme example of a politically biased education system. It is a kind of education system that is still more about politics than education. Pupils of various backgrounds have to swear together at the beginning of each school day that they are "Turkish, honest, hard-working" and that they would "sacrifice [their] presence for that of the Turkish nation". This is only one obvious example of the fact that the education system in Turkey is anachronistic. Hence, it is not surprising that there is increasing pressure for changes to be made. Change has long been identified with westernisation in Turkey. This identification is even more noticeable since Turkey became a candidate country of the Union. Any policy reform that ignores the perspective of the EU is somehow incomplete for a candidate country like Turkey. Specifically, the politics of education at the European level not only constitutes a theoretical alternative, but also incorporates a practical avenue for the politics of education in Turkey. In these senses, a study that focuses on the politics of education in the EU is born out of an intrinsic interest of the researcher, who would like to understand how the current state of the Turkish education system might change in the event of the Turkish accession into the Union.

1.5. Outline Structure

The introductory chapter has so far provided preliminary background information, clarified the focus of the study, specified the overall research aim with individual objectives, and highlighted the value of the research. It concludes with this final sub-section, which briefly outlines the structure of the thesis to be followed in the subsequent chapters. The following chapter is devoted to theoretical considerations. It is mostly composed of a thorough review

of the theories of nationalism with respect to three concepts: identity, integration, and education. However, the review is not limited to the theories of nationalism. In order to reach an in-depth understanding of these concepts and of the relationship between them, the chapter applies literature beyond that of nationalism on points such as the psychological bases of identification or the technical aspects of education. At the end of the chapter, the reader will have received a theoretical introduction to the role of education in the processes of social and political integration together with the dynamics that create such a role.

The third chapter fits the study into the theoretical understanding framed within the previous chapter. In this sense, it is an application of the theoretical considerations to the case of the EU. In particular, the chapter is composed of the efforts to explore the dynamics behind the European integration. If there are dynamics that are similar to those that have transformed education into an identity construction mechanism within the process of national integration, it would be possible to argue that the education policy may be given a similar role in the process of European integration. However, in addition to the similarities, the chapter also considers the differences. In this way, it complements the understanding of identity, integration, and education by applying the dimensions of post-modernity into the discussion.

The necessity of the third chapter can be better understood when the fourth chapter is considered, which is concerned with the methods employed to implement the empirical research in this study. It details the study proposal on the research strategy, the data and data collection techniques, the framework of data analysis together with the possible limitations of all these proposals. The chapter starts by elaborating the specific research objective that the empirical research is related to: analysis of the EU discourse on education. In cooperation with the overall research aim, it is this specific objective that determines the research methods employed in this study. In this sense, research methods are not matters of choice. They are as dependent on the research aim and objectives as they are interrelated among themselves. The chapter aims to justify the use of methodologies over these interdependencies. It also discusses the origins of the research methods, relates the

methods to data, and proposes the way the research shall be undertaken. In so doing, it does not ignore the possible limitations of the research methods employed.

The chapter on research methods is followed by the actual conduct of the research. Chapter 5 serves to the last individual objective of the thesis, as it reveals the results of the critical analysis of the discourse of the EU on education. The research concentrates on two main sources of discourse: official policy documents of the EU institutions as written discourse and individual contributions of the EU officials in the form of either written or spoken discourse. The chapter partakes in three main types of intellectual activity: brief descriptions of the data, a critical analysis of 39 texts from the discourse of the EU on education, and a synthesis of the analysis with the theoretical considerations of the earlier chapters.

The final chapter completes the synthesis initially started in the previous chapter, offers a self-evaluation, and concludes the study. It begins by reminding the reader of the overall research aim together with the individual objectives of the study. A summary of the findings and the conclusions drawn from these findings follow this section so that the reader has the opportunity to see the synthesis explicitly. Furthermore, this chapter also touches on recommendations, the contribution to knowledge, and self-reflection in the final sub-sections. Based on the possible avenues that arise from the conclusions drawn, this chapter offers a couple of recommendations for future research. There is another sub-section, which answers the all-important question of how the research has enhanced existing knowledge. Finally, the chapter ends with the researcher's reflections on the process that has been used to produce this work.

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

2.1. Introduction

Building or evaluating a theory is part and parcel of science. What makes theories so important in science is their ability to accomplish an understanding of a phenomenon. Accomplishing an understanding has never been easy due to the complex nature of realities. In this sense, nationalism is a good example. Even for Ernest Gellner, a leading theorist of nationalism, understanding nationalism is hard-fought because "there is almost virtually an inverse relationship between the self-image and self-presentation of nationalism and the actual reality" (1993, p. 19). Part of the problem arose by the misleading tendency to consider nationalism in marginal terms such as "a psychology of extraordinary emotions" or "dangerous and powerful passions" of extremists (Billing, 1995, p. 5). However, these are just the tip of the iceberg.

Involving in theories is an attempt to see the mass below the tip of the iceberg. The state of the mass and the tip of nationalism is clearly reflected in Billing's formulation of "banal nationalism", a concept which refers to the everyday practices of social life that connote the nation and thus constantly reproduce the national identity (1995, p. 6). Accordingly, people are continuously reminded of their national identity through not screaming but familiar elements in even the most stable nations. These elements, such as a national flag hanging in front of a public building, are so much a part of daily life that after a while people do not even notice them. To be precise, although the elements of banal nationalism that are sprinkled throughout everyday life do not really attract attention, they do penetrate the consciousness of people. Due to this sly characteristic of banal nationalism, the existence of nationalism is unquestioned while its power remains "unnoticed" (Ibid.). This is a characteristic which makes nationalism even more powerful.

Explanation of an observed phenomenon is another function of theories. Besides the rather passive accomplishment of observation, science necessitates an active contribution of explanation. To illustrate this with the example of nationalism, theories of nationalism do

not only accomplish an understanding of a phenomenon but also assist a researcher to explain why that phenomenon exists the way it does. Theories of nationalism are capable of such assistance, as "there is no nationalism without theory" (Billing, 1995, p. 63). The function of explanation further consolidates the importance of theories for research, because scientific research is based on the principles of both discovering and interpreting the discovered.

Nationalism is not a mere example in this study. Theories of nationalism compose a major part of the theoretical surface that the research is based upon. This chapter is the result of an attempt to understand the education in the processes of polity formation in order to explain the politics of education in the EU. It is an analytical review of the theories of nationalism with respect to three basic and related concepts: identity, integration, and education. Discovering these three concepts within the theories of nationalism is one of the individual objectives of this research. By this means, it is aimed to create a theoretical surface on which the study fits and makes sense. The discovery of the theoretical relationship between identity, integration, and education has the potential to shed light on the role of the EU education policy within the process of European integration.

Identity, integration, and education are rich and thus ambiguous concepts at the same time, as almost any concepts in social sciences. They portray different patterns in different contexts. For instance, as Seton-Watson noted in 1977, "many attempts have been made to define nations, and none have been successful" (p. 3). Since then, many other attempts have been made by more recent academics in the field such as Gellner, Anderson, and Hobsbawm. Still, it is not possible to agree on the best definition of the concept of nation. This is also the case with many other concepts in the field of political science in general, including the three basic concepts in this particular study. In order to gain an in-depth understanding of these concepts and of the relationship between them, this chapter applies literature beyond that of nationalism in some places. For instance, sections about the psychological bases of identification and technical aspects of education are the results of efforts to achieve such a depth.

2.2. Identity

Identity as a word is derived from the Latin *identitas*, which comes from the root *idem* meaning *the same*. Nonetheless, the contemporary usage of the word also includes the concept of distinctiveness at the same time. The concept of sameness can be stated as *A* being identical to *B*, whereas distinctiveness presumes consistency or continuity over time. Hence, the notion of identity concurrently establishes two relations of comparison, one being that of similarity, and the other that of difference. Likewise, Guibernau defines two criteria for identity: continuity and differentiation (1996, p. 73). For instance, the continuity of a national identity comes from the historical roots of a nation, while the distinctiveness of this historical entity forms the differentiation of that nation's identity from that of other nations.

Being a popular but ambiguous term, identity corresponds with a variety of meanings in different branches of the academia. It becomes further complicated within social sciences depending on the context employed. Throughout this thesis, the term is perceived as an element of social and political action. In the respect to this specific face of the term, as Brubaker and Cooper formulate, identity refers to the "processual, interactive development of the kind of collective self-understanding, solidarity, or groupness that can make collective action possible" (2000, p. 7). Despite the assumptions that identity of an average person develops simply within a very small circle limited to parents and close friends, identity formation is rather a complex and unstable process with the adaptation of modern and post-modern forms of social organisation (Cote, 2002, p. 1). If the concept of identity is to be examined within the framework of this connotation and perspective, the correct context to focus on would be the literature on nationalism. Guibernau argues that identities cannot be thought of outside the context of society (1996, pp. 72-3). Identity, in this sense, defines the relationship between an individual and society or the position of the individual within the society (Ibid.). When the characteristics of the society match those of nation, identity comes in the form of national identity.

2.2.1. Psychological Bases of Identification

Identification is a psychological matter as well as being social and thus political. Individual identities are important in the sense that a collective identity is composed of individual identities in the final analysis. Leaving aside the actual construction of the European identity, as Demossier explains, "any attempt to discuss what is meant by European identity requires us to take into account traditional and contemporary ways of self-identification" (2007a, p. 53). This is because individual and collective levels of identity are so "closely connected" that a comprehensive approach must take both levels into account (Calhoun, 2001, p. 39).

Psychological approaches to identity in general are based on the concept of internalisation. It is discovered that human beings absorb ideas, attitudes, or beliefs from the surrounding figures in their character in order to survive (Bloom, 1990, p. 50; Spiering, 1996, p. 110). This process, which continues from infancy to adulthood, is called internalisation. There is a psychological need for internalisation of symbols in order for individuals to identify themselves with a political structure. Such an internalisation practice does not emerge just because a political structure exists out there (Bloom, 1990, p. 52). As Bloom suggests, there is also a need for an active process of providing individuals with symbols and the necessary conditions for them to be able to internalise these symbols (Ibid., p. 59).

During infancy, internalisation is limited to the figures close to the infant, i.e. parents. Therefore identification is personal in this phase. Yet, adults can internalise things that are distant or abstract. Since personal figures are replaced by distant or abstract and thus communal ones, the process of internalisation turns into socialisation for adults (Spiering, 1996, p. 110). As a result of the processes of internalisation and socialisation, human beings become individuals, that is, they construct an identity. However these processes of identity construction are not untouched. In the search for ideas, attitudes and beliefs to incorporate within themselves, human beings are mediated by, what Habermas calls, "identity-securing interpretive systems" (1975, p. 69). An identity-securing interpretive system is a factor that affects the identification processes in a way that people tend to identify themselves with certain things whereas they abstain from some others (Ibid.).

Psychological approaches to identity concentrate on the reasons behind the nature of identification. Their concept of internalisation is an important contribution to the understanding of identity. However, as socialisation replaces internalisation, there is a need for socio-political approaches to consolidate this understanding. Socio-political approaches to identity deal with the social and political factors that affect the processes of identification, in other words, identity-securing interpretive systems. The latter set of approaches is of relevance to the research, which is in a sense an inquiry into whether politics of education is part of a European identity-securing interpretive system. Hence, the theoretical considerations on the concept of identity continue within the socio-political approaches to identity. In so doing, the chapter gradually concentrates on national identity since, as Spiering puts, "nation-state is the optimal 'identity-securing interpretive system' which man has created for himself" (1996, p. 110).

2.2.2. Socio-Political Bases of Identification

There are normally both relative agreements and basic disagreements in any field of theory. The scholarship on identity could not agree more on one main point: the important role of common characteristics in creating and holding a society together. These are the characteristics of a collective identity. However, it is not possible to say the same for naming or ranking these characteristics. In other words, there is a disagreement in the literature about the defining characteristics themselves. The literature on identity formation betrays a divide between the biological-ethnical and political-cultural perspectives. This divide emerges as a result of different perceptions of the connection between superstructure, i.e. identity, and base (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000; Cederman, 2001; Moore, 2001).

On the one hand, a group of scholars of the so called essentialist perspective claim that the connection between the identity and base is a strong and relatively direct one. So much so that, the emergence of the social and political collective identity can be seen as nothing but a mechanical result of the *cultural raw materials* or *identical assets* such as biology, ethnicity, or human nature. On the other hand, there is another group of scholars composing

13

the constructivist perspective, who disagree with these basic essentialist claims. The constructivist perspective discovers that the connection between the identity and identical assets has been weakened and broken by the involvement of the economic, social and especially political elements in the process of identity formation. Since this study is based upon constructivist presumptions as opposed to essentialist ones, a further analysis of the divide is necessary.

The concept of identical assets is a good starting point in relation to the essentialist approach. It is a basic concept for this school of thought since essentialists consider identical assets as the determinants of any collective identity. The essentialist approach claims that it is the identical assets that produce a collective identity. Moreover, the relationship between a base and the superstructure, or an identical asset and the collective identity, is defined in a straightforward manner. It is a definition that does not leave much room for the factors of the formation of collective identity. For example, it is alleged that an ethnic core as an identity asset is bound to lead a group of people into a particular collective identity. In the absence of necessary identical assets, there is nothing much that can be done to construct a collective identity. Although there are some essentialist views which leave the door slightly open to some mediating factors in this analysis, it would not be wrong to argue that the one-way understanding of essentialism is too absolutist and conclusive to expand the theory to anywhere.

Out of the other identical assets that essentialists define, ethnic core deserves special attention. If it is not the only identical asset, it is certainly seen as the strongest base in holding the collective identities firmly in the ground. Anthony Smith, one of the leading scholars of nationalism and ethnicity, claims that national identity is based upon ethnic core, which he calls "ethnie" (1986, p.21). According to Smith, each nation is born on and developed around an ethnie which come into being as "myths, memories, values and symbols" (Ibid.). In view of that, national identity is "the continuous reproduction and reinterpretation of the pattern of values, symbols, memories, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of nations" (Smith, 2001, p. 18). Having said that, Smith deliberately stays away from an approach entirely based on ethnicity. Ethnicity in Smith's terms has more cultural elements than biological ones. For example, according to Smith,

dimensions of ethnicity are a collective name, a common myth of descent, a shared history, a distinctive shared culture, an association with a specific territory, and a sense of solidarity (Ibid., p. 22). Smith's emphasis on the ethnic components of nations does not support the idea that national identities are primordial or immutable (Moore, 2001, fn. 18).

It is easily realised that there is a distinction between the strong and soft notions of collective identity within the literature. According to Brubaker and Cooper, a strong collective identity entails a clearly defined boundary between the well-built homogeneity inside and the sharp distinctiveness from others outside (2000, p. 10). Based on concepts like gender, race, and ethnicity, such a structure is compatible with the essentialist perspective of identity. Yet, as the title clearly suggests, the soft understanding of identity rejects the strict structures mentioned above. An understanding of identity is considered as soft when the collective identity is associated with the adjectives "multiple, unstable, in flux, contingent, fragmented, constructed, negotiated" (Ibid., p. 11). In other words, the identity base is thought as soft enough to be constructed within such perspectives as constructivism.

The constructivist approach rejects the categorisation of particular essentials as indispensable property to the collective identity. Instead of strictly limiting the identity formation with any type of core assets, constructivism observes the societal features as artefacts that are "moulded, refabricated, and mobilized in accord with reigning cultural scripts and centres of power" (Cerulo, 1997, p. 387). For instance, in Gellner's famous words, "it is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way around" (1983, p. 55). This is why constructivists object to the essentialist idea that there is continuity from priory ethnic groups to contemporary nations (Anderson, 1983, p. 9). The essentialist approach simply ignores the discontinuity caused by the dominant political discourses in history. Constructivist thought in the nationalism literature leaves a much larger space for the elements in between the identical assets and identity. With an emphasis on the transformative effects of the political process, constructivism replaces the one-way understanding of essentialism with a multi-dimensional one. In other words, there is not an absolutist link between cultural raw material and political identities but a process which reformulates the raw material. According to constructivists, such as Gellner, this reformulation process is the basis of identity construction, a process through which

intellectuals and political activists manipulate and mobilise the cultural raw material (Cederman, 2001, p. 142).

The nature of collective identities leaves a great space for social construction. Compared to personal identities, collective identities are rather "fluid" which makes it possible for the collective identities to be socially constructed (Moore, 2001, p. 9). Returning to the base and the superstructure example, constructivist thought emphasises the importance of the formative stage of a structure. The same base may give rise to different superstructures developed under different conditions. For instance, Guibernau defines national identity as "a psychological phenomenon heavily influenced by the political discourse of nationalism" (2001a, p. 88). Here Guibernau underlines the role of politics in the formation of a collective identity. State intervenes in affairs that shape a nation-wide collective identity in the process of nation-building (Guibernau, 2001b, pp. 242–68). The nature of collective identities, which the constructivists explain with the concept of consciousness, is open to such interventions.

2.2.3. Consciousness and Collective Identity

Collective identities are constructed out of consciousness. Due to the complexity and magnitude of communities, it is not usually possible for a member to personally meet the other members of the community. Moreover, because a political community is a living entity, it covers the past and future as well as the present time. For the members living in the present time, the past and future are periods that are out of direct observation. In such communities, there exist physical spaces among the members and between the members and the community as a whole. These physical spaces are filled with consciousness, imagination, and belief. This is a clear pattern that can be observed in any community, in which human relations are beyond the direct contact limits.

A community is abstract rather than concrete. In Cohen's words, "community is largely in the mind. As a mental construct, it condenses symbolically, and adeptly, its bearers' social theories of similarity and difference. It becomes an eloquent and collective emblem of their social selves" (1985, p. 114). As the community is an abstract entity, identification with a

16

community is a matter of consciousness. Parekh puts these two concepts together nicely in his definition of national identity as "a matter of moral and emotional identification with a particular community based on a shared loyalty to its constitutive principles and participation in its self-understanding" (1999, p. 69). These views of community and identity move collective identity away from identical assets towards the minds, in other words, collective consciousness.

The dimensions of a nation make national identity a good example for the role of consciousness in a community. National identity is a form of consciousness that enables members of the same nation to imagine themselves as a unified community. Anderson defines a nation simply as "an imagined political community" (1983). National identities are imagined because "even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson, 1983, p. 15). Similarly, emphasising the role of belief in nation-building, Miller notes that "a nationality exists when its members believe that it does" (1993, p. 6). These are the constructivist notions that challenge the essentialist formulation of collective identity around identical assets. A collective identity can still exist without a common identical asset or despite a dividing one if a collectivity of people can imagine themselves as members of a distinctive community.

Consciousness can be constructed. It is this very characteristic of consciousness that opens collective identities to political interest and thus action. According to Parekh "every political community tends to, and needs to, form some general conception of the kind of community it is and would like to be, what it stands for, how it differs from others; in short, some view of its identity" (1999, p. 66). Politics comes onto the scene in order to decide on the view of the collective identity and to mobilise the community in line with the political view. This process is at the heart of the construction of a collective identity. For instance, nations are constructed "by the way of talking and thinking and acting that relies on these sorts of claims to produce national identity, to mobilise people for collective projects, and to evaluate peoples and practices" (Calhoun, 1997, p. 5). In other words, construction of a collective identity refers to the creation and implantation of the way a community imagines itself into the minds of the members of that community. These imagined, or in other words invented

17

or constructed, aspects of social life in time turn into social facts, which then bounds the members of the community to follow.

As a final point on consciousness, it should be noted that collective identities are based upon collective consciousness. The constructivist emphasis on consciousness is open to the misinterpretation that nationhood is an individual matter. Agreeing with the constructivist thoughts on the importance of consciousness for national identity formation to some extent, Canovan feels the need to underline that nationhood is not a matter of personal choice (1996, pp. 54-5). To the contrary, national identities are the products of collective consciousness. Therefore, except for rare cases in which individuals deliberately choose their nationality, collective consciousness dominates over the process of the creation of national identity. Consequently, it is not the personal but the collective consciousness that attracts the political interest of identity construction.

To summarise the theoretical considerations on identity, the notion that identity is an element of social and political action is the key. It is instinctive for young members of humankind to internalise the primary others such as parents. As internalisation turns into socialisation in later ages, people develop the ability to identify themselves with distinct things. They come to feel that they are part of a larger community which is out of their direct observation. The community and thus their identity live in their consciousness. This is a structure that leaves a large space for social and political factors that affect the process of identification, in other terms, identity-securing interpretive systems. The second part of the theoretical considerations examines the scope of collective identity construction. It is an analysis of how nothing else but the nation-state has come to be the optimal identity-securing interpretive system.

2.3. Integration

Collective identities are multiple as people live in different circles of numerous communities. A possible set of circles around an academician, for instance, could range from an academic community as well as a local, regional, national, and European community, to the world as a

community respectively. People can and actually do identify themselves with various combinations of communities at the same time. Still, some of these collective identities are usually felt more strongly than others. Since collective identities are constructed, the question of which one of these collective identities becomes the foremost collective identity is closely related to the question of the most advantageous identity-securing interpretive system. A strong collective identity makes the system of the circle advantageous whereas the advantageous system has more power to construct a stronger collective identity for its circle of community. For example, national identity owes its dominant position among other collective identities to the advantageous position of nation-states in world politics. Then again, nation-states would not be that advantageous if national identities were not stronger than other collective identities. This close relationship puts the level of collective identity construction at the centre of academic attention.

Integration is a fundamental concept in answering questions on the level of collective identity construction. Collective identities provide communities with sameness within their borders and differentiation from outside. At the same time, inner unity and outer differentiation are the defining features of social and political integration. In this sub-section, the thesis deliberates the theoretical considerations on national integration in order to understand the construction of the foremost collective identities by the most advantageous identity-securing interpretive systems. In an attempt to create a theoretical surface, the thesis adds a modernist approach to the above detailed constructivist one.

2.3.1. Modernity and National Integration

Constructivist and modernist approaches to collective identity are highly compatible schools of thought so much so that these titles are used interchangeably in academic texts. Modernism is based upon "an understanding that nationalism is all about the construction and contestation of concepts of identity in the social conditions specific to modernity; that it is, in this sense, essentially political" (Periwal, 1995, p. 229). This is a purely constructivist way of perception. However, there is more to modernist thought. The contribution is made

in line with the notion that the motive behind the construction of national identities is the political process aiming to accommodate the changes of modernisation (Hobsbawm, 1975, p. 84). This contribution makes modernist thought one of the most common lines of constructivist approach to nations, nationalisms, and national identities.

Nations, nationalisms, and national identities are shaped by broad historical processes. Nationalism as a transformation and particularly the national identities as outcomes are the products of modern history. The national form of identity stood out in this specific period of history due to the characteristic elements of modernity: the processes of industrialisation and bureaucratisation (Moore, 2001, pp. 76-7). In other words, categorisation of the collective identities finds its ideal at the scale of nations within the process of modernisation. Modernisation is a process which both necessitates and creates an integrated political community.

Gellner explains the emergence of national identity as a result of the transition from agrarian to industrial society. In the nineteenth century, the level of the necessitated community was above that of the agrarian societies. The transition to industrial society opened the door to urbanisation. As production moved from workshops in small villages to larger industrial sites in cities, increasing numbers of people left their countryside to work and live in those cities. By this means, industrialisation caused the melting of traditional communities of localities within a larger, and possibly national, society (Birch, 1989, p. 36). However, the core of this explanation cannot be reduced to the economic relations of the transition. In Gellner's theory, the process of industrialisation neither refers to the production in technical or economical terms nor to the *relations of production* in Marxist terms (Hroch, 2006, p. 26). Gellner is rather interested in the changes that the industrialisation process brought to the preceding traditional way of life. Therefore, it is a holistic approach composed of the social and political as well as the economic changes that this transition brought about. To be more precise, the argument is that the standardised pattern of economic and administrative activities in an industrialised society naturally creates homogeneity among its members.

There is a drastic difference in the role of culture between agrarian and industrialised societies. While culture is the organising principle of industrial societies, kinship structures

do not leave any room for other principles to rule the agrarian societies. Moreover, in agrarian societies, culture is heterogeneous; it shows important discontinuities between neighbouring settlements as well as between the elite and lower ranks in each settlement. However, because communication is not crucial for the functioning of agrarian societies, such heterogeneity does not cause major problems within pre-modern societies. Besides, agrarian societies are based on stability rather than mobility. However, industrial societies have to be mobile in order to sustain economic growth.

The process of industrialisation created its dynamics for change not only in an economical sense but also in social and political senses. In any sense, communication and mobility were the two main changes that modernisation brought together. To begin with, one of the aspects of the industrialisation process was the intensification of social communication within the transforming societies. This aspect had long been missing from the studies of nationalism until Karl Deutsch came up with a criticism of nationalism on the basis of the social communication system (1953). According to Deutsch, the leading scholar to examine the impact of social communication on nation-formation, "the ability to communicate more effectively, and over a wide range of subjects, with members of one large group than with outsiders" lies at the heart of any nation (Ibid., p. 71). In this sense, nation is a group of "people who have learned to communicate with each other and to understand each other well beyond the mere interchange of goods and services" (Ibid., p. 65). This is a formulation that regards the historical progress of nationalism as a result of effective social communication in communities. Underlying the role of social communication within the process, Deutsch agrees on the idea that the process of industrialisation mobilised the societies in line with nationalism (Ibid., p. 100).

In addition to social communication, mobility was another important change that industrialisation created. The isolated and segmented structure of agrarian societies was not convenient for mobility to develop. For instance, communication, which is the mobility of ideas in a sense, was very much limited compared to modern societies. Thus, the change was deep and widespread, ranging from the mobility of ideas to that of individuals themselves. In a society under the effects of such a mobilised process of industrialisation, social communication turns out to be a key element. A homogenous society is a prerequisite for

mobility and communication. If a society is marked by heterogeneous divides, such as by disunion of languages or classes, neither the ideas nor the individuals can be effectively mobile.

Modernisation brought standardisation of life to the preceding highly hierarchical agrarian societies, in which there had been a discontinuity between the different social classes (Moore, 2001, p. 77). There was relatively less homogeneity in agrarian societies. The life of a peasant was drastically different from the life of his or her lord in an agrarian society in the Middle Ages. For instance, as Moore illuminates, even the languages that each of these classes spoke was different in many cases (Ibid.). Moreover, while the lower classes were mostly illiterate, the upper classes of the society were composed of literate and educated people. Hence, there was a "cultural discontinuity" within the agrarian society which minimised the communication between and to an extent within the social classes (O'Leary, 2001, p. 23). Such a lack of communication was sustainable for the structures in agrarian society. However, it is contrary to the dynamics of modernisation.

The dynamics of modernisation shuffled the structures that were typical to agrarian societies and contrary to the modern ones. The increase in communication and mobility introduced an analogous change in the size of the societies. However, this process was not all deterministic. The deterministic integration of agrarian societies into modern ones was further supported within the processes of nation-building, the planned activities of government (Birch, 1989, p. 37). Birch defines nation-building as a deliberate practice of replacing sub-national loyalties with a national one (Ibid.). This practice was possible through the national institutions developed to make use of the natural flow of political socialisation. As a result, nation-states became the primary locus of collective identification with modernisation.

2.3.2. Nation-State and its Biggest Myth

The central features of the modern restructuring of societies are territory, autonomy, and identity (Schmitter, 1996, p. 217). These are the main blocks that a nation-state builds on. The formation of a nation-state is, then, the process of building or strengthening this structure, where one or two of the blocks are missing or weaker than the other(s). Forming the most advantageous polity size to fit all is not quite possible (Dahl & Tufte, 1973, p. 138). Regions, nations, and localities each have their own reality. However, this does not prevent theoreticians from hypothesising the functionality of the nation-state. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was a wide hegemony of the idea that the nation-state was "the only viable political organisation worthy an age of liberalism and enlightened politics" in Europe (Mommsen, 1995, p. 211).

Unlike any other socio-political structure of pre-modern times, nation-states clearly define the spaces of their own. Their boundaries and thus territories are undoubtedly marked. This is compatible with the modernist view that there should be clear-cut boundaries around the categories such as nation, race, or ethnicity (Giroux, 1992, p. 54). Universalism and consensus are among the central concepts within the discourse of modernism. Accordingly, there is a uniformity and consensus within the boundaries of a nation-state whereas there is a complete differentiation with the outside of these boundaries. Within every inch of these boundaries, at least in theory, the state enjoys autonomy.

Sovereignty in general and especially the monopoly over the economy and politics within their territories enable the state to wield enormous influence over a society. These two features are the source of a third one, namely, collective identity. The existence of identity depends on the distinction between *self* from *others*. If there are no *others*, it is not possible to define *self* or *us*. This is true for collective identity as well as personal identity. The division between *us* and *others* is clearly marked by the borders of the states in the case of national identity (Grosvenor, 1999, p. 246). While borders separate the national units from each other, they also provide unity and cohesion within themselves. In this sense, boundaries are crucial for the existence of national identities.

The existence of clear-cut boundaries drawn between people gives rise to the misperception that the people who fall in the same boundaries are perfectly homogeneous. Homogeneity has always been one of the characteristics that the nation-state needs. Since nations do not homogenously exist in nature, the nation-state has to eradicate the elements causing heterogeneity within the territories of the state (Guibernau, 2001b, p. 258). In order to do so, in Guibernau's words, "it [does] not hesitate to apply thorough measures ranging from forced assimilation to repression, discrimination, or even mass deportations of people and genocide" (Ibid.). The history of individual nation-formations in Europe frequently involves efforts of one of the nations dominating the others within the borders of a state (Ibid., p. 249). As Guibernau exemplifies, the history of nation-formation in Spain and Britain are the ones that first spring to mind; the Spanish nationality dominated the Catalans, Basques, and Galicians while the Scots, Welsh, and Cornish were Anglicised in Britain (Ibid.).

The borders of states do not usually overlap with those of nations. There are borders that cross nations and thus that leave parts of nations in different nation-states. Others, despite not dividing nations, force more than one nation to live in a single nation-state. Examples of these situations can be found in the Member States of the Union, and indeed everywhere in the world. Despite the fact that the borders in Europe have never been completely settled, as Davies proposes, "present day nations and regimes have a strong inclination to believe that they and their forebears have possessed their present territory since time immemorial" (1999, p. 39). It is controversial how much nation-states were homogenous even at their peak times. Under the dynamics of the twenty-first century, pure homogeneity of a nation-state is nothing more than obsolescence. However, monoculturalist approaches perceive differences as a threat to the unity of a society. Accordingly, unity is a must for a functional society. In this sense, society cannot function unless the differences are melted within a common culture. Unity can be held through consensus among the members of the society. It should be noted at this point that, as Kincheloe and Steinberg reveal, consensus means the successful domination of differences by the so-called common culture in monoculturalist terms (1997, p. 4).

The construction of a single national identity is one of the abilities stemming from the territorial and sovereign nature of the nation-state. Myths have a special role in the

construction of a national identity. The biggest myth of the nation-state is that there is a national identity shared homogeneously by all the people living in the state (Guibernau, 2001b, p. 259). As the term myth connotes, all the people living in any state have never been completely homogenous. However, the term also connotes a common belief on the pure homogeneity of nations. Originally heterogeneous masses falling in a state territory come to believe that they form a homogenous community as a result of the social reproductive policies of the state.

2.3.3. Social Reproduction of Nations

The theoretical considerations on integration in general and national integration in particular dovetail well with the concept of social reproduction. Social systems are not fixed or static. They are living structures that are at the same time reproducible (Barel, 1974, p. 93). As Barel puts it, the process of social reproduction entails both the "dying off of and emergence of social forms" (Ibid., p. 94). The modernist approach to collective identity defines how the transition from one to another social form arises due to the natural reactions to the conditions the society lives in. In addition to deterministic interactions, there are also interventionist policies leading to the social reproduction of systems. Nation-state politics of homogenisation includes the intended efforts to intervene in the essentials and relations of the social transformation, as the very meaning of the word reproduction betrays.

First and foremost, it needs to be noted that the society is a complex totality. This is one of the notions that differs the constructivist approach from the essentialist thought which perceives the society to be rather simple and stagnant. A society which involves various structures, institutions, and processes is complex in nature. The complex nature of society is open to production and reproduction as collective identities are constructible and reconstructible. The emergence of national identity is a good example of such a social reproduction. An economically originated transformation of previously agrarian societies created a parallel transformation of collective identities. The new economic wind of industrialisation blew the social structures above and beyond the agrarian societies. The

result was a new and newly dominant collective identity for society matching the level of new economic integration.

A second feature of social reproduction depends on the significant role of social institutions that have the capacity to transform the society. Processes of social reproduction are led by interventionist as much as deterministic developments. For instance, economic, social, and essentially political institutions interrupted the relatively simple relations of the pre-modern society and constructed a modern one. There was no place in this transformation for the links that the essentialists claim to exist naturally between an ethnic core and the identity. It is mainly the political institutions that give a society its complex form. The state obviously has a special place among these institutions. The State, as the political authority of the societies, influence the social transformation processes. As in the case of nation-state formation, the political authority may support the processes of social reproduction initiated by an economic transformation.

National identities are a result of deterministic transformation supported by interventionist policies. This is a process of social reproduction of previously heterogeneous collectivities of people into comparatively homogenous nations. The pure homogeneity is a myth because "it is nationalism which engenders nations, and not the other way around" (Gellner, 1983, p. 55). Still, the historical facts, that a relative homogeneity is reached out of heterogeneous collectivities and that nations stay together although they are not purely homogeneous, substantiate the constructivist arguments. If collective identities were not constructible or societies were not reproducible, nations would not emerge out of the divided and disconnected collectivities of agrarian societies.

As a final feature of social reproduction, the theory can be narrowed down to the specific position of the educational institutions within the social reproduction processes. Both the literature on social reproduction and nationalism include an essential section dealing with the mass-based instruments of identity formation. Specifically, "more than anything else", the public education stands out with "a central function not just as a knowledge producer but also as a creator of citizens" among the institutions of the modern society (Cederman, 2001, p. 140). Studying the relationship between the educational institutions and the society

at large, it is discovered that the public education plays such a significant role in the formation of the society that any formulation in the public educational sphere has the potential to affect the structure of the society (Morrow, 1995, p. 9). The third sub-section of the theoretical considerations is devoted to the concept of education as a mechanism of social reproduction in the process of social and political integration.

2.4. Education

The development of printing was a cornerstone in the formation of nations in Europe (Guibernau, 1996, p. 66). Before this development, there had been hegemony of the Latin language on the limited number of writings in Europe, which formed a barrier in front of national languages. However, the hegemony of Latin was shattered after developments in printing. Helping to end the hegemony of Latin in the first phase, mass printing gradually led to the expansion in vernacular languages and literature (Ibid.). According to Anderson, printing gave birth to "popular vernacular nationalism" by crystallising and formalising the oral images and symbols that unifies the nation together (1983, p. 29).

If the development of printing is one of the cornerstones, the other that followed and complemented it was the improvement in literacy in European societies. The former would not mean much if it were only the elite classes who could read and write, which was the case in Europe before the fifteen century (Guibernau, 1996, p. 66). According to Guibernau, there was a strong relationship between literacy and the development of nationalism in nineteenth-century Europe (Ibid., p. 69). Guibernau shows that the European states developed their nationalist propaganda more successfully in areas where the literacy rates were higher than the areas with illiteracy in the nineteenth century (Ibid.). In the meantime, literacy has been widely secured over Europe.

Education is basically the transmission of knowledge and skills such as literacy. Education of this sense is as old as humankind. The appearance of the concept of education within political theory has a long history as Gutmann successfully sets the review out by referring to Plato and Locke (Gutmann, 1998, p. 28). In his *The Republic*, Plato emphasises education as

27

necessary for "a state that aims to establish a constitutive relationship between individual and social good based on knowledge" (Ibid.). Centuries after Plato, John Locke used the verb *to educate* as a synonym for the verb *to govern* in his *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, which is a good indicator of the connection between education and politics not only at the level of language but also at the level of political theory (Ibid.).

However, the concept of universal education is a relatively new one as it necessitates a systematic organisation through which all the young members of the society receive many years of formal schooling (Gardner, 2004. p. 235). It is possible to find some formulations of compulsory public education systems in the early historical phases of nation-formation of almost all the European states (Bartolini, 2005, p. 84). The very first examples of public education appeared in Prussia back in 1763 and it had started to spread throughout the continent at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Ibid.). Industrialisation started to create a functional need and a social desire for education. As a result, the practice of education expanded from a small group of intellectuals to the masses of middle and working class people of early industrialisation at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Mallinson, 1980, p. 46).

The influence of public education on the society has become a central part of the nation-building process since the nineteenth century. The integration of masses as a nation is demanding as it necessitates an "intense creative activity" (Thiesse, 2007, p. 16). There is a need for "mechanisms that produce social cohesion and consciousness, and strengthen the will to accept and exercise the rights and duties" (Ruegg, 1993, p. 48). Education well fits into this definition. As Galtung proposes, "the school is used to reinforce the nation where there is one, to create one where there was none in advance" (1981, p. 274). Education is capable of creating culturally unified people out of many peoples who have previously been culturally diversified (Spring, 2004, p. 3). It helps the citizens develop the ability to imagine themselves as part of the community. Education of this sense differs from the basic definition, which is worth conceptualising.

2.4.1. Politics of Civic Education

The basic differentiation in education is between the philosophic education and civic education at the theoretical level. To begin with the philosophic education, it is enough to look the word education up in any dictionary. In other words, philosophic education refers to the core of education in the sense that it deals with the scientific phase of the education. There is no intention for distortion in this phase; the classical aims of philosophical education are searching for and the transformation of the truth as well as training the people in order to let them reach the capacity to conduct rational inquiry (Galston, 1998, p. 44). Although it may be hard to distinguish in practice, the civic education clearly differs from the philosophical education in theory. Being the education "within, and on behalf of, a particular political order", the function of the civic education is not the pursuit of the truth but the creation of a society in which the members "effectively conduct their lives within, and support, their political community" (Ibid.). In this respect, to the degree that *the politically correct* moves away from *the truth*, the civic education also differs from the philosophical education in practice. Moreover, because the politically correct tends to change more easily, drastically, and quicker than the truth does with respect to time, place, or even world view, the civic education is varying, whereas the philosophical education is relatively universal.

Civic education, by definition, can best be employed in the societies where the state in general and the political authority of the government in specific are legitimised as superior to the any kind of social association with respect to the formation of the society. However, when the subject of discussion is the contemporary liberal states, as in the case of Europe, where the public authority is restricted with various delimiters such as individual or community autonomy and rights, the boundaries and characteristics of the civic education are not that clear cut. Still, this does not mean that there is no civic education within the liberal societies. It is quite the opposite; the civic education may and usually does find a place within the education policies of liberal democracies (Galston, 1998, p. 50). The argument that there is no need for civic education within the liberal states has been greatly challenged. Accordingly, even though the liberal democracies stand on the idea of individual

rights and spheres limiting the public authority, at least the formation of liberal citizens who can maintain this liberal framework requires the civic education.

Civic education has the potential to be the most significant element of identity formation (Smith, 1991, p. 118). In this sense, both the existence and content of civic education are relevant: the former is important for the spread of literacy via primary education whereas the content of the education is a crucial further step (Ibid.). Guibernau defines four "vital" variables within the national curricula that enable the education policy to affect the formation of national identity as content of history, choice of language(s), choice of religion(s), and presentation of the others (2001b, p. 265). Creating loyalties within the hearts and minds of students is not limited to certain classes such as civics but rather expanded throughout the entire education system (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 293). As Kymlicka formulates, "the aim of educating citizens affects what subjects are taught, how they are taught, and in what sorts of classrooms" (Ibid.).

There is another but parallel differentiation in theories of education, the one between education politics and politics of education. The concept of education politics has come to be associated with the effectiveness of the policies governed (Dale, 1989, p. 24). In this sense, here the focus is on the stage. However, politics of education refers to the backstage. Rather than focusing on the effectiveness of policies in the area of education, politics of education necessitates placing the attention on the "relationship between production of the goals and the form of their achievement" (Ibid.). For the state, education is more than what it means to the students. In addition to the definitions that can be found in any dictionary, education is a policy area through which the state pursues political goals. Despite the formal aspects of education within the classical meanings of teaching, such as knowledge, skills, and technical matters, rather informal aspects related to nation-formation have come to the forefront from the states' point of view (Bartolini, 2005, p. 86). The creation of a unified nation and of a sense of legitimacy, which would tie the unified nation to the state, has always been among the most significant political aspects of public education.

Education is an area of public policy. As in any other policy area, it is natural to see the reflections of the wider political interest in education policy (Cohen, 1971, p. 41). In this

sense, the state is not expected to follow a different policy in education than the ones followed in other areas. In Cohen's words, "to expect that a state will allow its schools to serve aims other than those of the national political structure is to expect that a state will not behave like a state" (Ibid.). Notwithstanding politics of education, the state ideology is presented in the form of common sense within education. The notions related to the nation are promoted through public education as something natural and thus something beyond the sphere of politics. These notions are treated as if they are absolute truths that cannot be challenged. However, this is far from the truth in most cases. The symbols, history, and thus the identity that the national education promotes are those of the elite of the dominant nation in a state, which are frequently in conflict with those of others living in the same state, such as minorities (Bartolini, 2005, p. 86). Education composes one of the "vertical contact" channels between the elite at the top and the masses at the bottom of the society (Ibid., p. 81). The spread of education to the masses meant that the message of the elite, composed of myth, symbols, and all other identity creation elements, could reach a larger share of the society, who would thus imagine themselves as a collective community.

Civic education and thus the politics of it are justified with the need for citizenship education. Citizenship is the legal status of belonging, while national identity is the sense of belonging to a polity. Citizenship, as a legal status, is earned by birth in most cases. However, it is not inherited. In other words, citizenship necessitates learning (Oliver & Heather, 1994, p. 27). The rights and duties that citizenship is associated with and the way that citizenship relates the individual to the state are among the aspects of citizenship that a citizen has to learn. In order to realise their legal status as citizens, "they must develop certain attitudes, learn certain knowledge and acquire certain skills" (Ibid., p. 148).

The link between citizenship and education is obvious once the concept of citizenship is defined through the aspects of rights and obligations. These aspects of citizenship depend on knowledge (Heater, 2004a, p. 343). The more the individual is informed about his or her rights and obligations, it is claimed that the *better*, more *suitable*, and more *active* citizen he or she will be. Citizenship education is a concept that refers to the educational process that prepares the individuals for the relationship with their society and state. For instance, liberal-democratic nation-states provided the most effective circumstances for the process

of industrialisation to develop in the nineteenth century. Within these newly emerging polities, both the organisation of masses as nations and the governing of these masses according to the principles of liberal democracy necessarily gave birth to the formulation of the education policy (Oliver & Heather, 1994, p. 148).

It is crucial for the functioning of a democratic system that its citizens are aware of their rights and duties. In this sense, there emerges the need to educate the citizens so that they can participate in politics. Literacy has a basic importance for the development of citizenship. For the state, literacy is the tool with which it can communicate to its citizens and teach them how to be a *good* citizen. For the citizens, literacy is a crucial tool for learning their rights and claiming them from the state. Participation is one of the most crucial aspects of liberal democracies. Regardless of whether it is understood and practiced within a wide or narrow margin, participation is indeed a distinguishing aspect for liberal democracies. Citizenship is the legal answer to the questions of who can participate in a political system and of what the responsibilities and duties of those authorised to participate are.

Citizenship education is frequently mentioned as *education for citizenship*, the terminology emphasising the aim of learning. This terminology is an element of the *learning for approach* to education, which refers to the process of gaining and development of skills for a particular purpose. As having an emphasis connotes, there is a value attached to this approach. Citizenship is a political concept and status (Heather, 2004a, p. 349). The nature of the citizenship concept involves values and mind-sets in a close relationship with social and political culture. This relationship has inevitably opened the citizenship education to interest of politics (Ibid., p. 346). As a result, citizenship education is an area where there is a significant political concern and actual influence.

As it was formulated during the processes of nation-building in the history, one of the aims of the education for citizenship was "to shape the minds of pupils for political and social purposes" (Heater, 2004a, p. 131). By and large, the education for citizenship instils into students the confirmation of and the adaptation to the political settings and status quo with the sense of belonging to the nation (Ibid., p. 132). The basic motivation behind such

formulation as education for citizenship is the instinct of "self-survival" (Griffith, 1998, p. 31). Griffith emphasises that not only the totalitarian but also the most democratic states seek "to promote the values of their society and to prepare young people for their role in it" while formulating their education policy (Ibid.). Although educating the society about citizenship is common in many states, the concept of citizenship itself, in other words, what is taught at schools under the guise of citizenship education may differ in line with the ideology and interests of the state (Ibid., p. 32).

Even if an educational curriculum does not explicitly include the concept of citizenship education, it can still give education for citizenship to the students implicitly. Citizenship education can be given as a cross-curricular matter as well as a particular subject or a section of a subject during schooling (Oliver & Heather, 1994, p. 158). Given explicitly or implicitly, as a separate or cross-curricular subject, education for citizenship is one of the most crucial aspects of schooling, which involves the formation of political identity due to the close relationship between citizenship and political identity. As Oliver and Heater propose, "an individual who is grossly ignorant about political and legal affairs and/or deeply prejudiced against social, cultural or religious groups to which he or she does not belong can hardly be considered to be an effective citizen" (Ibid., p. 152). Collective identity formation is about destroying the prejudices that exist in society in order to build a single community that matches the borders of the state.

2.4.2. The Interdependency between the Economy and Education

Public schooling of the masses emerged at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It is not a mere coincidence that the emergence of public schooling occurred at the same time as industrialisation and national formation. As Dale proposes, "the major motor of educational change in capitalist societies is the changing nature of the capitalist state" (1989, p. 45). In the nineteenth century, the basic function of education was the provision of "future economic and political success of the state alongside its social stability and the social, intellectual and moral development of its citizenry" (Coulby & Jones, 2001, p. 23). Education

was used as a tool to meet the functional needs of industrialisation. Before the process of industrialisation, the concept and the practice of education were very limited. In addition to the education of the elite, which was rather private, the churches had been in control of education in some parts of Europe. Therefore, the emergence of public education had to include a conflict over the education between the church and the state in the areas where the church had been controlling the education (Ibid., pp. 15-6). France is a classic example of such a historical conflict in Europe.

Mass education had a central role in the transition from traditional to modern society (Ferry, 2005, p. 227). Before the initiation of public schooling, education used to take place through informal institutions within the personal circle of each individual such as family or fellow countrymen. Because of its dependency on oral and personal or local traditions, there used to be great variations with respect to knowledge across a society. The industrial revolution saddled the state with a responsibility to adapt itself to the changes and challenges brought by the revolution. Mass education was used as a tool to build national unity by the state to adapt itself to these changes and challenges (Ibid.). For instance, it needed to enhance the smooth functioning of mobility within the society by opening up the mechanisms for social communication. In this sense, education was a crucial tool used in order to create common bases for communication (Ibid.). As Ferry exemplifies, unification of the knowledge through classes like history and geography or of the language through the standardisation of writing and speaking were among the historical outcomes of the role of education in the transition from traditional to modern society (Ibid.).

Homogenising role of education is a necessity of economic growth as well as a future of political choice (Gellner, 1987, p. 102). A modern society is mobile in the sense that there occurs the flow of both abstract and concrete forms of realities. For instance, both ideas and people are mobile in a modern society. In addition to physical mobility, people are mobile across as well as within the divisions of labour. Moreover, even the most stable sectors need to communicate with at least the others in the economy. This is only possible if education starts with a generic phase in which everybody gets the same and basic education. The generic phase of education provides the necessary grounding to lay specific foundations on. For instance, be it primary or elementary, compulsory education starts with such a phase in

all education systems. It forms the whole compulsory education in some states. In any case, the specification in education starts only after this generic phase.

It is inevitable that a progress in economic integration necessitates policy coordination in other areas including education policy (Habermas, 1994, pp. 29-30). Hence, education and economy are two interrelated policy areas in a state (Spring, 2004, p. 3). This is why, for instance, it is the so-called national interest what rules the education system in a state (Mallinson, 1980, p. 54). Approaching economy as a value, citizens are taught that the economic system that the state favours, be it economic liberalism or communism, has a comparative worth among others (Spring, 2004, p. 3). Therefore, citizens are raised to be loyal to the economic system. Approaching economy as a practice, schools are the places that prepare the citizens "to fit onto the economic structure" (Ibid.).

Emphasising the role of educational institutions within the process of modernisation, Mallinson argues that schools are "agents of urbanisation" in the sense that educational institutions adapt the masses to the conditions of urbanisation (1980, p. 46). Education promises an engagement of the successful students to the society by awarding a leaving certificate. Knowledge is at the core of education. Within the analysis of politics of education, it is usually kept separate from the role of education in nation-building. However, knowledge, as a commodity, is related to the nation-building process. For the well functioning of an economy, knowledge needs to be as mobile as other commodities. It can be mobile provided that there is a set of standardisations so that the knowledge can flow all around through the channels of communication. Channels of communication can exist among individuals who have had the same kind of formation throughout their schooling years. In other words, there is a need to talk the same language, not only of the linguistic sense but also of other elements of identity such as values, understandings, or even ideologies.

2.4.3. Organisation of Education: Standardisation of Content and Methods

The organisation of education, through education policy, primarily involves the standardisation of content and methods (Spring, 2004, p. 2). Cohen defines education as "the inculcation of standardised and stereotyped knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes by means of standardised and stereotyped procedures" (1971, p. 36). Under these standardisations, people spend a significant part of their life within the steps of education. Moreover, the average time spent in education is increasing as more students choose to have a higher education after completing the compulsory education. A student faces the state whenever he or she attends the school directly through the symbols of the state, such as the flag, and indirectly through the rules of the school. As Spring points out, the rules of the school are a sample of the rules of the state that a student faces outside the school (2004, p. 10).

Education is an agent of socialisation. One of the most essential differences of socialisation through education is that it is standardised. It composes the formal part of socialisation in the life of citizens since public education is standardised by the state. However, socialisation through other agents, such as family, peer groups or media, is not standardised but varied. As the actors of this kind of socialisation are first and foremost the family and peer groups, the process is potentially dissimilar for different members of a society. This is especially obvious during the primary socialisation, where children are basically related to their parents or relatives within the wider family. Unstandardised processes of socialisation result in varying identities rather than a uniform one.

Education is the "predominant mode of shaping the mind" in societies which successfully completed the transformation from pre-modern to modern societies (Cohen, 1971, p. 36). It socialises the masses in particular ways (Torres, 1998, p. 15). Students are lead towards some specific orientations and kept away from some others. There is no need to look for an explicitly stated aim of an education policy in so doing. As Torres explains, it is even true for the most democratic states on the earth (Ibid.). While preparing the students for a

democratic social life, democratic states are in the position to decide on the socialisation process of the students.

To begin with, the content of education is standardised through the use of a national curriculum. In order to do so, government bodies prepare textbooks for different branches of education. As Coulby defines, curricula are "knowledge systems which can play an important part in the shaping of identities and in the production and reproduction of cultural and political practices" (2000, p. 249). Knowledge, values, and skills taught at school are so organised that they lead the citizens towards developing a sense of belonging to the community they live in. However, as Dale argues, where the education systems are concerned, the "reality differs somewhat from the formal picture" (1989, p. 46). Concentrating solely on the formal curriculum may cause the reality to be missed. For instance, as Dale catches, mathematics is not formally one of the subjects that must be taught in England (Ibid.). However, it traditionally is a must everywhere within the country. This is an example of the fact that traditions do matter in the area of education. Traditions that education systems have long been forming could be more important than curricula in some cases. Symbols, myths, and memories of nationhood are so embedded within the education systems throughout Europe that even though these elements of nation-formation are not formally included within the curricula, they could still have an effect within the education systems to a certain degree.

One of the most fundamental traditions of education is that it involves both formal and hidden curriculums. In addition to the official curriculum of education systems, there is also a hidden curriculum which covers all the other sets of elements, rules, and traditions used as a part of schooling. The hidden curriculum involves the "material culture of schooling" composed of a large variety of items that symbolise the community (Grosvenor, 1999, p. 248). Grosvenor cautions that the true potential of education in the construction of collective identity cannot be assessed by concentrating only on the formal curriculum (Ibid.). In this sense, a comprehensive approach must also include the hidden curriculum of the education systems.

The education policy, like other policies, refers to a process as much as to a statement (Trowler, 1998, pp. 48-9). The practical process may differ from the statement on some occasions as the implementation of policy statements is a complex process (Ibid., p. 49). The role of public education has always been "far beyond the transmission of knowledge and skills", which is usually the formal statement (Picht, 1993, p. 85). As Coulby puts, "it is in schools and universities that the cultural and epistemological underpinnings of national identity and nationalism are produced and reproduced" (2000, p. 246). By and large, as Bernhard advances, "[education] inexorably attempts to gain autonomy over personal and social life experiences" (2005, p. 192).

In addition to what students are taught, Spring emphasises that the way the things are taught is crucial as well (2004, p. 4). What makes it more standardised is that, as developed in Europe, education is also compulsory for everybody. It is the state that both funds and organises the education for the masses. It is known that the identities of children are constructed by "often unequal" resources available (Osborn et al., 2003, p. 149). In this sense, vividness is among the "distinct advantages" that states have in formulating national identities (Smith, 1992, p. 62). Safa distinguishes schools from any other public institution of a society as "the school is the only national-level public institution in which all members of society, theoretically at least, should spend some years of their lives" (1971, p. 211). Children enter the system of public education at an early age. They are still at the very beginning of constructing their own identities when the state takes them over from their parents. Since the concept of nation is imaginary not concrete, like most of the concepts of religions, there is a need to teach the people to "believe" in it (Spring, 2004, p. 5).

Attending an institution of public education is one of the most basic and intense "common experiences" that the members of a nation have in their life (Spring, 2004, pp. 4-10). The common experience of schooling includes passing through the "rituals of statehood", such as flags, maps, and anthems, which "link the individual to the idea of a collective *people*" (Ibid., p. 10).[3] Education takes places in designated buildings divided into classrooms. Spring argues that the classical organisation of public mass education, which brings all the children

---

[3] Emphasis in the original.

together and puts them under the sole control of the state, "provides the opportunity to mould entire generations to serve political and economic interests" (Ibid., p. 2). Grosvenor likens the organisation of the students within separate classrooms to the organisation of nations within national borders (1999, p. 247). Schooling of children in classrooms is thought to help the sense of belonging together to develop.

Education passed through a kind of secularisation process in Europe during the nineteenth century. The control over education moved from church to state in line with modernisation. In France, this transition occurred more suddenly after the French revolution (Guibernau, 1996, p. 67). Therefore, children started to be educated to love their *fatherland* rather than their *Lord* (Hroch, 2006, p. 29). Within the first couple of decade immediately after the French Revolution, there emerged a clear divide in education between state and religious schools in France. This divide was not only limited to administration but also reflected in the substance of education provided. For instance, in the state schools, the students were taught to support the Republic, whereas students of Catholic schools were instructed to approve of the monarchy. This caused a great deal of concern to Napoleon Bonaparte, who made it public in as early as 1805 that:

> There will be no political stability so long as there is no teaching body based on stable principles. So long as children are not taught whether they must be republicans or monarchists, Catholics or free thinkers, etc., the state will not constitute a nation but will rest on vague and shifting foundations, ever exposed to disorder and change. (Quoted in Herold, 1955, p. 118)

The Republicans reorganised the curriculum of the secular schools around the concept of nation in order "to render concrete, palpable, and emotionally resonant the previously distant and abstract notion of France, and so to surround patriotic duty with a penumbra of dignity and grandeur" (Brubaker, 1992 p. 107). As a result, in addition to military service, compulsory education was one of the two mechanisms employed in the "making of Frenchmen" after the Revolution (Ibid., pp. 104-10). The French Revolution made use of the fact that education functions like "one enormous sorting device" which situates the children within different parts and layers of a society (Galtung, 1981, p. 272). The education that a child gets is very much decisive in the future of the child. It is one of the roles of education to

help the children "to locate themselves" within their environment (Coulby & Jones, 2001, p. 11). The location, be it in their region, state, or in the world in general, that a children finds himself or herself has a direct relation with the identity he or she will develop.

2.4.4. Education and Nation-Building

Theories of nationalism have a special place for education. Joseph notes that mass education is "necessary" for the continuation of social heritage because it opens up ways for the transmission of national traditions and knowledge (1929, p. 118). According to Guibernau, education is one of the main tools of nationalism to reach the people (1996, p. 71). There is a variety of elements and strategies that states employ to create a national identity, which may change from one state to another or from one occasion to another in a single state. However, what remains common is the need for a tool to spread the word of these elements and strategies. In this sense, education is a key instrument available to states for disseminating the strategies of nation-formation such as impressing a national image on the people's memories with symbols and rituals (Guibernau, 2001b, p. 258). Education is capable of creating senses. In Joseph's words, "the sense of being nation, of being bound together and distinguished from other groups" is among the senses that education creates (1929, p. 116).

Although constructivism and essentialism approach collective identity from different perspectives, the significance of education in the process of nation-building is one of the rare points they seem to agree upon. A modern education system forms a vital part of the nationalising process as "mass education alone can endow its citizens with self respect and a sense of identity" (Gellner, 1983, p. 36). In Gellner's theory, the public system of education is evaluated as the essential element for instilling ardent feelings in the members of a nation. Smith furthers the argument by adding that the aim of a public education system is to "unify [people] around certain shared values, symbols, myths and memories" (1998, p. 41).

Education is one of the nation-building instruments that strengthen the structural changes made at the top of the society. It makes these changes "acceptable and permanent" by opening up ways to penetrate from the very top to the very bottom of a society (Wintle,

1996a, p. 17). As Guibernau notes, whenever there has been a historical occasion to redraw the map of the continent since the emergence of nationalist movements in Europe, such as the periods after each world war, education came to be the policy area that the nation-states concentrated on (1996, p. 71). That is also why the polities that are relatively young are more likely to be involved in the political aspects of education. The history of the European states shows that the processes of state formations included efforts to reform education systems in their initial phases (Green, 1990, p. 80). This is not just a mere coincidence, but also a result of the fact that education is "an important and integral part of the whole project" of state formation (Ibid.). State formation is more than just building the government. Government without the people who are willing to be governed by that government is meaningless. In other words, the construction of a nation is a part of state formation. This is why the practice of state formation necessitates the formulation of public education.

The role that is attributed to public education in the process of nation-building implies a "change of ontology" in the sense that it is based on the transformation of the conceptions of the individuals about the members of their society (Enslin, 1998, p. 364). Such a change of ontology has two features for two different levels. The first feature, as frequently mentioned, is the notion that these members of the society are tied to an upper structure, which is the nationhood. Secondly, the belief that they are tied to a certain national identity causes a moral change among the citizens so that the members of the same nation start to behave towards one another on moral grounds, which brings a relative homogeneity in the society. In other words, as with any other kind of membership, being a member of the society enforces on the citizens a set of moral obligations to their fellow nationals.

The basic function of schooling is literacy education, which is indirectly used as a communication tool for "national agitation" (Hroch, 2006, p. 28). Furthermore, literacy is taught over the "proper form" of the national language (Langman, 2006, p. 71). As Langman points out, this form is created subjectively to support the hegemonic national identity against others, such as minorities, within the society (Ibid.). Although Renan, like many other scholars of nationalism, believes the importance of consciousness in forming a nation, he draws attention to a different aspect of consciousness (1939, p. 190). In this sense, collective

consciousness includes forgetfulness as well as remembrance. For instance, with the standardisation of language of instruction in national schools, children do not only learn the national language but also tend to forget other dialects. The choice of language for education is the first and foremost step in nation-formation. The imposition of a single language as the proper language of instruction is an exclusive approach that causes a possible falling, if not dying, of other minority languages (Guibernau, 1996, p. 70). In such a case, it is not only the language but also the very existence of minorities that fall under the threat of assimilation (Ibid.). Guibernau instances the change in French politics to "one people, one nation, one language" with the Revolution, which aimed to put an end to the linguistic diversity that six million people had enjoyed before the revolution (Ibid.).

The change in French politics is just one example of how education is both indirectly and directly used to serve the aspirations of the state (Hroch, 2006, p. 28). The public education emphasises the national view through not only the context but also the language used. Formal schooling in general requires an adaptable standard, that is, a national language that transcends local dialects. In these aspects, the process of education reconciles the cultural diversity of the members of the society with national unity by encouraging interaction among the members, which in return greatly helps the emergence and development of a common identity as a sense of nationalism (Enslin, 1998, p. 363).

On examining the historical period that gave birth to the emergence of nationalism, Guibernau notes that "to be outside of the limits of the nation meant, first and foremost, that one was unable to understand and be understood" (1996, p. 67). This pattern has kept its validity at a large extent throughout the centuries. The foreign, as a concept, still includes the language element which is at least different if not incomprehensible any more. As Flora et al. argue, the process of nation-building does not only need a standardised national language to be used at home but also one other or others for communicating over the borders (1999, p. 171).

Deutsch lists education as one of the leading formal "social channels of communication" that nationalism employs to control the lives of people living in a particular society (1953, p. 78). Communication, by the very definition of the concept, necessitates the existence of

commonalities between the parties. A common language is at the core of these commonalities, which is standardised and taught through mass education. The standardisation of a language is a political process, in which standards are created by the elite and expected to be recognised by the public (Flora et al., 1999, p. 171). Historically, the process of standardisation passed through two main phases. Firstly, among the languages spoken in a society, one of them stood out as the national language. Having been supported by the government as the official language, these languages gained predominance over the others. Secondly, the national languages are further standardised in themselves by alphabetisation via the introduction of initially mass printing and then education (Ibid.).

History may provide as many dividing elements as uniting ones for people. Renan stresses that a nation-building process may necessitate "getting the history wrong" if the history of the society has witnessed experiences that are potentially dividing for the people in the society (1939, p. 190). That is why "no serious historian of nations and nationalism can be a committed political nationalist" (Hobsbawm, 1992, p. 190). In order for these people to form a community, underlying the historically uniting elements is not always enough. There usually appears the need to cross the dividing elements out. During the formation of nations in Europe, the diversities and the heterogeneous structure of the societies were ignored in order to make all the members of a society imagine themselves as a single community. In this sense, the imagined communities of the modern era are situated on the assumption of a strict differentiation between *us* and *them*, where *we* are the same and homogenous whereas *they* are completely different and usually inferior. In accordance with this sense, public education may take no notice of the differences within the society. To the contrary, in some cases, it intentionally disguises diversities where they exist.

Nationalism is akin to religion in the sense that both are composed of "a set of beliefs of common origins, specialness and destiny, and rituals, patriotic pledges, songs, anthems and celebrations" in order to be able to unite the masses under an identity (Langman, 2006, p. 72).[4] Because these elements are based on knowledge, they require informational activities

[4] Nationalism is compared to a religion on different occasions by various scholars. One of the first examples of this can be seen in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, where Durkheim examines the similarities between religious and national festivals (2001, p.285).

such as teaching and learning. This is why the church had deliberately gained ascendancy over education before the political modernisation of the nineteenth century in Europe. For the same reason, the state needed the ascendance, though with a slight difference: education has been used to serve the needs of nationalism rather than religion since the change of ascendancy to the state.

Modern education moves from the assumption that there is one and only one correct answer to the questions asked. Students are expected to believe that there is only one correct answer and the answer itself. Such a universalistic understanding in education has its reflections on the socialisation of the children. Students of modern education are taught that "there is only one correct way of behaving within the society as a whole-no matter where one goes within its borders-and there is only one standard of loyalty to the state" (Cohen, 1971, p. 43). For instance, education involves persuading the citizens that the boundaries of the state, which are politically drawn and in most cases disputed, are unquestionably valid (Spring, 2004, p. 3). Students are taught that the boundaries of their state exactly match the boundaries of the people, as if all the people falling within the boundaries form a unity which is completely different from the ones falling out (Ibid., p. 10). They also learn that the land surrounded by these boundaries is only theirs whereas the others have their own land somewhere outside (Coulby & Jones, 2001, p. 14). In this sense, public education tries to instil a state of homogeneity within the state territories which are taught to leave *the others* outside. In order to do so, this understanding ignores and tries to eliminate the diversity within the territories, whereas it differentiates the outsiders even in the cases where the state territories involve part of an outsider nation.

Langman notes that the "well-studied student will not only know his/her nation's history and geography, but how his/her nation is a little different, perhaps a lot better than others, especially those on the border" (2006, p. 72). Still, the use of national education in nation-building has different sides. In societies where the existing cleavages tend to continuously deepen, a firm education policy in favour of unity can work as a defensive tool in the long term (Birch, 1989, p. 43). Moreover, in democratic multinational states, education undertakes "a dual function" of promoting identities (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 314). That is to say,

while education favours the identity of a national constituent, it can at the same time be used to promote the transnational identity above all the national constituents.

2.5. Conclusions

The theoretical framework of this study is composed of three basic concepts of theories of nationalism; namely identity, integration, and education. Identity is understood in this study as an element of social and political action. There are two further underlying assumptions in this understanding. Firstly, identity has an effect on the ways people perceive, evaluate what they have perceived, and behave. These effects make identity attractive for politics, which has an interest in these matters. Moreover, identity is not given but constructed. The latter assumption turns the political interest into political involvement as the malleable nature of identities enables politics to change the ways a society perceives, evaluates, and behaves. Socialisation does not only change these ways but also unifies them. Human beings are able to internalise elements that are distant or abstract and thus common. A collectivity of human beings comes to identify themselves with the same ideas, attitudes, or beliefs that are different from the elements of identification for another collectivity. They become increasingly similar in themselves and equally different from the others. In other words, collective identities are integrative. This is why collective identities are closely related to the social and political integration of people.

Education is an agent of socialisation. As any other agent of socialisation, it has an identity construction effect on society. However, it stands out among other agents of socialisation for being formal, standardised, and compulsory. These aspects equip education with crucial powers to change the ways a society perceives, evaluates, and behaves. Moreover, education is also governmental. It is the political will to standardise the compulsory education system for all the members of a society. To put all these together, education is not only a powerful identity construction tool but it is also wide open to the interest of political authority. Such interest comes into existence as the politics of education in more or less any political system that is involved in the construction of a collective identity.

When all these concepts are handled in analytic and argumentative modes of exposition, there emerges a strong theoretical surface on which the remainder of the thesis can be built up. This is exactly what this chapter has started to do. Achieving the second individual objective of the study, the chapter has moved beyond the conceptual relationship towards a theoretical one. This theoretical surface sits on two basic presumptions. Firstly, a process of radical economic change imposes parallel transformations on society. The process of industrialisation is a good example in this sense. Industrialisation was a process that moved the level of economic integration above the level of the then existing agrarian societies. The new level of nations had a much bigger scope composed of numerous and various agrarian groupings. As a result, the level of social integration started to move towards the new level of economic integration. The emergence of national identities matching the level of economic integration was an important consequence of this move. Secondly, politics gets involved in the change by mobilising the society for the new formation. In other words, the deterministic change is supported by the interventionist policies. National identities did not only emerge naturally but were also constructed by political authorities. Due to the crucial role of education in identity formation, the education policy was at the centre of identity constructive interventions of political authorities. Nation-states used education as a standard way of socialisation in order to transform previously divided and heterogeneous communities into nations with a collective identity.

So far the thesis has clarified the three basic concepts and discussed the role of education in the process of social and political integration. So much so that, the thesis now has a clear stand on the what, how, and why questions regarding the role of politics of education in the processes of national integration of modernity. However, the focus of this study is on the politics of education in the EU. The European integration is neither national nor modern. Can the role of the education policy still be understood with the presumptions of theories of nationalism? The answer to this question is hidden in the dynamics and characteristics of the European integration. Therefore, in order to place the presumptions of theories of nationalism in the particular context of the EU, the next chapter is devoted to the contextualisation.

CHAPTER 3: CONTEXTUALISATION: APPLICATION OF THE THEORY TO THE CASE OF THE EU

3.1. Introduction

The methodology follows the chapter on theory in a traditional thesis layout in social sciences. The traditional sequence is interrupted in this thesis for the reasons related to the research methods. Firstly, the chosen research strategy necessitates a preliminary familiarisation with the case before any analysis is performed. As an attempt to analyse the case in depth, this chapter defines the dimensions of the case by applying the theoretical considerations to the EU. More to the framework of analysis, the chapter provides the context of the discourse to be analysed soon after. The true meaning of a text can only be understood within its context as is widely agreed by the different schools of critical discourse analysis. However, as a case study within certain academic limitations of Master's degree, the thesis diverges from the discourse-historical school: instead of repeating the technical information on the EU, it concentrates on application of lower range theories relating the general theoretical considerations to the specific case of European integration. In so doing, the thesis contextualises the case rather than the EU, which is compatible with the problem-oriented nature of critical discourse analysis, and thus serves the third individual objective. All these methodological assumptions are discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The characterisation of a phenomenon inevitably tends to vary if the phenomenon is perceived as only one of its kind. Such a perception neutralises the theories that could otherwise help with understanding the phenomenon. Academic studies on the EU, which noticeably tend to include normative aspects, show a great deal of discrepancy with respect to the nature and future of the EU. The characterisation of the EU as a sui generis polity contributes to the discrepancy, ranging from federalism on the one hand to a kind of inter-governmental cooperation on the other hand. This chapter is composed of the efforts to explore the dynamics behind the European integration and particularly to understand whether these dynamics are similar to those that transformed education into an identity construction mechanism within the processes of national integration.

3.2. Replicating Nation-Formation

Increasing interdependencies across borders have been causing some alterations to the character of nation-states. As a result, nation-state sovereignty is no longer as strong as it used to be due to the "intensification of international interconnectedness" (Guibernau, 2001b, p. 242). The strict division of the world into nation-states has been blurring in a transformation process dominated by interdependency. As this process takes us into a post-national era, there emerge question marks on the optimality of nation-states in our age. According to Beetham, the nation-state is "increasingly out of step with the necessities of the world in which we actually live" (1990, p. 219). In Bell's popular terms, it is "too small for the big problems of life, and too big for the small problems of life" (1987, p. 14).

These developments evoke the fate of the communities of the pre-modern times. Agrarian communities were replaced by national ones because they were too small for the industrialisation to proceed. Just as agrarian communities were too small for industrialisation, the Europe of nation-states is too fragmented for globalisation. The new formation of cross-border interdependence necessitates a further homogenisation beyond the borders of the modern era. Hence, the European integration is a continuation of a trend in the same direction as national integration: an increase in the scale of masses. According to Brzezinski, "under the pressures of economics, science and technology, mankind is moving steadily toward large-scale cooperation. Despite periodic reverses, all human history clearly indicates progress in this direction" (1970, p. 296). At this point, Gellner agrees by observing that "one of the obvious features of the modern world is the increase in the scale of social political units" (1978, p. 133).

Theories of nationalism provide a pair of optimum lenses to make sense of the European integration because the European integration is, in a sense, a replication of national integration in the post-modern times. Despite arguments that the EU is a unique political entity, the process of the unification of Europe is very much the same as the unification of nation-states in the past (Shore, 2000, p. 50). The nation-state is followed as a model not only in theory but also in practice. As Bellier and Wilson observe, the European elite "borrow heavily from the models of nation and state building, precisely because many do not know

how to escape intellectually and linguistically from the dominant model of the nation-state" (2000, p. 6). Or, even if they do know, they may well share Smith's belief that transcendence of the national identity does not appear to be possible unless the defining structures of nationalism are adopted for the post-national level (1991, p. 169). In the final analysis, as Duara notes, "whatever the shape of the European community, it is likely that it will have to incorporate some of the functions and symbols of the nation-state" (1996, p. 163). This is already visible in some aspects such as standardisation and homogenisation, which are at the heart of the process of European integration (Olsen, 1996, p. 261).

These replications are obvious with respect to identity construction (Banchoff, 1999; Shore, 2000; Costa, 2004). The construction of a collective European identity does not differ from the construction of national identity (Banchoff, 1999, p. 185). For instance, Costa argues that the construction of a collective identity and the role of the elite within this construction are among the main commonalities between a national integration and the European integration (2004, p. 214). First of all, as in the national integration process of the nineteenth century, the elite have a crucial role in the process of European integration (Ibid.). The European integration is very similar to a national integration in the sense that it is, like the nation-formation of modern times, as well a project driven by the elite who aim to create collective consciousness (Shore, 2000, p. 34).

Secondly, Costa continues, integration necessitates the construction of a collective identity (2004, p. 214). When the European leaders met the challenges of the European integration with respect to legitimisation, they planned to do what their forefathers had done to meet the similar challenges of national integration in the nineteenth century: the construction of a collective identity (Banchoff, 1999, p. 181). Although the EU is different from the nation-state and even claimed to be unique in some aspects, it needs a political community to match its physical borders "like any other polity" does (Green, 2000, p. 293). In order for a collective identity to emerge, the elite have to employ a "creative and imaginative force" as collective identities do not emerge on their own (Ibid.). That is where the education comes onto the scene.

A third similarity, which is largely ignored by the sceptics of European identity, is the length of time needed for the construction of a collective identity. It took centuries for some of the national identities to be constructed in Europe. In this sense, language is a good example. For some, a European identity cannot emerge because of the lack of a standard language. However, the standardisation of a language out of various languages in a polity takes a long time. During the historical process of nation-formation, it took centuries to standardise the national languages in Europe (Bartolini, 2005, p. 213). There used to be a diversity of languages spoken in agrarian societies. In addition to different languages, the same language could have strong and varied dialects due to the lack of communication between the localities. Furthermore, as Thiesse argues, the language used could vary with social status or even with context concerned (2007, p. 19).

Wintle observes that, "most Europeans understand more of each other's languages than they do of non-European ones" (1996a, p. 15). In addition to the other second or third languages that Europeans speak, the English language has been emerging as a "new standard" in Europe (Bartolini, 2005, p. 213). More than half of the European citizens speak English. This is the result of a bottom-up dynamics rather than a top-down approach. Despite the multilingualism of 23 official languages that the Union favours, the English language comes to the fore as a result of the practical necessities of the increasingly intense interaction in Europe. That is why, for instance, 68 per cent of European citizens think that English language is the "most useful language to know" (Commission of the European Communities [CEC], 2006a, p. 30). Furthermore, the efforts of the Union to reach every citizen in their native language are, in Wintle's terms, "regularizing and minimizing the language barriers in the continent" (1996a, pp. 20-1).

Yet the history of the European integration, which spans just over half a century, is a "very short period by historical standards" (Green, 2000, p. 321). Hence, the emergence and existence of a European identity cannot be conditioned to have the same structure with national identities. Leaving everything aside, comparing the European identity to national identities in their contemporary phases is misleading because the former is just emerging, whereas the latter is a comparatively fully-fledged concept of centuries. While the European integration itself is still a project under construction, it is not realistic to have high

expectations from the construction of the nations as a community or, for instance, the role of education within this process. European identity is in the ongoing process of being constructed. Demossier argues that it is not even possible to define the European identity while it is still elusive and under construction (2007a, p. 51).

Still, the history of the European integration is long enough to betray the dynamics behind. The chapter continues by detailing the replication of national integration in post-modern times with respect to the basic dynamics of the European integration. These dynamics are in accordance with the two premises of theories of nationalism on the emergence of education as an identity construction tool in the processes of political integration: a change imposed on the society by a process of radical economic transformation together with the political support for the change to advance. In these senses, the issues of legitimacy and citizenship are good examples of these two basic dynamics respectively.

3.2.1. The Functional *Need and Lead* of the European Integration

Europe has been under a "new wave of modernisation" as a result of "economic restructuring linked to technological development" (Garcia, 1993, pp. 15-6). Moving from the idea that nations were born as a result of the functional needs of modernity, another birth is expected while Europe is moving from modernity to a post-modernity that has different functional needs. Globalisation in general and particularly Europeanisation have been causing a change in dimensions in Europe (Ibid., p. 16). The activities, issues, or affairs which used to take place within the borders of each state have increasingly been spilling out of these borders, across which there have been more and more intensified interactions. In Wallace's terms, "inward and outward investment, multinational production, migration, mass travel, mass communications, all erode boundaries that 19th century governments built between the national and foreign" (1991, pp. 66-7).

Economy spills out of national borders; capital, production, and services are internalised. This is the pattern all over the world. What is specific to Europe is that there emerges a

supranational structure, the EU, pooling the spilling economy out of European states together to a certain extent. Economic dynamics inevitably carry the other aspects to the European level. Europeanisation is not limited to executive, judicial, or administrative competences but also is pervading the society. Regardless of the personal views and desires of the peoples of Europe, the dynamics produced by the political structures emerging at the European level unavoidably have an effect on the society. As Howe proposes, "the people of Europe may not be willing themselves to be part of a new nation, but they are acquiescing, and will probably to do so, as political structures that typically precede such a development are put into place" (1995, p. 37).

This brings up the idea that as the European integration advances, the process and progress of integration is expected to have some kind of recreational effect on identities (Preston, 1997, p. 114). It is inevitable that a polity like the EU has some kind of an effect on the perceptions of the individuals (Risse, 2001, p. 200). In other words, as Risse formulates, "the way individuals and social groups view themselves and the nation-state" cannot be expected to stand up to the European integration (Ibid.). The structure being created by the transfer of traditional competences of nation-state to the European level reforms the peoples of Europe. The institutional structure of the Union, which is different than that of Member States, differentiates the European citizens. As Scharpf puts it, "just as playing together can create teams, living under a common government, and participating in common political processes, can create political identities" (1997, p. 20). The integration process has already showed its redefining effect on identities (Demossier, 2007b, p. 4). On the one hand, the European integration has facilitated the emergence or development of some collective identities within the Member States (Demossier, 2007a, p. 50). On the other hand, research shows that the European national identities have been weakening for the last three decades (Dupoirier, Roy, & Lecerf, 2000, p. 51).

Identities are not only abstract concepts boxed in brains. They do appear in practical life as patterns of perception, evaluation, and thus behaviour. Although this idea is valid for both personal and collective identities, the latter comes to the fore for the concerns over patterns of behaviour because collective identities come into existence as collective patterns of behaviour. For instance, national identity is not only a subject of politics or sociology but also

economics. This is one of the reasons why collective identities have been such a key matter since the beginning of industrialisation. A disharmony in the way of perception, evaluation, and behaviour may cause communication problems to the degree that it slows down, if not blocks, the economic functioning. A collective European identity would increase the economic functionality within the Union by decreasing the differentiation in the ways of thinking and behaviour among the citizens from different Member States.

The Need for Legitimacy.

The state of democracy in the EU is highly controversial. The understanding of the democracy in the Union greatly varies depending on the approach to the European integration. For instance, the EU is already as democratic as an intergovernmental polity could get for Moravcsik (2002) whereas Majone (1994, 1996), perceiving the EU as a regulatory state, argues that it must not be democratic at all. Yet, there is consensus on the idea that the EU does lack a substantive legitimacy. Substantive legitimacy is about how the governed perceive the governor. *Eurobarometer* results show that the support for the European integration had generally been increasing until the beginning of the 1990s, but since then it has been in decline. According to the latest research, only half of the European citizens support the EU.[5]

The unbalanced development of the European integration creates a democratic deficit. On the one hand, economic integration has been increasingly advancing. On the other hand, the social integration lags behind this advancement. From a nationalist perspective, one of the most obvious problems of the European integration is caused by the gap between *borders of the state* and *borders of the nation* in Gellner's terms, between *legal community* and *moral community* in Walzer's, or between *political community* and *imagined community* in Anderson's. As John Stuart Mill mentions among his considerations on representative

---

[5] *Eurobarometer 69*, conducted in spring 2008, shows that 52 per cent of the European citizens support the membership of their county to the EU, while the EU has a positive image on only 48 per cent of the citizens (CEC, 2008a).

government, he generally believes "the boundaries of governments should coincide in the main with those of nationalities" for the progression of democracy in any state (2001, p. 288). As one of the main reasons for this conditionality, he introduces the idea that "among a people without fellow-feeling, especially if they read and speak different languages, the united public opinion, necessary to the working of representative government, cannot exist" (Ibid., p. 286).

One and a half century after his formulation, Mill's ideas on the relationship between democracy and national identity are still relevant. Moore agrees, despite putting it in a milder way than Mill, that a shared national identity can be the key for a functioning democracy (Moore, 2001). In this sense, collective identity and democracy are tied together on the basis of representation. Accordingly, a shared collective identity secures and strengthens the function of representation, which is a defining element of most of the modern democracies, because it helps to form a unity to represent and a trust in that unity for the representative (Ibid., p. 87). First of all, there should be a unity among people to generate a representative for themselves, whom will act on behalf of the unity in the decision making process. Moreover, this relationship of representation is expected to be built on trust from the bottom up to the representative. Providing unity and trust for representation, a shared collective identity renders a democracy functioning, in which there is a dialogue between the representative and constituent and so participation of the society (Ibid.).

The question to what extent there is a dialogue and participation in the political processes at the European level is directly relevant to the state of democracy in the EU (Van der Eijk & Franklin, 1996, p. 7). In order to increase the dialogue and participation, the EU has detailed and secured the right to vote and to stand as a candidate for both the municipal and EP elections for citizens of the Union (European Council [EC], 1992, Article 17.1).[6] Accordingly, citizens of the Union are granted the right to vote and stand in the elections in their Member State of residence irrespective of their Member State of origin. However, despite the legal

---

[6] The Article 17.1 of the *Treaty of Maastricht*, which this right is originally based upon, has been further detailed by the adapted legislations. See EC (1993, 1994, 1996).

rights recognised on the documents, neither the electorates nor the political parties fully exercise these rights at the European level.

These experiences verify the assumption that there is a relationship between collective identity and democracy. If democracies at the two levels are compared with respect to dialogue, participation, or salience, it is seen that democracy functions better at the level of Member States, where stronger collective identities exist. However, these three indicators of representative democracy are relatively low at the EU level, which lacks a collective identity that is as strong as the Member State democracies have. Similar to the fact that the EU elections are secondary to the elections at the national level, European identity comes later than the national identity for most of the European citizens.

A stronger European identity can facilitate the realisation of the citizenship rights with regards to democracy in the EU. Otherwise, these rights are likely to stay in EU documents as nothing but nice expressions without the unity and trust that a shared identity can build among European citizens. For instance, for a European citizen who resides in another Member State than of his or her origin, the realisation of the right to stand in elections depends to a large extent on the degree of adaptation of the citizen to the society. Providing a commonality and in turn trust and legitimacy, a shared European identity can make such an adaptation easier.

The legitimacy of the Union has been under challenge ever since it called itself a union. This challenge reached its peak whenever the Union needed to refer to the peoples of Europe since the *Treaty of Maastricht*. The problems that occurred during the ratification of the Treaty, which have brought the legitimacy problem to the fore, were not only related to the substance of the Treaty but also to the fact that "[people] were becoming increasingly alienated from the idea of the European Community" (Lodge, 1994, p. 343). Banchoff notes that the European integration causes a "double legitimacy problem" because it moves sovereignty from a level with collective identification to the one without (1999, p. 184). In other words, European integration challenges the legitimate nation-states while it creates a structure which still lacks legitimacy. Therefore, legitimacy is not only a problem of the supranational institutions of the Union but also of the governments of the Member States.

As long as the EU is not legitimate, the Member States are in a situation of transferring their sovereignty to an illegitimate polity (Beetham & Lord, 1998, p. 41).

Because the problem behind the lack of public support is mainly due to the lack of legitimacy as recognition, the change in the substance of the institutions is mostly irrelevant. The best example is the fate of the efforts of the Union to sign a new treaty at the beginning of the millennium. Despite the efforts to reform the failed *Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe* as the *Treaty of Lisbon*, the failure itself did not change. The fact that European citizens are alienated from the process of European integration is still there regardless of the substance or name of the Treaty. However, the construction of European nations and the European community has been an "authoritarian and elite-driven programme" (Demossier, 2007a, p. 57). After all these failures in referenda, it is obvious that furthering the integration will not be possible, at least in legitimate ways, without winning the hearts and minds of the Europeans. In the same vein, the official approach of the Union recognises that there is a legitimacy problem and that the solution of the problem lies in creating a sense of belonging among the peoples of Europe (Hersom, 2004, p. 40).

Whereas citizenship is related to both procedural and substantive legitimacy, identity is rather related to the substantive legitimacy, in other words, legitimacy as recognition (Banchoff, 1999, p. 184). Identification and legitimacy are closely interrelated. Legitimacy, in addition to sovereignty, is the main motive behind politics of identity (Calhoun, 2001, p. 38). Collective identification with a political system brings legitimacy to the system. People do not identify themselves with a political system that they do not recognise as legitimate. However, the political system with which people identify themselves tends to be recognised as legitimate.

The construction of a European identity is a project born as a result of the need to legitimise the Union (Banchoff, 1999, p. 180; Calhoun, 2001, p. 37). The fact that the EU does not have a collectively identified community is seen as "the most serious of the obstacles to the development of political legitimacy" in the integration process (Beetham & Lord, 1998, p. 33). Integration is "less difficult" if the institutions are recognised as legitimate by the people who share a collective identity (Garcia, 1993, p. 10). Hence, European integration would

benefit from a collective European identity. As Garcia and Wallace remark, with the help of such an identity, "the institutions of the European Community would have a much stronger point of reference from which to gather loyalty from its citizens and build up a much needed legitimacy" (1993, p. 172).

3.2.2. The Political Intervention

Processes of radical economic change impose parallel transformations on society. However, the transformations that societies go through cannot be fully understood without examining the role of politics. Politics, in this sense, is a "functional response to expanding material conditions of production", which has the ability to redefine the cultural assets to serve these conditions (Cederman, 2001, p. 148). In other words, according to the constructivist and modernist perspectives, politics prevails over culture where there is a clash in between the two, which causes the reconstruction of the cultural assets in favour of the politics. The European identity is a good example of such a post-modern transformation of societies. It is not only a point of deterministic development but also an interventionist one. The political intervention in favour of collective identity construction is not an invention of the post-modern times. The political intervention in the post-modern transformation follows the way that is familiar to humankind from the transformations of modernisation. In this sense, not only the existence of intervention itself but also the way politics intervenes in the transformation process is similar to the scenarios of national integrations of modern times.

As forming a polity above nation-states does not automatically create a community above nation, a European identity cannot be expected to mechanically emerge due to the unification of Europe (Smith, 1995, p. 125). However, as a result of the inseparable natures of economics, politics, and society, although identity formation has not been an apparent aspect of the European integration, it has come to be "precisely what the EU is doing" (Bellier & Wilson, 2000, p. 15). Ignorance of the social and political aspects of integration ended with a "fundamental shift in official EU discourses" after the first decades of economic integration (Shore, 2000, p. 42). It was a shift from a deterministic approach to an

interventionist one. The Union needed to intervene in the integration process by constructing a collective consciousness among the peoples of Europe. Hence, the institutions of the Union, which themselves emerge within the integration process, are at the same time the forces behind the construction of a European collective identity. It is the politics and specifically the European political elite who decide on the selection of particular ideas that fit in the instrumentally defined interests of the political power. It is possible to argue that the relationship between the collective identity and collective interest is an interactive one. A "change in instrumentally defined interests might well lead over time to identity changes" whereas the interest formulation cannot be isolated from the identity or identity change within a society (Risse & Engelmann-Martin, 2002, pp. 292-3).

The dynamics of the European integration enforce the necessity of constructing a collective identity to match the polity emerging above nation-states. This is an interconnected development which the European nations experienced during their nation-building processes in the nineteenth century. The well functioning of the Single Market is an economic motive for the national governments as well as for the EU institutions and the European elite to contribute to the construction of a collective European identity (Warleigh, 2003, p. 113). While moving in post-industrialisation, a collective European identity is needed in order to prohibit a clash between nationally-divided identities of the industrialisation era.

Nationalism and the identity formation inherent in nationalism are the tools for social constructions on the way to the desired social structures. Collective identity formation was an instrument in the transition from agrarian societies to the modern ones. When these perspectives within the nationalist literature are applied to the Europeanisation of national identities, there appears to be a picture in which the sub-project of European identity formation is expected to be engineered hand in hand with the project of European integration. These two projects are interactive in the sense that the degree and the success of one of them have the potential to effect the development of the other, which in return affects the former. For example, on the one hand, to the degree that the European integration is tightened, there emerges a larger area to manoeuvre for the convergence of the European national identities into a collective European identity. On the other hand, as

the European identity emerges and develops, the European integration achieves an important base to advance upon.

As a study of the discourse on education, the thesis analyses the attitudes of the European elite in the fifth chapter. At this stage of the discussion, it is still possible to preview in general that European politics supports the post-modern change by mobilising the European society for the new formation and that the European politicians borrow from the national experiences in so doing. For instance, the notion that the well functioning of industrial economies depends on mobility seems to find general acceptance in the EU. Mobility is one of the key principles of the Single Market. Although mobility was mainly examined on the basis of labour in Gellner's analysis of nationalism, the EU approaches mobility from a wider perspective. What has come to be known as the Four Freedoms includes the freedom of movement of goods, persons, services, and capital. The initiation of the European citizenship, in this sense, is a good example where the European politicians adopt the defining structures of nationalism to the post-national level.

The Initiation of the European Citizenship.

Inner European migration has always been one of the dynamics of the European integration (Hake, 2001, p. 99). The *Treaties of Rome* has given some rights to workers of the Union in order to induce the mobility of workers within the Union. As the integration has progressed, there emerged a need for further inducements. The *Treaty of Maastricht*, establishing the European citizenship, intended to fill such a need by extending the rights beyond the scope of workers to all European citizens (Ibid., p. 102). In this sense, the concept of European citizenship in general and particularly the rights associated with it are a response to the economic needs of the era (Ibid.). Behind the idea of the European citizenship, there lies the need to eliminate the barriers in front of mobility within the Union (Koslowski, 1999, p. 157). Before the creation of European citizenship, freedom of movement, the backbone of mobility within the Union, was not that free from legal barriers with regards to the rights.

The Member State citizens who migrated to another Member State had to leave some political rights behind in their country.

The European citizenship was born with theoretical and legal problems. Both theoretical and legal definitions of citizenship are built on the existence of a state (Shore, 2000, p. 66). Moreover, the match between the citizenship and nationality composes one of the bases for political stability in a nation-state (Heater, 2004b, p. 190). However, the initiation of the European citizenship is a challenge to the assumption that citizenship is national. European citizenship marks a "fundamental break" in the tradition that simply links the concept of citizenship to the existence of a state (Koslowski, 1999, p. 155; Costa, 2004, p. 208). As Koslowski puts it, European citizenship "violates the logic of the classical system of nation-states which is based on the principles that everyone belongs to a state and preferably only one state" (1999, p. 156).

The development of the European integration itself has brought challenges over the supposedly direct relationship between citizenship and nationality (Habermas, 1994, p. 20). With respect to the substance of the European citizenship, it has given birth to the rights that separate citizenship from nationality (Koslowski, 1999, p. 161). As a result, there has emerged the concept of non-national citizens, which refers to the European citizens residing in a Member State of which they are not a national. This is a deviation from the understanding that nationality and citizenship are inseparable. As in the case of non-national citizens, one does not have to be a national of a state to exercise the right to vote and stand in elections in that state.

Citizenship has recently come to be associated with political identity. Theoretically speaking, there is a strong tie between citizenship and identity. The relationship between these two concepts is close and direct, if not completely overlapping. For instance, according to Delanty, the only difference between identity and citizenship lies in the roots: citizenship has its roots in law whereas the roots of identity hold on to culture (1995a, p. 31). In this sense, on the surface, the relationship between citizenship and identity is a kind of equation. To the extent that a citizen uses the rights and fulfils the duties set by the law, he or she has an identity. Citizenship first classifies and then situates the classified people, the citizens, in a

direct relationship with the state via some sets of rights and responsibilities (Shore, 2000, p. 71). As Shore argues, each of these actions is constructive in the sense that they realise the theoretical concepts of nationality and state as well as the relationship between nationals and the state (Ibid.). Therefore, citizenship itself has an identity formation effect and thus is a tool for nation-building whereas identity strengthens the concept of citizenship (Heater, 2004b, p. 187).

Opening the supranational space for citizenship, the process of the European integration itself has given rise to theoretical tensions over the tie between citizenship and identity (Habermas, 1994, p. 20). The emergence and development of citizenship and identity in the context of European integration have historically been in accordance with the theoretical relationship between these two concepts. There is a "strict relationship" between the concepts of European citizenship and European identity in the sense that they are the two legs of the project that create legitimacy as recognition for the Union (Panebianco, 2004, p. 33). It is this relationship that makes the citizenship significant for the Union (Weiler, 2000, p. 179). European citizenship has been created in order to attach the people to the Union via the rights that it secures for them and thus to construct a European identity.

Koslowski perceives the very creation of the European citizenship as an indirect acceptance of the Member States that political identity is not exclusive to states either and so that it can be multiple as is the citizenship (1999, pp. 164-5). Moreover, European citizenship also ends the monopoly of nation-state as the sole guarantor of rights for individuals (Guibernau, 2001b, p. 262). The existence of certain rights associated with the European citizenship ties the European citizens to the Union, which crosses the borders of nations-state. In these senses, European citizenship has added another dimension to the concept of citizenship, which has opened a space for the construction of European identity (Koslowski, 1999, p. 155). The place of European citizenship is defined in the *Treaty of Amsterdam* as to "complement but not replace national citizenship" (EC, 1997, Article 17.1). If citizenship can be European while complementing but not replacing the national, why can identity not be European in this way?

Human beings identify themselves with a myriad of things around them. In other words, a combination of multiple identity alternatives lives in each individual. If multiple identities can and do live in peace in individuals, the European identity does not have to replace the other collective political identities of the people of Europe. In this sense, the European identity can go together with national and sub-national identities without clashing. Identities are multiple in their nature. This has always been the case. Even before the European integration, people living in Europe had multiple identities. However, the predominant identity has been the national one among all the identities living in the people since the modernisation. What seems to be changing with the European integration, as Waever remarks, is the dominance of national identities over all others (1993, p. 164). According to Waever, the construction of European identity might enhance "a true multiplicity of identities" by challenging the dominance of national identities in Europe (Ibid.).

Due to the hegemony of national identity, collective identity has come to be associated with national identity although collective identity is a general concept opposed to individual identity. Despite the fact that it is the dominant form, national identity is only one of the multiple identities that individuals have. The fact that national identities are in a dominant position among other collective identities does not mean that the domination itself is fixed or that identities are unitary (Kostakopoulou, 2001, p. 24). As Smith remarks, "however dominant the nation and its national identification, human beings retain a multiplicity of allegiances in the contemporary world" (1992, p. 67). Identities are multiple and the balance among them is in flux. Moreover, some of these multiple identities are collective in their nature, such as regional or local identities. Hence, the exclusive focus of the ethno-national essentialism on the nation-state as the sole locus of identification is already being challenged by the existence of other collective identities (Kostakopoulou, 2001, p. 24).

Although the multiple identities of a person may be in equilibrium, Wintle stresses that the equilibrium shifts in favour of one or some of these identities (1996a, pp. 22-3). As Calhoun puts it, "every collective identity is open to both internal subdivision and calls for its incorporation into some larger category of primary identity" (1994, p. 27). The construction of a European identity involves the redefinition of existing national identities "in ways compatible with membership in the European Union" (Banchoff, 1999, p. 180). However, as

the official approach states, European identity is complementary (Shore, 2000, p. 52). Identity at the European level does not replace the national ones, like European citizenship, but supplements them. The European identity is not competing with but complementing the national, regional, or local identities existing in Europe. Because the functions and dimensions of the European identity and national identities are different, these two are not competitive but compatible. European identity can compatibly exist with national identities like national identities continue living with regional and local identities (Wintle, 1996b, p. 2). As Beetham and Lord justify, there is no reason for the European identity to clash with national identities, while each national identity in Europe has sub-national identities that they can coexist with (1998, p. 47).

The focus of analysis inevitably affects the conclusions drawn out of the analysis. For instance, a narrow focus on individual nations may observe great differences among the European states. However, with a more a general consideration of Europe, it might well be seen that all the differences that a narrow focus catches actually form a rather harmonious whole at the European level. This would not mean that there are not any differences but that these differences are a part of a unity in the final analysis. It cannot be ignored that, a further narrower focus, for instance on different regions in a single European state, could possibly give as many number of differences in that state as among the various European states. If the differences in a nation-state do not interfere with forming a nation at the state level, there is no reason to expect that the differences between the European states would hold the Union back from constructing a European community.

The initial motivation behind the introduction of European citizenship was to support the integration process (Shore, 2000, p. 74). The European elite perceived the danger in front of the further integration, which was, as Magnusson and Strath formulate it, a "deep sense of malaise and public disaffection with the European construct that threatened to undermine its political legitimacy" (2004, p. 18). In other words, it was understood that a sense of belonging among the peoples of Europe to the space created by the Union was necessary for the further development of the European integration. European citizenship is the result of the efforts to fill this need (Hersom, 2004, p. 37). It is seen as a crucial tool for the EU to legitimise itself in both procedural and substantive terms (Koslowski, 1999, p. 161;

Panebianco, 2004, p. 21). In addition to the rights that it creates in relation to procedural democracy, European citizenship substantively "leads more Europeans to recognise the EU as a legitimate framework for political contestation" (Koslowski, 1999, p. 161).

The idea was that European citizenship, which was born in a treaty, would live in the consciousness of the Europeans. In other words, at the time of initiation, it was thought that the European citizenship would not stay limited in legal documents but spill out to the hearts and minds of the people (Garcia, 1993, p. 12). It was again thought that, in the absence of classical national elements such as language or religion at the European level, the European citizenship might supply the necessary ground for the construction of the European identity formation (Delanty, 1995b, p. 159). In theory, the European citizenship would "ideally (...) make people *feel* European, fostering the group-identity that could glue the Community together, because it would work the same way as the national identity in the nation-state" (Hersom, 2004, p. 37).[7]

There are doubts about the success of the European citizenship in meeting the initial expectations. The general perception is that the introduction of European citizenship "aroused neither enthusiasm nor anxiety among the newly hailed citizens of Europe, most of whom were either unmoved by or unaware of it" (Shore, 2000, p. 67). As a result, for instance, more than half of the European citizens do not even know what European citizenship means (CEC, 2008b, p. 5). The case of non-national citizens is a good example for the failure of European citizenship. The rights defined for the non-national citizens are seen as the most important addition of the European citizenship. However, the exercise of these rights has been disappointingly low so far. For example, in the 2004 elections for the European Parliament, there were only 57 European citizens standing as candidates in a Member State of which they were not a national (CEC, 2006b, pp. 7-8).

Irrespective of the criterion of success, the initiation of the European citizenship itself confirms the will of the European politicians to adopt the defining structures of nationalism to the supra-national level. It is still too early to give the final verdict on the success of the

---

[7] Emphasis in the original.

European citizenship. Many aspects of European integration were first seen as "trivial and empty" as the European citizenship at the time of initiation (Weiler, 2000, p. 171). However, as Weiler argues, many of these once discredited aspects have proved themselves crucial as the integration further progressed (Ibid.). Moreover, disappointment about the European citizenship may even motivate European politicians to adopt other defining structures of nationalism to support the citizenship. Shore explains the failure of the European citizenship with the lack of "a coherent sense of identity and European consciousness to invest the legal shell of citizenship with social meaning" (2000, p. 83). Likewise, due to the lack of collective identity, non-national citizens are still seen as others in the state that they reside. Election statistics show that there is not enough trust towards the non-national citizens standing in the elections (Panebianco, 2004, p. 22). This illustrates that although the European citizenship legally encourages the citizens to migrate, it cannot guarantee the integration of the migrants into their new environment (Hake, 2001, p. 103). Without the support of a collective identity, European citizenship itself cannot even meet the legal promises. This could motivate European politicians to follow the examples of national integration and to get involved in identity construction through the use of education.

3.3. Conclusions

Theories of nationalism provide a solid surface to build upon an understanding of identity construction role of education in the processes of national integration of modernity. However, the European integration is post-national as well as post-modern. In order for the theoretical considerations of the previous chapter to enlighten the focus of politics of education in the European integration, there is a need to contextualise the case. For this reason, the thesis has devoted this chapter for the application of the theoretical considerations to the case of the European integration. The contextualisation of the case proves the ability of the theories of nationalism to provide a pair of optimum lenses for the European integration and particularly for the role of education within this integration.

The ability of theories of nationalism stems from the fact that the dynamics behind the European integration are similar to those behind national integrations. In various senses, the

European integration is a replication of the national integration in the post-modern times. First and foremost, the European integration refers to a process of radical economic change that imposes parallel transformations on society. Just as the modern state had been born as a result of an increase in mobility among the previously isolated and segmented agrarian societies, the Union was born as a result of a further increase in mobility among still isolated and segmented nation-states. The increase in the scale of social and political units, which was started by the process of national integration, continues with the European integration. As a result, the European integration covers a wider range of area and subjects than that of individual nation-states.

National integrations demonstrate that the economically driven processes of integration need and lead changes in the social and political spheres to advance. The social effects of such a process concentrate on collective identities. The process of European integration, disregarding how it was originally limited to economy, inevitably causes some kind of an effect on the perceptions of the individuals. Unless a balance among the spheres of integration is reached, there emerges an asymmetrical development which is not sustainable for a long time. The issues of legitimacy give an idea about the fact that the Union has been suffering from such an asymmetrical development where the economic integration has advanced well beyond the social and political integration of Europe.

This is where politics come onto the scene. Politics supports the economically driven change by mobilising the society for the new formation that the change needs and leads. One of the main commonalities between national integration and the European integration is the key role of the elite. Like in the processes of national integration in the nineteenth century, the elite form another dynamic behind the European integration. The European elite or specifically the people involved within the decision making processes of the EU contribute to the integration process by supplying the functional needs of the integration so that it can further progress. In so doing, the elite are inevitably affected by the model of nation and state building.

The initiation of European citizenship is an example of the functional response of politics to changing economic conditions. It confirms that the European politicians follow the models of

nation-formation in confronting the expanding economic conditions and that defining structures of nationalism are adapted to the European level. Is this political attitude also valid for the education policy? In other words, is the EU education policy given the role of supporting the process of European integration by the construction of a collective European identity? This is the very question composing the overall aim of this research. The thesis will try to reach an answer to this question with an analysis of the EU discourse on education. Before the actual analysis, however, there is a need to introduce the research methods to be employed in the analysis.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH METHODS

4.1. Introduction

Aiming to advance an understanding on the role of education policy in the EU, this study has precisely stated the critical analysis of the EU discourse on education among its individual objectives. The empirical research of the thesis is closely related to this specific research objective. Among the theoretical considerations, it is discussed that education has a special role due to the dynamics in the process of social and political integration. This is the role of supporting the process of integration by the construction of a collective national identity. The previous chapter has applied these theoretical considerations to the case of the Union and hence have explored similar dynamics in the process of the European integration that could possibly lead the education policy to have such a role. All these arguments create the need for an empirical research on whether the education policy is given the role of supporting the process of European integration by the construction of a collective European identity.

Intending to implement an empirical research, the thesis includes this chapter in order to inform the reader how it proposes to proceed with the process of empirical research. It provides details on the research strategy, the means of collecting data for analysis, the framework for the analysis of the data collected, and the possible limitations of the research methods employed respectively. In this manner, the chapter aims to ensure that particularly the analysis in the following chapter and the thesis as a whole gain a fuller sense.

4.2. Research Strategy

The overall approach that the thesis follows to implement the research is an intrinsic case study. Just like the application areas of case studies, the very understanding of the strategy itself is at variance. However, there is a relative agreement on the idea that a case study is an in-depth inquiry of a phenomenon (Yin, 1984; Bromley, 1990; Stake, 1995). This is the

basis of the case studies as a research strategy. To further the understanding of case study as a research strategy, it is possible to categorise case studies as instrumental or intrinsic with regards to the general aim of the research in question (Stake, 1995, p. 3). Instrumental case studies aim to establish generalisations through the analysis of the case under analysis. In this sense, the case analysed is just an instrument to achieve a broader objective. This forms a contrast with latter category since intrinsic case studies are conducted just to understand the case itself. In other words, a case study is intrinsic if the researcher has an intrinsic interest in the case analysed.

Research strategies are usually not a matter of choice. It is the overall research aim and the particular individual objective that determine the research strategy of a study. This is exactly the situation for this research. The overall research aim of this study is set out to advance an understanding of whether the education policy is given the role of supporting the process of European integration by contributing to the construction of a collective European identity. As the theoretical considerations make clear, education policy is theoretically and practically given such a role especially in the processes of national integration. In this sense, the element of the EU in the overall research aim forms a particular case of a broader theory. Achieving the overall research aim clearly necessitates an in-depth inquiry of a phenomenon, which echoes the basic definition of a case study. This study intends to analyse whether the theory on the role of education policy in the process of integration explains the case of the Union. Moreover, since the interest of the research is on a particular case, it is an intrinsic case study, not an instrumental one.

For the majority of case studies, one of the most challenging criticisms comes with the doubt of the generalisability of the results (Anderson & Arsenault, 1998, p. 159). This doubt is compelling for the instrumental case studies, where the researchers try to gain an insight into a theory by analysing an individual or a group of cases. However, intrinsic case studies do not raise such doubts. The aim of intrinsic case studies is to understand the particular case being studied rather than to propose hypotheses for a generalising theory.

4.3. Data Collection

The objective of the analysis determines not only the research strategy but also the empirical material to be collected and analysed. In line with the objective of analysis, that is the critical analysis of the official EU discourse on education, the data of this study is composed of the elements of the discourse. The fundamental elements of discourse are texts, so much so that it is not unusual to refer to discourse analysis as textual analysis. Within the discourse theory, a text is defined as the verbal record of the language in use either in written or spoken form (Brown & Yule, 1986, p. 3). Hence, together with the adverb official, the empirical material of this study can basically be categorised into two: official policy documents of the EU institutions as written discourse and individual contributions of the EU officials in the form of either written or spoken discourse.

However, this basic categorisation is not enough to answer the questions of what, why, and how regarding the choice of the empirical material. The rest of this sub-section tries to answer these three questions. To begin with the discourse limitations, the first limitation on the data covered is in terms of the historical period. This is due to the fact that the history of the European education policy is not as old as the history of the Union itself. The first signs of cooperation in the area of education at the European level appeared at the beginning of the 1970s. It was in 1971 when the Ministers of Education from the six Member States came together for the first time. Hence, the era of the empirical material researched is between 1971 and 2009.

There are studies which date the birth of the educational cooperation back further to the agreement on a common vocational education and training policy in the 1960s (EC, 1963).[8] The reason for not following the same path in this study is the second discourse limitation, which is on the scope of the education policy. In this sense, the two limitations, time and scope, are interrelated. Contrary to the relative immaturity of the European education policy, education policy is theoretically immense. Education policy, as it is thoroughly discussed among the theoretical considerations, is one of the collective identity construction

---

[8] See, for instance, Berggreen-Merkel (1999).

tools available in a polity. However, the area of education policy, like in any other policy area, is multifaceted. This fact is not different in the case of the EU. Although the European education policy is still relatively immature, it is composed of various faces, some of which are beyond the scope of this study. For this reason, the second discourse limitation leaves some specific and technical but at the same time important aspects of European education policy out, such as research, lifelong learning or vocational education. In so doing, the study focuses on the official EU texts that are constructed in order to generally define and thus locate the education policy among others in the process of European integration. Therefore, the empirical materials of this study have been chosen among those (a) official policy documents of the EU institutions and individual contributions of the EU officials (b) defining and locating the education policy among others in the European integration process (c) since 1971.

The analysis chapter refers to 41 sources. Two of these sources are only referred to ensure coherence. The remaining 39 texts are analysed in line with the methods detailed in this chapter. The large majority of the texts examined during the data processing phase of this study are the official policy documents written by the four EU institutions: the European Commission, the Council of Ministers, the European Council, and the European Parliament. A careful reader will realise in the analysis chapter that the official documents of the European Commission are used more frequently compared to the documents produced by the other three institutions. There are 18 of these documents. That means approximately half of the texts analysed are the reports, communications, policy statements, decisions as well as the *white papers* and *green papers* of the Commission. The reason behind this figure is simply related to the general positions of these institutions within the policy making process of the EU. The EU, like any other political organisation, defines and redefines its position and itself in a policy area through the communication of decisions. The role of the Commission in the EU in general and in the education policy in particular arguably makes the documents of the Commission the most efficient ones in defining a policy area in the process of integration. However, the contribution of the Council of Ministers, the European Council, and the European Parliament to the discourse is undeniable. The research includes an analysis of 16 texts composed, sometimes in cooperation, by these three institutions. These texts are in the form of treaties, conclusions, resolutions, decisions, recommendations, or reports. One

of these documents starts with a foreword written by a European Commissioner for Education, Research, and Sciences. This demonstrates that the role of individual officials cannot be neglected in the analysis of the official discourse of even such formal organisations like the EU. The contribution of the EU officials into the discourse comprises the second category of the data, which includes fewer but still important texts. These are a speech given by a European Commissioner for Education and Culture, a study conducted by a head of the unit at the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the Union, and three reports written by two key European political figures.

Documentary sources are one of the widest-used data forms in social research (Finnegan, 2006, p. 138). It can be argued that the place of documentary sources is even more crucial for the method of discourse analysis since the texts, the fundamental elements of discourses, are stored as documents. Official documents and records, which are the empirical material of this study, is one of the main categories of documentary sources. Provided as a governmental activity, official documents reflect the representative approach of the governments with regards to definitions, explanations, and solutions (Jupp, 2006, p. 276). These documents are both the tools to choose and thus the evidence of official choices between the different approaches in a policy-making process. The EU is involved in policy-making like any other polity. However, unlike most of the other examples, the implementation of these policies is by and large left out of its competences. Compared to the policy-implementation phase, this offers extraordinary advantages to the examination of an EU policy in the policy-making phase. Official documents are produced not only for the polity itself to function but also for the public to observe the functions of the polity. This kind of public documents provides the observers and particularly the researchers with a high degree of credibility, objectivity, and certainty compared to some other kinds of sources of private domains (Denscombe, 2003, pp. 216-7).

One of the ways that the Union supports the study of and research on the European integration is through the establishment of the European Documentation Centres. A European Documentation Centre is a special collection within a university structure, which is mainly devoted to the official publications of the Union. In this sense, these centres are composed of essential sources for an analysis of the EU discourse. The majority of the

material analysed for this study was uncovered at one of these centres located in the Templeman Library of the University of Kent. Moreover, the EU puts together a strong effort to make its publications available online, which therefore makes the Internet a good source of information for studies on the European integration. Consequently, the European Documentation Centre and Internet have been the main tools of data collection for this research.

4.4. Framework for Data Analysis

The framework for the data analysis is arguably the most important part of the research methods in a study. Without a framework for analysis, specifying a research strategy or collecting research data would not make sense, as the overall aim of a study is to reach a synthesis through an analysis of the data. However, these are the complementary elements of research methods. Since they are interdependent, the choice of research methods is not something arbitrary but rather cognitive. As a result of the cognitive vision of the overall aim and individual objectives of this research, the study proposes the critical discourse analysis (CDA) as its framework for analysis of the empirical data defined and collected according to the strategy and techniques identified above.

CDA is both a theory and a methodology on the study of the relationship between language in use and social reality. Both aspects of CDA are closely interrelated. In this sense, although this section primarily approaches CDA as a research methodology, it is impossible to define CDA as a methodology without considering its theoretical assumptions. Even though the methodological and theoretical assumptions of the CDA are considered together, it is still hard to define an established understanding of what CDA traditionally is. The reason behind this is two-fold. Firstly, as is going to be discussed in detail below, CDA is a problem-oriented and thus eclectic approach. It leaves a large area for the researcher to manoeuvre in searching for the answer to the research question. Therefore, shaped and re-shaped by the various research questions, CDA tends to include different ways of analysis. Secondly, CDA is an approach that is still under development. It is a relatively new approach that only

emerged a few decades ago. Consequently, it may be considered too early for CDA to have a classical way of understanding and explaining, if it is ever going to have one.

Nevertheless, CDA is not spineless. One of the defining bones of its spine is the concept of discourse. CDA perceives discourses in two different but related senses:

> There is discourse as itself (part of) social practice, discourse as a form of action, as something people do to or for or with each other. And there is discourse in the Foucauldian sense, discourse as a way of representing social practice(s), as form of knowledge, as the things people say about social practice(s). (van Leeuwen, 1993, p. 193)

Hence, discourses have the abilities to both determine and represent reality (Jager, 2001, p. 36). To continue with Jager's words, they "live a life of their own" (Ibid.). As "instruments of social construction of reality", discourses have an effect on non-discursive practices. They are used to construct non-discursive practices. Moreover, producers of a discourse, i.e. those in power, may and usually do have other instruments to construct a social reality in addition to the discourse. In this sense, discursive practices are supported with other instruments in order to construct a social reality. In the final analysis, the social reality constructed will be in accordance with the discourse employed. This is why and how a discourse can represent a social practice.

Like the CDA in general, this particular study does not ignore any of these senses. However, it primarily concentrates on the discourse in the Foucauldian sense in order to achieve the overall research aim of the study. Hence, the discourse of the EU on education is rather understood as an instrument representing the policy of the Union with regards to the role of the education in the process of integration. In this study, the focus of analysis is on the communicative actions of a polity. It moves from the assumption that discourses reflect social realities. If a study aims to understand a role of a policy, the discourse of the key policy-making institutions and officials is well worth analysing. Discourse analysis basically focuses on the texts. Yet, understanding the linguistics of a text is not the ultimate aim but a tool for achieving an overall research agenda: "analysing opaque as well as transparent

structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak, 2001a, p. 2).

Texts are produced in different forms of genres. Simply put, a genre is a way of interaction (Rogers, 2004, p. 56). Fairclough defines a genre as "a socially ratified way of using language in connection with a particular type of social activity" (1995, p. 14). Genres vary according to the fields of action and the control of a discourse. A genre can be a piece from media or a brochure as well as a party programme or a governmental decision (Wodak, 2001b, p. 89). The theoretical power comes to practical existence through the use of the genres of a discourse. As this is a study in the field of a public policy, the genres are accordingly among the governmental documents and the speeches as well as writings of governmental officials. Through these types of genres, the EU is exercising a power in the area of education policy.

This brings the discussion to the concept of power. Power is "a major premise" of CDA since "texts are often sites of struggle in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and struggling for dominance" (Wodak, 2001a, p. 11). This indicates the close relationship between language, discourse, and power. As Wodak captures, "the constant unity of language and other social matters ensures that language is entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power" (Ibid.). It is from such perception of power that CDA is linked with two other essential concepts: ideology and critique (Ibid., p. 9). CDA perceives ideology as "an important aspect of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations" (Ibid., p. 10). In other words, ideology is a cover on top of power and power related relations. As Fairclough remarks, "in human matters, interconnections and chains of cause and effect may be distorted out of vision. Hence 'critique' is essentially making visible the interconnectedness of things" (1985, p. 747).

What makes a discourse analysis critical is the aim behind the analysis. CDA is considered as a socially and politically motivated approach. Making the power relations easier to understand is one of the motivations of CDA. In so doing, it explicitly defines itself against those who are in power and for those who are subject to the power (Wodak, 2001a, p. 10). Standing critical to power, CDA frequently involves asking questions about the interest of

those in power (van Dijk, 1986, p. 4). In addition to the principle choice of critical stand, a CDA analyst has to make choices in different phases of a research study (Wodak, 2001b, p. 65). Choices of some specific data among others or a particular way of interpreting the chosen data among other ways of interpretation are the usual examples. For instance, the role of a critical discourse analyst frequently includes text reduction to "very clear formal properties" (Meyer, 2001, p. 16). In making these choices, the analyst may have prior judgments. Even if an analyst claims to be free from such judgements, the text-reduction method carries a high risk of bias in a research study.

Due to these choices, the most frequently cited criticism of CDA is the issue of bias. For instance, among his views of CDA, Widdowson argues that CDA is a biased methodology on the grounds that it has an ideological position against the power and that it eclectically chooses the data among those supporting such a standpoint (1995, p. 169). However, the scholars of CDA stand firm against the criticisms of CDA being a biased methodology. The prevailing counter argument is that a completely unbiased theory or methodology is a myth (Fairclough, 1996; Meyer, 2001; Chilton, 2005). There is no single approach in social sciences that is free from values. In this sense, the only but important difference of CDA lies in the explicitness of this methodology. Unlike other methodological approaches of social sciences, CDA clearly defines its position, which is more ethical than ignoring the existence of such values.

The Discourse-Historical Approach

There is not a clearly defined framework of data analysis in CDA (Meyer, 2001, p. 23; van Dijk, 2001, p. 98). In this sense, any study which adopts CDA as a framework of analysis needs to do more than just spell the common features out through the basic concepts. In other words, there is a need to clarify how the researcher approaches CDA since CDA is rather composed of "cluster of approaches with a similar theoretical base and similar research questions" (Meyer, 2001, p. 23). Among others, this study principally follows the basic methodological assumptions of the discourse-historical approach in CDA, which has

been developed by Ruth Wodak and her colleagues since the beginning of the 1990s. It is an interdisciplinary, context-sensitive, problem-oriented, and eclectic approach. The thesis continues by clarifying these four methodological assumptions of the discourse-historical approach before closing the chapter with the methodological limitations and potential problems.

Interdisciplinarity.

The analysis of a discourse covers the grounds of a language in use. However, in order to understand the relations of these grounds in a wider perspective, discourse analysis needs to be integrated with other disciplines (van Leeuwen, 2005, p. 11). The construction of discourses is a process where a variety of contextual factors plays a key role. The source of interdisciplinary interest in discourse is the fact that discourse is not simply a matter of linguistics but also of a wider context that is composed of the factors affecting the language in use. For example, Meyer lists historical, social as well as political factors among others that determine the characteristics of a discourse (2001, p. 15).

It is thought that an interdisciplinary approach is more likely to produce original research results than a single discipline (Wodak & Weiss, 2005, p. 123). Interdisciplinary approaches deal with relatively under-researched areas which fall in between different disciplines. In a typical CDA, interdisciplinarity is not limited to the analysis of the empirical data (Wodak, 2001b, p. 69). It is a principle followed throughout the study. The chapter on theoretical considerations is an example of this characteristic. Although the theories of nationalism form the backbone, the theory in this study is also linked to other disciplines such as psychology and education. In this manner, it is aimed to gather the most helpful blend of theories to understand and explain the empirical case under consideration.

The discourse-historical approach complements the linguistic dimension with others necessary to understand and answer the question in hand (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 35). The overall research aim and individual objectives of this study require an interdisciplinary

approach. For instance, this particular study integrates political, social, and to a certain extent psychological dimensions together with the linguistic dimension. Moreover, in some places, historical aspects are added to the discussion in order to support the theoretical considerations. This interdisciplinary approach continues with the research methods. A discourse based analysis, which is basically linguistic in itself, is adopted to analyse the case.

The discourse-historical approach applies the principle of triangulation as a research tool to comprehend a research question in all its aspects (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 40). The principle of triangulation refers to the idea that combining different methods, theories, and sources is not only allowable but also favourable as long as it helps the researcher to answer the research question (Cicourel, 1964; Denzin, 1978; Yin, 1984). Its application is a result of the "endeavour to work interdisciplinarily, multi-methodically and on the basis of a variety of different empirical data as well as background information" (Ibid., p. 35). In order to minimise the effects of prior judgments of a discourse analyst, a group of scholars of CDA offers the application of the principle of triangulation within the research activity.[9] This means the basic dimension of any discourse analysis, which is linguistic analysis, should be supported with the addition of other dimensions. In this sense, CDA is positioned on a wider and thus stronger basis composed on more than a single leg of linguistic dimension. The application of the principle of triangulation makes CDA an interdisciplinary approach. However, it also opens the doors of CDA to other disciplines of sciences (Wodak, 2001b, p. 65). As a result, for instance, CDA can fit well in the research methods of a study like this thesis, which is primarily in the area of political science.

Context.

Scholars of interdisciplinary CDA, led by Ruth Wodak, have developed a context-sensitive approach. This development is a result of the notion that discourses can only be understood within a context. In Wodak's words, "the discourse-historical approach attempts to integrate a large quantity of available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of

---

[9] For instance, see Wodak (2001b), Reisigl & Wodak (2001), or Weiss & Wodak (2003).

the social and political fields in which discursive `events' are embedded" (2001b, p. 65). This is why Wodak calls their approach context-sensitive. However, sensitivity is not limited by simply noting the context to a side. Moreover, and arguably more importantly, it also includes an explanation of the text within these contexts in the light of social theories (Ibid.). Such efforts are crucial since a discourse analysis cannot be critical as long as the discourse is analysed in relation to a wider context (van Dijk, 2001, p. 108).

Contexts help us understand the relevance of the text under analysis (van Dijk, 2005, p. 74). It is the context that makes the linguistic codes of a text meaningful. It relates the codes to the world outside the text. In van Dijk's words, "a theory of context provides a theory of relevance" (2001, p. 109). Because CDA is not limited to the linguistic analysis of a text but also concerned with the context, it necessitates the "theorization of social processes and structures" (Wodak, 2001a, p. 3). Furthermore, the choice of certain interpretations of text needs to be justified. This is also where theory comes into the CDA scene. Theory is one of the important tools of CDA for the justification of the preferences made during a research (Wodak, 2001b, p. 65). In this sense, theory composes the context to a large extent together with other tools such as history.

A text only finds its true meaning when it is analysed in a context because the whole is more than the sum of its parts. Likewise, a discourse is more than just a sum of the written or spoken words or sentences. The same word or sentence may refer to a completely different meaning under different structures or contexts. This makes understanding a discourse within the limits of texts impossible. An analysis of a text has to be based upon understanding the context that the text belongs to. Texts are reflections as well as parts of social reality. An analysis of a text gives the analyst an image of reality. However, this is only one singular image among many other images. In this sense, a good understanding of the context is necessary to locate the reality in hand among the other pieces of the big picture.

Instead of following one single theory, CDA synthesises different theories in order to better understand the problem in hand (Wodak & Weiss, 2005, p. 125). If the question is multi-dimensional, dimensions of which fall into different theoretical areas, following a grand theory may be a deficiency for the research. As an alternative, the discourse-historical

approach claims a rather pragmatic standpoint: any conceptual tools relevant to the context of the problem should be eclectically gathered together (Ibid.). CDA applies both general social theories and lower range theories in research (Wodak, 2001b, p. 70). Correspondingly, van Dijk points out a difference between global and local contexts. According to this differentiation:

> Global contexts are defined by the social, political, cultural and historical structures in which a communicative event takes place. In CDA, they often form the ultimate explanatory and critical rationale of discourse and its analysis. Local context is usually defined in terms of properties of the immediate, interactional situation in which a communicative event takes place. (van Dijk, 2001, p. 108)

This pattern is followed in this research: the general social theories on the role of education within processes of social and political integration are considered in the second chapter, whereas the third chapter deals with the lower range theories relating these general theories to the specific case of European integration. Nevertheless, there is also a distinguishing pattern in this thesis. When the EU discourses are under analysis, contextualisations tend to include a descriptive analysis of the EU as an organisation explained in greater detail elsewhere. At this point, instead of repeating the descriptive information on the EU, the thesis follows a different way of contextualisation. In so doing, it does not contextualise the EU but the particular case regarding the role of the EU education policy, which is compatible with the problem-oriented nature of CDA.

Problem Orientation and Eclecticism.

The defining features of the discourse-historical approach are all interrelated. However, the relationship between problem orientation and eclecticism is so close that it is necessary to discuss them under the same sub-heading. The discourse-historical approach is problem-oriented and thus it focuses on a particular reality rather than specific linguistic structures (Wodak, 2001b, p. 69). Problem orientation necessitates eclecticism. CDA does not refrain from combining any method "as far as it is helpful to understand the social problems under investigation" (Meyer, 2001, p. 29). This brings the issue of eclecticism into the foreground.

Due to the interdisciplinary character, both the theory and the methodology tend to be eclectic in CDA. One of the consequences of eclecticism on the methodology, as can be seen in this work, is that it expresses itself as interdiscursivity and intertextuality (Wodak, 2001b, pp. 69-70). The concept of interdiscursivity refers to the fact that discourses are interrelated in their nature. It is unlikely to identify a discourse which stands apart and alone among the other discourses. A similar case is valid for texts as "any text is a link in a chain of texts, reacting to, drawing in, and transforming other texts" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 262). In this sense, a text may and usually does belong to different discourses. A discourse on a subject is not always limited to the texts on that specific subject since they tend to "cross between fields, overlap, refer to each other or are in some other way socio-functionally linked with each other" (Wodak, 2001b, p. 67). Therefore, usefulness is the main criterion for the choice of data introduced for analysis. If a text is useful in answering the research question, it is added to the data to be analysed regardless of the discourse that it belongs to.

Problem orientation is the defining characteristics of intrinsic case studies as well. Because the approach is problem oriented, case studies are successfully incorporated as research strategies in the discourse-historical approach. As a result of being problem oriented, the discourse-historical approach analyses the problem in a historical period (Muntigl, 2000, p. 3). This is also compatible with the nature of case study which necessitates an in-depth inquiry of a phenomenon. Moreover, understanding the characteristics of a case, i.e. "a general understanding of the workings of the organization and its practices", is a central routine of not only any case studies but also the discourse-historical approach (Ibid.). CDA does not favour a specific research strategy. A critical discourse analyst has to consider the particularity of the research question when deciding on the research strategy (Wodak, 2001a, p. 3). The preference of the research strategy for this study is an example of this idea. As mentioned above, the choice of case study as the research strategy is a result of the related individual objective of this study. For similar reasons, case studies frequently come to be applied as research strategies in CDA.

The fact that there is no best way of conducting a CDA as a methodology brings advantages as well as disadvantages for a researcher. It is thought that a step-by-step way of collecting data makes the whole research process easier for a researcher. In this case, the researcher

has a map to follow a definite path so that there is less risk of getting lost in the process of analysis. Yet, CDA provides researchers with a larger area to manoeuvre so that they can better concentrate on their research question rather than the path. This flexibility is closely related to the fact that CDA is an interdisciplinary approach. Otherwise, it would not be possible for an approach to fit well in various research projects from different disciplines. The guide of a critical discourse analyst is specifically written for each individual case in accordance with the theoretical analysis of the particular context (van Dijk, 2001, p. 98).

4.5. Limitations and Potential Problems

A complete analysis of a discourse is not possible for practical reasons (van Dijk, 2001, p. 99). On the one hand, the borders of a discourse may not be definite as a result of interdiscursivity (Wodak & Weiss, 2005, p. 127). Consequently, a discourse analyst frequently finds himself or herself in trouble with clearly defining the borders of a discourse. On the other hand, the borders of the methods of discourse analysis are not definite either. As the CDA is a problem-oriented approach, the methods used in CDA are determined by the specific research question of a study (Meyer, 2001, p. 25). Therefore, it is not possible to find objective criteria of completeness for each and every discourse analysis.

Intertextuality and interdiscursivity are the two central concepts which increase the risk of having limitations and problems in a research. The risk is even more serious for small-scale research like a Master's thesis. This study is not an exception in this sense. With the stated choices of discourse limitation, the study has defined its focus as the EU discourse on education. Due to the intertextuality and interdiscursivity of the EU discourse on education, it has not been achievable to access every single text accounting for the related discourse on education. Like in the case of any other discourse, the discourse on education cannot be limited to a specific field. It originates in but is not restricted to the European education policy. This study is possibly limited to the extent that the EU discourse on education spreads away from the centre of the European education policy.

EU institutional discourse is thick with intertextuality and interdiscursivity. In the final analysis, the very idea of Europe is a part of a discourse. As Strath articulates, "Europe is a discourse about a territorium, the demarcation of which is contested, as are the extent and content of its institutions" (2000. p. 24). Therefore, it necessitates a well-balanced relationship between text and context. This is why the study does not rely on data alone. In order to minimise the risk of being limited, it invokes theory and history as the context to identify the facts and realities hidden between the lines of the data. This is an approach that has been successfully applied in numerous studies in various areas. Institutional and political discourses are among the most frequently analysed areas in CDA (Wodak, 2001a, p. 2). Moreover, the application of the approach to the EU or to the concept of identity construction is not something new. The founding scholars of the approach have already experienced it on the issues related to the EU[10] or to the processes of identity construction[11] and even to the construction of the European identity in particular[12]. However, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, the subsequent chapter is the very first attempt to apply this methodology particularly to the EU discourse on general education.

---

[10] See, Muntigl, Weiss & Wodak (2000) or Wodak & Weiss (2001).
[11] See, Wodak et al. (1999).
[12] See, Wodak (2004).

CHAPTER 5: CASE STUDY FINDINGS: DESCRIPTION, ANALYSIS, AND SYNTHESIS

5.1. Introduction: The Historical Background

This chapter reveals the results of the case study described in the chapter on research methods. It concentrates on two main sources of discourse: official policy documents of the EU institutions as written discourse and individual contributions of the EU officials in the form of either written or spoken discourse. Serving as the last individual objective of the thesis, it includes brief descriptions, a detailed analysis, and an initial synthesis of the EU discourse on education. The initial synthesis of the analysis with the theoretical considerations is completed in the subsequent concluding chapter of the thesis. On the way to the synthesis, this chapter starts with a brief historical outlook on the roots of the EU discourse on education.

The official discourse of the Union starts with treaties as the treaties start with preambles. The issue of political integration has always been one of the points underlined in the preambles to the treaties of the EU. As early as the very beginning of the story of European integration, the *Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community* heralds the "foundation of a broad and independent community among peoples long divided by bloody conflicts" (European Coal and Steel Community [ECSC], 1951, the preamble). In the same decade, the *Treaties of Rome* stated the aim of this community, in a way that would become a classic phrase, as "to lay the foundations for an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe" (European Economic Community [EEC], 1957, the preamble). This objective can be seen in other preambles such as the one to the *Treaty of Maastricht*, which promises "to continue the process of creating" such a union (EC, 1992, the preamble).

Despite the connotations of social and political integration in the preambles, the "foundations" laid were initially limited in the area of economy. This had been the case until the early 1970s. The first half of the 1970s witnessed significant changes within the history of European integration. Whether one traces the discourses on identity, integration, or

education, he or she would end up at the beginning of the 1970s. In other words, the discourses on identity, integration, and education all emerged at around the same time in the history of European integration. In a report on the education and training programmes, the Commission explicitly notes that the "growth of the Community's education and training programmes has coincided with mounting interest in the development of a concept of 'a People's Europe'" (CEC, 1993a, p. 22). However, this is not a mere coincidence as the analysis of these discourses shows an exhaustive interdiscursive pattern.

The first ever resolution of Ministers of Education in the history of European integration deals with the issues of culture, identity, and integration instead of concentrating on knowledge, learning, or teaching. The history of the European education policy is not as old as the history of the Union itself. The first signs of cooperation in education at the European level appeared at the beginning of the 1970s. It was in 1971 when the Ministers of Education from the six Member States came together for the first time. In this meeting, the Ministers agreed to form an operational group to initiate common policies in the area of education. Among the work of this group, resolutions stood out as the benchmarks of cooperation in the area of education policy. The very first clues about the future of the European education policy were hidden in the first resolution reached: The Ministers of Education defined identity as an "exceptional source of development, progress and culture" (CEC, 1987, p. 11). Accordingly, there was a need for a "European model of culture correlating with European integration" (Ibid.). In this formulation, the "European model of culture" refers to a new identity which is different than the existing national identities. In this sense, the resolution hints at a collective European identity. Such an identity could flourish out of the "historical affinities" of the European nations only if there is cooperation in the area of education at the community level (Ibid., p. 11). The resolution also includes an attempt to legitimise the interest in culture, identity, and integration with the argument soon to be repeated elsewhere that "on no account must education be regarded merely as a component of economic life" (Ibid., p. 15). Legitimised or not, this occasion marks the start of the cooperation with an inclination for politics of civic education rather than philosophic education.

The inclination became more apparent as well as fitting in the picture that developed within the next couple of years. Despite the arguments that date the roots of identity politics further back in the history of the Union, the general opinion points to the *Paris Summit* of 1972 as the landmark. Marking the birth of the political aspect of the European integration, this Summit made the way for noteworthy developments related to European identity. Soon after, the concept of "European identity" was explicitly introduced during the *Copenhagen Summit* in 1973 while the "citizen's Europe" followed in the next *Paris Summit* of 1974. With the former occasion, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the time affirmed that the "time has come to draw up a document on the European Identity" in the document entitled *Declaration on the European Identity* (CEC, 1973). However, it was a rather a loose statement wishing for a synergy among the Members States in international relations rather than a document manifesting a collective political identity in Europe. Notwithstanding, the declaration is important in the senses that it not only marks the first formulation of the concept of European identity but that it also officially recognises the European identity as "a function of the dynamic construction of a United Europe" (Ibid., p. 122). This approach was further developed by the comprehensive proposals written by the officials for the future of the European integration, namely the *Tindemans Report on the European Union* in 1975 and the *Adonnino Reports on a People's Europe* in 1985. These proposals refer to the European identity as a collective political consciousness and consider education as an essential mechanism to create such consciousness.

It has been almost four decades since the Ministers of Education met for the first time. Within this time period, there has emerged a thick discourse on education. The thickness of the specific discourse, together with the characteristic intertextuality and interdiscursivity of the EU discourses in general, makes the organisation of the analysis challenging let alone the actual analysis. With the guide of the theoretical and methodological presumptions as well as the discourse itself, the thesis meets this challenge by organising the analysis under five interrelated sub-headings. These include the analyses on education as an area of politics, European identity, citizenship, and higher education as a separate category. However, before a discussion of these areas, the chapter explores the reflections of the chain of relations from economics to education on the discourse.

5.2. Economics, Politics, and thus Education

Yet another action and development plan for the future of the Union was announced at the beginning of this decade. At a meeting in Lisbon in March 2000 for a special agenda, the *Extraordinary European Council* agreed on a new strategic goal, commonly referred to as the *Lisbon Strategy*. Against the challenge of "a quantum shift resulting from globalisation and the challenges of a new knowledge-driven economy", the *Lisbon Strategy* aimed for the EU to "become the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, and respect for the environment" (EP, 2000). The challenge and strategy defined on this occasion verify the theories that the changing nature of economy necessitates a parallel change in society and that politics paves the way for the economic transformation by ensuring the social change. More to the case of the Union, the reference to "greater social cohesion" echoes the assertion that the Union seeks further harmonisation than that of modernisation. This is not an easy task as the Commission admits in an attempt to redefine the concrete future objectives of education in light of the *Lisbon Strategy*:

> The Commission believes that no single Member State can accomplish all this alone. Our societies, like our economies, are now too interdependent for this to be realistic. While we must preserve the differences of structure and system which reflect the identities of the countries and regions of Europe, we must also recognise that our main objectives, and the results we all seek, are strikingly similar. We should build on those similarities to learn from each other, to share our successes and failures, and to use education together to advance European citizens and European society into the new millennium. (CEC, 2001, p. 15)

Within the context of the *Lisbon Strategy*, this single paragraph provides some solid evidence for the appropriateness of the theoretical considerations proposed in this thesis. To begin with, it is a statement about how the presently divided structure of European societies is incompatible with the emerging economic formation. Despite the reference to the official motto of *unity in diversity*, the Commission corroborates the theory that the well functioning of the economy needs and leads a further harmonisation in society. The advancement of the European integration is closely related to the reconstruction of the European societies. Furthermore, the Commission equally corroborates the premise that

education turns into an agent in charge of the reconstruction in the new transformation process. At this juncture, the role of the education is directly related to the change in economic formation. The preferred wording, "to use education together", lends more weight to the premises of the thesis: the verb *use* connotes that political purposes of education prevail over non-political while the adverb *together* suggests the interest of the Union in defining the purposes.

The link between economics and education dates further back than the *Lisbon Strategy*. As declared by a Commission report, this link was the main motive behind the very first meeting of the Council of Ministers of Education in 1971 (CEC, 1988a, p. 4). Briefing the historical development of the European education policy, the report concludes that the "Community programme on education was vital since the Community's economic policies would be effective only if they were accompanied by appropriate policies in the field of education" (Ibid., pp. 4-5). This is only one of the numerous occasions that the EU discourse underlines the link between economics and education. During the decade between 1985 and 1995, the frequency of the references made to the link was noticeably high due to the preparations for and the establishment of the Single Market. Based on the principle of free movement of goods, capital, people and services in a common area, the Single Market is the end product of the economic transformation that the thesis defines as the source of the politicisation of education. The completion of the Single Market indicates an advanced economical integration beyond the social or political integration of Europe. In this sense, the interest in education within the context of the Single Market substantiates the theory that explains the politicisation of education in the framework of economic transformation.

The Commission's medium-term perspectives for this decade verify these premises in a way which leaves nothing to the imagination. In the Commission's terms:

> The completion of the Internal Market, the adoption of the Single European Act and the recent decisions of the European Council in Brussels in February 1988, place

education and training in a new context in the construction of European Community. (CEC, 1988b, p. 2) [13]

As a result of these economic changes, the Commission expects "all forms of economic activity will become increasingly European and mobile" and thus expresses the need for the redefinition of education (CEC, 1988b, p. 2). The expectation of Europeanisation and mobility corresponds to the theoretical considerations of homogenisation and mobility as the changes that economic transformations impose on societies. One week after the announcement of these perspectives, the Council of Ministers based a resolution on the same consideration that "enhanced treatment of the European dimension in education to be an element contributing to the development of the Community and achievement of the objective of creating a unified internal market by 1992" (Council of Ministers [C o M], 1988, p. 5). The Council of Ministers proposes the functional necessities of the economic developments as the justification for the development of the European dimension in education. In the *Green Paper on the European Dimension of Education*, the Commission adds references to the "responsibilities of young people" in a "new social and cultural" besides the economic environment:

> In the new context afforded by the Single Market, education has as one of its aims the preparation of young people to exercise their responsibilities in a wider social and economic area. It is in this perspective that the development of a European dimension of education must be seen as an important factor in the adjustment of the educational process to the new economic, social and cultural environment. (CEC, 1993b, p. 3)

More references are made to the relationship between economics and education after the completion of the Single Market. For another example, in a report entitled *Accomplishing Europe through Education and Training*, which is self-explanatory enough, the Commission emphasises the need for education to play a role in change:

> If Europe is to remain at the driving edge, economic and political progress must be complemented by offering a European vision to her young people. Education and training efforts must mobilize themselves around this emerging picture. (…) this task is

---

[13] Budgetary issues were at the heart of the *European Council* in Brussels in February 1988. The Council decided to revise the system of its own resources and established the principle for the correction of budgetary imbalances (EC, 1988).

an urgent one in order to facilitate the best adaptation possible to new employment conditions and the development of the learning society. (CEC, 1997a, p. 1)

The relationship between economics and education leads to similar experiences with nationalisation in modern and Europeanisation in post-modern eras. These experiences verify the idea that the role of education is defined by a combination of economic determinism and political will. Like in the processes of nationalisation, an economic transformation expanding the integration beyond the existing social borders, i.e. the establishment of the Single Market, initiates corresponding changes in the ways societies perceive, evaluate, and behave. The above examples from the discourse of the Union demonstrate a familiar political will, which so defines the role of the education that the functional needs of the economy are supported. In so doing, the EU heavily borrows from the old discourse of nationalism for a new battle of the European integration simply because the economic transformations leading nationalisation and Europeanisation are strikingly similar. The remainder of the chapter further analyses the EU discourse to advance an understanding of whether these similarities have given the EU education policy a comparable role to the education policy of nation-state.

5.3. Education as an Area of Politics

The pieces of the discourse referred to in the previous sub-section indicate a contradiction. On the one hand, it is declared that the major motor of cooperation in education has always been economic in nature. On the other hand, after 30 years of the first signs of cooperation, the relationship between economics and education is presented as something new to consider with the *Lisbon Strategy* and thereafter. This contradiction raises doubts about the competence of the Union to accomplish its policy objectives. The basis of the competences in the area of education was attributed to the EU by the *Treaty of Maastricht*. The Treaty defines the competences in this area as follows:

> The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member

States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity. (EC, 1992, Article 126)

It is a rather vague and limited definition for not only the role of the Union but also the education itself. This makes the legal base deficient. Moreover, contradicting with the data analysed in this section and thus the attributes of the actual developments, it is also misleading. Anders Hingel, the head of unit at the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the Union, confirms this misleading deficiency. As he admits, "after the first reading of the Treaty, one could be liable to misunderstand what is presently happening within the field of education on a Community level" (Hingel, 2001, p. 3).

In this sense, there is another contradiction between theory and practice. On the one hand, Member States restrain the competences of the Union with vague and limited terms. On the other hand, the Union is involved in the education policy beyond the limits set in the Treaty. This contradiction proves the significance of education for governance. Due to all the characteristics of education mentioned in this thesis, education has a special place within the state organisation. Member States do not want to lose the power that education provides them for their national unity. Education is associated with the national sovereignty of the nation-state. This is why governmental ministries of education are given the adverb *national* more commonly than any other ministries in any Member-State. Nevertheless, for the same reason, the Union has been interested in the education policy since the beginning of the 1970s. The discourse on education was developed without a definite base in the Treaty for two decades. This fact alone justifies the doubts of the ability of the Treaty to cover the role of education policy in the Union. Still, the ratification of the *Treaty of Maastricht* has officialised the involvement of the EU in education. Gaining a limited but official base, the position of the Union has not been weakened but strengthened by Article 126.

The initial aim of the education policy, as stated in the *Treaty of Maastricht*, is "developing the European dimension in education" (EC, 1992, Article 126.2). In a resolution, the Parliament notes on this dimension that "the European dimension has become in recent decades an increasingly important aspect of education, especially in national school curricula" (EP, 2006a, p. 100). As a central aspect of this dimension, the model of European

educational area was introduced in 1997 (CEC, 1997b). With the related communication, the Commission announces that the "gradual construction of an open and dynamic European educational area" has been in progress (Ibid., p. 3). The construction of this area, as it progresses, is expected to move the competences within the area of education towards the Union, since it is "European" as opposed to national. A statement by the head of unit at the Directorate General for Education and Culture betrays that the area constructed at the European level is "logically" being filled by the institutions at this level, i.e. the Union:

> What is presently happening in co-operation in the field of education tells us, that not only is a **European Space of Education** in its making, <u>common principles</u> of education are being agreed upon between Member States, leading logically to a **European Model of Education**. (Hingel, 2001, p. 4)[14]

The head of unit at the Directorate observes that the traditional emphasis on the diversity of national systems in the Union has been increasingly replaced by an emphasis on uniformity at the European level:

> The Lisbon [European Council] conclusions implicitly give the Union the mandate to develop a "common interest approach" in education going beyond national diversities as can already be seen in the demand to Ministers of Education to debate common objectives of educational systems. This mandate will lead to an increase in the European dimension of national educational policies. (Hingel, 2001, p. 19)[15]

The intervention of the Heads of States or governments at the *Lisbon Summit* shows that there is a political will in favour of a role for the education policy at the European level despite the rather limited space that the Treaty leaves for the Union to manoeuvre in the area of education:

> The "politicisation" of initiatives during the last few years in the field of education of injecting, "from the top", an acceleration and deepening of European co-operation might have been an answer to the more slow and more conservative development of Ministries and National educational authorities. The latest development experienced in the Lisbon conclusions where Heads of State have taken the initiative, is a continuation of the politicisation trend. (Hingel, 2001, p. 19)[16]

---

[14] Emphases in the original.
[15] Emphasis in the original.
[16] Emphases in the original.

The strategic target that the Union set at the *Lisbon Summit* for the current decade is "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth accompanied by quantitative and qualitative improvement of employment and of greater social cohesion" (EP, 2000). The target of achieving greater social cohesion is understood as commissioning the education policy to create "a sense of belonging". Approximately one month after the announcement of the *Lisbon Strategy*, Viviane Reding, the Commissioner for the Education and Culture of the time, redefined her objectives according to the target set during the Summit:

> My objective would be to build a Europe in which everyone has the opportunity to fully develop their talents, to feel that they can contribute to the best of their ability, and that they should have a sense of belonging. (Reding, 2000)

Although the *Lisbon Strategy* includes the target of "greater social cohesion", the emphasis is still rather on economy. This makes the Commissioner feel the need to underline "the dual role of education" so as to counterbalance the role of the education policy in identity construction against rather technical roles which the Strategy may seem to favour:

> In this speech, I have specifically insisted upon the dual role of education, and I will continue doing so throughout my mandate. On the one hand, education will serve the economy, competitiveness and employability, and on the other hand, citizenship and social cohesion. This is not a 'zero sum game', as one says in English. The fact that we are giving more attention to economic challenges does not mean we will be giving less attention to social objectives. (Reding, 2000)[17]

As it comes to the "social objectives" of education, the Commissioner introduces the issue of identity over the concept of "soul":

> It is clear that we cannot see education as a mere vector for economic growth: **it is also the biggest gathering of European citizens!** - and if we want to build a living Europe, with a soul, a destination and a world role, a Europe that its citizens hold close to their hearts, it is there, in the schools, the universities, the training centres, that Europe can grant itself a soul - of this I am convinced. (Reding, 2000)[18]

---

[17] Emphasis in original.
[18] Emphasis in original.

As an initiative of the *Lisbon Summit*, the Member States are invited to comment on the education policy in light of the new era marked by the *Lisbon Strategy.* The report by the Commission, based on these comments, is evidence of the fact that the Member States are concerned about the identity construction role of the education policy. With regards to the content of the education, "a number of Member States underline the role of education in transmitting the values of society - democracy, citizenship, community - though this also underlies the comments made by all Member States on the role of education as a whole" (CEC, 2001, p. 4).

A commonality in most of the documents examined in this study is the existence of assurance clauses or sentences right after a presumptuous sentence or towards the end of an assertive text. These are put in the text in order to assure those who are critical of a deeper supranational cooperation in the area of education so that an agreement over a text can be reached. A communication from the Commission includes a striking example where, in the same sentence, the Commission both states an assurance clause and a way of escape from the limitations stated in the assurance: "Opportunities should be found, and created, to maintain a steady advance towards convergence and coherence wherever this can be done without damage to the rich traditions of the diversity of educational practices in the Community" (CEC, 1988b, p. 4). In another characteristic example, the Parliament "stresses that the European dimension [in education] complements national content, but neither replaces nor supplants it" in a resolution (EP, 2006a, p. 102) although this stress was not mentioned in the draft version of the resolution (EP, 2006b).

The development of the education policy of the EU cannot be fully understood without considering the sceptical stands to the cooperation in the area of education. Due to the role of the education policy in identity construction and the importance of this role for the individual national identities within the Member States, any steps towards a deeper cooperation at the European level give rise to scepticism and resistance. However, education is an area which is impossible to leave completely out of the integration process. Hence, there is a third stand with regards to the cooperation in the area of education, which favours the limitation of the supranational cooperation to economic and technical aspects. Nevertheless, the cooperation in the area of education was actually started by a clear

argument of the Ministers of Education underlining that "on no account must education be regarded merely as a component of economic life" (C o M, 1974, p. 2; CEC, 1987, p. 15).

5.4. European identity

On the proposal for recognition of the higher education diplomas, which was a major step towards the creation of a common European educational space, the Commission criticises the way the Member States cooperates to promote the cultural unity in the Union. According to the Commission, the emphasis on unity will stay deficient as long as it is left to the individual Member States:

> In spite of the wide diversity of national traditions, the existence of cultural unity within Europe is a fact that is nowhere called into question, but that in the law of the Member States of the Community only makes its presence felt in sporadic and feeble fashion. One expression of this cultural unity is the university (…). (CEC, 1985, p. 3)

On another occasion, the Parliament raises a parallel criticism that the "information about Europe that is conveyed to pupils, teachers and students varies widely from country to country" (EP, 2006a, p. 101). The occasions of such criticism denote that the promotion of unity needs to be given a new life and that the key to success lies in cooperation in the area of education. The urge for such cooperation for the sake of cultural unity is a reminder of the way education was nationalised in the processes of nation-building. Previously diverse systems of education were unified by cooperating at national levels. It is worth quoting Napoleon again, who worried that "the state will not constitute a nation but will rest on vague and shifting foundations, ever exposed to disorder and change … so long as there is no teaching body based on stable principles" (Quoted in Herold, 1955, p. 118). Since any cooperation necessitates the emergence of one such centre rather than various different centres, the matter of cooperation is also related to control over education. In this sense, the creation of a European educational space is a way to enhance the authority of the Union in the education policy.

In order to stand for the unity within the "wide diversity" represented by the identities in Europe, education is mentioned first among the other areas which the Commission intends to apply. In a work programme, the Commission is quick to show this intent as the first sentence under the sub-heading related to education: "By advancing in the areas of education, culture, audiovisual policy, youth and sport the Commission can make a clear choice in favour of the citizen and of a European Identity drawing strength from our shared cultural heritage" (CEC, 2000, p. 16). This objective is also shared by the Council and the Ministers of Education who:

> EXPRESS their intention, in the face of the challenge arising from the completion of the European Single Market, to intensify cooperation in the field of youth, so as to reinforce young people's awareness of belonging to Europe and take account of their wish to play a positive role in the building of the European Community. (EC & C o M, 1991, p. 1)[19]

The Resolution on the European Dimension in Education directly relates such an intention with the officially stated objective:

> To strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and make clear to them the value of European civilisation and of the foundations on which the European peoples intend to base their development today; that is in particular the safeguarding of the principles of democracy, social justice and respect for human rights. (EC & C o M, 1988, p. 5)

The Council and the representatives of the Member States are convinced that "it is through education that Europeans will acquire the shared cultural references that are the basis of European citizenship and of a political Europe" and that:

> It is therefore essential to target intelligible action, shared by all of the Member States, at young people, schoolchildren, students, researchers, all those being educated and their teachers; that it is by building the Europe of intelligence that we will bring about a true feeling of being part of Europe. (EC, 2000, p. 16)

The Commission does not refrain from revealing that the European integration involves efforts to "make Europeans", which is a replication of the nation-building at a European

---

[19] Emphasis in the original.

level. In the *Report on the Establishment of a European Foundation*, the Commission reveals this replication as "the Community is more than a geo-political entity, neither is it for mere geopolitical reasons that we are attempting to make the citizens of our countries into responsible Europeans with a sense of their common" (CEC, 1977, p. 15). The Foundation, which the Commission was proposing in this connection, was to "develop the European citizen's sense of belonging to one and the same community with a common heritage from the past and a common destiny for the present and the future" (Ibid., p. 8). In this sense, not only the attempt itself but also the way that the Commission could think of is a replication of the nation-building process. The Commission believes that the role of education on the consciousness and belonging of the people is becoming stronger than ever. It is underlined in the *White Paper on Education and Training* that "education and training will increasingly become the main vehicles for self-awareness, belonging, advancement and self-fulfilment" (CEC, 1995, p. 2).

The Resolution on the European Dimension in Education, which is referred to above, is largely based on the *Enhanced Treatment of the European Dimension in Education*, an important piece of the discourse on education in the Union. According to this report, the "ultimate aim" of the European cooperation in the area of education is "a European model of culture correlating with European integration" (CEC, 1988a, p. 4). Such cooperation is essential because the youngsters need to see the Union "not only as an institutional, economic and political area but also as a human community whose members are establishing ever more and ever closer relationships because they have taken the decision to build together, a European society" (Ibid., pp. 6-7). It will be a cooperation which ensures that the European youngsters receive "appropriate intellectual, psychological and occupational preparation" so that they "can play a full part in the construction of European Union" in the future (Ibid., pp. 5-13). It was later confirmed in the document subtitled *A European Success Story* that creating such an ability was a success criterion for the European education policy (CEC, 2002). Marking the first millionth Erasmus student, the Commission takes the occasion to announce that "Erasmus students are contributing to shaping a common European identity" (Ibid.).

5.5. Citizenship: *Learning about* Europe

The interdiscursive development on education and particularly on the identity construction role of education in the Union is advanced by the European citizenship. The interdiscursivity develops as a result of the official policy to make use of the theoretical relationship between citizenship and identity as well as the one between citizenship and education. To begin with the *Education for Active Citizenship in the European Union*, the Commission published the overview of and recommendations on the goals and achievements of the project of European citizenship (CEC, 1998). Criticising the variations of the interpretations of the project, it reinforced the principles of the European citizenship: "the shared values of interdependence, democracy, equality of opportunity and mutual respect" (Ibid., p. 16). The values emphasised as the basis of the European citizenship are similar to the values of the European identity. Some of these values were intended to be included in the Constitution as "the Union's values".[20] Accordingly:

> The Union is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail. (EC, 2004, Articles I-2)

The recurrence of the same or similar values as attached to both citizenship and identity is pregnant with meaning. Above all, the Constitution declares that promoting these values is among the top three aims of the Union, together with peace and well-being of the people (EC, 2004, Articles I-3). The recurring emphasis placed on these values is just a result of such significance attached to them. These remarks corroborate the theory that shared values are crucial for the emergence of constructs such as citizenship or collective identity. Then again, the proposition of these values for both citizenship and identity on different occasions is a sign that the Union follows the approach which closely associates citizenship with identity. For instance, a sentence reads in the *White Paper on Education and Training*, "multilingualism is part and parcel of both European identity/citizenship and the learning society" (CEC, 1995,

---

[20] Although the *Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe* has never been implemented, the *Treaty of Lisbon*, which is under ratification process, keeps the related articles as they are in the *Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe*.

p. 47). In this instance, the slash between the words identity and citizenship epitomises that the Commission perceives these two concepts so related that they could be alternatives to each other.

These are already theoretically related concepts. Citizenship is the legal status of belonging while national identity is the sense of belonging to a polity. In this sense, enfolding citizenship with values causes these already related concepts to become even closer to each other. So much so that, as in the case of the EU, distinguishing between citizenship and identity is no longer possible. As a result, education for citizenship starts working the same way as education for a collective identity within the Union. This opens an area for the Union to manoeuvre since citizenship is a concrete concept on which the Union has sufficient competences, whereas identity is rather abstract and deficient of a legal basis especially with regards to the construction by education.

The Union benefits from the close relationship between citizenship and identity by turning the theoretical relationship into a practical one. The EU documents frequently discuss citizenship in relation to the concepts of identity, integration, and education on several occasions. In this sense, the report entitled *Learning for Active Citizenship* is a prime example where the citizenship is explicitly linked to these concepts (CEC, 1998). It starts with a foreword written by Edith Cresson, then the Commissioner for Education, Research, and Sciences, who emphasises the link:

> The link between citizenship and education is a close one: in the first instance, the introduction of mass public education was certainly a key element in the emergence of modern citizenship, in that it provides a foundation for informed participation and integration. (CEC, 1998)

This is a link connecting the EU to a "broader idea of citizenship". Moreover, according to the Commissioner, this connection is a legally binding one:

> The Amsterdam Treaty commits us to developing citizenship of the Union, not just in a legal sense but also through the fulfilment of the ideal of a Europe close to its citizens. This means seeking to encourage people's practical involvement in the democratic process at all levels, and most particularly at European level. I maintain, then, that

turning a Europe of Knowledge into reality importantly includes promoting a broader idea of citizenship, which can strengthen the meaning and the experience of belonging to a shared social and cultural community. (CEC, 1998)

In the communication entitled *Towards a Europe of Knowledge*, the Commission reflects this binding nature with the expression of *must*: "[the educational area] must encourage a broader-based understanding of citizenship" (CEC, 1997b, p. 3). Such an understanding of citizenship is expected to be developed "through the sharing of common values and the development of a sense of belonging to a common social and cultural area" (Ibid.). If education is seen as enhancing citizenship based on shared values, the Commission confirms the theories of nationalism in the sense that education leads citizens to develop certain shared values. These values are the elements constituting the "spirit of European citizenship". For example, Socrates, one of the most important educational initiatives of the Commission, was first and foremost created to "develop the European dimension in studies at all levels so as to strengthen the spirit of European citizenship, drawing on the cultural heritage of each Member State" (CEC, 1987; CEC, 1989; EC & EP, 1995).[21]

Another communication from the Commission, entitled *Making Citizenship Work*, underlines that it is the shared common values and the sense of belonging to the EU that would make the citizenship work (CEC, 2004, p. 6). In the same communication, the Commission defines the programmes on education, training and youth as the "European instruments offering the opportunity to create a stronger sense of citizenship amongst young people" (Ibid.). It also defines a relationship between citizenship, values, and education in the observation that "the growing importance of citizenship in the European order and the values it is based upon has been mirrored by an equal growth in importance at Union level of education, youth and cultural policies" (Ibid., p. 4). The *Green Paper* that the European Commission published on *the European Dimension of Education* defines citizenship as an "added-value" of the European dimension of education. In this sense, it explicitly relates education to citizenship. According to the Commission:

This "added value" would contribute to a European citizenship based on the shared values of interdependence, democracy, equality of opportunity and mutual respect; it

---
[21] This is the first objective stated.

would also help to extend the opportunities for improving the quality of education; and working life. (CEC, 1993b, p. 5)[22]

The discourse on the European citizenship education shows that the Union does not neglect either the *learning about* or the *learning in* approach. Evaluating the education and training programmes, the Commission reports that the "idea and practice of European citizenship is reflected in and supported by the kind of experience they offer" (CEC, 1993a, p. 22). It is emphasised that citizens need to learn about the rights and duties stemming from the European integration and about the process of European integration itself, both of which are expected to give rise to the "ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe". A decade before the introduction of the citizenship of the Union, it was affirmed in a resolution of the Parliament that:

> Education about the Community and Europe must be provided in schools, both as a nucleus of common content in the various schools curricula and as a vital body of knowledge enabling European citizens to freely exercise their political rights of control and critical participation. (EP, 1982)

Two years later, the Council and the Ministers for Education reaffirmed the significance of learning about the integration with a similarly definitive conclusion that:

> The ever-closer union among the peoples of Europe that is called for by the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community can only be achieved on the basis of the citizens' understanding of political, social, and cultural life in other Member States. They must also be well informed on the goals of European integration and the European Community's means of action. Teaching about dimension is therefore part and parcel of the education of the future citizens of Europe. (CEC, 1987, pp. 143-4)

Relating citizenship to the sense of belonging, the Union makes it clear that citizenship education is not perceived as merely limited to teaching the legal rights and duties to the European citizens. Besides, it also involves investing education with all the necessary abilities to construct a social reality. In this sense, even the rather straightforward approach of learning about ties citizenship to the creation of a sense of belonging to the Union among the peoples of Europe. This is the perception that opens the citizenship education to the

---

[22] Emphasis in the original.

interest of politics. Such a formulation of the education policy engages the Union to promote constructive values among the citizens.

On the education of the citizens, the Union has been paying special attention to those subjects that have always been referred to in the process of nationalism among the others. In the *Report on the Establishment of a European Foundation*, the Commission prefers to look at history and geography as examples:

> The cultural education of Europe's citizens must not be forgotten. For instance, the history of the Community countries is still inadequately covered and is often presented from a national point of view. We do not propose a uniform popularized history of Europe for all the children in the Community, but rather *an increase in their knowledge of other countries of the Community through studies and publications in history, geography and the history of arts*, encouragement being given where possible to translations in the various Community languages. (CEC, 1977, p. 15)[23]

A rather recent resolution of the Parliament, *Initiatives to Complement School Curricula Providing Appropriate Support Measures to Include the European Dimension*, confirms the interest of the Union in history. In this resolution, the Parliament urges the Union that "efforts must be made to agree on a common understanding of history and a definition of European values" (EP, 2006a, p. 101). A more striking suggestion was made by the *Adonnino Reports*, which went further to propose that the European dimension shall include "preparation and availability of appropriate school books and teaching materials" to create "a people's Europe" (Adonnino, 1985a, p. 24).

There is more to the *Adonnino Reports* than this striking proposal. It marks a crucial momentum in the history of the integration for closing the gap between the peoples of Europe and the Union. Previously, in the *Report on the Establishment of a European Foundation*, the Commission compared the European integration with that of nations and observed that there was a need "to strengthen understanding of, and support for, the work of the Community" since "the Community remains invisible to most of its citizens. Unlike national states it neither offers direct services to, nor makes direct demands on, the great majority of them" (CEC, 1977, p. 8). These observations were consolidated by the

---

[23] Emphasis in the original.

inopportunely low turnout rates in the 1984 European Parliamentary elections. As a result, the Council assigned the *ad hoc Committee for a People's Europe* lead by Pietro Adonnino, a member of the Parliament, with the task "to propose arrangements which will be of direct relevance to Community citizens and which will visibly offer them tangible benefits in their everyday lives" (Adonnino, 1985b, p. 111). The main proposal of the *Adonnino Reports*, against the challenges in front of the European integration, was the construction of a sense of belonging among the peoples of Europe. One of the policy areas that Adonnino suggested for the creation of "a people's Europe" was education (1985a, pp. 23-6). These education based proposals of the *Adonnino Reports* confirm the relevance of the education policy to the gap between the people and the Union, in other words, the legitimacy of the Union.

5.6. Higher Education: *Learning in* Europe

Yet another proposal of the *Adonnino Reports* was the creation of exchange channels among the peoples of Europe (Adonnino, 1985a, pp. 25-6). Over time, the exchange programmes in education have come to form an important aspect of identity formation within the EU education policy. Gaining and interpreting knowledge, facts, and concepts is the basis of the learning about approach to education. Although the learning about approach is seen as the most classic approach partly due to explicitness and simplicity, it is not the only approach employed in education systems. The EU education programmes that include the exchange of students, teachers, and academics are a product of the learning in approach to education. The emphasis of the learning in approach is on practice, process, and activity rather than the acquisition of facts and concepts. In this sense, it is active rather than passive learning. It is through this instrument that the Union actively encourages the staff and students "to gain direct experience in another Member State" (CEC, 1993a, p. 5). For instance, instead of learning their rights originating from the EU citizenship while sitting in a classroom in their country, exchange students of the EU programmes learn through their exchange experiences that they have the right to move to and reside within the territory of the Member States of the Union. As a report on the education programmes states:

[The education and training programmes] are themselves instruments of free circulation and examples of the recognition of European diversity. They offer experience of the reality of European union and unity: the free movement of people, ideas, and products. (CEC, 1993a, p. 22)

The issue of exchange was initially mentioned in a report written by Leo Tindemans, a former prime minister of Belgium. The report defines education as a potential source of an "external sign of solidarity" and stipulates the realisation of this potential to student exchanges:

[The EU] must encourage greater integration in educational matters by promoting student exchanges. The aim is to give Europeans of tomorrow a personal and concrete impression of the European reality and a detailed knowledge of our languages and cultures since these constitute the common heritage which the European Union aims specifically to protect. (Tindemans, 1976, p. 28)

The most fundamental remark on the issue was made by the *Treaty of Maastricht*. Under the article devoted to the education policy, the Treaty lists what the aims of community action shall be: "encouraging mobility of students and teachers" and "encouraging the development of youth exchanges and of exchanges of socio-educational instructors" together with "promoting cooperation between educational establishments" among three others (EC, 1992, Article 126.2). In parallel with this article, exchange, or mobility, is defined as one of the three instruments of all the education programmes in the EU (CEC, 1993a, p. 5). The emphasis on mobility through education is just part of a much bigger project of mobility undertaken under the Four Freedoms:

Mobility in education and training is an integral part of the freedom of movement of persons - a fundamental freedom protected by the Treaty - and one of the main objectives of the European Union's action in the field of education and training, based both on common values and on respect for diversity. (EP & C o M, 2006a, p. 5)

The emphasis on mobility evinces the theoretical considerations on the relationship between mobility and economic developments and on the role of education within this relationship. The unification of Europe through the economic integration of previously divided polities both stimulates and necessitates an increase in mobility. The well functioning of the economy over a wider area than that of individual Member States

depends on the ability of goods, capital, services, people, and labour to move freely within the EU. The emphasis on the mobility through education demonstrates the Union's endeavour to open the mechanisms of mobility with the learning in approach to education. In this way, the Union complements the learning about approach, which creates a common basis for social communication, with concrete tuitions of the learning in approach to further the mobility.

Citizenship of the European Union, which has extended the rights beyond the scope of workers, was an important aspect of the *Treaty of Maastricht*. In addition to introducing rights, it also marks the creation of a space where all the EU citizens can enjoy these rights principally anywhere within the Union. Defining the rights under the roof of the EU, citizenship eliminates the borders and thus the barriers in front of mobility. However, removing the barriers does not necessarily guarantee mobility. Setting the formal scene for education for the first time, the Union has attributed significant importance to issues of mobility in this policy area with the same Treaty. This preference authenticates the theory that the EU needs to prepare the social and political bases of further mobility and that education is seen as simply the right area to consult for this need.

Hence, enhancing the mobility of Europeans through the channels of education has theoretically and practically been applied in the integration process since the 1970s. The mobility of the students is supported legally, economically, and academically. However, as the *Green Paper on Education, Training, Research: The Obstacles to Transnational Mobility* highlights, there has been some obstacles to mobility (CEC, 1996). In this sense, the *Lisbon Strategy* has breathed new life into the mobility of students. It has called on the Member States, the Council and the Commission to "take the necessary steps within their areas of competence to foster the mobility of students, teachers and training staff, in particular by removing obstacles" as previously noted in the Green Paper (EP, 2000). Soon after the statement of the *Lisbon Summit*, the Council and the representatives of the Member States introduced an action plan for mobility, which defines the mobility of students as "a major political goal" (EC, 2000, p. 4). Yet another document on educational mobility betrays why the Union attaches such an importance to mobility of students:

> Mobility brings citizens closer to one another and improves mutual understanding. It promotes solidarity, the exchange of ideas and a better knowledge of the different cultures which make up Europe; thus, mobility furthers economic, social and regional cohesion. (EP & C o M, 2006a, p. 5)

In theory, the Commission cannot decide the content of the courses to be studied by the exchange students while organising the exchange programmes within the area of education. However, partnership to the exchange programmes necessitates the convergence in practice between the university programmes and also within the curriculums in order to make the exchange possible and to ensure it runs smoothly. As the Commission observes, "the free movement of people (…) [makes] it essential for national education and training systems to consider the European dimension" (CEC, 1995, p. 3). In other words, the exchange experience not only brings citizens together but also the systems. Both the institutional partners participating within these programmes and the education systems they belong to develop a mutual understanding shared throughout the Union.

There is one last factor contributing to the improvement of mutual understanding. The EU has been financially supporting the institutions, academics and students to study the European integration from any perspective. The initiative called the *Jean Monnet Programme* is a leading example of this support. The objectives of the programme are specified as "to stimulate teaching, research and reflection activities in the field of European integration studies" and "to support the existence of an appropriate range of institutions and associations focusing on issues relating to European integration and on education and training in a European perspective" (EP & C o M, 2006b, p. 62). Since the launch of the programme in 1990, studies on European integration have increasingly become an important area in higher education. Although European integration is a phenomenon that deserves academic interest itself, the effort of the EU to support the studies on the integration is undeniably essential for the improvement of mutual understanding.

Yet another academic study on the European integration is a step closer to the conclusion at the end of this sub-heading. This chapter, like the other chapters in this thesis, is lengthy and needs to be summarised. In addition to a summary, there is also a need to complete the synthesis of the analysis of this chapter with the theoretical considerations of the previous

ones. For these reasons, the concluding discussions are organised in a self-standing section. All these are supplemented with the rather technical aspects of a conclusion in the subsequent chapter to make a final push and finish the thesis with a flourish.

6.1. Introduction

The overall aim of this research has been to advance an understanding of whether the education policy is given the role of supporting the process of European integration by construction of a collective European identity. Education policy has been an essential mechanism for states in the process of the formation of their own nation. In addition to the economic and civic functions of educations systems and policies, the nation-formation experiences are evidence for the fact that there is another function of education related to the construction of collective identities. Whatever the specific policy and programmes are, the tools of such a policy have to deal with the socialisation process through which peoples turns into a collective whole by developing a sense of belonging to the community. Because education is one of the main aspects of socialisation, it stands as a policy tool that the EU may employ.

In order to achieve the overall research aim, the thesis has taken the followings as the individual objectives:

- Discovering the concepts of identity, integration, and education as well as the relationship between them;
- Theoretically discussing the role of education in the process of social and political integration;
- Exploring the dynamics in the process of the European integration that could lead the education policy to have a similar role;
- Critically analysing the discourse of the EU on education.

In this closing chapter, the thesis will revisit each of the research objectives above in order to summarise the findings of this research and also to offer conclusions reached on the findings in light of the theoretical considerations. As each individual objective is part and parcel of the process to reach the overall aim of this research, structuring the conclusions on top of

the objectives is expected to result in a coherent bunch of answers to the hypotheses. After the summary of findings and conclusions, the chapter moves on to discuss the contributions of this research to the existing knowledge together with recommendations for possible further research in terms of how to progress this study. As a final sub-heading, the chapter includes a section that reflects on the research process that has been undertaken.

6.2. Research Objectives: Summary of Findings and Conclusions

As soon as one is born, a psychological process of internalisation starts: infants, with an instinct to survive, absorb whatever they are surrounded by. The elements of surroundings become points of identification for each individual. Identification starts to build human beings as similar, if not the same, in the same environment and as different from those outsiders. This is at the heart of the concept of identity which connotes sameness and distinctiveness at the same time. During the early stages, surroundings are physically limited, i.e. initially to parents, and thus identification is rather personal. However, surroundings are not necessarily something physical for adults, who can internalise elements that are distant or even abstract. Once the physical borders of the surroundings disappear, elements of surroundings develop into collective points of identification. Collective identity is a result of such a process of indirect internalisation, put another way, socialisation. Through the process of socialisation, a collectivity of human beings comes to identify themselves with the same ideas, attitudes, or beliefs that are different from the elements of identification for another collectivity. In other words, they start to form an integrated whole compared to outsiders with their differentiating way of life, habits, and customs. The processes of internalisation and socialisation are not untouched. There are institutions which, consciously or not, affect and lead these processes. Among others, family and school are thought to be the most effective institutions of this kind. Unlike the family, schools are communal and systematic. United under the same roof to be educated together, members of different families within a community learn about the elements of surroundings in an organised way.

Discovering the concepts of identity, integration, and education as well as the relationship between them has been the opening individual objective of this research. In so doing, firstly,

the thesis has clarified the understanding of these three concepts which have been repeatedly referred to throughout the text to achieve the overall aim. As a result, three premises have been uncovered: (1) identities are constructed, (2) collective identities are integrative, and (3) education has a function of collective identity construction. More to the point of conclusion, it has been discovered that education is potentially a social reproduction mechanism, since the way education is organised influences how a collectivity of individuals identify themselves and what they identify themselves with.

The analysis of the EU discourse on education reveals that the official approach of the Union postulates these three premises. To begin with the last one, the function of education systems related to the construction of collective identities has never been ignored in the discourse. On the contrary, it is given a stance that is equal to the economic, civic, or rather technical functions of education, even during the periods dominated by economic strategies. In such periods, the discourse emphasises "the dual role of education" to counterbalance the social objectives of education. In other periods, the construction of the social bases for the European integration is defined as "the ultimate aim" of the education policy. All these and the other pieces of discourse cited on the function of identity construction rest upon the first premise that identities are constructed. If identities were not social constructs, the discourse would simply ignore the related function of education. However, as the chapter on analysis demonstrates, the discourse does not only include references to but is also based upon the premise that identities are socially constructed. The main motivation behind the references made is the idea that a collective identity could lead a "sense of belonging to one and the same community" out of the individual European communities. In other words, collective identities are seen as a source of social and political integration. Therefore, without a doubt, the analysis shows that the approach presented in the discourse is based on the constructivist point of view as opposed to the essentialist one.

An individual can have as many collective identities as the number of groups that he or she feels that they belong to. Among those numerous possible collective identities, national identity has well proved itself as the prominent one all over the world. For that reason, as defined by the second individual objective, the research has focused on theories of nationalism in order to discuss the previously uncovered premises within the context of

nation. For this objective, the social constructivist approach followed to discover the concepts above is spliced with modernist approaches in the theories of nationalism. From the modernist point of view, national identity, like nations and nation-states, is a product of broad historical processes shaped by modernisation. In the pre-modern area, societies were heterogeneous not only because communities were isolated with stable borders but also because they were segmented within themselves at the same time. Contradicting with the driving forces of modernisation, these agrarian features disappeared within the processes of industrialisation and bureaucratisation. Functional necessities of the new formation fashioned modern societies as homogenous, standardised, and mobile. Effective mobility of goods, services, people, or ideas could only be possible in a homogenous society where the composition is standardised. National identity stood out in the process of modernisation as a form of consciousness that enables members of the same nation to imagine themselves as a unified community. National identity owes the ability to lead the members of a society to form a homogenous whole to the integrative function of collective identities. In order for people to develop a collective identity, there is a need for a standardised process of socialisation through which masses can potentially identify themselves with the same ideas, attitudes, or beliefs. Nation-states are the states which have politically standardised education systems through public schooling in order to create a homogenous society where mobility can function smoothly.

Theories of nationalism have provided a rich theoretical setting to discuss the relationship between the basic concepts of the thesis. Consequently, concentrating on its second individual objective, the thesis has advanced the conceptual relation to a theoretical one that national identities, nationalisations, and nationalism, which includes the use of education as an identity construction mechanism, are all the products of the process of modernisation. Requiring a homogenous structure for mobility to be smooth in a larger area, the driving forces of modernisation invoked education as a standard way of socialisation in order to transform previously divided and heterogeneous communities into nations with a collective identity. Therefore, theoretical considerations in nationalism have added two more premises to the research that (4) a process of radical economic change imposes parallel transformations on society and that (5) politics supports the change by mobilising the society for the new formation. In other words, education has an identity construction

role in the process of nation-formation due to economically initiated deterministic developments supported by the interventionist policies of the elite.

The European integration has been more about economics than anything else. It is hard to observe a social or political change identical to the transformation in economics. The European integration is essentially a transformation based on the principle of the free movement of goods, capital, people, and services in a common area of initially six but increasingly a greater number of states. However, economics cannot be excluded from the society. The lack of a social base has serious repercussions on economic transformation. Therefore, the economic transformation causes parallel changes in society through the political will. The discourse analysis testifies that education has been one of the areas that the European political will has been channelled into. This is a discourse that makes social integration a precondition of a well functioning economy and that defines education as something "to use" for this condition. Since the very first stages of cooperation in the area of education, the strategic importance of education in transforming the society in line with the economical necessities has been something continuously referred to or connoted in the EU discourse. By this means, it is underlined that the effectiveness of the economic policies can be guaranteed "only if" the education policy is "used" in accordance with these aims. Among the other economic policies, the analysis observes that the creation of a unified internal market is given special attention. The frequency and volume of the references and connotations show an increase during the establishment of the Single Market. This signals the close-knit relationship between the economics and the education in the European integration, which is similar to the experiences in the national integration process of the nineteenth century.

The way that education is related to economics is just another aspect that evokes the old discourse of nationalism. Like the agrarian societies of the pre-modern era, national societies are "now too independent" in the view of the "increasingly European and mobile" economic relations. Diagnosing the problem in similar terms with the discourse of nationalism, the EU prescribes a familiar remedy: a "greater social cohesion". The emphasis on Europeanisation, social cohesion, and mobility in the EU discourse corresponds to the theoretical considerations of homogenisation and mobility as the aspects of change that economic

transformations impose on society. Mobility composes a noticeable part of the EU discourse on education. It is always mentioned somewhere at the top among other aims or tools of the EU education policy. The emphasis on the educational mobility demonstrates the endeavour of the Union to open the mechanisms of social communication by the learning in approach to education. In this way, the Union complements the learning about approach with concrete tuitions of the learning in approach to further the mobility.

The learning about approach, however, is generally considered in relation to the civic function of education systems. Citizens are expected to learn about their rights and duties in the society they legally belong to. In this sense, citizenship education fills the social need to learn about social life. Theoretically speaking, it is rather simple and straightforward when compared to the political function of education. Nevertheless, the analysis reveals that these two functions, as they are perceived in the EU discourse on education, are difficult to tell apart. The EU favours a "broader-based understanding of citizenship" which includes social values as well as rights and duties. This formulation basically equates European citizenship to European identity. As citizenship turns into identity, citizenship education is bound to fulfil the identity construction role. Beside the civic function of education, the citizenship education involves investing education with all the necessary abilities to construct a social reality. Therefore, even the rather straightforward approach of learning about ties citizenship to the creation of a sense of belonging to the Union among the peoples of Europe. This was a deliberate tactic used to hide the identity construction under the rather innocent aims of civic education in the nation-building processes. In the case of the EU, it is also a way round the problem of limited competences in the area of education policy.

The third objective of the study has been set to contextualise the case of the EU on the basis of the five premises made thus far. These five premises have provided a pair of optimum lenses for the research to make sense of the European integration in general and particularly the role of education within this integration. Despite the popular characterisation of the EU as sui generis, the European integration, in a sense, is a replication of national integration in post-modern times. Just as with agrarian communities being too small for industrialisation, the Europe of nation-states is too fragmented for globalisation. The national borders which used to provide a comfortable scale for the functions of modernisation are now like artificial

dikes in front of increasing floods of international activities, issues, or affairs. The new post-modern formation necessitates a further homogenisation beyond the dikes of the modern era. In this sense, post-modernism indicates progress that is heading in the same direction as modernism: an increase in the scale of homogenous units. So much so that, the post-modern transformation is a replication of what the modernisation had previously given rise to. This research is based on one of the best examples of this transformation, the EU. Born out of a process of radical economic change, the European integration echoes the fourth premise of this thesis. Therefore, it is expected that this economically driven process of integration may need and lead changes in the social and political spheres to advance. Motivated by this idea, the research has mainly focused on the fifth premise to observe the political formulation for the mobilisation of the society in the new transformation. Specifically, it has concentrated on whether the education policy is given the role of collective identity construction in the European integration. In order to test this hypothesis, the research has chosen the method of critically analysing the EU discourse on education.

The analysis has evinced a discourse that perceives, defines, and relates the concepts of identity, integration, and education in the same old way as was used in the process of nation-building. The only difference is that this time it is not a national but the European integration in question. In this sense, it is an old discourse in a new battle for European integration. Discourse is a form of knowledge that represents social realities. Putting these two together, the research reaches its overall aim to advance a comprehension of the role of education policy in the European integration. As a result of similar transformations and political will, education policy maintains its characteristics in post-modern times. It once more assumes a similar role: the role of supporting the process of European integration by the construction of a collective European identity. However, how effectively the education policy has been fulfilling its role is open to debate. The fact that the Union has limited competences in the area of education raises doubts about its role. Still, despite its limited competences, the EU has been producing a solid discourse on the educational function of collective identity construction. It should be noted that the Union is still young. If it replicates the nation-formation, there is a long way to go before the effects of the EU education policy can be properly tested.

6.3. Contribution to Knowledge

It is not possible to produce a completely unique piece of academic research. Even the most original academic studies owe a great deal to other academic studies. This is not only acceptable but also how academic knowledge develops. The limitations on the uniqueness of a research study are comparatively stricter for a Master's thesis due to the constraints of the level. However, even for a Master's thesis, contribution to knowledge is an indispensable criterion, as it is one of the basic motivations behind any research. It is this criterion that positions a thesis at a place beyond a mere learning exercise. Motivated by the desire to contribute to the existing body of knowledge, the study uses the thesis as an opportunity to introduce an incremental contribution, mainly through the application of a newly emerging methodology to a relatively under-researched area. Critical discourse analysis, and specifically its discourse-historical branch, has been applied to EU discourses before. Yet, to the knowledge of the author, this research is the very first attempt to apply this methodology particularly to the EU discourse on general education.

One of the most important criticisms raised against the proposal of this research was on the availability of sources in the research focus to achieve the overall research aim. It was rightly doubted whether it would be possible to find enough sources to feed the thesis. This was an indication that the proposal was sailing on an under-researched area which falls in between different disciplines. The study deals with this challenge by applying an interdisciplinary approach all the way through the thesis. Gathering the most helpful blend of theories together to understand the empirical case under consideration, the thesis delves into disciplines of education, history, and to some extent psychology, in addition to the theories of nationalism which form the backbone of the theoretical framework of the study. Furthermore, implementation of the empirical research is another aspect of the interdisciplinary approach. A discourse based analysis, which is originally linguistic, is adopted to analyse the case in its political as well as social, historical, and psychological dimensions. Hence, the application of an interdisciplinary approach has made this research not only possible but also different and hopefully successful in a relatively under-researched area.

One of the reasons why this area is academically under-researched is because education is ostensibly an under-developed area of policy at the European level. It is a fact that the EU has limited competences in this area. However, there is also another fact: the EU has produced an enormous volume of discourse on education despite its limited competences. The former fact is formal, which is an important barrier to investigate the role of education at the EU level further. However, the methodology followed in this research is critical in nature; it believes that the power relations may well be hidden under cover. Within the competences or not, the EU has been drawing a role for the education policy. The theoretical and methodological assumptions of the CDA have been crucial in making visible some interconnectedness which otherwise would easily stay under the cover of formal facts.

Despite the fact that the thesis owes these contributions mainly to the way the research has been conducted, there is still an aspect making the methodology applied distinctive. It is widely agreed among the different schools of CDA that the true meaning of a text can only be understood within its context. The discourse-historical school, which this study has been following, emphasises the element of history in defining the context of a text. As a result, context tends to be defined by collecting lengthy and in depth historical background information before the empirical analysis. In practice, for instance when the EU discourses are under analysis, contextualisation includes descriptive analysis of the EU as an organisation explained in greater detail elsewhere. At this point, the thesis diverges from the discourse-historical tradition. Instead of repeating the technical information on the EU, efforts have been made to apply lower range theories relating the general theoretical considerations to the specific case of European integration in the third chapter. In so doing, the thesis has contextualised the case rather than the EU, which is compatible with the problem-oriented nature of critical discourse analysis. Such an understanding of context is more effective, particularly for the Master's degree level, where the theses are expected to be hypothesis-driven rather than descriptive within a pre-defined extent.

6.4. Recommendations for Future Research

Education is an area of politics that is still thought to be predominantly national. As a result, the transfer of competences to the EU level has been relatively limited in the area of education. One of the premises of this thesis is that the EU has been pushing for a larger space to manoeuvre in this area of education so that the education policy can be used more effectively for the purposes of the Union, i.e. the creation of a collective European identity. However, EU activities in education are not limited to the function of education policy related to the construction of collective identities. There is also an involvement in economic and civic functions of education policies, in which the Member States are comparatively more willing to cooperate at the EU level. In this sense, further research could focus on whether the Union's involvement in economic and civic functions of education is a strategy for developing a space of governance in which the Union can practice functions of education policy related to the construction of collective identities. For instance, if the official target of becoming "the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world" has motivated the Member States to cooperate more in the area of education policy, has this motivation opened up a space for the EU to involve further in identity construction aspects of education?

These are the questions intended to uncover a basic matter: how would school education be structured if the EU had more or full competence in the area of education? Although the matter is basic, bringing it to light is academically complicated because the EU does not have such a competence yet. However, despite being on a smaller scale, it has a similar experience which may encourage academic premises to grow: the European Schools. The European Schools have been established in order to educate the children of the parents working for the EU institutions. Having been established by the EU and for the children of the EU personnel, these educational institutions comprise a unique setting where the EU organises a small scale education system for approximately 20,000 pupils studying in 14 schools. Having been established by and for the EU, the European Schools are run by an education system as close as it could get to the ideals of the EU elite in the area of education. Research on the European Schools would reveal these ideals. In this sense, the European Schools are other possible avenues for future research. Moreover, in a Green

Paper which is also referred to in the analysis of this thesis, the Commission acknowledges that "the educational approach developed by the European Schools has already made a contribution to the development of the European Dimension of education and (…) their experience could serve as a reference point"(CEC, 1993b, p. 12). Therefore, future research on the European Schools would also provide valuable academic experience for the education policy of the EU in general.

6.5. Self-Reflection

Research is a discipline which gives a researcher the opportunity to enhance his or her knowledge not only on the topic being researched, but also on the research process itself. This very last section of the thesis is devoted to a brief reflection by the researcher, which is worth noting down for students who are at the beginning of the journey of writing their own theses. Although the act is generally referred to as thesis writing, writing a thesis up is only the final part of a larger practice: research. In this sense, the work that has been presented in this text is just the final result of a lengthy research process. Overlooking this detail gives rise to unrealistic views about a thesis. As a result, on the one hand, students are becoming overambitious and thus disappointed after a while. On the other, it may well lead evaluators to underestimate work of this kind.

Research for a thesis at Master's level, particularly if it is in the humanities and social sciences, requires a great deal of reading. For instance, students have to face daunting amounts of reading in order to put a research proposal together alone, which, for some, does not even count as part of a research process. Besides, it would not be wrong to argue that the specific case of this particular research has required even more reading than an average thesis in the same area because the empirical data is composed of the EU discourse on education. Consequently, this thesis has been greatly more about reading than writing.

The more one reads the more he or she understands that there is a lot more to read. Every article, document, or text read is an asset for a student who, hopefully, will register these assets soon as a thesis to prove that he or she is a competent researcher. At the same time,

spending more and more time reading means there is less time for writing, which may worry those who psychologically equate the progress of their thesis to the number of pages that they have written. Therefore, it is important to be aware of the facts that a thesis is only the product of a comprehensive research process and that it can only be successfully written if one patiently climbs the other steps of the research process, i.e. reading. In the final analysis, whenever this study became static, together with the help of the people acknowledged at the beginning of this thesis, the key to making progress was hidden there in articles, documents, and texts.

REFERENCES

Books and Articles

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anderson, G. J. & Arsenault, N. (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Banchoff, T. (1999). National identity and EU legitimacy in France and Germany. In T. Banchoff & M. P. Smith (Eds.), *Legitimacy and the European Union: The contested polity* (pp. 180-198). London: Routledge.

Barel, Y. (1974). The idea of reproduction. *Futures, 6*, 93-102.

Bartolini, S. (2005). *Restructuring Europe: Centre formation, system building and political structuring between the nation-state and the European Union.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beetham, D. (1990). The future of the nation-state. In G. McLennan, D. Held, & S. Hall (Eds.), *The idea of the modern state* (pp. 208-222). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Beetham, D. & Lord, C. (1998). *Legitimacy and the EU.* New York: Longman.

Bell, D. (1987). The world and the United States in 2013. *Daedalus, 116*(3), 1-32.

Bellier, I. & Wilson, T. M. (2000). Building, imagining and experiencing Europe: Institutions and identities in the European Union. In I. Bellier & T. M. Wilson (Eds.), *An anthropology of the European Union: Building, imagining and experiencing the new Europe* (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Berg

Berggreen-Merkel, I. (1999). Towards a European educational area. *European Journal for Education Law and Policy, 3*, 1-7.

Bernhard, A. (2005). "Multiple identity" as a new ideal of personality: Social scientific discourse about identity and possible consequences for education and pedagogy. In R. F. Farnen, H. Dekker, C. De Landtsheer, H. Sunker, & D. B. German (Eds.), *Democratization, Europeanization, and globalization trends: Cross-national analysis of authoritarianism, socialization, communications, youth, and social policy* (pp. 183-196). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Billing, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism.* London: Sage Publications.

Birch, A. H. (1989). *Nationalism and national integration.* London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.

Bloom, W. (1990). *Personal identity, national identity and international relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bromley, D. B. (1990). Academic contributions to psychological counselling: I. A philosophy of science for the study of individual cases. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 3*(3), 299-307.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis.* Cambridge: CUP.

Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Brubaker, R. & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "identity". *Theory and Society, 29*(1), 1-47.

Brzezinski, Z. (1970). *Between two ages: America's role in the technetronic era.* New York: Viking.

Calhoun, C. J. (1994). Social theory and the politics of identity. In C. J. Calhoun (Ed.), *Social theory and the politics of identity* (pp.9-36)*.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Calhoun, C. J. (1997). *Nationalism*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Calhoun, C. J. (2001). The virtues of inconsistency: Identity and plurality in the conceptualisation of Europe. In L. E. Cederman (Ed.), *Constructing Europe's identity: The external dimension (pp. 35-56).* Boulder, CO: Lynn Reiner.

Canovan, M. (1996). *Nationhood and political theory.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Company.

Cederman, L. E. (2001). Nationalism and bounded integration: What it would take to construct a European demos. *European Journal of International Relations, 7*(2), 139-174.

Cerulo, K. A. (1997). Identity construction: New issues, new directions. *Annual Review of Sociology, 23*, 385-409.

Chilton, P. (2005). Missing links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 19-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cicourel, A. (1964). *Method and measurement in sociology.* New York: The Free Press.

Cohen, Y. A. (1971). The shaping of men's minds: Adaptations to imperatives of culture. In M. L. Wax, S. Diamond, & F. O. Gearing (Eds.), *Anthropological perspectives on education* (pp. 19-50). New York: Basic Books.

Cohen, A. P. (1985). *The symbolic construction of community.* London: Tavistock.

Costa, P. (2004). From national to European citizenship: A historical comparison. In R. Bellamy, D. Castiglione, & E. Santoro (Eds.), *Lineages of European citizenship: Rights, belonging and participation in eleven nation-states* (pp. 207-226). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cote, J. E. (2002). *Identity formation, agency, and culture: A social-psychological synthesis.* Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coulby, D. (2000). Warfare by other means: Unity and fracture in European education. In J. Andrew, M. Crook, D. Holmes, & E. Kolinsky (Eds.), *Why Europe? Problems of culture and identity, Volume 2: Media, film, gender, youth and education* (pp. 245-254). London: Macmillan Press.

Coulby, D. & Jones, C. (2001). *Education and warfare in Europe.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Dahl, R. A. & Tufte, E. R. (1973). *Size and democracy: The politics of the smaller European democracies.* California: Stanford University Press.

Dale, R. (1989). *The state and education policy.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Davies, N. (1999). *The isle: A history.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Delanty, G. (1995a). The limits and possibility of a European identity: A critique of cultural essentialism. *Philosophy and Social Criticism, 21*(4), 15-36.

Delanty, G. (1995b). *Inventing Europe: Idea, identity, reality.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Demossier, M. (2007a). Political structuring of cultural identities in the European Union. In M. Demossier (Ed.), *The European puzzle: The political structuring of cultural identities at a time of transition* (pp. 49-66)*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Demossier, M. (2007b). Introduction. In M. Demossier (Ed.), *The European puzzle: The political structuring of cultural identities at a time of transition* (pp. 1-12)*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Denscombe, M. (2003). *Good research guide: For small-scale research projects* (2nd ed.)*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.

Denzin N. K. (1978). The logic of naturalistic inquiry. In N. K. Denzin (Ed.), *Sociological methods: A sourcebook* (pp. 54-73). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Deutsch, K. W. (1953). *Nationalism and social communication: An inquiry into the foundations of nationality.* New York: The Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons.

Duara, P. (1996). Historicizing national identity, or who imagines what and when. In G. Eley & R. G. Suny (Eds.), *Becoming national: A reader* (pp. 152-178). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dupoirier, E., Roy, B., & Lecerf, M. (2000). The development of national, subnational and European identities in European countries. *Cahiers Européens de Sciences Po, 4*, 4-51.

Durkheim, E. (2001). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Originally published in 1912]

Enslin, P. (1998). Education for nation-building: A feminist critique. In P. H. Hirst & P. White (Eds.), *Philosophy of education: Major themes in the analytic tradition: Society and education: Volume 3* (pp. 363-375)*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1985). Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 9*, 739-763.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1996). A reply to Henry Widdowson's discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 5*(1), 49-56.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction: Volume 2: Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.

Ferry, J. M. (2005). The new European question: The problem of post-national integration. In A. Dieckhoff & C. Jaffrelot (Eds.), *Revisiting nationalism: Theories and processes* (pp. 222-238). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Finnegan, R. (2006). Using documents. In R. Sapsford & V. Jupp (Eds.), *Data collection and analysis* (2nd ed.) (pp. 138-152). London: Sage.

Flora, P. Kuhnle, S. Urwin, D., & Rokkan, S. (Eds.). (1999). *State formation, nation-building, and mass politics in Europe: The theory of Stein Rokkan.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Galston, W. (1998). Civic education in the liberal state. In P. H. Hirst & P. White (Eds.), *Philosophy of education: Major themes in the analytic tradition: Society and education: Volume 3* (pp. 44-55)*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.

Galtung, J. (1981). Literacy, education and schooling – For what? In H. J. Graff (Ed.), *Literacy and social development in the west: A reader* (pp. 271-285). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garcia, S. (1993). Europe's fragmented identities and the frontiers of citizenship. In S. Garcia (Ed.), *European identity and the search for legitimacy* (pp. 1-29). London: Pinter.

Garcia, S. & Wallace, H. (1993). Conclusion. In S. Garcia (Ed.), *European identity and the search for legitimacy* (pp. 172-177). London: Pinter.

Gardner, H. (2004). How education changes: Considerations of history, science, and values. In M. M. Suarez-Orozco (Ed.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 235-258)*. Ewing, NJ, USA: University of California Press.

Gellner, E. (1978). Scale and nation. In F. Barth (Ed.), *Scale and social organisation* (pp. 133-149). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Gellner, E. (1983) *Nations and nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Gellner, E. (1987). *Culture, identity, and politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gellner, E. (1993). Nationalism and the development of European societies. In J. Livonen (Ed.), *The future of the nation state in Europe* (pp. 19-30). Hants, UK: Edward Elgar.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education.* London: Routledge.

Green, A. (1990). *Education and state formation: The rise of educational systems in England, France and the USA.* London: Macmillan.

Green, D. M. (2000). On being European: The character and consequences of European identity. In M. G. Cowles & M. Smith (Eds.), *The state of the European Union: Volume 5: Risks, reform, resistance, and revival* (pp. 292-322)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griffith, R. (1998). *Educational citizenship and independent learning.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Grosvenor, I. (1999). 'There's no place like home': Education and the making of national identity. *History of Education, 28*(3), 235-250.

Guibernau, M. (1996). *Nationalisms: The nation-state and nationalism in the twentieth century.* Cambridge: Blackwell.

Guibernau, M. (2001a). National identity and modernity. In A. Dieckhoff & N. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Modern roots: Studies of national identity* (pp. 73-93). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Guibernau, M. (2001b). Globalization and the nation-state. In M. Guibernau & J. Hutchinson (Eds.), *Understanding nationalism* (pp. 242-268). Cambridge: Polity.

Gutmann, A. (1998). Undemocratic education. In P. H. Hirst & P. White (Eds.), *Philosophy of education: Major themes in the analytic tradition: Society and education: Volume 3* (pp. 28-43)*.* Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.

Habermas, J. (1975). *Legitimation crisis.* Boston: Beacon Press [Originally Published in 1973]

Habermas, J. (1994). Citizenship and national identity. In B. van Steenbergen (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 20-35). London: Sage Publications.

Hake, A. K. (2001). Inner-European migration: A test for European identity. In F. Cerutti & E. Rudolph (Eds.), *A soul for Europe: Volume 2: An essay collection* (pp. 95-112). Leuven: Peeters.

Heater, D. (2004a). *A brief history of citizenship.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Heater, D. (2004b). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education* (3rd ed.). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Herold, J. C. (Ed). (1955). *Mind of Napoleon: A selection of his written and spoken words.* New York: Colombia University Press.

Hersom, C. (2004). European citizenship and the search for legitimacy: The paradox of the Danish case. In E. Moxon-Browne (Ed.), *Who are the Europeans now* (pp. 37-77)*?* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1975). *The age of capital, 1848-1875.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Howe, P. (1995). A community of Europeans: The requisite underpinnings. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 33*(1), 27-46.

Hroch, M. (2006). Modernization and communication as factors of nation formation. In G. Delanty & K. Kumar (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nations and nationalism* (pp. 21-32). London: Sage Publications.

Jager, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32-62). London: Sage Publications.

Joseph, B. (1929). *Nationality: Its nature and problems.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jupp, V. (2006). Documents and critical research. In R. Sapsford & V. Jupp (Eds.), *Data collection and analysis* (2nd ed.) (pp. 272-290). London: Sage.

Kincheloe, J. L. & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Koslowski, R. (1999). EU citizenship: Implications for the identity and legitimacy. In T. Banchoff & M. P. Smith (Eds.), *Legitimacy and the European Union: The contested polity* (pp. 155-179). London: Routledge.

Kostakopoulou, T. (2001). *Citizenship, identity, and immigration in the European Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Langman, L. (2006). The social psychology of nationalism: To die for the sake of strangers. In G. Delanty & K. Kumar (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of nations and nationalism* (pp. 66-83). London: Sage Publications.

Lodge, J. (1994). Transparency and democratic legitimacy. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 32*(3), 343-368.

Magnusson, L. & Strath, B. (2004). A European social citizenship? Preconditions for future policies from a historical perspective. In L. Magnusson & B. Strath (Eds.), *A European social citizenship? Preconditions for future policies from a historical perspective* (pp. 11-30). Brussels: Peter Lang.

Majone, G. (1994). The rise of the regulatory state in Europe. *West European Politics, 17*(3), 78-102.

Majone, G. (1996) *Regulating Europe.* London: Routledge.

Mallinson, V. (1980). *The western European idea in education.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14-31). London: Sage Publications.

Mill, J. S. (2001). *On representative government.* London: ElecBook. [Originally Published in 1861]

Miller, D. (1993). In defence of nationalism. *Journal of Applied Philosophy, 10*(1), 3-16.

Mommsen, W. (1995). *Imperial Germany 1867-1918: Politics, culture, and society in an authoritarian state.* London: Hodder Arnold.

Moore, M. (2001). *The ethics of nationalism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moravcsik, A. (2002). In defence of the "democratic deficit": Reassessing the legitimacy of the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(4), 603-634.

Morrow, R. A. (1995). *Social theory and education: A critique of theories of social and cultural reproduction.* Albany, NY, USA: State University of New York Press.

Muntigl, P (2000). The European Union: Policy-making through organizational discursive practices. In P. Muntigl, G. Weiss, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *European Union discourses on un/employment: An interdisciplinary approach to employment policy-making and organizational change* (pp. 1-26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Muntigl, P., Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2000). *European Union discourses on un/employment: An interdisciplinary approach to employment policy-making and organizational change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

O'Leary, B. (2001). The elements of right-sizing and right-peopling the state. In B. O'Leary, I. S. Lustick, & T. M. Callaghy (Eds.), *Right-sizing the state: The politics of moving borders* (pp. 15-73). Oxford University Press.

Oliver, D. & Heather, D. (1994). *The foundations of citizenship.* Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Olsen, J. P. (1996). Europeanization and nation-state dynamics. In S. Gustavsson & L. Lewin (Eds.), *The future of the nation-state: Essays on cultural pluralism and political integration* (pp. 245-285). London: Routledge**.**

Osborn, M., Broadfoot, P., McNess, E., Ravn, R., Planel, C., & Triggs, P. with Cousin, O., & Winther-Jensen, T. (2003). *A world of difference? Comparing learners across Europe.* Berkshire: Open University Press.

Panebianco, S. (2004). European citizenship and European identity: From treaty provisions to public opinion attitudes. In E. Moxon-Browne (Ed.), *Who are the Europeans now* (pp. 18-36)*?* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Parekh, B. (1999). Defining national identity in a multicultural society. In E. Mortimer & R. Fine (Eds.), *People, nation and state: The meaning of ethnicity and nationalism* (pp. 66-74). New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd.

Periwal, S. (1995). Conclusion. In S. Periwal (Ed.), *Notions of nationalism* (pp. 228-247)*.* Budapest: Central European University Press.

Picht, R. (1993). Disturbed identities: Social and cultural mutations in contemporary Europe. In S. Garcia (Ed.), *European identity and the search for legitimacy* (pp. 81-94). London: Pinter.

Preston, P. W. (1997). *Political/cultural identity: Citizens and nations in a global era.* London: Sage.

Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse & discrimination: Rhetorics of racism & antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Renan, E. (1939). What is a nation? In A. Zimmern (Ed.), *Modern political doctrines* (pp. 186-205). London: Oxford University Press. [Originally Published in 1882]

Risse, T. (2001). A European identity? Europeanization of the evolution of nation-state identities. In M. G. Cowles, J. Caporaso, & T. Risse (Eds.), *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and domestic change* (pp. 198-216). London: Cornell University Press.

Risse, T. & Engelmann-Martin, D. (2002). Identity politics and European integration: The case of Germany. In A. Pagden (Ed.), *Idea of Europe: From antiquity to the European Union* (pp. 287-316)*.* West Nyack, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education.* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ruegg, W. (1993). Nationalism and internationalism: A need for balanced identities: A political science perspective. In K. Schleicher (Ed.), *Nationalism in education* (pp. 41-53). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Safa, H. I. (1971). Education, modernisation, and the process of national integration. In M. L. Wax, S. Diamond, & F. O. Gearing (Eds.), *Anthropological perspectives on education* (pp. 208-229). New York: Basic Books.

Scharpf, F. W. (1997). Economic integration, democracy, and the welfare state. *Journal of European Public Policy, 4*(1), 18-36.

Schmitter, P. C. (1996). If the nation-state were to wither away in Europe what might replace it? In S. Gustavsson & L. Lewin (Eds.), *The future of the nation-state: Essays on cultural pluralism and political integration* (pp. 211-244). London: Routledge.

Seton-Watson, H. (1977). *Nations and states.* London: Methuen.

Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The cultural politics of European integration.* London: Routledge.

Smith, A. D. (1986). *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity.* London: Penguin.

Smith, A. D. (1992). National identity and the idea of European Unity. *International Affairs, 68*, 55-76.

Smith, A. D. (1995). *Nations and nationalism in a global era.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smith, A. D. (1998). *Nationalism and modernism: A critical survey of recent theories of nations and nationalism.* London: Routledge.

Smith, A. D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, ideology, history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Spiering, M. (1996). National identity and European Unity. In M. Wintle (Ed.), *Culture and identity in Europe: Perceptions of divergence and unity in past and present* (pp. 98-132). Avebury: Aldershot.

Spring, J. (2004). *How educational ideologies are shaping global society: Intergovernmental organisations, NGOs, and the decline of the nation-state.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* London: Sage Publications.

Strath, B. (2000). Introduction: Europe as a discourse. In B. Strath (Ed.), *Europe and the other and Europe as the other* (pp. 13-35). Brussels: Presses Interuniversitaires Européennes.

Thiesse, A. M. (2007). The formation of national identities. In M. Demossier (Ed.), *The European puzzle: The political structuring of cultural identities at a time of transition* (pp. 16-28). New York: Berghahn Books.

Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Trowler, P. (1998). *Education policy: A policy sociology approach.* Eastbourne, East Sussex: The Gildredge Press.

van der Eijk, C. & Franklin, M. N. (1996). *Choosing Europe? The European electorate and national politics in the face of Union.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (1986). *Racism in the press.* London: Arnold.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage Publications.

van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production: A CDA perspective. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 71-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: A synopsis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 193-223.

van Leeuwen, T. (2005). Three models of interdisciplinarity. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 3-18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Waever, O. (1995). Essay 3: Europe since 1945: Crisis to renewal. In P. den Boer, P. Bugge, O. Waever, K. Wilson, & W. J. van der Dussen (Eds.), *The history of the idea of Europe* (pp. 116-169). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Wallace, W. (1991). Foreign policy and national identity in the United Kingdom. *International Affairs, 67*(1), 65-80.

Warleigh, A. (2003). *Democracy and the European Union: Theory, practice and reform*. London: Sage Publications.

Weiler, J. H. H. (2000). To be a European Citizen: Eros and civilization. In K. Goldmann, U. Hannerz, & C. Westin (Eds.), *Nationalism and internationalism in the post-cold war era* (pp. 170-194). London: Routledge.

Weiss, G. & Wodak R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1-34). London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Widdowson, H.G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language Literature, 4*(3), 157-172.

Wintle, M. (1996a). Cultural identity in Europe: Shared experience. In M. Wintle (Ed.), *Culture and identity in Europe* (pp. 9-32). Aldershot: Avebury.

Wintle, M. (1996b). Introduction: Cultural diversity and identity in Europe. In M. Wintle (Ed.), *Culture and identity in Europe* (pp. 1-8). Aldershot: Avebury.

Wodak, R. (2001a). What CDA is about - A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2001b). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-94). London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2004). National and transnational identities: European and other identities constructed in interviews with EU-officials. In R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Transnational identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp. 97-128). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (1999). *The discursive construction of national identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. & Weiss, G. (2001). 'We are different than the Americans and the Japanese!': A critical discourse analysis of decision-making in European Union meetings about employment policies. In E. Weigand & M. Dascal (Eds.), *Negotiation and power in dialogic interaction* (pp. 39-63). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wodak, R. & Weiss, G. (2005). Analyzing European Union discourses: Theories and applications. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *New agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 121-136). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

European Union Sources

Institutional Sources

CEC (1973). Declaration on European identity. *Bulletin of the European Communities, 12*, 118-122.

CEC (1977). Commission report on the establishment of a European foundation. *Bulletin of the European Communities, Suppl. 5/77,* 1-24.

CEC (1985) Communication from the Commission: Proposal for a Council directive on a general system for the recognition of higher education diplomas. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 217,* 3-3.

CEC (1987). *European education policy statements* (3rd ed.). Brussels: Office for Official Publications.

CEC (1988a). *Enhanced treatment of the European dimension in education.* Brussels: V/751/88-EN.

CEC (1988b). Communication from the Commission: Education in the European Community - Medium-term perspectives: 1989 - 1992. *COM(88) 280 final*, 1-16.

CEC (1989). *European education policy statements: Supplement to the 3rd edition.* Brussels: Office for Official Publications.

CEC (1993a). Report from the Commission to the Council, European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee: EC education and training programs: 1986 – 1992: Results and achievements: An overview. *COM(93) 151 final*.

CEC (1993b). Green paper on the European dimension of education. *COM(93) 457 final*.

CEC (1995). White paper on education and training: Teaching and learning: Towards the learning society. *COM(95) 590 final*.

CEC (1996). Green paper: Education, training, research: The obstacles to transnational mobility. *COM(96) 462 final*.

CEC (1997a). *Accomplishing Europe through Education and Training:* Study Group on Education and Training Report. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC (1997b). *Communication to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Towards a Europe of knowledge.* Luxemburg: Office of Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC. (1998). *Learning for active citizenship: A significant challenge in building a Europe of knowledge.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/archive/citizen/citiz_en.html on 23rd of June 2009.

CEC (2000). Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: The Commission's work programme for 2000. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 81*, 9-80.

CEC (2001). Report from the Commission: The Concrete Future Objectives of Education Systems. *COM(2001) 59 final*.

CEC (2002). *"One million Erasmus students": A European success story.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/education/archive/million/million_en.html on 21st of January, 2009.

CEC (2004). Communication from the Commission: Making citizenship work: Fostering European culture and diversity through programmes for youth, culture, audiovisual and civic participation. *COM(2004) 154 final*.

CEC (2006a). *Special Eurobarometer 243: Europeans and their languages.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_243_en.pdf on 13th of September, 2008.

CEC (2006b). *European elections 2004: Commission report on the participation of European Union citizens in the Member State of residence (Directive 93/109/EC) and on the*

electoral arrangements (Decision 76/787/EC as amended by Decision 2002/772/EC, Euratom). Retrieved from: http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0790:FIN:EN:PDF on 13th of September, 2008.

CEC (2008a). *Eurobarometer 69: Public opinion in the European Union: First results.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb69/eb_69_first_en.pdf on 4th of January, 2009.

CEC (2008b). *Flash Eurobarometer 213: European Union citizenship: Analytical report.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_213_en.pdf on 4th of January, 2009.

C o M (1974). Resolution of the Ministers of Education, meeting within the Council, of 6 June 1974 on cooperation in the field of education. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 098,* 2-2.

C o M (1988). Resolution of the Council of Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on the European dimension in education of 24 May 1988. *Official Journal of the European Communities, 177,* 5-7.

EC (1963). Council decision of 2 April 1963 laying down general principles for implementing a common vocational training policy. *Official Journal of the European Communities, 63/266*, 25-28.

EC (1988). *Presidency conclusions (Brussels, 11 - 12 February 1988)*. Brussels: SN 461/1/88.

EC (1992). The treaty of Maastricht. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C* 191.

EC (1993). Council Directive 93/109/EC of 6 December 1993 laying down detailed arrangements for the exercise of the right to vote and stand as a candidate in elections to the European Parliament for citizens of the Union residing in a Member State of which they are not nationals. *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 329*, 34-38.

EC (1994). Council Directive 94/80/EC of 19 December 1994 laying down detailed arrangements for the exercise of the right to vote and to stand as a candidate in municipal elections by citizens of the Union residing in a Member State of which they are not nationals. *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 368,* 38–47.

EC (1996). Council Directive 96/30/EC of 13 May 1996 amending Directive 94/80/EC laying down detailed arrangements for the exercise of the right to vote and to stand as a candidate in municipal elections by citizens of the Union residing in a Member State of which they are not nationals. *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 122*, 14–14.

EC (1997). *The treaty of Amsterdam.* Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/treaty/pdf/amst-en.pdf on 3rd of May, 2009.

EC (2000). Resolution of the Council and of the representatives of the governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council of 14 December 2000 concerning an action plan for mobility. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 371,* 4-10.

EC (2004). *The treaty establishing a constitution for Europe*. Retrieved from http://www.eurotreaties.com/constitutiontext.html on 3rd of November, 2008.

EC & C o M (1988). Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on the European dimension in education of 24 May 1988. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 177,* 5-7.

EC & C o M (1991). Resolution of the Council and of the Ministers meeting within the Council of 26 June 1991 on priority actions in the youth field. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 208*, 1-2.

EC & EP (1995). Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 1995 establishing the Community action programme 'Socrates'. *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 87*, 10-24.

ECSC (1951). The treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community. In *Treaty establishing the European Economic Community and connected documents* (pp. 1-90). Luxembourg: Publishing Services of the European Communities.

EEC (1957). The treaties of Rome. In *Treaty establishing the European Economic Community and connected documents* (pp. 5-183). Luxembourg: Publishing Services of the European Communities.

EP (1982). Parliamentary resolution on a Community programme in the field of education. *Official Journal of the European Communities, 87/1982.*

EP (2000). *Lisbon European Council (23 and 24 March 2000): Presidency conclusions.* Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm on 23rd of June 2009.

EP (2006a). The European dimension of school teaching materials: European Parliament resolution on initiatives to complement school curricula providing appropriate support measures to include the European dimension. *Official Journal of the European Communities, C 306 E*, 100-102.

EP (2006b). *Draft Report on initiatives to complement school curricula providing appropriate support measures to include the European dimension.* Retrieved from

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/pr/620/620563/620563en.pdf on 20th of January, 2009.

EP (2009). *Results of the 2009 European elections.* Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/parliament/archive/elections2009/en/index_en.html on 16th of July, 2009.

EP & C o M (2006a). Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on transnational mobility within the Community for education and training purposes: European quality charter for mobility. *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 394,* 5-9.

EP & C o M (2006b). Decision No 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action programme in the field of lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Communities, L 327*, 45-68.

Individual Sources

Adonnino, P. (1985a). Report from the ad-hoc committee on a people's Europe to the European Council, Milan, 28 and 29 June 1985. *Bulletin of the European Economic Community, 7,* 18-30.

Adonnino, P. (1985b). Report from the ad hoc committee on a people's Europe to the European Council, Brussels, 29 and 30 March 1985. *Bulletin of the European Economic Community, 3,* 111-117.

Hingel, A. J. (2001). *Education policies and European governance: Contribution to the interservice groups on European governance. European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture Education.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/governance/areas/group12/contribution_education_en.pdf on 23rd of January, 2009.

Reding, V. (2000). *Education in the 21st Century: Education for the Knowledge Economy. Conference of the Asia-Europe Foundation, Luxembourg, 2 May 2000.* Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/00/158&format=HTML&aged=1&language=FR&guiLanguage=en on 21st of January, 2009.

Tindemans, L. (1976). European Union - Report by Mr. Leo Tindemans, prime minister of Belgium, to the European Council. *Bulletin of the European Communities, Suppl. 1/76*, 1-32.