European Identity on the Perspective of Incoming and Outgoing Erasmus Students: A Study of Stereotypes and Prejudices as Cultural Differences

Fatih Göksu

DIRECTOR DE LA TESI

Dra. Pilar Medina Bravo

DEPARTAMENT DE COMUNICACIÓ

upf. **Universitat Pompeu Fabra** *Barcelona*

To my family

v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ABSTRACT

European education programs and European identity are acknowledged as inextricable concepts considering the fact that education programs such as Erasmus plays an important role on the construction of European identity by using exchange programs to create awareness. This study mainly tries to realize if incoming and outgoing Erasmus students are conscious of this European identity and if stereotypes and prejudices as intercultural communication barriers are obstacles in this construction based on the fact that Erasmus students live in intercultural community. European exchange programs such as Erasmus have a proved effect to strengthen relations among European societies. In this context, the research investigates if Erasmus as a most important exchange program has an effect to build European identity. Besides the research tries to understand how Erasmus student see their own identity in relation to European one and what effect are observed in students' national identity by investigating Catalan Erasmus students.

RESUM

Els programes d'educació de la Unió Europea i la identitat Europea són reconeguts com a conceptes que inevitablement van de la mà, donat que programes educatius com l'Erasmus juguen un paper important en la construcció de la identitat Europea, i són utilitzats per crear consciencia. Aquest estudi tracta d'analitzar si els estudiants d'Erasmus, tant els que arriben com els que marxen, són conscients d'aquesta identitat Europea, així com determinar si els estereotips i prejudicis, tals com les barreres de comunicació interculturals, són obstacles en la construcció d'aquesta identitat, basant-nos en que aquests estudiants viuen dins de comunitats interculturals. Programes Europeus d'intercanvi com el programa Erasmus tenen el poder particular per enfortir les relacions entre les diferents societats europees. En aquest context, l'estudi investiga si l'Erasmus, com a programa d'intercanvi més important, repercuteix directament en la creació de la identitat Europea. A més, l'estudi intenta entendre com els estudiants d'Erasmus viuen la seva pròpia identitat en relació amb l'Europea, i quins efectes s'observen en la identitat nacional dels estudiants a través d'investigar els estudiants d'Erasmus catalans.

PREFACE

"High culture is nothing but a child of that European perversion called history, the obsession we have with going forward, with considering the sequence of generations a relay race in which everyone surpasses his predecessor, only to be surpassed by his successor. Robespierre, Napoleon, Beethoven, Stalin, Picasso, they're all runners in the relay race, they all belong to the same stadium." (Kundera 1999: 122)

An identity is no longer determined by powerful feelings of devotion to one's own country or belonging to an ancestry. In current times, identities are increasingly becoming a result of way people interact with other people; or groups they are associated with. These help people find their individual place in their own community. These interactions are formed by the millennial in multiethnic, multicultural and multi-religious ways. These are influenced by frequent meetings, which are brought about by the availability of several types of transport.

Defining the elements of identity in accordance to interaction patterns seem easy but Boneu (ed. Gomez, 2003) states that defining specific European identity is difficult, in particular if one aims to articulate it clearly. Dumoulin (1998:39) claims that, in order to identify oneself it is necessary to have an implicit "idea of oneself and of others, which implies the acknowledgement of a certain difference, and, in fact, that of belonging to a community. If, as we frame it in the context of that vast and complex loss in values and certainties that is marking our time". The Europe region has one of the highest diversity in the terms of countries, languages, ethnic groups, cultures and forms of life. These factors have always historically contributed and still continue to contribute to construction of European identity, either in unison or in conflict. However, Europe has since ancient times till this day perceived itself as one unit in cultural terms.

Culturist Manuel Castells (2009) argues that Europe is painfully discovering that the abstract principle of individual citizenship is directly challenged by the multiculturalism of an increasingly multi-ethnic continent. Progressively, as Europe restructures territorially and globalizes its labor force, ethnicity can be increasingly

seen as a major component of social dynamics and power struggles. Irina agrees with Castells but she claims that integration has many other positive aspects. According to her "integration is no longer thought of as the rational by-product of economic prosperity; rather it represents a political process, entailing 'an element of identity'. Fortunately European politicians have also come to view of integration as a cultural process. They consider culture to be a political instrument, for further construction of European identity" (Irina, 2012:96).

Thus, we should accept that research on European identity, is intricate and a delicate contemplation. Also, as Boneu explains, Europe is constantly being rebuilt. According to her "we are dealing with an area in which the consensuses reached are broad, the existence of disagreements in such a current debate is just as commonplace" (ed. Gomez, 2003:37). Considering, the present existence of a European identity as complex; questions of concern come up when we attempt to understand the how and when of the quick origin of this identity. These types of questions are based on one particular observation. The observation that we have not progressed in the same harmony in the building of a European identity as we have progressed in economic integration. As Boneu notes from Luykx: "there is a "dysfunction (between both integration formulae), given that the economic one "is advancing too speedily" and European identification "going too slowly" (ed. Gomez, 2003:40). In the present time, we still observe the same criticism as we hear people saying, 'Europe is just a monetary union'.

In this context, it is critically important to discuss the European identity, which inspires a sense of Europeanness. One should keep in mind that currently, the European Union (EU) is playing the role of a gradually evolving unique political unity. For this primary reason, it is imperative that the EU project is discussed in new terms and from several perspectives; in order to create a new understanding of Europe which does not underestimate its unique character. EU would be able to undertake innovative and courageous actions in the areas which are traditionally dominated by national states, such as education and cultural policies. This can be

achieved, provided that discourses and discussions about European integration process are not reduced to a nation-state-EU dilemma.

The fundamental issue in this study is to define - "Being European –what does it mean"? Also, describing the values and principles that define a European. We all believe that Europe is based on principles "of Freedom, Democracy, Respect for Human Rights and for Fundamental Liberties and the Rule of Law, that we turn these principles into a standard of behavior favoring the fight against all forms of prejudice and exclusion, be it economic, ethnic, cultural or racial." (Boneu, ed. Gomez, 2003:47). As Boneu (ibid: 47) explains, "The reflection about the Europe of the future should bring about a committed attitude about the scope of the principles that we have placed at the foundation of our behavior and that make up the substance of our identity" and this might be achieved through education and youth driven movements.

There has been a borderless European higher education space, characterized by long-standing and eminent educational universities. The recent times have witnessed an establishment of an outstanding higher education system based on the European values and on the idea of universal knowledge. The universities throughout Europe have been making a great contribution to the creation of a common European culture and togetherness. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, Europe has been facing express changes in once steady determinant of ethnicity and culture. The European society is gradually shaping towards a multicultural society. A society in which futuristically, its members will have to rely on a greater acceptance of inter-cultural communication and inter cultural learning. Representatives from different cultural backgrounds will frequently be exchanging information, and in this process they will be confronted with unknown symbols and different interpretations of symbols.

Education and active educational programs have a very important role to play. With European culture infused in educational programs, it seems like an effort towards creation of young Europeans of tomorrow. Education and work based cross-border

mobility has been seen as an especially useful tool to promote European identity. As Fligstein (2008:139) stated; "increased interactions between Europeans can lead to a common European identity". He explains that people due to their interpersonal contact, 'come to see each other less as Italian and French, and thus foreign, and more and more as sharing common interests, a process that eventually will lead to seeing themselves more as Europeans and less as having merely a national identity (Fligstein, 2008: 139).

In the last couple of decades, Europe's education programs have provisioned for an influx of students with diverse religious, social and ethnic backgrounds. This results in a healthy exchange of ideas and allows people to obtain a holistic cultural experience. Every year thousands of students all over the world leave home for the purpose of participating in an educational experience in a country or province other than their home. The purpose of the students for going abroad differs from each other according to their needs, abilities, interests or expectations for those students. Learning language or improving their linguistic skills is one of these purposes. Dwyer (2004) considers studying abroad as a consequential impact on students in the areas of prolonged language use, academic accomplishment measures, intercultural and personal development, and career choices but the real purpose of the program is initially to promote European we-feeling. As the former European Commissioner for Education Ja´n Figel (2006) declared in one of his speeches, it is clear that Erasmus (European Union Student Exchange Program) can contribute enormously to forge and promote a European identity. The program breaks down social and cultural barriers among Europeans and the immigrants. Thus, one may safely assume that one of the original aims of Erasmus program is to promote a European identity.

Politically, one can see that international dimension of higher education in Europe constitutes an important component in agenda of European and national governments, institutions of higher education and their representative bodies, student organizations and accreditation agencies. The 1980's saw a stimulation of European programs for cooperation and exchange in education and research. These exchange programs have been so internalized in the education system that over the years they

have transitioned from a reactive to a pro-active strategic issue. With a substantial progress in their focus, scope and content, they have moved from being an added value entity to a mainstream status. Increasing competition in higher education and cross-border delivery of higher education, have challenged the values traditionally attached to cooperation: exchanges and partnerships (De Wit, 2005). The understanding of foreign cultures is a necessity for young people and an exchange is an important and great way not only to achieve that understanding but also to get to know one better (Stepanoviene, 2003:61).

For a better understanding of European identity, it is essential that we do not focus on concepts and theories based on nation-state or integration-subjected identifications. Potential European identity, which might emerge from this study, could bear witness to the birth of a new kind of identification that may shape our social reality in the decades to come.

INDEX

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

EB: Eurobarometer

EC: European Commission

ECSC: European Coal and Steel Community

EFTA: European Free Trade Association

EU: European Union

ICT: Information and Communication Technologies

SEA: Single European Act

TEEC: Treaty Establishing the European Community

UK: United Kingdom

WWI: World War I

WWII: World War II

LIST OF FIGURES

1 INTRODUCTION TO IDENTITY

Our lives are shaped by an important phenomenon called identity. We inherit certain identities, while some are created and defined by our environment, history, beliefs, values and norms amongst other factors.

As soon as we open our eyes to this world, we start being "someone" with certain physical characteristics that we are born with. However, in the early stages of our lives we are unable to identify who we are, as we are unable to identify various distinguishing characteristics. As we grow up, we begin to have a better understanding of varying characteristics and their identification. This understanding is brought about by the environment we are exposed to, and our elders in the family and society also play an elemental role.

All these elderly figures and our relation with them allow us to define ourselves and so we are able to find a distinct position in our lives. During childhood, all human beings are exposed to same formative structure but afterwards certain social environments, social traditions or values begin to function as mirrors for us. These sociological and psychological experiences help us recognize and find ourselves. But one can safely assume, that the above discourse does not explain everything about identities, as this fluid phenomenon has always been difficult to comprehend and define.

The issue of identity is a substantial question today. Identity is seen as a major element in each person's life, although at times we do question its importance. Identity is a factor, which makes a person part of a group while at the same time gives this person the individuality. To determine their individuality, people focus on the unique aspects of their personality and perspective that differentiates them from others. Similarly, to show their solidarity to a group they emphasize on those personality aspects, which are not unique but common to a group in order to belong to a particular group of people and behave like them. Since historical times, there have been various views on identity, its origin and how much it affects individuals and their perspective of the world and other fellow humans.

In recent years, gradually the various aspects of identities have not only gained excessive popularity not only in the area of social science but also in the area of communication and its tools such as televisions, newspapers or magazines and recently internet. However most of the media coverage on identities can be addressed as problematic. For instance, national identity and the issues addressed to nationalist movements might be seen as an evolving phenomenon.

Cultural theorists Stuart Hall (1996) refer to this identity confusion as "identity crisis". According to Hall "crisis of identity is seen as a part of a wider process of change which dislocating the central structures and process of modern societies an undermining the framework which gave individual stable anchorage in the social world" (1996:596). But for Bausinger (ed. Vestergaard: 1999) this change is a necessity and it should be received as natural. Besides, identity crisis happens because of the need for adaptation to life and is considered to be normal. For him, identity, as a rule, is ever present in the naturalness of human life and it has to be readjusted, in instances of new challenges, which can be easily found in a complex society like ours. In complex societies, there are great varieties of specialized systems that people have to adapt with, and they as an individual understand the different collectives and ascertain their identification offers which result in a complex structure and a plural strategy to save and protect identity or identities (ibid).

In addition, complexity of the modern life requires us to investigate different identities; nevertheless these identities might trigger conflict for certain occasions. In these situations, we may experience tensions between our different identities when one identity clashes with the demands of other one. That identity related problems could easily be observed in the communities, which create segregation between, races or even in personal relations. Erikson (1963) and Woodward (1997:51-56) raise concern over this struggle. Woodward approaches the issue from national identity perspective. According to her "especially in the global arena national identities are contested and clashes between different communities are represented by conflicting

23

national identities, often with disastrous consequences". And for Erikson these consequences are found mostly in modern societies.

It is interesting to see that Erikson had explanations for the identity conflicts more than half a century back. In his book "Childhood and Society" (1963) he draws attention to clash of identities from the perspective of youth. According to him; young people especially in the modern societies are challenged to give meaningful answers to twin identity questions: "Who am I" and "How do I fit into the adult world". He claims that beginning in adolescence, we address these identity questions in many different ways: through exploration and commitment, by means of behavior, attitudes, feelings and goals. In his argument, it is seen that 'self' is very substantial because he asserts that the identity, as is a configuration of "self" that develops over time. According to him; we are individuals in communities and each of us might experience some conflicts regarding our identities based on our different position in the world as member of a specific community, social class, ethnicity, religion, as a parent, as a worker or as unemployed. But on the positive side, identity also gives us a belonging in the world and offers a link between the community and us.

The belonging or the association that Erikson had mentioned can be different institutions such as families, colleagues, political groups and educational settings, which bring people together. We participate in these institutions and experience what we may see as choices. However, Castells (2009) mentions about the power of these settings as identity builders' institutions. He argues that identities can be originated from dominant institutions and they become identities when and if social actors internalize them and construct their meaning around these internalizations. And yet, he (2009) also claims that identities are stronger sources of meaning than social roles because of the process of self-construction and individualization that they involve. Woodward (1997) also points out comparison of the role and meaning, but she introduces the topic in a different way. According to her, social context can engage us in different social meanings.

> *"Consider the different identities involved in different occasions, such as*
> *attending a job interview or a parents 'evening, going to a party or a*

24

football match or visiting a shopping mall. In all these situations we may feel, literally, like the same person but we are differently positioned by the social expectations and constraints and we represent ourselves to others differently in each context. In a sense, we are positioned and we also position ourselves according to the fields in which we are acting" (1997:51-56).

In other words, we might have variety of characteristics, showing our expected allegiance to different groups. But in different social contexts, we are more likely to place more importance to our stronger characteristic and choose (if or when faced with such choice) a group accordingly. This is especially unique to ethno-national characteristics, as they usually prevail over others and push us into conflict with other groups, which we would otherwise identify ourselves with.

Thus, the expansive literature review shows that a simple discussion of identity is not possible, as it is a complex phenomenon. One should be aware that identities are diverse, complicated and evolving both in the social context in which they are experienced and in the symbolic systems through which we make sense of our own positions.

1.1 Concept and Construction of identity

"All identities exist with their contrasts and everybody has their own others" (İnanç 2005:16).

The notion of identity has been a topic for discussion not only in the world of academia but also in daily conversations. This can be attributed to the fact that the concept is a quite common subject in popular discourse when we are trying to question the origins of our identity. But despite this abounding interest in identity, the concept itself remains something of an enigma.

It is, as a matter of fact, one of the central topics of human life and thus attracts considerable academic attention. Given the interest in identity across a broad spectrum of disciplines, one might initially expect simple and clear statements of what people mean when they use these concepts. Of course, one can find brief definitions and clarifications in many places. However, defining identity, as one of much debated notion of the social science, has always been a challenge. This is not just because of wide definition of the subject but also due to its constant evolvement.

According to Philip Gleason (2011) who studied on the semantic of identity, the word comes from the Latin root idem, "the same" and has been used in English since the sixteenth century. It also has a technical meaning in algebra and a logic that has been associated with the perennial mind-body problem in philosophy since the time of John Locke. While Smith (1995) claims that the notion of identity is as old as recorded history, Strath (2002: 387) agrees and adds "identity, a concept of ancient Greek philosophy and mathematics, entered into the realm of social sciences in the end of the nineteenth century with its inclusion to the discipline of psychoanalysis". However, in the 1970s and 1980s the concept has become a necessary part of social science and occupied the buzzword of the day in the 1990's (Andersson, 2010).

It is surely understandable that definitions came to vary and certain scholars even came to view the concept as manageable in divided fields. But none of these opinions have not affected the question of identity. Although anthropology and psychology being the main areas that study identity; many other disciplines afterwards such as international relations or political science were interested in investigating this debutante phenomenon as well.

Hall (1996) asserts that, there has been notable explosion in recent years around the concept of identity and at the same time it has been subjected to a searching critique. One of his works "Identity in question" he points out the shift in the concepts. According to him (1996:596), "old identities which stabilize the world for so long are in decline, giving rise new identities a fragmenting the modern individual as a unified subject. Woodward (1997) also mentions about the shift by using Hall's

example but she defines it with a term, which she calls "representation". This "representation" includes the signifying practices and symbolic systems through which meanings are produced that position us as subjects. For her "representations" also produces meanings through which we can make sense of our experience and of who we are. We could go further and suggest that these symbolic systems create possibilities of what we are and what we can become, implying a "construction process" of our identities.

In the modern context, construction of identity has many diverse and complicated levels as we can understand from the various works that have been done in the recent decades. According to these researches there are two main views of how to construct identity. Social scientist from Chicago School, George H. Mead introduced one of them. He developed a concept of identity composed of "I", "Me" and "Self". Mead had the view that the social construct of human beings paralleled Darwin's view of human origins but Mead's social psychological story of human origins expressed the emergence of the self-consciousness as a product of social and physical evolution with particular emphasis on social factors and the social genesis of the mind. According to this view self-consciousness in the sense of a human personality needs the two elements 'I' and 'Me' (Cronk, 2009). Psychologist Erik Erikson (1963) has improved this theory by adding Freud's ideal of 'Ego'. Erikson argued that the ego is a positive driving force in human development and personality. He defined the ego as a person's ability to unify experiences and actions in an adaptive manner.

Cillia, Wodak (et. al, 1999) aim to explain in their book how the "ego" functions in the construction process. According to them, ego, is the main authority, which enables people to direct their own behavior. With this ego, we manage to shape social roles and interpret expectations from these roles. Expectation here refers to people we interact with or society that we live in. Moreover ego gives us an ability to distance oneself from one's own internalization. After all, a powerful ego is necessary to establish an individual identity. One of the auxiliary focus of his study is to analyze the development of identity in the course of human life.

"Self" has a duty to experience with our body, a way of seeing the physical self as different for other people and it is a vital point to obtain a better understanding of the concept called identity for Mead and Erikson. But for some scholars such as Castells or Bizimana, 'other' (difference) presents more substantial facts to capture the bigger picture. The fundamental existence of difference is a crucial component of any identity formation. Each identity develops significantly with the existence of this difference and the nature of "difference". Sometimes the difference might result with 'otherization'.

There have been assertions from post-modernists that in the construction process, when we include 'other', negative forms might appear and to prevent that it is possible to create an identity without using other as a comparison (Johansson: 2007). But despite these claims, process of "othering" comes to the forefront in any academic researches regarding to formation process. Particularly Bizimana (ed. Gomez: 2003) expresses how we differentiate ourselves from others and how this differentiation plays its role in the process of identity formation:

> *"Identity refers to 'the way we categorize ourselves and others'. The condition of being oneself can vary and be affected by various contextual factors. The way we define, categorize and group us as different from others implies a preference for certain criteria to the detriment of others. As these criteria depend themselves upon some functional circumstances, therefore part of a dynamic process, the concept of identity becomes itself dynamic rather than static and definite. At one time the subject of an identity may be an individual, a family, a community, as it can be a society at another time"* *(2003:289).*

Position of other also takes it place at the studies of Political Scientist Caporaso. He (2005) discusses that the relationships between identity, interest, preferences and loyalties are not clear but identities have both social and individual components in construction process so they can be defined as "self-conception" rooted in society regarding with who we are in relation to others. Hall (1996) also claims this type of formation by including with a concept called "significant others". Here 'other'

becomes a tool, which connects the individual to society, or what we call "cultural world" and for this connection we may ask another question. "Is identity given or fix phenomenon?"

> *"The notion of the sociological subject reflected the growing complexity of the modern world and the awareness that this inner core of the subject was not autonomous and self-sufficient, but was formed in relation to 'significant others,' who mediated to the subject the values, meanings, and symbols - the culture - of the worlds he/she inhabited. G.H. Mead, C.H. Cooley, and the symbolic interactions are the key figures in sociology that elaborated this 'interactive' conception of identity and the self. According to this view, which has become the classic sociological conception of the issue, identity is formed in the "interaction" between self and society, the subject still has an inner core or essence that is "the real me," but this is formed and modified in a continuous dialogue with the cultural worlds "outside" and the identities which they offer" (1996:597).*

Among several scholars there is an endless negotiation about the role of 'other' played by 'difference' in identity formation. However, the discussion about the role of 'difference' in this formation stems from the nature and consequence of its own format. Arguments made by scholar present the emergence and existence of an identity requires the existence of an 'other'. For instance, Yurdusev (2003) considers the 'other' as a necessity for the asset of any unit of identity and identification process. He goes on by arguing that this need can be logically and historically showed. Alternatively, there are scholars like Abizadeh who oppose this thesis. Although Abizadeh admits the importance of 'difference', he opposes this thesis by dismissing the idea that existence of an 'other' is a prerequisite for the existence of an identity. He says "It is one thing to say that identity presupposes 'difference'; quite another to say that it presupposes an external 'other' (2005:45)." However, besides asserting that the necessity of the 'other' is a logical and historical necessity, Yurdusev (2003) also emphasizes the importance of how the 'other' is perceived. If the 'other' is seen only as a difference or as a stranger, it is considered to be just 'unfamiliar' with the identity in question. On the other hand, if it is seen as a

threating force, then the identity is formed in negative terms, through exclusion of the 'other'. Similarly, Diez (2004) asserts that the study of identity and difference depends on possibilities of different kinds of difference, which are more or less exclusive differences and antagonistic and violent differences. This is all to say, it can be argued that difference may not necessarily end by a relation of 'othering'. If ever there is an 'othering', the intensity of 'othering' may also change from one case to the other.

Stuart Hall is considered as one of the most prominent author on identity as he touches the notion from fields as diverse as philosophy, social science, linguistics, psychology, film studies and art history. He presents the role of 'other' in more steady grounds. According to him, we need to understand identities as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formation and practices, by specific modalities of power. Thus they are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are of sign of an identical, naturally constituted unity – an identity in its traditional meaning (Hall, 2000). From Hall's perspective, we see that the development of identity is strongly affected by society as other. It can also be claimed that most of the studies agree that identity is formed at the personal level and individuals are subjected to family circle and histories beginning from a young age. For Bausinger this circle has particular purport as he has developed a term for this situation called "concentric circles". According to him, identity was structured in concentric circles such as family, neighborhood, village or town, region or nation and in our complex society; we have to deal with the complex constitution of an identity by combining concurrent partial identities respectively. These partial identities belong to not only a specific locality or society but also of specific groups, of social status, age and gender. This clearly implies that identity is far more dynamic, flexible and subject to change (Bausinger ed. Vestergaard, 1999)

Detailed related literature review provides us with commonly accepted proposition such as: identities are given and constructed socially but some scholars also mention that identities might shift under external and internal dynamics. Baykal (2005) agrees that, this process reveals other identities that belong to same individual or society. He

claims identities can be modified or constructed in time through relations with others and multiple identities are possible both for individuals and for communities, especially in layered structures. Turkish scholar Güvenç offers (1996) the same about identities but he also discourses on role of regional geography and climate with reference to developing of identities. According to him identities are formed in the alignment of social and historical process. These processes have effect on people's individual and social relations. Different identities appear as a result of living in diverse geography and climate. Role of individual in the life and his/her relation alters in conjunction with development of his/her identity and people experience this change throughout their lives.

As is evident from the literature review, each scholar has a different perspective on development of identity. For instance, Bloom discusses in his research the changes that mentioned before; take place in an identity, which he refers to as "identification". Bloom (1990) describes that identification is an ongoing and dynamic process. It is also the mechanism of internalizing social values and attitudes by individuals starting from early childhood by providing psychological security, which eventually led to so-called personal identities, that are constructed with regard to their physical and social environment and shift substantially over space and time. Identities are sources of meaning for the actors themselves, and by themselves, constructed through a process of individuation (Castell, 2009). But actually both individual and social components are integral to identity construction.

One of the researchers Grzegorz Pozarlik actually manages to explain the entire complicated concept in a one paragraph. The paragraph questions who we are, why we have identity crisis and where we are in this construction process. According to him identification process works by redefining identity as it evolves. As Pozarlik writes (ed. Klein, Jong and Tamcke, 2013: 78) "living in a society, which does not provide a safe haven from pressure of answering the daily existential question of who I am, reinforces temporality and an open-ended character of identity construction. Thus, identity is continuously evolving through a process of permanent redefinition

of symbolic meanings of categories, which serve as frame of reference of self-identification".

Hale goes one step further and defines the social environment effect as "social radar". For him, the social world has a huge impact on individual identities. He explains "it is, in a certain way, a kind of social radar, a perceptual device through which people come to see where they stand in relation to the human environment (2004:463)". Thus, groups are defined by common relationships with respect to the social reference. Of course, the reality of group behavior involves much more than this, but the core premise is essential as a point of theoretical departure.

From the abovementioned literature review, we can deduce that identity is a social fact and has an underlying core of contrast and diversity, given and constructed strongly by the influence of other. Moreover identity is a demanding concept as it aims to deal with persistence and change, similarity and difference, objectivity and subjectivity, the collective and the individual level of social and political understanding of the self, all at the same time. It is worth trying to develop a concept that tries to deal with human paradoxes, even those that may never be fully resolved. As we mention before, there are many different facts and opinions in the construction of identity process. Hall, Mead, Erikson or Castells are few of many researchers who have studied identity. Till date, many ideologies relating to the meaning and formation of the term, "identity" has been developed. One might easily say that it is almost impossible to find a unique concept and formation process for identity, which meets the diversity of all ideas and concepts.

In sum, identity is both a source of corporation and differentiation. It is an ongoing concept prone to the challenges in terms of validity and reasonability. Serving as the main point of communication, boundaries constitute lines of separation forming the common distinctness of the members inside and perpetuating that reality. It has definite and actual function in comprising the identity system particular of the self and the others. Identities basically claim a kind of unity. A unity is only possible when collectivism of the parts is promoted and differences between them are

reduced. Thus instabilities are also inherent in every form of unity. Humans and collectives are always in search of stability and certainty in themselves and their environments. It is reasonable to think that there are certain commonalities in the collectives pre-existing, as in essentialism or formed through the course of history, shaped by intended constructions by specific actors, as in constructivism. In both perspectives, it is undeniable that those commonalities of the collectives today are currently challenged and constantly negotiated.

1.2 Approaches and Types of Identity

Previous part of study aimed to explain the concept and construction of identity from the perspective of basic grounds and main elements such as the role of other and role of ego-self. This part of the study is the wider version of the first part and focuses on the identity construction from more theoretical aspects by including long-discussed subjects and different types.

Social scientists, for a long time have tried to explain how individuals conceive and process their identities. Overall, identity is a concept that is relevant to humans and it comes from development of a perception of oneself based on the questions like: who, what and how I am (Risse, Brewer and Hermann, 2004). Erikson (1963) gives an answer to these questions in a very simple way: "A man's character is dissembled in the mental or moral attitude in which, when it came upon him, he felt himself most deeply and intensely active and alive. At such moments there is a voice inside which speaks and says: This is the real me!"

As previously explained, one should bear in mind that different identities are activated selectively depending on the case in which we find ourselves. In social science, these activating factors are discussed based on two key approaches of identity formation. One is constructivist and the other one is essentialist. There is one basic difference between these two theories. The essentialist approach claims that biological qualities such as gender or sexuality play an important role in shaping an

identity; while constructivist approach believes that society has more influence in shaping it. Essentialist arguments are often made about abstract categories such as human nature, race, truth, beauty, art or history, etc. and claim the reality of these things is to be found in their essence or in their innermost nature.

The essentialist thought views identity as something natural and eternal within a person. It is something that a person inherently has and is something that endures throughout a person's lifetime and does not change. Woodward (1997) mentions that identity often seems to involve essentialist claims about belongingness where, identity is seen as fixed and unchanging, for the background of a person. These qualities are almost always marked by visual cues, making these categories more clear and easier to notice. Besides these qualities contain social and more importantly authoritarian perspective.

However Weiler (1995) address this approach not from individual side but from collectivist side. He expresses that essentialist approach treats collective identities as given and independent from identity politics, thus rejecting the socio-historical process of fabrication behind identities. All these claims are based on nature, such as race and kinship in some version of ethnicity. But often the claims are based on an essentialist version of history and of the past, where history is constructed or represented as an unchanging truth.

The other theory about identity formation is constructivist approach. This approach accepts that identities can change according to space, time and as well as context. According to this theory, an identity is defined by cultural and social environment and therefore they are not predestined.

Bognar and Almasi as well, address the importance of interaction and change in this approach. As regards to them, in the constructivist view, "identity is not a source but rather an effect of mutual individual influences. Hence the constructivist approach sees identity as flexible and changeable, it can be formed and created by applying specific policy measures" (2014:31). Jenkins also agree that constructivist approach is all about interactions made by individuals with others and with society. In the

words of Jenkins, identities are socially constructed, "always the outcome of agreement or disagreement, always a matter of convention and innovation, always to some extent shared, always to some extent negotiable (Jenkins and Sofos, 1996:4)". Thus, essentially these interactions are responsible for shaping up of an identity.

Recently, the exploration and appreciation of identity in constructivist approach has come to occupy central place for many scholars. Especially for scholars who study this theory in the perspective of not only social and cultural areas but also political and international relations. This interest becomes clear particularly when the formation is subjected to political construction. Sociologist Martin Kohli (2000) draws attention to this point. He express that formation of several political identities is dependent on incentives and mobilization efforts by political entrepreneurs and thus influenced by opportunist environment. Consequently, more indicative of constructivist political approach than of a thickly particularistic self-definition in an essentialist sense. Manuel Castell takes one-step further adds another determinant. According to him, all identities are individually formed in a constructive way along with biological, political and religious factor, which is more effective in the formative process.

> *"It is easy to agree on the fact that, from a sociological perspective, all identities are constructed. The real issue is how, from what, by whom, and for what. The construction of identities uses building materials from history, from geography, from biology, from productive and reproductive institutions, from collective memory and from personal fantasies, from power apparatuses and surely religious revelations. But individuals, social groups, and societies process all these materials, and rearrange their meaning, according to social determinations and cultural projects that are rooted in their social structure, and in their space/time framework (Castells, 2009:7)".*

Existence of different identities is possible in a constructivist understanding of identity formation and this formation can be seen in various ways amalgamated in one identity. For instance, one individual might have social, collective, national,

religious or even ethnic identity. In this context this part of the research, discusses different type of identities in order to have a better perspective and interpretation on the construction of identities.

Social scientists Delanty and Rumford (2005) state that identity of an individual with respect to self-concept is composed of three elements. These three elements can be classified as individual, collective and social identities. All three, individual, collective and social identities play a vital role in the shaping of an identity but primarily, this research focuses on the national identity, as a separate identity type even if arguably accepted for Delanty and Rumford is a part of social identity as it is socially constructed. The research makes this separation purposely as national identity is one of the main structural parts of the study.

National identity has always been seen as constructed identity in the perspective of historical facts. But to acknowledge the constancy of active formation we need to move beyond the simple explanation of historical side. Lunn (ed. Jenkins and Sofos: 1996), suggests, even if it is important to see "the past" as the locum of dynamic processes of national identity formation the link with historical imagery is not adequate to understand the whole concept because a nation is more than an extended kinship community. A nation is first connected by its socio-biological relationship and then by history, culture and traditions practiced. The common practice and adherence by the members form a community. People often refer to history when tracing their national identity and lineage. At such time, interpretation of history acquires a certain level of significance. But as Cillia, (et. al, 1999) claim, not only past of a nation but also present and the future are three main factors that also contribute to the construction of national identity. The identity formation process can be influenced by present and future political problems, crises, threats, prospective political aims or values.

While Lunn (et. al, 1996) discuss the time-period phenomenon in the construction of national identity, scholars such as Reicher and Hopkins (2001) address the social interaction effect. According to them, group members' dynamic national identities

are constructed by influences of public debate and general rhetoric. These identities are not given or natural but structured and restructured through the process of social interactions. Thereby, conceptions of national identity vary with time and place and are mostly a matter of power. Power influence on identity development is going to be discussed later when the research argues the Jurgen Habermas' and Benedict Anderson' arguments. Here we can simply mention identity is constructed according to interest of power so interaction between power and identity is nonlinear.

As many researchers stated in their works (Ariely 2011; Gherghina 2012; Orchard 2002; Reicher and Hopkins 2001), one particular definition of national identity reflects an attempt to understand what the nation and its' relations with others should be. In this regard, the border and the content of nation are construed deliberately in a way that makes the desired changes in the social structure possible. Cinnirella (1997) for instance writes that definitions of British and Italian national identity show different views on whether or not participants support European integration or other policies implemented by politic organizations. This takes us to the importance of relations with institutions or more likely seen the way as groups.

The concept of national identity represent the way in which people understand who they are, how they relate to others and what is important for them. In this sense, conceptions of nationality are expected to determine how national identification impacts perceptions of inter and intra-group relations. Sociologist Michael Billig (1996) defines that contents of national identity include people's imagination of the in-group, out-group and the world of nations and so people can perceive "ourselves" as a national "us". Here Reicher and Hopkins (2001) suggest that to understand the relationship between national identification and perceptions of group relations, we should investigate the diverse construction of the nation's boundaries, content and relations with others.

It seems that process of national identification and group attitudes should not be thought independent from how individuals comprehend national identities. One study done by Pehrson, Vignoles and Brown (2009) hypothesized that national

identification and prejudice relationship should be weakest in countries where the civic definition of nationality is widely endorsed but should be the strongest in countries where the ethnic or cultural definitions are widely endorsed. In their research, they have unveiled that wherever the definition of national belonging based on language prevailed, the relevant relationship was stronger than when national belonging was defined in the terms of citizenship. They explained that identification with a nation defined in a cultural or ethnic way implied more negative attitudes with respect to immigrants than identification with a nation defined based on shared citizenship.

The research above sounds more reasonable when we consult Jacobs' and Maier's article. According to them (1998), constitution of a national community cannot suppress all the difference between individuals or social groups. Although the national community can outrank these social groups in favor of the common "we", which distinguishes natives from foreigners. Related to this topic and perceptions against out-groups, it should be mentioned a recent study was conducted by Pehrson, Brown and Zagefka. Pehrson (et. al, 2009) argued that perceptions of out-groups vary depending on 'what nationality based on' and 'who can potentially belong to it'. In their study, they reported that when English participants subscribed to the essentialist or ethnic national group definition, there was a positive relationship between national identification and negativity towards immigrants. Additionally, there was no relation when participants rejected the essentialist definition. Above all, researchers claimed that the content of national identity is crucial because it determines the influence of a given out-group over the national projects of autonomy, identity and unity.

As seen above, national identities are strong type of identity because they satisfy deep human psychological needs, such as the need to belong somewhere and to overcome the pointlessness and transience of human existence through the dream of collective immortality. This reasoning, as mentioned, is powerful in national identities but sometimes they are known to impact social identities as well. For instance, Risse (2008) mentions that features of national identity are similar to

features of social identity by nature. According to him, social identities contain ideas describing and categorizing an individual's membership in a social group including emotional, affective and evaluative components.

Similarly Risse, Hogg (2006) argues that social identities focus on characteristics such as stereotyping, ethnocentrism, discrimination, prejudice, intergroup conflict, conformity, normative behavior, group polarization, crowd behavior, organizational behavior, leadership, deviance, and group cohesiveness. The research utilizes the concept of many of these traits in our research, namely prejudice, discrimination, ethnocentrism and stereotyping, hence, it is important to review more literature about these identity types in order to understand the next chapters better.

When we discuss social identity, first name to come up is Henry Tajfel who originally formulated the social identity theory. According to him (1981) social identity as a part of the individual's self-concept is derived from self-knowledge of his/her membership of a social group (or groups). Moreover the value and emotional significance that the individual attaches to that membership also reflect the feature of this identity type. Besides definition contains collective actions and acceptance of groups that would drive loyalty emotions, group obligation and other feelings. Bloom (1990) agrees that shared identifications supply a psychological connection among individuals and increases their tendency to behave as one unit. This can also influence them to stir a mass movement for protecting and escalating their common identity. Thus, social identity has a significant effect on our actions, intentions or judgments.

To have a wider explanation, we need to understand how social identity is developed. Firstly, identities might be socially determined and they evolve in relation to other individuals within a social background. As Zetterholm (1994) argues "individuals have a need for transcendence to experience themselves as something more than just individuals with short-life span and to partake in the cultural life of the social group and by this way, individuals connect in social groups and develop a sense of social identity. Klein (et. al, 2003) discuss that the concept of 'other' can have a bearing

here as well to understand the development of social identity because, the commonalities characterizing a social group determine the treatment of outsiders and the 'other'. Thus, an identity might change according to the relevant context or time.

Social identity is used broadly in social psychology literature to refer to the psychological link between individuals and the social groups or communities to which they belong. The group that individual belongs to is considered the "in-group", and a strong social identity fosters feelings of mutual obligation among group members and impels attachment and loyalty to the group (Tajfel, 1981). At the same time, individuals, inherently prone to categorization, identify and label others not part of their social group. They draw boundaries around their group identity at the expense of 'out-groups', and consider their own group to be more favorable or even superior. Hence, social identity simultaneously integrates and divides people resting on shared beliefs about inclusion and exclusion/differentiation (1981).

According to social identity theory, the formation of group identity requires defining of an in-group with common interest or characteristics and separation of this group from an out-group with dissimilar and negative characteristics. This difference between in-group and out-group also implies the concepts of self and the other which is frequently discussed in identity question. Neumann (2006) claims that the definition of in-group and out-group characteristic is an important element of identity construction as only the outside can recognize and validate us. As is evident from this discourse, in-groups need out-groups as an active and ongoing part of identity formation. Social identity is created and transformed via communication so perceptions of others have more effect on social identities rather than the groups itself (Kostakopoulou, 2001).

Another aspect of social identity is that it is integrated with multiplicity of identities. Kohli (2000) notes, individuals can identify themselves with various social groups at various levels. For example, with a socio-economic group in a local setting, with a political party at the national level, with a national attribute in an international context. Tajfel approaches this diversity also in the perspective of multiple identities.

He (1981) mentions that multiple identities unite to make one individual identity. This identity remains a constant feature of any individual and keeps evolving during the whole lifetime. However, based on the social context, certain collective identities might have an essential effect on the behavior of a person. For example, during a football match, collective identity of the favorite club has a bigger impact than the religious one, which would play its main role in a church or mosque.

The discussion about the nature of the context and the meaning of the social identities, which group members engage in, does not necessarily carry a universal consensus. The members may have a different or may be conflicting viewpoints for different future projects. In other words, if there are different versions of the in-group definition, together with its norms, values, interests and its relations with other groups, this differentiation might be assumed as the consequence of the contradictory collective projects.

As we explained before, social identity is part of the individual self-concept. At the same time, it differently interacts with various associated collective identities. In particular, the social identity itself is composed of and influenced by various collective identities. So, the social identity can be seen as the common denominator of the individual identity and the collective identity. It is imperative to mention these concepts here because in the second and third chapter of the thesis, the research discusses how collective and social identities play a role on Erasmus students' behavior. Now that we have discussed the concept and content of social identity, the following section focuses on collective identity.

Delanty and Rumford (2005) express that collective identity is a singular sense of belonging to one nation, which is a process, is also referred to as identification. As previously mentioned, identification is a continuum that accounts for the way individuals develop the feeling of belonging to a group which. Everyone identifies with a range of available groups with differing levels of intensity, conscious intent and choice. In a simple meaning, collective identity is not aggregate of individual

identities but definition of a certain group. To form a collective identity, social group and collective togetherness should co-exist.

Von Busekist (2004) who has studied the terms of identity, express that collective identity has many traits. He explains this sort of identity as a dynamic entity, which is dependent on the context and on the individuals who generate it. For him, collective identity is constructed and dependent upon entrepreneurs (individuals or institutions). This type of identity maintains a close relation to the system of values, whether that be a relation of approbation or rejection, in an internal or international system. He also mentions that collective identities draw boundaries and include a "central motif as in music or a pertinent common denominator that permits individuals to recognize and articulate their attachment when it is conscious" (Von Bukesit, 2004:82).

Some type of symbols, work of arts, traditions, habits, values, beliefs and collective ego, which count as a heritage of the past, also form collective identity. However at different times, different identity elements may be active. For example, as İnanç (2005) mentions, the main element for European identity was Christianity, but culture and modernity remained at the forefront and national identities became stronger than religious ones so national feelings became a part of collective identities.

Consequently, on can safely assume that when an identity is being described within a country, geographic region and social status or class may be determining factors. Similarly, while describing an identity outside of her/his own country, racial classification or group may be the determining factor. Also, sometimes gender or family is used as the determining factor which indicate transmission and continuity of an identity through lineage.

Many people are able to unite multiple identities and they might carry a unified identity as citizen of their local community, region, country and the world, all at the same time. While some of these identities are more notable than the others, the person still feels some connection to the secondary set of identities. Besides, some

people specify certain boundaries around their primary identities and find it difficult to relate to what they consider to be the out-groups. As Risse (et. al, 2004) discuss, the distinction between 'hem and us' is a shifting one, meaning that it varies across individuals and contexts. For some, nationality may be the dividing line, for others it may be the region or local community. Hence, for a particular set of individuals, there are varying contexts where the lower-order and higher-order identities may be perceived as mutually threatening.

In briefly, identity is a unit of study in several branches of social sciences and it has various types and theories and maybe some more to be revealed. Surely, researches on formation of identity have long witnessed the dominance of realism over other theories. However, recent regional and global developments exhibit the importance of culture-identity relations.

1.3 Culture and Identity

Earlier, culture was understood to be synonymous with 'people'. This scenario has changed in the last decades because of the idea that cultural differences are not viewed anymore as outlandish otherness. Nowadays cultures are increasingly conceived as contradictions and conflicts, with nugatory change. Besides, culture and cultural identities have come to be known as paradoxes whereas they should be evaluated as richness in mankind. Obviously, when we talk about culture and identity, differences are becoming a part of our social discourse. But a universal consensus on what we are to understand as culture has become even more difficult to achieve. Likewise, it is no less difficult to find ways to investigate and analyze cultures and how they influence identities.

From this starting point, like the term 'culture', 'cultural identity' has many different meanings and similar to 'culture' different paradigms indicate certain meanings of the term. Within the humanities cultural identity also exists, but with another

meaning. It is a form of identity created by a uniform use of texts and exchange of and use of symbols as parts of identities (Fornas, 1995).

But Martinez (2011) claims these are not part of identities, these are actually represent different sort of cultural identity. He states that when we realize all the diverse cultural identities that people have, we also see the confusion associated with the intersection of issues of race, language, religion, gender, generation and age so forth, as they operate within individuals. He argues that all these factors interact and come out differently in different people. So understanding cultural identities offers insight into how people relate to the many groups. For a holistic comprehension, we have to realize the variety of groups that create an individual's cultural identity. Based upon these thoughts, from the constructivist perspective, we presume that it is a general understanding that cultural identity is a form of social identity constructed in relation to other people in a given period of time.

According to Hall (1996) there are at least two different ways of thinking about cultural identity. One of them defines cultural identity in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective 'one true self' hiding inside the many other. It refers to a more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves' which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common. Within the terms of this definition, our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes, which provide us, as 'one people' with stable, unchanging and continue frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions of our actual history. In other saying cultural identity is based on specific cultural forms that socially constructed (Jensen, 1998; Salo Lee, 2003).

In this social construction affect of expedient sometimes comes into prominence. In fact, one of the most characteristic features of cultural identity today is the meaning of politics. "We have moved from broader politics based on universality such as Marxism to politics where gender, ethnicity and local identity have been given central significance. This has created new social categories and new identities and new political groups (Friedman, 1994:11)". For this new identities or new groups it is

important to be perceived that cultural identity is understood as a feeling of belonging to a cultural group. It depicts behavior, which is based on common values, joint history, language and tradition. But here language has a bigger role in a person's cultural identity (Liebkind, 1994).

> "Language is a part of a person´s cultural identity. It is a powerful unifying force for group cohesion. Language is used to reinforce the identification and bond with a particular group. The solidarity towards one´s own group is shown, when appropriate, using that group´s own language. An ethnic group is a group, which classifies itself as a separate group and has its own culture, which it wants to maintain. (1994:250)"

Byram (1989) declares that language and the context in which it is used are directly subordinated to each other and language cannot operate alone without the cultural context. To have a better understanding of language effect, it is benignant to examine the research done by Giampapa (2001) who investigated the identities of Italian-Canadian adolescents and their negotiations through their use of language and cultural effects on identification process. His study revealed that the participants have multiple identities and multiple positions that change and develop within and across different settings. In addition, Giampapa found that language is a strong factor in the development of positioning and identification of the participants and identity representations are never permanent but a complex multicultural and multilingual hybrid of the participants' desires.

Jacobs and Maier's thoughts on the subject also rewarding to comprehend the main subject better. They (1998) discuss the relation between language and native race from the perspective of nation-states. According to them, nation-states promote a standard language, by developing a language policy. This language policy has been used by politicians, writers or journalists to surpass the regional and social differences in language. Schools are instrumental in achieving an affiliation of the national language as a mother language through integration in course curriculum. These are primarily employed to overcome the race related issues. At the same time

it must be remembered that language ideologies can be used not only to integrate but also to separate or exclude and decide 'who is in' and 'who is out'.

From this context, we should include the discussion on cultural identity as national culture as a principal source. Here, Salo Lee (ed. Gomez, 2003) and Jameson (2007) address the balancing power of cultural identity and nationality. Salo Lee claims nationalism and national culture to be a necessity of politics under the name of cultural identity. According to her, even if the members of the society are different from each other in term of class, gender or race, a national culture seeks to unify them into one cultural identity with one great national family. And Jameson mentions that cultural identity is an individual's sense of self-derivation from formal or informal membership in groups. These groups transmit and infuse traditions, attitudes, values, beliefs or knowledge in members. It would be appreciated if the groups balance components related to class, language, geography and the social aspects of biology.

In the last few decades, discussions on the relation of culture and identity have largely focused on nationality issues. This is exemplified by the many attempt to raise nationalistic cultures mostly by political organizations or states. "we can point at a functionalist based understanding of cultural identity where the goal is to find a national mind, a particular characteristic identity of the population as a whole" (Rogilds, 1995:11). And yet contemporary nationalism is more reactive than proactive, it tends to be more cultural than political, and thus more oriented toward the defense of an already institutionalized culture than toward the construction or defense of a state. When new political institutions are created, or recreated, they are defensive trenches of identity, rather than launching platforms of political sovereignty (Castell, 2009).

> *"Cultural nationalism aims to regenerate the national community by creating, preserving, or strengthening a people's cultural identity when it is felt to be lacking or threatened. The cultural nationalist regards the nation as a product of its unique history and culture, and as a collective solidarity endowed with unique attributes. In short, cultural nationalism is concerned*

with the distinctiveness of the cultural community as the essence of a nation (Yoshino, 1992:34)".

Even if many scholars speak of unifying power of nationalism on cultural identity, there are ongoing debates that even when the nationalism is too strong, cultural identities with claims by particular race can cause issues such as prejudices or stereotypes. One investigation revealed that the role of cultural identity in stereotype threat among black population in America. Study used an empirical measure and indexed the extent to which participants followed beliefs and practices of African culture. As a result it is found that people who have strong cultural identities are more dominant or more prejudicial when interacting with others (Smith and Hopkins 2004).

In our routine life our communication, habits and living are still shaped by our national, regional and local traditions. And this forms the basis of our true cultural identity. It should be remembered that culture is seen as a rather dynamic and bounded whole that lies at the basis of the formation of identity, without, however, being exclusively connected to a particular community – and in particular to a national one, even if protestation is made in that sense – as a more classical 'anthropological' concept of culture would suggest (Sassatelli, 2002). It is also one of the assumptions, that if the corpus of European culture is sufficiently promoted and protected, a European consciousness will naturally emerge (ibid). This emphasis on the role of culture in the construction of community makes more obvious the contradiction that affects all cultural policies. The contradiction of promoting the spontaneous flowering of culture, using culture as a legitimizing tool while also claiming that culture deserves to be safeguarded as the highest product of human activity. It should be recalled that European culture has developed with a multitude of interactions through debates and contradictions. The core of the European cultural identity resides in the capacity to question and reconsider all the certainties.

1.4 Intercultural Communication, Its Barriers and Identity Relations.

Identity has a main role in intercultural communication because it serves as a bridge between culture and communication. We come to understand our identity through communication with our family, friends and others and it is through communication that we express our identity to others. It is important to realize this fact about our identity, particularly with reference to intercultural interactions. In addition, when we talk about the relation between identities and intercultural communication, we need to focus on the culture from two perspectives. Firstly, cultural codes are not fixed in intercultural communication and secondly, even if nations play a significant role on cultures, they are not alone in the formation and so identities are not entirely correlated to nations.

As we mentioned earlier, each person has multiple dimensions of identities, usually depending on the nature of the social interaction. These interactions are games of identity which are played everywhere in society (Hall, 1992) and this is exactly why we have to include the socializing feature of identity within intercultural communication. Because as Jensen (1998) notes, discussion on identity as a subject in intercultural communication depends on the topic, what participants are talking about. As some conversations will actualize national identity while other conversations will not concern national ideas at all. After all, the conversation still has to be seen in an intercultural context.

While Jensen mentions the importance of the subject in intercultural conversation, Johnstone (1999) claims that researchers realize it is frustratingly difficult in intercultural communication research, to see exactly how people could ever get along successfully across boundaries. He explains, that if a person's early cultural and linguistic socialization, forces him/her to act in certain ways and not others, then it is a Utopian adaptation. Also it can term as a Utopian adaptation, if adopting new communicative strategies or expectations transforms one's personality. More than that even within national borders; intercultural challenges are aggravated by this

static view (Vestergaard, 1999). Are people's identities an effect of their membership of linguistic, national, regional and ethnic groups and does such group membership create problems for intercultural communication or create superficial representation? But the main point, from multicultural perspective should be based on that cultures of communicators should not be seen as meeting points between individuals and consequently the focus must be on affects of their identities on communication across boundaries.

> *Intercultural communication is increasingly the norm in the relatively heterogeneous, unfocussed, multiethnic, polyglot conditions that characterize the social worlds of more and more people everywhere. These are situations in which nations and cultures, or people and cultures, are not in one to one correspondence, but instead individuals draw on social and linguistic resources from many cultures. As a result, different ways of acting and taking meet within individuals rather than at social boundaries or within social groups. Work that sees communication among people who are different as "multicultural" argues for a less deterministic view of the relationship between culture and linguistic behavior than is suggested in the frameworks of cross-cultural or intercultural communication (Johnstone, 1999:252)*

As we said earlier, cultures are not entirely correlated with nations in intercultural communication. Cultures can be correlated with races, ethnic groups, sexual orientations, genders, or even socio-economic status. Johnstone (1999) agrees but has a different approach to the issue from different perspective. He argues that groups are the main players who make separations. For him, the major social boundaries are boundaries between group identities rather than national boundaries. According to him "languages and cultures meet, then, at the boundaries between distinct social groups that interact in limited circumstances. People's behavior, their interpretation of others' behavior, is seen as made inevitable by social facts about them". Here Jensen (1998) approaches the topic in the same way but he uses a different aspect of separation. He explains that we use an understanding of cultural identity which is not limited by race, nation or ethnicity but as a figure which holds different kinds of

identity such as work, hobby and gender. By doing this he claims, we do not create a hierarchic structure and avoid having one certain determinant identity.

Hall and McGrew (1992) argued having more than one identity in the cultural systems and its effects on intercultural communication instead of group separation. They claim that the self is fragmented and does not contain one identity but several identities, which are often contradictory ones. According to them, this way, identity becomes a "moveable" feast formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surrounds us. "Within us are contradictory identities pulling in different directions, so that our identifications are continuously being shifted about (1992:277)". Jensen (1998) quotes from Colier and Thomas and claims "these separations and multiple identities we foster skills for pinpointing the identities that for example young people who live in diaspora express and these multiple identities are relevant to intercultural communication because it delivers us with an explanation why certain topics create heated discussions" (1987:12). If certain topics actualize different identities, then the communication will have connotations that the participants might not be prepared for.

These connotations can be referred to as intercultural communication barriers in the literature such as misunderstandings, stereotypes or prejudices. These cultural issues can also be twisted politically, for example when the majority fixes the minority with the idea that "they" are different, have another religion and lack native linguistic skills. This social process of 'othering' is construed by the majority and results in increased distances from other groups. Jensen (1998) gives an example of the case in his work such as:

> *One Turkish-Danish girl is constructed as traditionally Turkish by Danish girls and seen as inauthentic or confused if she chooses to position herself with more features in common with Danish girls. The girl can choose between being in the group by positioning herself as Turkish like the ethnically Danish girls expect or otherwise having a lower status in the group. In both cases the Danish girls are the defining group. Through their*

construction they maintain the right to include or exclude the Turkish-Danish girls. In everyday life's intercultural conversations this means that the ethnic minorities have to invalidate the majority's simplified understandings of them. (Jensen, 1998:13)

Hortobagyi (2009) argues that when we engage into a conversation in a multicultural setting, one has to presuppose that the members of a group share the same code, symbols, signs and meanings. In such a setting, when the participants who communicate represent a different communication system then the differences can lead to clashes or conflicts. When that happens, intercultural communication process fails. Shaw explains that intercultural communication fails leading to cultural miscommunication and this is when we respond negatively towards other people's culture. According him, this is called identity disconfirmation, "the process through which individuals do not recognize others, do not respond sensitively to dissimilar others, and do not accepts other's experiences as valid" (Shaw, 2012:513).

Shaw mentions identity disconfirmation but the prior literature review shows that identity is constantly produced through the views of the others. Thus, minority's identity construction is an exemplified response to how they have been stereotyped by the majority. According to scholars (Howarth, Permanadeli, Sen, Wagner, 2012:524) "perceived prejudice and stereotypes increase the level of identification by disadvantaged group members with their in-group and perceived discrimination leads to increased hostility towards the out-group". We can observe here, that in-group identity and out-group stereotyping are interconnected in many ways as noted by Howarth (et. al, 2012) "minoritized groups have a strong representation not only of their own 'being-a-group' but this representation relates to the views and expectations of the wider society more generally" (Howarth, Permanadeli, Sen, Wagner, 2012:525). Moreover, dominant stereotypes of minorities are not arbitrary but are determined by the out-groups' own political interests in combination with the attributes and behavior of the minority group. Apart from that, permeability of the group boundaries on one hand, and the legitimacy and stability of status differences

between groups on the other, affects the ways in which a low status minority responds to discrimination by a majority.

Baraldi (2006) expressed the dynamics of group behaviors on the perspective of identities. He noted from Gudykunst (1994:56) that the only basis we have for communicating with strangers is their group memberships and our stereotypes about the group. According to him: "Strangers' communication maybe based on any (or more) of their social identities. To communicate effectively, we need to understand which social identities are influencing strangers' behavior and how they define themselves with respect to these identities". Naming one form of communication which influences all types of identities is stereotyping but communication is unavoidable as cultural forms thrive in communication. This also implies that intercultural communication has effects on identities.

1.4.1 Stereotypes as Cultural Barriers

Walter Lipmann first coined the term "stereotype" in his 1922 book "Public Opinion." Briefly, Lipmann suggested that the environment surrounded by an individual is actually too complex to comprehend; hence the individual constructs "a picture in his head" of the world, which is out of his reach. This so-called "picture" he stated, was somewhat culturally determined and largely guilty due to easy reasoning processes used. He further stated that the connection between stereotypes and reality were often separate features, hence 'strange'. He also discussed how stereotypes were rigid and resistant to change. Today, stereotypes are defined as beliefs about the characteristics, attributes and behaviors of members of certain groups. Not only they include beliefs about groups, but they include theories regarding how stereotypes are and why certain attributes go together, these theories in turn influence when stereotypes are applied as well as when they might be revised or changed (Hilton and Von Hippel, 1996).

Since the theoretical analysis of Lippmann, several assumptions have been made regarding stereotypes. According to the common assumption, stereotypes are shared among members of a social group (Tajfel, 1981). According to the assumption of contrast, the attribution of a particular trait to a particular group derives its stereotypic nature in part from attributions of other traits to the same group or from attributions of the same trait to other groups (Ashmore and Del Boca, 1981). Finally, according to the assumption of consistency, stereotypes are biased in that they portray groups in simplistic and internally consistent ways (Judd, Ryan, and Park, 1991). Krueger (1996) notes, measurements of stereotypes have been established in ways that make each of these assumptions possible to research, such as checklist paradigms, percentage formats, etc.

Why do people engage in stereotypic thinking? Bodenhausen (et. al, 1994) claims that stereotyping typically involves a multiple array of purposes, reflecting both cognitive and motivational processes. It is well known that stereotypes emerge as a way of simplifying the demands of the perceiver, making information processing easier by allowing the perceiver to rely on previously stored knowledge in the face of new incoming information (Bodenhausen, Kramer and Susser, 1994). Stereotypes are also likely to emerge in response to environmental factors such as different social roles, group conflicts differences in power justifications of the status quo and a need for social identity. Hence as evident, stereotyping may occur in various contexts in order to serve particular functions born from those contexts (Fiske, 1993).

Now that the "why?" of stereotypes has been dealt with, the next question is "when?" It has been suggested that a number of motivational as well as affective factors influence when and how stereotypes surface, however it is generally the cognitive processes that serve as the mechanism for certain motivational effects which determine their influence on perception, judgment and behavior. For instance, Ditto and Lopez (1993) found that people typically required more evidence to convince them that a disliked person was intelligent rather than unintelligent. Such a finding may suggest that motivation can lead to rapid confirmation yet slow the acceptance of disconfirming information, such that there may be a reduction in use of negative

stereotypes of a liked group. On the other hand, Wilder (1993) argues, it can influence which type of information processing strategy is utilized, for instance, by increasing the likelihood that a non- conforming group member will be assimilated to the group stereotype.

The content of stereotypes and the strength with which they are held may vary according to many factors; however, stereotypic content has generally been suggested to stem from two sources. The first are mental representations of actual differences between groups, otherwise stated, they are actual representations of reality, reflecting a kernel of truth (Judd and Park, 1993) or an aspect of reality to which the perceiver is exposed to such as cultural stereotypes about food preferences or love of football. Although such stereotyping may cause perceivers to generalize to other members and overlook individual differences they generally do not cause perceivers to deviate from accurate perceptions (Hilton and von Hippel, 1996). This taps the fact that not all stereotypes are necessarily negative, for instance Germans are said to be more efficient and Italians lazier than others However, these stereotypes are quite selective in that they are built around features that are most distinctive of the group creating the largest between group differentiations accompanied by little within group variability. The second source of stereotypes, those formed without basis on actual group differences, are generally those regarding enduring characteristics such as race or religion. These, however, are considered to be most prone to erroneous judgment (Hilton and von Hippel, 1996).

Brown (1965) also discussed certain characteristics of stereotypes, which are assumed to be particularly undesirable. Stereotypes, he investigated might not be based on direct experience and so may be insensitive to contrary evidence, serving to rationalize selfish behavior and further ascribing it to racial inheritance and cultural acquisition. According to Brown (1965), what seems to be the trouble with stereotypes is that they contain not only description but also evaluation, evaluation which is based on local norms. Norms are generally taken to be universally valid, hence differences in norms will inevitably cause unfair stigmatization.

Campbell (1967) went on to list four characteristics that he thought were guilty with stereotypes. The first was stated to be the 'phenomenological absolutism'" of the in-group member, which is the view that the out-group is perceived as the in-group chooses to perceive it without questioning it. The second point is the exaggerated out-group homogeneity effect, in which within differences are minimized and similarities between groups are not recognized. The third deficiency regards erroneous causal analyses such that the individual is likely to attribute group differences to racial instead of environmental causes. The fourth issue concerns hostility directed toward the out-group. The individual may attribute her/ his hostility toward the out-group as a consequence of the negative characteristics of that out-group instead of recognizing that it is her/ his existing hostility that has created a label of a characteristic, suggesting it is inherent to that out- group.

Although stereotypes are generally held and changed by individuals, the meaning and implication of stereotypes tend to emerge in contexts of group membership. Tajfel (1981) described how individuals tend to belong to a variety of groups in order to satisfy their needs and achieve positive social identity. This results in individuals viewing their group membership as an important personal character, which is commonly salient; this in turn influences how they perceive others.

Individuals will come to classify others into social categories and evaluate them on these bases. Social categorization theory, therefore, posits that stereotypic content will reflect the comparison of the in-group to the out-group, for optimal differentiation to occur. It has therefore been suggested that categorization is the underlying process of stereotyping and also prejudice (Wilder, 1986).

Le Vine and Campbell (1972) have studied that differences in roles and customs between groups are reflected in stereotypic content. They stated three types of cultural and role differences: (1) rural-urban lifestyles; (2) differences between occupational groups and (3) differences in industrialization. Suggested, for instance, is that a perceived rural-urban contrast will be associated with the attribution of sophistication which a manual-no manual contrast will be attributed with intellectual

and emotional development and differences in industrialization with attributions of efficiency, work ethos and self-control. It seems the case that the role-relevant behaviors of groups are salient and taken as attributed traits and further generalized to all group members.

Similar to this idea is Eagly and Kite (1987)'s Social Role Hypothesis. Behind this hypothesis is the assumption that stereotypes are derived from public figures, which stand to represent the target country and because such figures represent the country only partially, the content of national stereotypes are somewhat distorted. Similarly, for instance, aggressive and immoral behavior is said to be attributed to populations of enemy states, whilst dominance to populations of countries to which the country of the perceiver is dependent. In addition to this, Eagly and Kite (1987) have been found that the content of stereotypes for hostile nations contain more argentic attributions, whereas stereotypes for allied nations contain more communal attributions.

Peabody (1985) offered a different understanding to the content of stereotypes. He argues that the content is based on perceptions of cultural differences between nation states, which are taken as traits representing the character of the national population. Similarly, Hagendoorn and Hraba (1989) claimed that deviancy from one's in-group values is reflected in the stereotypic content defining the out-group.

Brown (1986) proposed that the content of stereotypes might reflect the historical, societal or political relation between countries and may partly be determined by the nature of interaction between the groups involved. This has been studied in 'mirror image' researches. Bronfenbrenner (1961) proposed that two groups in conflict are likely to have 'mirror images' of one another, otherwise stated, two groups will perceive themselves in the same positive way and perceive the 'enemy' in similarly negative ways. This was evidenced in a study with the former Soviet Union and the USA, members of each country regarded itself as peaceful and free yet saw the other as aggressive, deluded, and exploited.

Von Ehrenfel (1961) suggested that geographical factors determine stereotypic content. Based on anthropological studies, he claimed that northern inhabitants would be perceived as 'hardworking' and 'cool' yet southern inhabitants as 'easygoing' and 'emotional'.

Linssen and Hagendoorn (1994) offered a three-class categorization for the nature of explanatory determinants formulated from the hypothesis addressed above. The first type refers to the structural nature of determinants. Here, the content of out-group stereotypes are determined by the position of the out-group, its features, its members' selective visibility plus the relation between in and out-group. The second type is claimed to refer to determinants of a cultural nature. Here cultural values of the in-group are used as yardsticks to which the cultural features of the out-group are evaluated. The third type concerns the non-social determinants such as climatic and geographical factors, which are associated with specific traits, those suggested by Von Ehrenfels. With this categorization in mind Linssen and Hagendoorn (1994) found that stereotypes contain four dimensions of content namely, efficiency, emotionality, empathy, and dominance.

Linssen and Hagendoorn (1994) also found that the attribution of efficiency was mainly determined by perceived economic development, degree of industrialization, and government services; however, geographical location particularly appears to be a determinant of the attribution of efficiency. Emotionality was found to be almost completely determined by geographical location and empathy was related to geographical size and political power attributions to the nation. Attributions of dominance, on the other hand, were determined by geographical size and perceived political power and nationalism of the nation (Poppe and Linssen, 1999). It has therefore been suggested that the content of national stereotypes will reflect such economic, political, cultural, and/ or geographical features of the nation state in question

1.4.2 Prejudices as Cultural Barriers

Philosophers have always dealt with the nature of prejudice throughout the history. Although some authorities have defined prejudice as well as explaining its types one by one, prejudice has remained as a controversial issue, and is handled in all doctrines and disciplines such as politics, economics, sociology, psychology, literature, etc. The reason is that knowing the nature of prejudice does not abolish the practice of prejudicial attitudes in all parts of the world. For instance, although people claim that they have no prejudice for any group, their attitudes towards them are unconsciously shaped in the opposite direction. Therefore, as one of the types of prejudice, subtle prejudice, for instance, is an unsolved problem in our time as well.

Allport (1979:3), in his book 'The Nature of Prejudice', begins to handle the subject defining the nature of prejudice in the first chapter called "What is the problem?" Here, Allport gives the definition of the concept of prejudice showing the steps of its derivation. According to him (1979:6), "the word prejudice, derived from the Latin noun praejudicium, has, like most words, undergone a change of meaning since classical times". In addition to this basic definition, the concept of prejudice has naturally taken its place in theory books.

In Allport's (1979:7) definition, prejudice is "a guilty or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group, and this person "is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group". Here, one of the most important things is the negativity of the concept of the prejudice. For the sake of fortification, Allport (1979: 516) asserts that "prejudice is an existing psychological fact", which should also be taken into consideration from this perspective. From the same perspective, Billig (1991: 126), argues, "It has been suggested that the prejudiced themes exist at a psychologically deeper level than the denial of prejudice". Billig puts emphasis upon the prejudice from the psychological aspect because psychology determines our reactions towards other people. For that reason, "the prejudiced themes are held to indicate the 'genuine' attitudinal structure". With more emphasis on culture, Billig (1991:129) claims, "prejudice, as

an everyday concept, as well as a social-scientific one, represents a strong cultural value".

Diekman (2005: 23) present a method to understand the concept of prejudice as: "The best way to understand the nature of prejudice is to take both the structure of the social environment and the psychological structure of the individual into account". Because prejudice is related to individual's attitudes, the characteristics of the individual are a determining factor in their reactions to the outer world.

An important component of prejudice is 'the over categorization' which "is perhaps the commonest trick of the human mind" (Allport, 1979: 8). In 'the over categorization' some people may not take into consideration the individual characteristics of the members of some groups. Instead, they may categorize them according to the group they belong to. In other words, the characteristics of the group are at the fore, not the characteristics of the members of the group. As a result of this, "given a thimble of facts we rush to make generalizations as large as a tub" (Allport, 1979:8). Namely, some people come face to face with prejudice according to the group they belong to because some negative impressions are attached to their group ignoring their own characteristics. But, at this point, it is crucial to remind the nuance that "not every overblown generalization is a prejudice" (Allport, 1979: 9). For instance, "some are simply misconceptions, wherein we organize wrong information". This means that when the new information is acquired, the current wrong thoughts and attitudes may be abandoned. In addition to this, it is necessary to include the definitions of stereotype because prejudice and stereotype are closely related to each other, and they might be confused to one another.

The main feature of prejudiced people is externalization. In this type, the prejudiced person externalizes him/herself from the negative happenings around him/her. Allport (1979:404) portrays this characteristic in the expression: "To the prejudiced person things seem to happen "out there". He has no control over his destiny". Namely, they have a deterministic point of view of life. They think that everything is already governed beyond their will. In addition to this, "it is easier and safer for a

person in inner conflict to avoid self-reference" (Allport, 1979: 404). The prejudiced person believes that the negative events that happen to him/her are not his/her own fault, but the fault of the others outside of him/her. He/she does not question himself. Instead, he/she almost always finds other people faulty. It is better to think of things happening to him rather than as caused by him. To emphasize, it might be added that the prejudiced person does not find his/her personality or his/her wrong attitudes faulty. Individual puts blame upon others and claims, "It is not I who hates and injures others; it is they who hate and injure me" (Allport, 1979:404). Allen (1997: 448) comments on this type of characteristic as: "Rather than believing that they control what happens to them by use of their own resources, they believe that fate controls them". They have a strong belief in fate. So, they try to externalize themselves from unpleasant happenings.

An attitude which might turn into prejudice is the 'prejudgment' itself, but we cannot claim that prejudgments by all means convert into prejudice. In other words, "prejudgments become prejudices only if they are not reversible when exposed to new knowledge" (Allport, 1979: 9). As having a strong basis, "a prejudice, unlike a simple misconception, is actively resistant to all evidence that would unseat it" (Allport, 1979: 9). The change that happens in a prejudiced person's mood when the individual is challenged is that we tend to grow emotional when a prejudice is threatened with contradiction. So, comparing and contrasting the terms "prejudgment" and "prejudice", Allport (1979: 9) claims, "the difference between ordinary prejudgments and prejudice is that one can discuss and rectify a prejudgment without emotional resistance".

In conclusion, it is appropriate to state that although the concept of prejudice seems to be difficult for people to develop it, it is so easy and sneaky that people might change their attitudes unconsciously, which the result of cognitive processes is. The reason is that people have a tendency to have prejudice.

1.4.2.1 Eliminating Prejudices: Contact Hypothesis

Contact hypothesis is one of the critical social psychological perspectives that help understand the role of contact in-group relations (Allport, 1954). Basically, the hypothesis suggests that the contact between different racial and ethnic groups help to reduce prejudice and promote positive attitudes. It was claimed that the direct contact helps individuals achieve information about out-group at firsthand that is most probably accurate and reflecting out-group's values, experiences, and lifestyles. This positive knowledge is assumed to be generalized among all members of the ethnic group and leads to reduction in prejudice between groups.

Although there is no simple and direct relationship between contact and prejudice reduction, contact under favorable conditions tends to contribute changes in the attitudes of the groups while contact under unfavorable conditions may increase already existing prejudice and intergroup tension (Pettigrew, 1998). Allport (1954) defined four optimal conditions that determine the direction of change, namely, equal group status, in which both groups expect and perceive equal status within the situation, that both groups work interdependently to attain the common goals without intergroup competition (Johnson and Johnson, 1984), and authority support that provides explicit social sanction to establish norms of acceptance contact hypothesis has been tested in various group situations.

Some evidence supports the role of Allport`s four optimal conditions. Generally, it was found that contact is more efficient if it takes place under favorable conditions (Pettigrew, 1998). In one recent revealed a significant effect size that intergroup contact has significant contributions in intergroup prejudice reduction (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2005). The findings revealed that effects of intergroup contact can be generalized beyond participants in the immediate contact situation in a variety of contexts and a broad range of groups. Also, the results suggested that the inclusion of Allport`s optimal conditions in the contact situation increases the positive effects of intergroup contact. However, these conditions were not found to be crucial to achieve prejudice reduction in intergroup contact. Without Allport`s optimal conditions, a meaningful relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice

observed. Hence, it was concluded that although these conditions facilitate achieving positive contact outcomes, they should not be regarded as essential, as assumed in the past (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2005). It is important to note that research suggests that unpleasant contact between groups does not reduce prejudice or intergroup bias; rather it may create fear of further contact, causing intergroup anxiety (Islam and Hewstone, 1993).

1.4.3 Role of Group Identification on Intercultural Barriers

Group identification is central to explain the occurrence of cultural conflicts in addition to incompatible interests of groups. The strength of group identification plays a significant role on discriminating attitudes and behaviors. People with high group identification are motivated to act in terms of their membership of a specific group.

This identification to group becomes a part of psychological self and inclines normative collective behaviors and beliefs that the group offers. Individuals who feel highly committed to their groups begin to think, feel, and act in terms of the way that the group is reflecting (Tajfel and Turner, 1986). For example, it has been found that people with high group identification are more likely to realize cultural differences against other group members in terms of their attitudes, behaviors, and cognitive judgments than those with low group identification (Tzeng and Jackson, 1994).

Majority groups discriminate against minority groups to obtain and/or enhance their positive distinct group identities. However, it is not only majority group that discriminates against the minority/disadvantaged group; minority group also discriminates against the majority group. Due to the reason that minorities feel more insecure than majority, they are in need to cope with feelings of insecurity with the intention of improving the fate of their group and achieving a positive social identity. That is to say, minority groups try to compensate feelings of insecurity by strengthening their positive social identity through discriminating against the

majority (Simon et. al, 2001). Besides social identity theory posits that if an identity threatening situation exists, people try to achieve or maintain a positive distinct identity.

Due to the reason that disadvantaged groups feel more threat and insecurity, one possible way to cope with threat is having a strong orientation toward the in-group. It was found that, perception of discrimination based on one's group membership may make the individual identify with in-group more strongly and may increase the rejection of out-group members (Crocker et. al, 1991). Correspondingly, in-group identification of minority group members was found to be stronger than majority group members. That is to say, the relative social position of the in-group determines people's level of identification with their groups; the lower the status of the group, the stronger the connection. (Rothberger and Worchel, 1997).

The definition of majority and minority groups is mostly based on the numbers. Groups having numerically more members defined as majority and groups having numerically fewer members are defined as minority (Simon, 1992). Additionally, the status of groups or relative power that the groups hold determines the majority and minority groups, assigning oppressed and relatively powerless group as minority and dominant and powerful group as majority even though the numerical relation is balanced or reversed (Simon et. al, 2001).

2 THE CASE OF EUROPE AND CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDEANTITY

"Europe as the continent of humane values, the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the French Revolution and the fall of the Berlin Wall; the continent of liberty, solidarity and above all diversity, meaning respect for others' languages, cultures and traditions. The European Union's one boundary is democracy and human rights. The Union is open only to countries which uphold basic values such as free elections, respect for minorities and respect for the rule of law" (EU Document 2001: 20).

2.1 Introduction to Topic

In the contemporary times of global cultural age, human interaction at domestic and international levels generate global cultural flows. These cultural flows can be attributed to lead to transformation of people's identities thus leading to greater diversity within societies. This diversity is ideally observed in Europe because the structure and policies of the continent impact the preservation and the development of common values. Concurrently, the structural policies also respect the diversity of cultures and traditions of the peoples of Europe as well as the other national identities.

Thanks to these facts, Europe is actually becoming more European; meaning it is not only Europeanizing economically but also politically or more importantly socially. Nation-states on the continent are growing and coming closer together. With these geographical and political changes, a change can also be seen in the way Europeans think about what a nation-state is and what is national identity? Additionally, more importantly it makes individuals wonder what Europe is, what it means to be European, and whether there is such a thing called European identity. It also necessitates discussions about the territorial boundaries of Europe as a continent. There is not a common perception even among the officials and political elites of the EU about the boundaries of the EU. Most of them argued that it is impossible for the

EU to have clear-cut boundaries. Some of them argued that it is necessary for the EU to have clear-cut boundaries to maintain the ongoing political integration process and to prevent its transformation to the UN. It is obvious that it is too hard to clarify the boundaries of Europe throughout history and having clear-cut boundaries is against the dynamic structure of the EU, which helps it to adjust to different circumstances. Europeans asks these questions with respect to their social reality and wait for the answers from the institutions such as European Union.

Today, the European Union, which started as an economic integration, stands at crossroads. Despite of the excessive efforts to strengthen the political integration, the future prospects of this type of integration are highly unclear and uncertain. This was quite evident in the recent constitutional crises. The idea of creating a politically united Europe is not new and indeed, goes back to the early Middle Ages. Historically, different parts of Europe had been conquered by ambitious colonial leaders such as Charlemagne, the Frankish Emperor, Napoleon and Hitler in the different time periods. However, these attempts were fated to fail due to the fact that these short victories were attained at the expense of other people's freedom.

Till the end of the World War II (WWII), Europe experienced tragic wars, which took millions of lives. In this regard, the WWII was a turning point not only in the world history but also in the European integration history. Being completely destroyed economically, politically and socially, the European states came together under the supervision of the United States. The European Economic Community seeking to complete the political integration as an ultimate goal was established in 1951. In short, the idea of Europe being a political union, which has been intensively discussed in the recent years, has been a long-lasting political aspiration. In this context, the reasons behind the recent crises can be comprehended as the alarming result of the lack of association of the European people with the political integration process. The strongly ingrained national identities can be considered as one of the very reasons of this public separation on European politics. In addition to the national reservations, the distance between the European people and the European policy-makers have resulted in questioning the legitimacy and even the long-term

objectives of the EU. In this context, it is absolutely essential that a supra European identity be constructed.

But construction of European identity requires a long term, ambitiously pursued identity-politics teamed with a wide-based social participation. In ancient Greece, a good citizen was described as 'a good citizen is a citizen interested in politics, well informed and competent about political life, with strong and stable preferences". And being a strong political union does not require more than being a good citizen. Deep-rooted national identities of the member states tend to have a weakening effect on the construction of supranational identity in Europe. In fact, development of a sense of 'Europeanness' is hindered by the national policies of the member states towards the preservation and maintenance of the national identities. The problem of democratic legitimacy and the lack of public support for the EU policies worsen the situation as seen during the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, with the European Constitution aiming to strengthen the political union. Today, having faced with cross-border issues such as illegal migration and ecological disasters as well as global threats like terrorism, the member states are seeking to enhance cooperation areas. On the other hand, they are also reluctant to share their authority in the areas of state sovereignty. As a result, identity-formation remains a challenging issue involving both national concerns and supranational goals of the member states.

In the field of European studies, these concerns and goals put an importance on the subject of identity and integration. Because the contention of defining Europe and European identity is tightly related with the discussion on the enlargement of Europe. How far should the enlargement go? Which countries should be admitted to European Union, which countries should not be? When we debate on Europe or European identity, discussions of non-European identities or the others type of identities also appear on the stage. In this context, the origins of the European identity, its existence and limits and the relation between national identities and European identity are the most important areas of the study.

Considering, this point of view, we should primarily define who or what Europe's 'others' are. For nation-states, 'others' have traditionally been other nation-states. Among the various others of Europe, the East has a special place. When I mean East, I particularly refer to the Russian and the Turkish other. Although India and China may also be considered as the Eastern others of Europe, in the formation of European identity they have not been as much influential as the Turkish and the Russian cases. The origins of the divide between the East and the West goes back to the barbarian invasions of the Greek and Roman civilizations. Later the division of the Roman Empire and the differentiation of the Western part through Latin Christianity and the Western part through Eastern Orthodoxy moved the division into another context. This division reached its peak during the Fourth Crusade. In the meantime the Turks in general, the Ottoman State in particular started to rise as the new banner holder of Islam. Thus to the division of the Catholic versus Orthodox, the Turkish threat was added. "Others have proposed that Eastern and Western Europe can be seen as each other's others and he states that European nation-states are socially constructed partly in opposition to Europe, vice versa; Europe in opposition to nationalities" (Moes, 2008:5).

The fact, that identities come into being with and against some 'differences', which are usually called, as 'the other' does not mean that the classification of an identity such as the self-versus the other is a permanent classification. As we mentioned before, identity is a dynamic concept, which does not have a static meaning and content. Thereby, with dynamic and variable connotations, in different historical context, there may be the dominance of different 'others' in the formation of a certain identity. Similarly, European identity had different meanings throughout the history with emphasis on different characteristics such as religion, civilization, science, democracy and so on. As a result, depending on the context, the European identity has had several 'others' throughout the history. Here it will be useful for both reader and researcher to gain more knowledge about the history mentioned above. Thus, this section of the study discusses the roots of European identity from ancient Greece to up to the present.

2.2 European Identity from Ancient Greece to 20th Century

The idea of Europe has always been an ambiguous one in terms of geography, etymology, especially until 19th century. But being European is a concept associated with civilization more than geography and it is being continuously reformed according to negative or positive developments in the modern times.

Literature shows, that for the ancient Greeks, Europe was defined as a geographical area and as a mythological entity. The geographical area consisted of three known continents, Europe, Asia and Libya, which are also known as Africa. Similarly, as a mythological entity Europe was Europa, the Phoenician princess who was taken by Zeus to Greece and named the continent after her. During the ancient times, the people that we call today "Europeans" had no coherent sense of any group identity as inhabitants of the same continent. Roman Empire also had the same understanding like Greeks have. They have placed themselves in the center of the world so Europe as a continent was not a place substantial until the dominance Christianity (Delanty, 1995).

Undoubtedly there have been many factors, which helped the formation of European identity, but none of them as important as Christianity. This is because, the cultural definition of Europe in real meaning started with it. Christianity is the principal element in the formation of European culture and also Christian Medieval Ages were the determinant of the European cultural codes (Boer 1993). For many important people Europe for a long time has been seen as Christian country and many for them, the first condition of being a European was to be a Christian. They perceived Europe as a big state which has superior values, that East does not have and main factor which forms these values was Christianity. With this perception, age of exploration has an important role because Europe defined itself as the only civilized area of the world.

The idea that roots of European identity lie in Christianity is actually prevalent in European discourse. It is argued that the proposed European Constitution should include a reference in its Preamble to the Judeo-Christian tradition. There are many

studies debating the fact that European values were essentially Christian in addition to some values that were shared with Muslims. The former President of the EU Commission Jacques Santer famously stated that the essence of the European identity should be sought in Greek, Latin and Christianity. However, such an exclusionary discourse ignores that Christianity has been a fissiparous factor in European history, that the recent EU enlargement waves incorporated large Orthodox populations, and that there are large Muslim populations in European countries (Delanty and Rumford, 2005).

While Europe achieved its social content with Christianity, its politic identity formation has been related with crusades. Çırakman (2001:29) argues, "what makes Europe is the heritage of Greek and Roman Empires, Christianity and industrial revaluation". A key event which influenced this period was the increase in religious conflicts. During middle ages, Christianity had already witnessed a divide between Eastern Church and Western Church. This divide never resulted in a significant armed conflict except in the Fourth Crusade. However, during the Reformation era it was not so for the new divides, which resulted in long and bloody wars but achieved enlightenment at the end. Thus, Christianity was now much more fragmented than during the medieval era.

The Enlightenment is another cornerstone in the development of Europe and the European identity towards modernity. The major developments which gave rise to Enlightenment were Renaissance and Reformation. Enlightenment saw advent of some important concepts such as science, reason and emancipation. Most importantly, after the Reformation, Enlightenment constituted the third step towards a secular Europe. The enlightenment ideals advocated the secular foundation of the emancipation under the banner of reason (Venn, 2006). This emancipation referred to the break from the old feudal, traditional societies and their ideologies. Accordingly, the established belief that inequality and poverty were inevitable was rejected (2006).

One of the outcomes of Reformation in terms of socio-political structure of Europe was the change in the balance of power between the church and the political

authority. Following the religious wars, during the Reformation era, the authority of the Church was undermined to the advantage of political authority. This undermining of the Church's authority, coupled with the increase in capitalist accumulation and the rise of a new bourgeois class gave rise to the formation of territorial states with stronger central authority.

In the formation of European identity before 20th century, beside of these major developments, nations that were seen as barbarians such as Huns, Mongols, Turks and Muslims have also held a prominent place. That is to say, East was social determinant and has always been the 'other' for Europe as a reference point. Çırakman (2001:31) argues, in a historical way, the threat, enemy or perception of other, which changes constantly, has revealed the idea of Europe. According to him: "the idea and self-knowledge of Europe has been emerged from the threats that all Europe perceived. Islam in Medieval ages, Turks in 16th and 17th century, Russia in 19th century and Soviet Union and Nazis in 20th century were the threats that provided the Europe's self-knowledge".

In the 18th century with the effect of the geographical discoveries we see a rise in humanism, secularism, industrialization, democracy and rationalization. The geographical discoveries played an important part in European identity. The distinction between the colonizer and colonized, contributed to a greater extent to Europeanness. The Europeans started to call themselves both European and civilized changing from Europe and Christian. (Inaç, 2002:120). Sociologist Delanty (1995) also made the same arguments. According to him, interactions between different thoughts and opinions have formed the idea of Europe and for this reason, not common points but different ones become important and interpretation of 'other' become one of prominence in the definition of identity. Thomas Diez (2004) also claimed that being European is a dreamed politic identity and had its 'other' way before modern ages. He argues that this identity is not given by birth but it is an identity defined by politic developments later.

But European identity is not only formed by the threats, which presumably came from Islam or other nations but also is constructed by the tensions, wars and disagreements that did not have a homogeneous geo-politic structure. Diversity and difference between power balances delayed the emergence of Europe as a union. But in the beginning of 16th century rediscovery of Roman law, opening of the universities and beginning of the international trade have given a new wave of identity. Effects of complex socio-economic structure and intellectual developments that emerged with modernity have also been complex and multi-dimensional in Europe. Only after 18th century, did the idea called 'Europe' gained a high popularity.

No doubt, all these changes have influenced the European identity because as we know, an identity is changeable and multi-dimensional. Considering the fact those socio-economic and political developments alternate with each other, any progress in any area will change or recreate the hierarchy of the facts, which have influenced the European identity. In Europe, beginning of Renaissance gave a person a chance to become an individual entity, separated from society but the real progress started with enlightenment, which carried the liberties forward.

2.3 European Identity after 20th Century

Until 20th century even if there was an idea of togetherness, there were not any serious attempts to implement it. But after the WWII, in a modern meaning, the process of unity began in Europe. The two world wars have created an activation of another process in Europe that hurled the idea of European identity into a different dimension. From the late renaissance to the modern times, the role of religion as an influential factor in the European identity is diminishing and is being replaced by the notions of European culture and civilization.

One of main points about European identity is that until now, Europe has exhibited a centralized trait from 18th century. But it is observed that First World War (WWI)

changed this characteristic as this war inflicted a deep wound on the economies of European States. In the words of Hobsbawn (2003:51): "This war has created a world that Europe is not center and has no power of determination where it would be". Responsibility of the WWI remains debated even today in respect with different dimensions. What is known is, particularly for Europe that the number of advances in science, technology and medicine as well as the revolutionary changes in social behavior occurred as a result of the 1914-1918 conflict. The aristocracy was overthrown or lost its role greatly. The socialist, labor movements, communism and fascism seized the opportunity to make considerable advances, which eventually led to WWII and the Cold War.

Both, the WWII and Cold War have been very important events that shaped the European identity. After both wars Europe was exhausted and devastated. In Europe, WWII led to a profound change in political thinking, at least in Western Europe, about how states would conduct their relations. According to Hobsbawn outsider also played different role. "America which took the center stage after Second World War had an effect on forming the European identity because what America cared for was homogenous and united Europe" (2003:51).

French political and economist Jean Monnet knew that Europe was not ready for political and military alliance so he started working on sub-policies such as trade and economic collaborations which would bring Europe together. For him, successful collaborations on sub-policies were going to spread upper policies in the course of time (Trauch, 1999). Foreign Minister of France, Schuman, presented this plan originated by Monnet officially and a union was founded by six countries which were France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxemburg by the name of European Coal and Steel Community.

Chronologically, in 1973, Britain, Ireland and Denmark joined the union. In 1981, the accession of Greece was accepted. Spain and Portugal joined in 1986. In 1995, the accession of Austria, Finland and Sweden to the European Union was adopted. On 1 May 2004, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania,

Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia joined the EU. This was the largest number of countries accepted at once to the union.

At this point, it is needless to say that investigating the establishment phase of European Union does not serve the purpose of this thesis. However, the above literature review aims to clarify those movements of consolidations, which were more about economic togetherness. The important point for the study here is the ideas and forms of European identity after significant historical events of political nature.

Brock and Tulasiewicz (1999) and suggest that the mid 1980`s was a defining point for the emergence of a European identity and a need for Europeans to start perceiving themselves as European. In 1985 the Single European Act was signed, eliminating trade barriers between the countries, leading to the creation of a common market. The European Community, which was renamed the European Union, became increasingly politicized and a European identity was assisted by the often directly linked campaigns to give the EU a public persona: a European passport, Beethoven's Ninth Symphony as the unofficial anthem of the Community, and the EU flag were adapted and became the symbols of the EU. For a sense of European identity to develop, the EU must acquire a psychological existence in the minds of its citizens.

In 90's, European Community had gained more political legibility and evolved to trans-national power and this transformation caused certain issues, especially with institutions, which were left unanswered during the political integration efforts. According to Ertugrul (2001), these political integrations were important because cultural and political belongings gave rise to togetherness. For this reason, European Union held on to European identity in order to solve the issue of legitimacy and worked to improve its cultural policies that would bring this legitimacy to the forefront.

It is not coincidence that European Union has accelerated the policies on identity especially after 1990's. At this point, end of the Cold War had an important role on the formation of European identity. Soares claims (1999) that, along with Cold War,

global policy had bipolar system and the world split up to three pieces. But with the end of Cold War, European Union faced a new situation, which was disposal of the geographic and historical borders and rediscovery of its own values. In the world after the Cold War, important point was not ideological, politic or economic but cultural differences between people. From this perspective, people and nations would answer the most important question which humanity faces for ages with something meaningful for themselves "Who are we? Consequently, these facts should be considered noteworthy while investigating the cultural and identity polices of Europe Union.

Actually, following the Cold War, there was an opportunity for creating a new European identity as the threats were over. But these ideas did not come true because the threats have not disappeared but have changed. Huntington (1998) argues that the reasons are the foreigners or immigrants who have become new threats. These situations proved that the "policy of othering" hasn't changed with ages. It is essential to consider that even though there is no change in the policy of othering, the influencing factors that influence these policies are varied and also constantly changing.

European culture has developed through an evolving history. Europe has move forward with values of democracy, freedom, or self-rule and such. In its construction of identity, Europe has experienced in its history significant effects of conflicts. Europe stuck to its ethnic and cultural identities, even during the wars, but still the European integrations has been difficult and moreover validity of the continent has been an ongoing issue since the establishment.

2.4 Validity of Europe

According to Wallace (2000), what Europe means to a European depends on where he/she lives in that continent. Europe is a moveable set of myths and images, both positive and negative, rooted in national histories and vernacular literature. It can be

claimed that being European or the definition of European identity, depends on which part of Europe is taken into consideration while giving these definitions.

> "Europe is an imaginary space, shaped and reshaped by politicians and intellectuals to serve their changing purposes. There is no "natural" basis for solidarity of Europe. Europe as a set of values or as a region of shared history has no clear outer limits, and many competing claims to constitute its historical core. An operational, institutionalized Europe cannot be constructed without drawing boundaries, without bringing some states in and leaving others out (Wallace, 2002, 82)".

Firstly, Europe is a concept that has a historical and ideological profundity. As of any concept, its meaning and correlations has always been subject to the conditioning of time, space, context and the subjects implementing that in their discourses and actions. On such complicated conceptual basis, Europe has been open to exploitation in favor of interest of some in the discourses and actions. As mentioned previous sections, place of Christianity as the central node for assumed commonality in the history Europe has long ago vanished (Russello, 1998). Christianity's being a fundamental reference in the self-definition of European people has been wounded first by the divisive and transformative consequences of the division of Roman Empire. With identifying itself with Christianity as the sole protector of it, German Empire had defined Slavic part of Europe as 'other'. That damage was made progress by the Latin invasion of Constantinople in 1204. Secondly, the radical challenge of the Reformation aiming the contents and the reasoning of the comprehensions of Christianity as belief system had deteriorated the unifying capability of Christianity over the continent (ibid).

In historical analysis, Europe and Europeans are hardly witnessed to be in consensual state of peace. Most integration intellectuals are making references to historical differences between 'Europeans' and other people in order to highlight differential feature of that 'community' of Europeans and render modern integration attempts reasonable and legitimate. However, it cannot be ignored that Europe's past is full of clashed of interests and devastating wars and atrocities originated from those

persistent competition. Experiences of centuries are fairly discouraging in terms of any perceptions or assumptions of any kind of historical notions for a sensible conception of Europe as a valid base for an entity (Gilbert, 2012).

The territorial dimension of those attempts to define Europe and Europeans in a certain way is also of prominence when the concept of Europe is being challenged (ibid). Territoriality needs a geographical unity with a central political authority that possess an effective controlling power and pushing some effective level of exclusive ownership. Even in time of Roman Empire those geographical conceptions of Europe and the exclusive political control did not give positive results. Moreover, deprived of the coherent structure of language, literature and political institutions, it is not easy to argue about the united, distinct cultural conception of Europe.

According to Gilbert (2012) those attempts on the main possible alternatives in terms of assumed validity of Europe as a together and reasonable conception, showed the weakness of the conceptual structure and reasoning behind it. After those considerations on the conception and its chance in time, it may be reasonable to conclude that claims for a unity in cultural, philosophical and political terms always preceded by a political project serving specific interest of the sponsors of such assumed unity.

2.5 Political Process of Europe on Way to Common Identity

Recently the mainstream European integration studies literature shifted from classical integration theories to a governance approach that takes the European policies for granted. Scholars began to deal with the nature of this Euro-polity, such as the meaning, boundaries and identity of the Euro-polity. In this context, the construction of a collective European identity has been a vital point and that multiple identities can be shared by an individual has been recognized. Scholars work on not only the nature of EU polity, but also the questions of legitimacy and democracy (Cowles and Curtis, 2004). So the research in this part analyzes why and how

European identity has become compulsory for legitimacy building within the process of European integration.

The level of integration achieved by the European Member States is unique in modern history. As the first step in the process of European integration, the European Coal and Steel Community was founded in 1951 by six countries "to tame the dark side of nationalism and to build a common future." (Friis and Murphy, 2000:231) In 1957, the Treaty Establishing the European Community (EEC Treaty or the Treaty of Rome) aroused from the ECSC. The EEC was established with a political motivation, but its objectives were primarily economic. The Treaty of Rome envisaged that the EEC would improve the citizens' quality of life by establishing a customs union, a common market and an external trade policy (European Commission).

The EEC later underwent a big crisis. General de Gaulle, then French President, constantly objected to the expansion of Community competence and Community institutions' powers. Therefore, during 1965-1966, French officials boycotted the Council of Ministers through "empty chair policy" which was terminated in 1966 with the approval of the Luxembourg Accord. Regarding this crisis, the Commission and some Member States, particularly Brandt's Germany argued "efforts should be made to develop a deeper sense of community by developing direct forms of legitimacy. Brandt specially referred to the need to give the Community a 'human face'." (ibid: 232) In addition to this political issue, the Member States suffered the global economic recession in the early 1970's.

The legitimacy and democratic accountability of the Community structures were affected by developments in international political economy, which therefore became decisive in the launch of the term of European identity in the Community jargon. It was no coincidence that term was activated by the European Council as a core concept in 1973 when the Community lost legitimacy due to dollar collapse and oil price shock impairing the established international order of political economy (Strath, 2000).

When the economic conditions were restored, the political mood shifted towards deepening and widening the integration process. Over time, not only the scope of competences of the EEC, but also the number of Member States increased. Nevertheless, the 'single market' constituted a crucial step in the development of the Community (Russello, 1998). In 1986, the Single European Act (SEA) amended the EEC Treaty and the customs union developed into a common internal market ensuring the free movement of people, goods, capital and services. Besides, the Community competence extended to areas such as social policy, environment and structural policy (ibid). Yet, the Maastricht Treaty can be termed as a cornerstone in the history of European integration.

According to Lepsius (2001) with the Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992, the European Community underwent a great change and turned into the European Union through the creation of an economic and monetary union. A substantial part of the Member States' jurisdiction in strategic matters was formally transferred to the EU. To give example for the extent of communitarization from Germany, the Deutsche Bundesbank delegated its jurisdiction for independent monetary policy to the European Central Bank. The German Federal Constitutional Court and other upper courts became subject to the jurisdiction of the European Courts, Community law preceding national law. This entailed the reconfiguration of the loyalties of European citizens according to new levels of governance. The EU has become a reference point for a collective identity as a result of the process of European integration and the broad extension of its area of judiciary and competence. Although the EU is not a state yet, it has become a polity in-between that cannot be described properly by employing national statist models (Lepsius, 2001).

With the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, the support for European integration began to decline and the legitimacy of the Community was questioned as the EU became more intrusive in national affairs and high politics (Kersbergen, 2000). The Maastricht Treaty included initiatives in important areas such as CFSP, an economic and monetary union and a European citizenship, which were considered by some segments of European populations as a threat to national identity. (Friis and Murphy,

2000) It was understood that genuine affiliation of Europeans to the EU was a major condition for the EU to obtain popular support for supranational policies with implications transcending nation-state.

When the Community was established, the founding fathers, expected that the integration process in the economic field would soon gain dynamism and spill over into other fields culminating in a federalist United States of Europe. While furthering European economic and political integration, the European elites and national officials took Europeans' support for granted and assumed that a European identity would emerge as a result of the integration process. This presumption sustained until the 1970s (Friis and Murphy, 2000). Therefore, the European governments had been pursuing European integration assuming that the public gave them a 'permissive consensus' toward deeper cooperation but this assumption was challenged by the result of the referenda in certain Member States over the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty and by subsequent developments (Follesdal, 2004). Before mentioning these developments, it is necessary to distinguish between dimensions of support for European integration.

According to Hewstone, the two aspects of political support for European integration are utilitarian and affective dimensions that are interconnected. Affective support is defined as "an emotional sentiment in response to the idea of European integration. It is related to the perceived legitimacy and popularity of, and loyalty to, the Community" whereas "utilitarian support is more cognitive and related to perceptions of concrete gains and losses." (Hewstone, 1986:41-42). Obradovic (1993) states that if the EU is to be more than an integrated market, perceived economic advantages are not sufficient to generate public support for EU policies on matters of high politics. The EU can enter into a crisis if the EU policies fail to produce positive economic outcomes. Starting from the mid-1980's, certain developments in the process of European integration increased the significance of affective support for the Community and pure utilitarian factors proved to be inadequate to provide the necessary level of support for furthering European integration (ibid).

With the demise of the Soviet Union, the 1992 Maastricht ratification crisis, pressures for EU enlargement, the growth of regionalism, and the immigration challenge, European integration became increasingly politicized disclosing the nexus of European project, identity and legitimacy. With the politicization of European integration, questions related to identity politics such as "who are we" and "who belongs" and the emotional dimension of integration, "community-building," became salient. It became clear to governments that they should take into account public opinion and create individual allegiance to the EU (Laffan, 1996).

During 1992-1993, the UK, Ireland, France, Denmark and Germany experienced crises of ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. Additionally, the triumph of the far-right and anti-integration FPÖ (Freedom Party) (gaining even more votes than pro-integration ÖVP and SPÖ) in Austria in 1999 parliamentary elections, the emergence of Eurosceptic political parties in many Member States, the Irish rejection of the Nice Treaty in the first referendum in 2001, Swedish rejection of Euro in 2003 referendum, French and Dutch rejection of the Constitutional Treaty in 2005 referenda have demonstrated that popular support for further EU integration could no longer be taken for granted (Longo and Murray, 2015). Additionally, "enlargement increased the internal heterogeneity within the Union by adding several new conceptualizations or polity-ideas about what a legitimate Union should look like" (Friis and Murphy, 2000:233).

The EU policy makers came to the conclusion that the EU should be made more appealing to public by creating an emotional bond between the citizens and the EU. As the EU continues to influence the daily lives of citizens, "the public's acceptance of the EU as a lawful, rightful entity is critical" (Cowles and Curtis, 2004:308).

2.6 Challenges of European Identity

One can find many reasons in the literature to be pessimistic about the possibility for establishing a European identity. The main obstacles on the formation a European

identity result from conflict concerning theoretical evidence of a European identity in the EU and the concerns about compatibility of national identities. Moreover, due to the institutional structure of the EU, to achieve a coherent, comprehensive, and consistent Union's identity is unlikely to be possible (Breakwell, 2004). All of these obstacles and lack of clearly defined borders of Europe create a big challenge on the possibility of a European identity.

More than the above-stated reasons, it has been also argued that the possibility of a single European identity is weak because of the fluidity of identities. Therefore, there could be many other identities, which clash and reconstruct one another in the process of identity politics. As Reif argued, "European identity is made up of a multiplicity of local identities, and it may be just as important to accept without fear the identity of others as to recognize one's own identity." (Reif, 1993: 151).

Another argument made that a democratic Europe is not possible since there is not European people or demos, which are independent from the process of its political constitution. (Kostakopoulou, 2001:9) The structural conditions for a democratic formation, such as the European political discourse regarding the public sphere that transcends the national public sphere, are lacking. (Grimm, 1995) Despite the EU's substantially integrated economy and the increasingly integrating administrative framework, it has not produced an integrated public sphere. Therefore political discussion is still organized at national level.

It should be said that the EU is trying to solve the problem of democracy deficit along with many others. The ongoing enlargement might have harmful effects on the problems of democracy deficit since the increased diversity would deepen the problem of legitimacy and lack of a European public sphere. In order to go beyond this paradox, a new sense of European identity that is not exclusive but inclusive has to be constructed. The development of public sphere, which means "for engagement across lines of different opinions" in diversity of models, together with the development of a social space, may facilitate the development of a more coherent European identity in the future. (Calhoun, 2001:51).

To conclude, in spite of various approaches on European identity, there are conceptual clashes that make defining the concept difficult. However, there might be some reachable and concluding remarks in terms of theoretical perspective. Here comes the logic of constructivist identity formation. Accordingly, the thesis considers European identity as a process; hence it is not an established one, but it is continually happening. In this sense, a future oriented, post-national, collective European identity would be theoretically viable. As the integration process continues, the EU will try to define its identity. Stemming from this point, the following chapter will examine political initiatives of nations to create their own identity and the efforts of the EU to create a European identity.

3 EUROPEAN IDENTITY AND NATIONALISM

Vincent: You know what the funniest thing about Europe is? / Jules: What? / Vincent: It's the little differences. I mean, they got the same [thing] over there that we got here, but it's just – there, it's a little different. / Jules: Example? / Vincent: All right. Well, you can walk into a movie theater in Amsterdam and buy a beer. And I don't mean just like in no paper cup, I'm talking about a glass of beer. And in Paris, you can buy a beer at McDonald's. And you know what they call a Quarter Pounder with Cheese in Paris? / Jules: They don't call it a Quarter Pounder with Cheese? / Vincent: Nah, man, they got the metric system, they wouldn't know what... a Quarter Pounder is. / Jules: What do they call it? / Vincent: They call it 'Royale with Cheese'. / Jules: 'Royale with Cheese'. / Vincent: That's right. / Jules: What do they call a Big Mac? / Vincent: A Big Mac's a Big Mac, but they call it 'Le Big Mac'... You know what they put on French fries in Holland instead of ketchup? / Jules: What? / Vincent: Mayonnaise. / Jules: Goddamn!" 1

3.1 Introduction to Topic

This chapter discusses the connections between Europe as a continent and identity as a concept and nationalism as an ideal, which are some of the key parameters of a European identity. This review will provide a better transition to and also understanding of the next chapter, which is the construction process of European identity.

As discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, all individuals are born with a given identity and during their life; they consider and enhance values related to their identity. Every person with a given identity wishes to be part of a society just to be recognized and realize himself/herself. Fisher (1998) claims, to accomplish this, they internalize the identity that society has. Thus, identity can also be defined as a state of being same, or the sameness of a thing with itself, or as individuality or personality.

---

1 The dialogue between John Travolta and Samuel L. Jackson from the movie Pulp Fiction (1994), written and directed by Quentin Tarantino, produced by Lawrence Bender (USA: A Band Apart)

According to these approaches individuals need an identity because of the "weakness of human being" as all human are social entities and need to live with others. Gürbüz (2012) defines in his book, the sense of adherence in a society as 'community consciences', 'community sense' or 'community mentality'. This sense is natural and a social necessity because of the conflicts in human life. People have an instinct to associate themselves with other's behaviors and provide their own physical and psychological entity a security. This is the main reason why individuals internalize themselves with their own environment. Likewise, people have tendency to protect given identity in case of strengthening and preserving (Gulec, 2004).

These tendencies mentioned above are the main constituent of nationalism, as an instinct of sense of belonging. But Hailbronner claims that nationalist feelings present more than a personal relation. "Nationality in a historical perspective is a new phenomenon and it can no longer be determined as a personal relationship of allegiance, but rather as a legal status embracing a set of mutual rights and obligations towards a political entity fulfilling certain requirements necessary for the existence of a sovereign state (2006:35)". These types of sources of nationalism can be found in context of necessity of grouping to survive and needs and instincts to live in peace with others around. Hence, what makes a specific group of people to live as a nation and not to annihilate them is 'mass consciences'. Because, the will to survive in human being is 'defense instinct'. But, the will power of nation is 'national consciences' or 'nationalism'.

According to Mauelon (ed. Gomez, 2003) the idea of a nation is linked to at least four fundamental concepts: a land considered one´s own (which must be claimed if others occupy it), political sovereignty exercised within it (or which one aspires to exercise, if there is external domination), a feeling of common belonging as co-nationals (which nationalism promotes, and of which it is nourished, furthermore defining the criteria of belonging) and a history through which the national community becomes a collective subject assuming its heritage and projecting itself into the future. But Gellner (1983) claims that concept of nation is simpler than these matters. He argues that, for two individuals to be considered to belong to the same

nation, they must have a common culture, understood as a system of ideas and symbols, associations and patterns of behavior and communication. The two individuals also need to realize each other as belonging to the same nation. Gellner discuss that nations are "the construct of convictions, fidelities and solidarities of men" (ibid: 20) and that two individuals are national fellow members only if they recognize in each other mutual rights and duties derived from their quality as fellow-members. For Gellner, the recognition of each other as part of the same category is what creates the nation and not the rest of qualities they may share.

However, what differentiates Gellner from other authors is the assumption that a true community exists deep inside, under the many layers of nationalist ideas. The part that is constructed is everything that goes beyond what the members of the original community can see. Therefore, he emphasizes a distinction between genuine communities, basically those in which their fellow members know each other face-to-face, and the falsity of the nation.

This distinction basically opens a space for Anderson (1989) to argue that all nations are imagined political communities because even though their members will never meet each other, they imagine that they belong to the same community and/or behave as if they did. For Anderson, communities are not distinguished by their falsehood or genuineness.

Anderson thinks, "Nations are imagined regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that might prevail. The nation is always conceived as a deep horizontal comradeship. This makes it possible for so many people willingly die for such limited imaginings." (Anderson, 1989:7). The main difference between Gellner's and Anderson's theories of nations is that Gellner implies that there can be communities which are real; and on the other hand Anderson claims that all communities are "imagined". Though, Anderson and Gellner have some common points, too. They both attribute the rise of nationalism to capitalism, industrialization and modernity.

3.1.1 Construction of National Identity in Europe

In general terms, the construction of national identity consists of identifying features that differentiate groups so their members can distinguish between "us - the nation" and "them - the foreigners" (Billig, 1995: 61). This way, individuals can contribute to the maintenance of a global world order, which is organized as nations. Individuals position themselves within a specific national group through communication. For this reason, the sense of belonging to a national group is not fixed but rather needs to be built up and maintained (Billig, 1995). Even in the case of people born, lived and educated in the same place, their national identity is a process under constant development and one that must be nurtured. In order to remind the individual of his/her national tie, it is necessary to reproduce it in ordinary life. The reproduction of national identity contains the recreation of a constellation of ideological habits, such as beliefs, assumptions, habits, representations and practices.

But in the case of European integration, situation was not about recreation or reproduction, it was more about eliminating the national feelings. More than a half century ago the Irish Sociologist Benedict Anderson (1991) predicted possible death of nations in Europe. According to him; nations might not be eternal any more. They had a beginning and they will have an end eventually. And they will probably be replaced by a European confederation. His prediction would have come true, in the new century were it not for an inherent contradiction in European politics. Just as the maturing European Union is beginning to replace the nation-state, the flag of nationalism is being raised all over the continent. Nationalism is being promoted in not only former communist countries but also in Western European states like Spain, Belgium and the United Kingdom.

To understand rise and falls of national identity in Europe in a better way we should present the identity classification of Manuel Castells. Castells clearly explains the creation of national identity in the last couple of decades. Here Castells (2009: 8) distinguishes among three types of identities from the empirical observation of groups: (1) legitimizing identity, (2) resistance identity, and (3) project identity. The first type refers to the identities created by institutions and the state. For instance, the

French state has created the French nation and not the other way around (i.e. the French nation did not precede the French state). Castells (2009) argues that French national identity was achieved by repression and that its cultural roots are found only within a small portion of what we know today as France. Two other examples of a legitimizing identity are the United States and the European citizenship, which does not emerge from the people but is led by the institutions.

The second type, 'resistance-based identity', is developed by groups who are in a degraded and stigmatized position, pushed towards the edges of society in cultural, political or social terms. They react to this pressure by constructing an identity that allows them to survive and resist assimilation by the system that subordinates them. These groups usually build upon history and self-identification, such as the eruption of the Ireland community in United Kingdom, which had been dormant until recently.

Finally, the 'project identities' are aimed at changing the whole social structure by introducing a new set of values. This type of identity is based on self-identification and changing people's position within society. The author considers that feminism and environmentalism are the most prominent examples because in both cases they have projected social values that have become dominant or at least very influential around the globe, and are being institutionalized and broadcasted in the media (Castells, 2009). For Castells, 'project identities' often represent the result of resistance identities. For instance, feminism resists a situation of oppression and, as a result, creates and introduces a new set of values based on the notion of gender equity.

A national 'project identity' can emerge as a type of resistance-based identity in the face of the ideals of cosmopolitanism and world citizenship. These ideals may cause a greater need for people to differentiate themselves and project their identities worldwide. Western Europe was amongst the first regions to witness an emergence of a 'national project identity' (Kramer, 2011). The process of emergence of a national 'project identity' can be segregated into two categories. One of them is the

unit of nation, which emerges as spontaneous products of newly developed formations and discrepancies brought about by the industrialization and capitalism. Second one is the unit of nation, which is formed as a defensive element against the menacing factors coming from the West with the contribution of the imposition of ideas from French Revolution (Zimmer, 2013). Thus, oriented towards the unity surrounding the pre-modern motto of "one language, one culture and one history". French Revolution, as a distinctive feature, brings a new understanding of legitimacy and this legitimacy threatens other absolutist monarchies of the Europe.

Although nationalism was discredited by the appalling slaughter that took place in Europe in course of two world wars, nationalism is now making a powerful comeback. Kramer (2011) claims that the upsurge of micro-nationalisms within established nation-states of Western Europe probably reflects a belief that reconstituting the state on the basis of a more "authentic" nation will better protect the rights and interests of citizens - especially where the territory of the would-be nation has strong economic potential. Respect for the right of nations to independent statehood has been relatively scant so far, but it could lead to the emergence of a still unpredictable number of small nations and national minorities in Europe (ibid). The method of constructing a national identity is sufficiently well established for it to be applied rapidly.

Europe as a political unity challenges the history of nation-states, their political traditions, and their governmental practices, and raises debates about the constitution of a new entity. The Member States engaged in this project deploy various efforts to prove their "will to live together." Similarly, historians search for a common past, as validated by the history of civilizations and by the processes of political modernization and economic development.

Considering the educational curricula in Europe, the academic structural policies explore how to transmit to younger generations a European identity. Academic curriculum takes into account the role of history in defining nations and their futures, and in the case of Europe, the future of a new identity that still remains to be defined.

Identity is central to all kinds of policies, be it nation-state or the EU. Regardless of the type, all policies need an identity to provide a psychological frame of reference in which to function and to define their values and serves as the basis for ranking their priorities.

3.2 European Identity vs. National Identity

One of the aims of this thesis is to discuss the connection between national and European identity and understand if one of them threatens the existence of other one. It has been argued that construction process of European identity within the EU has been ongoing without replacing national identities.

In the last ten years, in the terms of the possibility of European identity, scholars have been faced with many questions about the compatibility of European and sub-European (particularly national) identities. Since the EU is composed of many nation-states, the compatibility of national identities and European identity has been the subject of controversy in the context of European integration project. (Kostakopoulou, 2001:17) However, serious doubts about the ability of the EU for generating a collective identity stem from various obstacles in creation of national identities. Thus, the concept of European identity unavoidably creates the question of what the relationship of such an identity with national identity is. Moreover, ongoing enlargement process has intensified the question of how European and other identities go together to build a European polity. For these reasons, European and national identities are related to each other, but this relatedness is controversial.

According to Risse (2008), the European polity does not need to have demos, which replaces national identity with a European one; instead one in which national and European identities may both co-exist and complement each other. It is also argued that the construction process of European identity has also affected construction process of national identities within the EU.

Before going any further, it should be stated that this section of the study discusses the national identity of Europeans and European identity of Europeans. Moreover, the study shall also discuss the immigrant's effects on nationalism as it is related to rise of national and European feelings. Apart from that, this part of the thesis studies on interactions between European identity and national identities.

Recently, the rise of the right wing and extreme right wing parties across Europe shows that nationalism remains one of the most important political factors. However, this contemporary rise of nationalism differs somehow from nationalism of the 18th century, which spilled over Central and Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa after the 19th century. This nationalism can be seen as a reaction to political, economic and social changes, which were not only consequences of globalization, but also deepening and widening process of the European integration. Additionally, technological developments in communication and transportation, the mobility and flow of people changed the social structures. However, the picture of Europe is much more complex. The social structures of the Member States are becoming more multi-ethnic and multicultural, as the single market allows the citizens of European Union to move and reside freely within the Union, and also the legal and illegal immigrants. These new immigrant ethnic minorities have their individual identities and sense of belonging to their particular culture, but they seek a political representation and recognition of their separate identities because of their current place of residence.

The research conducted by Saggar (et. al, 2012), focused on the effect of immigration on national identity. In their study, 'The Impacts of Migration on Social Cohesion and Integration' they concluded that migration has an impact on British national identity. According to study, national feelings of British people grew over time as a result of latest immigration and the related threats. The broader historical and sociological literature supports this view, suggesting that religion, war, devolution and globalization influence this shift. Other study done by McLaren (2002) takes the same approach and includes the integration effect. She claims that there is significant negative relationship between the attitude of the dominant national group towards minorities and support for the EU. She also argues that

antipathy toward other cultures and perceived threat by the process of European integration toward national identity and culture is decisive in hostility toward the European Union.

The above discussion focused on explaining the relations between nationalism and other outside effects on formation of national identity. Further on, the study investigates and discusses the relation of national and European identity.

The uniting effect of a shared European identity has a substantial importance when considering the multi-cultural nature of the European continent. However there are some arguments that having a nationalist identity might reveal some unexpected outcomes that may have a negative influence on creating a European identity. A group of studies (Carey 2002; McLaren 2002; Kaltenthaler and Anderson 2001) state the relation between higher levels of national identity and lower levels of European identity. For instance, according to Kaltenthaler and Anderson (2001), stronger national identity creates less support for common identity because national traditions influence attitudes towards more specific EU policy areas. Surely trust level in the European Union is decreasing. The spread of Eurosceptic opinions and parties promotes the national feelings while European Union's statements criticizing the EU appear more and more in the discourse of politicians.

In his article Moes notes Wilson who says that dominant national identities are effective for a common European identity. But the common perception of European Union being a democratic institution, threatens the sovereignty of the nation-states. Wilson express "many groups of people among the member nations see the EU as a political organization which diminishes the national state sovereignty and these groups resist the EU's efforts at the creation of a European identity (2008:2)."

Another study done by Carey investigated if national identity is an obstacle to European integration and discovered that national identities are highly important in an individual's choice to support the organization like European Union. She tested the influence of national identity on attitudes towards the EU by using Eurobarometer surveys, which includes national identity variables. She found that

the data demonstrate not only that feelings of national identity are a strong influence on individuals' evaluations of European integration, but that maybe the effects are at least as important as utilitarian explanations, such as income, education and subjective economic evaluations and the results confirmed that stronger feelings of national identity lead to lower level support for the EU (Carey, 2002).

As we have discussed earlier, one individual can possess multiple identities. But for Kraus (2003) multiple identities have a potential for conflict due to interaction of distinctive dimensions of cultural and political allegiances whereas Stavrakakis (2005) states the total disintegration of personal identity into identity atoms might not be psychologically manageable. On the other hand, Wintle (2000) point out that people can have allegiance to different institutions/polities that may even seem to conflict or theoretically tend to exclude each other such as loyalty to both nation and the European Union. But Reif (1993:138) opposes and writes, "A stronger sense of belonging to the more immediate communities does not imply a rejection of a European political community." Vice versa, European identity need not emerge or increase at the expense of other identities. It is more viable to assume that in general, there is not a zero struggle between a national and a European identity. Jacobs and Maier (1998) discuss that these struggles will not suppress all the differences between national and European identity but it will only succeed if these differences appear as a secondary fact even if nation-states will internalize them as internal frontiers. Furthermore, since the second half of the twentieth century, increasing globalization and trans-national social networking have broadened the process of social construction of identities beyond the nation-state level. So, it can be possible that national identities cease to be the primary identities of people.

For a wider perspective, let us review a recent study done by Gillespie and Lafan. In their published study Palgrave Advances in European Union Studies (2006), suggest an original concept of European identity. This concept is based on a review of research on identity and on the relationship between citizens and the European Union (Gillespie and Laffan, 2006). They rightly discuss the concept of European identity from a historical perspective. They place European identity back into the context of

territorial integration, and in the long-term history of nation building. They take a wide range of theoretical understandings of identity into account and suggest a bi-dimensional analytical framework. First, identity may be focused on the self or on the other. Second, identity may be thought of as singular or plural. They then apply this framework to the combining of national and European identities and suggest four hypotheses on how European identity may develop. They illustrate these with different historical situations: The classical nation state, the post-Second World War Western European state, the Austrian empire and the multi-leveled polity.

Theoretically, most recent work emphasizes the fluidity of identity despite of its depth and hence the strong influence of context when one tries to measure any identification. This is especially true in the case of identity change. At this stage, European identity cannot be taken for granted and would benefit from cautious analysis that distinguishes between the collective and the personal aspects of identity change. We cannot be sure what European identity will ever be; but it is a work in progress.

Despite the fact that it has been overshadowed by the economic priorities from the very beginning, the construction of a collective European identity is crucial to the future of the European Union. On one hand, the ardent goal of creating a people's Europe postulates an overarching and comprehensive European identity, on the other, weakening of nation-states has triggered national an ethno-national identity crisis throughout Europe, which may result in perilous social and political fragmentations. Being aware of the significance of the identity formation for the sake of integration process, European institutions have undertaken initiatives in awakening a sense of Europeanness (Bellier and Wilson, 2000). In general terms, the efforts to create a European identity have developed in two ways: European cultural identity and European political identity.

People who live in community are always in need of authority, because of the basic requirements such as security. Security is provided by leaders who are selected by freewill of individuals in order to reach a social order. This social order requires

common identity to stick together as a community since people in the democratic countries legalize rulers chosen by freewill and identify their own identities with them as they think they share the same values, history, beliefs or enemies.

The identity of the European Union, not only is there no dominant identity similar to the national identity, but also the gulf between different cultures is more crucial. This is because, the European identity, tries to bring together people of European Union from 27 different countries, who have different nationalities, cultures, languages and religions. As such the last chapter of the study, highlights the different approaches to a possible European identity. An identity that can be accepted by all the different people of Europe and can minimize the tensions arising from the resistance of the national identities.

European identity has been in interaction with the national identities. European identity has been under construction process in all the Member States. It has been affected by that specific Member State's history, political structure and efficiency of its political institutions. The time of entry of a Member State in the EU and the length of its membership also influences the citizens' national identities and their level of European identity. For the citizens of the founding members of the EU, national and European identities are usually perceived as complementary with each other and usually have stronger European identity compared to the new members.

In sum, the complex relation between national identities and European identity constitutes a point of stress in European identity. This complication will probably be sustained in the future as they could reinforce and hamper each other at certain points. They both do require some degree of attachment from Europeans and that could rationally be handled in a consensual framework instead of the conflicting one, as in the models presupposing the relevance of both and affirming that one could well feel belongingness to one's nationhood and Europe at the same time, at distinct contexts. However in the process transfer of competencies and power from national to the 'European' political spaces, the 'revival' of national attachments does take place, gaining far ahead primacy over the attachment to the European identity and

integration. At such point, any overlapping of the attachments to the national and European polities is much hard not to be mentioned.

3.3 European Union's Identity Policies and Construction Process of European Identity

Before starting to this chapter, it should be reminded that this study examined two main formation approaches on identity. The first one was essentialist and the other one was constructivist. Here we are going to focus on constructivist approach as the European Union's identity policy is based on this one.

Beginning with the construction of the discourse on a European identity, it must be noted first that, before the recent process of European integration since the 1950s, or before the period of re-integration of Europeanization, the word identity had not been pronounced to depict a commonality among Europeans. Back then; it was only a common European culture, or at most a European unity, among different segments, people, societies, and nations of the European continent that was being promoted. Wording with identity, therefore, is a post-war conceptualizing used frequently by the EU genre, and therefore an historical phenomenon, as shown up to this point.

European Union made conscious efforts to encourage the formation of a sense of common identity among its citizens since the establishment. Oner (2011) claims that these efforts to have a single nation started in mid-1960's but were not effective until the last three decades. But in the last three decades supporters of European integration have seen the promotion of a European consciousness and the creation of a European identity as a crucial policy goal. Since the 1970's, the idea of European citizenship has been continuously promoted by politicians, intellectuals and administrators involved in the European community. The notion of "European identity" was launched in official European Union's agenda in the beginning of 1970's. For the first time in the European history, "Declaration of European Identity"

was signed by 9 member states in Copenhagen on 14th December 1973. In this declaration, 9 member states decided to have a definition of European identity by taking Europe's dynamic nature into consideration. In this definition, member states aimed to protect the common values in legal, political and ethical levels and preserve the diversity of rich national cultures. By considering the diversity, it was emphasized that the existence of different cultures brought originality and dynamism into European atmosphere. But main principles of the European identity have been explained as democracy, social justice, respect to human rights, and supremacy of law.

As we perceive from official polices above, Europe's dynamism and diversity of different cultures have an important place on European identity. Integration of different European countries made studies of European identity popular in 1990's. Particularly, the end of the Cold War enabled the examination of identity subject within several disciplines. Whitman (1998) claims, as the bipolar structure disappeared most international actors had to adopt new identities or redefine the old ones, to European community. Besides, the developments in Europe such as Maastricht Treaty, integration of Central and Eastern European countries to Union, immigration challenge etc. made identity politics important.

Another concept which developed parallel to the European identity is the concept of Union citizenship. In its simplest term, citizenship implies "membership to a political community, involving the possession of legal rights, usually including the rights to vote and stand for political office" (Jackson, 2003:2). In the modern sense, citizenship is state-centric and related to nationality. Union citizenship, on the other hand, does not have a national dimension. It advances the notion of modern citizenship as constitutive for community, namely, the European Union. "It adds to the first group of nationality rights enjoyed within Members State a second circle of new rights enjoyed in any Member State" (Wiener, 1997:532). The Maastricht Treaty gave constitutional status to Union citizenship and enhanced the supranational character of the Community. This created the basis of legitimacy for individual rights and confirmed the right of free movement on the territory of member states, the right

to address appeals to the European Parliament and to the European ombudsman, as well as the right of political participation to municipal and European elections in every member state under the same conditions as state citizens. Furthermore, it gave the right to get support outside the EU by any diplomatic service of another member state as if one were an own national.

3.3.1 Maastricht Treaty

The discourse on citizenship practice in the early 1990's showed that although the historical element of belonging was continuously addressed, the focus was shifted from creating a feeling of belonging to establishing the legal ties of belonging and an EU citizenship was the fundamental legal tie to bind the European community and its citizens (Wiener, 1997).

The idea to add a chapter on EU citizenship to the Maastricht Treaty was the last minute initiative of the Spanish Government. A treaty that should be ratified by the citizens without any regulation that directly concerns the citizens would not be approved within the society. In order to make them closer to the Union and feel attached to it, such an intervention was required. Despite the fact of establishing the concept of Union citizenship for the "people of Europe," it was never asked of them if they wanted to acquire the status of Union citizenship or not, which revealed a dilemma in the conceptual framework (Duff, et al, 2002). Requiring such a status automatically would not pose a problem under the recent circumstances in which the citizens are entitled with rights but not inculcated with to legal duties. In the Article 17 of the Treaty Establishing the European Community, the concept is legally announced thus: "Citizenship of the Union is hereby established. Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship" (European Commission). As it is seen from the definition, a citizen who has the nationality of any EU Member State attains EU citizenship. For instance, a citizen of France is

automatically a EU citizen and does not lose his citizenship rights in his own state but gather more rights courtesy of his EU citizenship.

Due to the mentioned reasons, the Maastricht Treaty is a breakthrough in the development process of Union citizenship. Union citizenship, as a concept whose first steps dates back to the entitlement of free movement and residence rights, is legally established with the Maastricht Treaty. With Maastricht, the free movement and residence of people has been affiliated with the citizenship concept (Baun, 1996). The right of free movement, which used to be correlated with economic activity and enjoyed by workers or job seekers, was granted to all nationals of member states; in other words, Union citizens.

With this Treaty, the Union citizenship became a part of the community primary law. The democratic deficit problem was enhanced by the provisions of Maastricht and a more citizen-friendly Union was created. The Maastricht Treaty represented the beginning of a process through which the liberal economic principles of the single market were equated with democratic rights (Dell, 2005).

Until the time the Maastricht Treaty was signed and EU citizenship was introduced, the institutional recognition of citizenship did not exist. Maastricht made no amendments to the national legislation of citizenship in the member states, hence there were made no differences in terms of national citizenship; therefore, the member states reserved their authority to determine their national citizenship criteria (Baun, 1996). However, they have undertaken the function to assess who may become European citizens in an indirect way since national citizenship is a prerequisite to becoming a European citizen.

In the Maastricht Treaty, it is indicated that "to strengthen the protection of the rights and interests of the nationals of its Member States through the introduction of a citizenship of the Union" is set as one of the main targets for EU. In the Treaty it was also touched upon the issue of identity by saying, "The Union shall respect the national identities of its Member States, whose systems of government are founded on the principles of democracy." (European Commission)

The regulation of European citizenship status within the scope of the Maastricht Treaty means that the specification of rights will be made by EU laws, the exercise of the rights will be implemented by EU institutions, and The Court of Justice of The European Communities will be in charge of resolving conflicts concerning this issue (ibid).

Tornos (ed. Gomez, 2003) notes about the expected changes after Maastricht Treaty in his article titled "The Meaning of European Identity". According to him, how Treaty of Maastricht has been reached and later on gave a lead to European Union is a result of social and political management. According to him:

> *"It sealed the on-going yearly attempts to manage to associate being European with a co-operative lifestyle in a unitary space of freedom, security and recognition of human rights, as it was formulated soon afterwards at the meeting of the European Council in Tampere. This was the path travelled up to now for the reconstruction of the idea of Europe by the elites, always somewhat ahead of its institutional construction. We now fulfill the two first conditions previously defined as essential for the promotion of a social identity: having a well-defined idea of the meaning of that identity and being able to realize the meaning of that identity in a map of relationships established according to some particular criterion (ed. Gomez, 2003:198)."*

The aspect of national identity is regulated more clearly in the provisions of the Maastricht Treaty by decoupling citizenship from the concept of demos and detaching it from the ground of nation-citizenship substitution. In this manner, the doubts of the "No Demos" supporters have been blighted; additionally, it has been demonstrated that a citizenship that binds individuals emotionally is not intended by the EU but rather a constitutional patriotism is the desired form of the new citizenship of the Union.

To sum up, Maastricht was a turning point in the formation of the EU. As Delanty (2007) states, Maastricht was a significant departure from the model of European

integration established by the founding Treaty of Rome in that for the first time it defined the EU in terms of a relationship to the individual citizen. The original emphasis, which focused on 'community' or 'society', shifted to the 'individual' and indeed 'citizen'.

3.3.2 Legitimacy Problem and EU

It is a well-known fact that European Union suffers from legitimacy problem such a long time (Fossum, 2001)". As Irina (2012) argued, beginning with the 18th century, the legitimacy of nation-state as democratic, modern sate has associated the process of democratization with the construction of identity and this relation between legitimate governance and identity is also true for the European Union. Manuel Castells summarized the identity and governmental issues that Europe faced in the last couple of decades with an explanatory paragraph below:

> "European nation-states were aware of the difficulty in managing the economic and technological so, they traded some degree of sovereignty for a greater capacity to intervene jointly in the shaping of the world economy. It followed the increasing integration of economic institutions, paved the way for joint action on key issues that required global governance. At the same time, they responded to increasing pressures from their citizenry's claims of identity in terms of their territorial and cultural specificity by engaging in a process of devolution of power that decentralized most European states, and even permitted, in certain cases, the participation of nongovernmental organizations in policy deliberations. Thus, over time, a new form of state emerged in practice: a state made of ad hoc networking in the practice of government between nation-states, European institutions, global institutions of governance, regional and local governments, and civil society organizations" (2009:30).

It is an accepted fact that starting from 1950's European Union has been very successful about economic togetherness but according to some scholars, the Union has not made the same progress in the identity synergy due to many reasons. Boneu (ed. Gomez, 2003) claims that assumptions on European Union's project are based most particularly on the observation that continent have not progressed in the same rhythm in the construction of a European identity as in economic integration. According to many, this challenge originated from legitimatizing role of European Union. Basically people had confidence in European Union on many topics except cultural ones. This legitimacy problem in EU is still an ongoing challenge, which can be observed clearly in the last developments.

Surely, being a technocratic and elite-driven project, EU confronted considerable public distrust since the beginning of its establishment. On the other hand, with the efforts to deepen and widen the European integration, EU has been evolving into a political union. As the European integration was mainly driven by economic incentives, its legitimacy was measured by its performance and by the legitimacy of the Member States (Eriksen and Fossum, 2002). However, particularly after the Maastricht Treaty, it has become obvious that the legitimacy of the Member States is no longer sufficient for the justification of EU acts. At this point, lack of European 'demos' as a recognizable category aggravates the situation by adding to the democratic deficit problem (Shore, 2000:19). Here the research approaches the legitimacy issue from both political structure of the Union and non-attributive cultural-collective togetherness.

According to Merkel (1999) reasons of legitimacy problem has mainly arisen from unfair distribution of power between EU institutions, lack of check and balance mechanism and absence of mediatory structures between social and political interest. Besides, the uniqueness of EU as a political entity, an efficiency-legitimacy dilemma should be mentioned in order to discuss the legitimacy problem in a comprehensive framework. Thus, legitimacy problem of EU should be discussed in term of widely accepted reasons by also taking into consideration the possible factual results.

It is difficult to describe EU in precise terms, as there is no precedent in the political history. Furthermore, it has been evolving constantly, so it is not possible to define the final stage. The vital point here is that EU was established through multilateral treaties negotiated by the national governments and approved by the supra national institutions such as European Commission, the European Parliament and intergovernmental bodies such as the European Council and Council of Ministers (Castell, 2009). So, EU is neither an intergovernmental organization nor fully supranational entity. Nonetheless the Maastricht Treaty is seen as a crucial milestone in the way of further integration because it necessitates growing sovereignty transfer from national to EU level. "As a result of its uniqueness in political realm, the classical definition of legitimacy remains insufficient to explain the specific legitimacy requirements of this complex political system" (Merkel, 1999:48).

Another issue related to the legitimacy problem that EU is facing a democratization dilemma with the deepening integration (Merkel, 1999; Eriksen and Fossum, 2002). The EC has proceeded on the way of further integration, mostly at the expense of democratization. Indeed, if the democratic mechanism had worked properly, the integration project would have developed well. As stated by Merkel "If the governments had been required to confer with the European Parliament, the national and regional parliaments or directly with citizens, a reciprocal blockade of the EC decision making would have resulted (1999, 54)".

As for the unfair distribution of power, the EU institutions act as a body of parliamentary democracy. The European Commission functions as an executive body, with both the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers having legislative power; and the European Court of Justice fulfilling its function as a judiciary power (ibid). Nevertheless, Lodge (1995) discusses that as opposed to parliamentary democracy, the allocation of power between these institutions is not balanced.

According to Toulemon (1998) both European Commission and The European Parliament have been violated by the Council of Ministers, the fortress of inter-

governmentalism. Especially, the Council of Ministers is more powerful and dominant than the European Parliament in the legislation process. "Even though the European Parliaments' position was empowered vis-a-vas that of Council of Minister's by asking its approval for the creation of the Commission and for the appointment of the President with Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties, legislation process is still formed and controlled by the Council of Minister" (Toulemon, 1998:123). Another point is that as being executive body of the EU, the European Commission has a significant power within the institutional structure. In addition, it can be regarded as the most supranational organ of the Union. On the other hand "its democratic foundation is extraordinarily weak on the account of the fact that the appointment of Commission members is in the hands of member states and the Parliaments' approval which has been asked since the Maastricht Treaty is far from providing an equal democratic control over process" (Merkel, 2009:50).

Finally, political parties, social movements, mass media and interest groups have played a crucial role in mediating between the society's interests and governments' policies in a wide range of areas in European political order. Moreover, in case of EU, it is not easy to agree that any of these factors has a considerable impact on EU decision-making process. Despite the fact that EU citizens directly elect the members of EU parliament, an integrated European party system is not founded yet. Merkel notes "with regards to the European interest groups, since the taxation, welfare, employment and wages are still being negotiated at the national level, the Europeanization of the interest groups is unsatisfactory (1999:49-52). More than all this, The EU also lacks important instruments for shaping public opinion, namely common ground, common language, common culture and multilevel communication network.

According to Strath (2002) disappointing results of the Maastricht referenda in certain member states and subsequent developments demonstrated that "permissive consensus" could not be taken for granted, to gain support for European integration. Also, an identity oriented affective support was necessary for legitimating of European Union's polity. Thus, the connection between democratic deficit and

identity became a debated topic. As Bellier and Wilson stated "the building of European Union is not only process of harmonization and integration, but one of the legitimization, in which the structures and aims of the EU must find approval and meaning among its people (2000:6).

Legitimation is a long debated topic and is an important part of European identification process. The EU needs a common identity and legitimation as a political community by the Member States and the individuals. As Reif (1993:131) explains "a certain level of common identity is required in order to legitimize the existence and further development of European integration." The legitimation of the European Union polity needs an identity-oriented and efficient support that can be promoted by the identity-building policies of the European Union. But what kind of identity should European Union promote? The study investigates more ideologies developed in this regard.

3.3.3 Political and Cultural Identity of Europe

Today the social structures of most of the nation states consist of different ethnic and cultural groups. Nevertheless, the current territories of the nation states generally do not overlap with cultural boundaries. As a consequence of the mobility of the people thanks to the recent developments in transportation and communication means, these heterogeneous characters of the societies become more apparent. As it is discussed in the previous chapters, nation states require somehow homogeneity through national values and is based on a national identity, which is somehow superior to other cultural identities. However, in parallel with the changes in the social structures of the societies, the superiority of the national identity to other cultural identities is being challenged by the recognition demands of these identities. When the European Union matters, the picture is more complex. When we compare with the national societies, the level of divergence and difference is higher in the European Union, and most importantly, and it is almost impossible to mention a superior cultural identity or a cultural identity of the majority, which is superior to other cultural identities

similar to the national identity. As such, multiculturalism for the European Union should be an equal co-existence of diverse cultural groups within a single polity and the stress should be on equality and divergence of particular groups rather than giving a voice to culturally oppressed groups.

European Union has been long implementing some policies to iron out the legitimacy problem and one of the solutions offered and applied was to form a cultural and political identity that support the construction of European identity. But the policy unnecessarily became a discussion topic by the scholars and elites of Europe whether Union should focus on it should be a political identity or a cultural identity. A political identity would connect the European Union and its citizens and creates a sense of togetherness among the peoples of Europe through political norms and values whereas a cultural identity would be based on shared history and tradition similar to the national identity.

As mentioned, the question of the European Union as a political body for its citizens is a controversial topic for many studies researching nature of European Union. According to Meyer, EU lacks a sufficient sense of shared citizen's identity, which is a necessary condition for its legitimacy as a body politic and solidarity of its citizens. The European Union still a far cry away from the achievement of a political identity that would be sufficiently well be enshrined in the hearts and minds of its citizens (Meyer, 2006). Meyer argues this to be primary reason for the crisis that EU confronted. According to him, the crisis is both a cultural and political identity crises since it concerns not only identity of the Union as a political body, but also the identity of the citizens as a sense of belonging.

But Meyer supports and suggests a more political European identity rather than a cultural one. He states that political identity should be based on two pillars: a consciousness of citizens as a sense of belonging to a polity and certain basic values and political objectives that citizens pursue jointly and that connects citizens. Consequently, a European identity should have these two components. Meyer stresses on the six central dimensions that are stated in the Treaties of the European

Union and the Draft Constitution. These can serve as the certain basic values and political objectives. These are:

- A liberal democracy under the rule of law and universal basic rights

- A Participatory Democracy,

- A multilevel trans-national polity under the principle of subsidiarity

 - A Social Space under universal social and economic basic rights.

- A multicultural community

- A civil global power these six objectives of the European Union.

Meyer claims, these are the values that a European political identity can be built upon (Meyer, 2016).

One of the supporters of political identity is Jurgen Habermas. According to him, a coherent system of rights requires politics of recognition that will also protect the integration of the citizens to the political life. Owing to this integration; the citizen can present his or her identity. Also, only EU constitution can enable European citizens to develop a common political identity because of the connection between three key elements to the implementation of a constitution (Habermas 2001). He affirms that these elements will then supply the EU with necessary conditions for identity formation. These elements are the emergence of a European civil society; the construction of a European- wide public sphere; and the shaping of a political culture that can be shared by all European citizens (Habermas 2001). In other words, Habermas surely sees common institutions, common sources of information, and common forums for communication as the providers of common political identity.

In his article, Michael Bruter also writes about citizens' perceptions of symbols, values and news with regard to their identification process to Europe. In his investigation, he makes a distinction between a civic and a cultural component of European political identity. By civic identity, he implies "the degree to which they

feel that they are citizens of a European political system, whose rules, laws and rights have an influence on daily life" (2003:1155). This term is quite close to Habermas' ideas for constitutional effects on political identity. .

Before getting into cultural identity of Europe we should investigate what is meant by European culture. The previous chapters shows that creating European culture is a historical phenomenon that stands for the cross-border connections that occurred throughout European history within and from Europe to the outside world. European culture, in this sense, should comprehend the cultural connections that have an impact on the nature, direction, duration and content of the Europeanization process. This can also be explained using the very basis of the term culture: European culture must 'cultivate' the Europeanization process in a unique, European way (Bondebjerg and Madsen, 2008). It must also be noted that the process is ongoing; i.e., European culture is still being constructed, and it is in turn still constructing the Europeanization process.

It should be mentioned that the concept of culture appeared before 18th century. However, this should not mean that the cultural development of Europe initiated precisely from that time. On the contrary, it has a much earlier history. With each event that results in the processes of communication and connection across European societies, some sort of common culture is accumulated (ibid). It does not have to be always unifying but examples of conflict and contestation such as wars also contribute in building that culture.

According to Bondebjerg and Madsen, (2008) the relationship between European culture and the process of unification is another side of the story, for it is almost taken for granted that an attempt of unification around Europe, a step towards a European culture, in the modern sense of the word, has been taken. For that matter, European unity and European culture have been considered to be hand in hand, for the latter being the justifier of the former, and for the former being the result of the latter. The ideal of European unity, in other words, is regarded as a projection of the ideal of European culture.

From this aspect, we can start to discuss European cultural identity. According to Delanty (2007) European cultural identity is too hard to construct, instead it is much more possible to construct European political identity which will lead to cultural identity anyway. The construction of European political identity, which is future, oriented and based on common values, will help the emergence of a multicultural Europe. Consequently, the discussion is open, as to whether EU needs a democratic, flexible and political identity or a multicultural identity, which can create a tie between the Union and its citizens and create a sense of belonging among the citizens (ibid).

Considering the ideas presented above, we can conclude that political identity is strongly connected with cultural and historical identity. This connection gives an important advantage to European identity over other types of identities because "European citizenship is not defined in ethnic terms but is defined in political terms, powered by cultural facts, and is about sharing of democratic cosmopolitan values" (Agirdag, Houtte and Phalet, 2015:2). In another meaning, it should be discussed that European identity is more conceptualized as a civic identity, which is less determined by ethnic characteristics such as language, religion or common descent and formed with cultural bounds.

A society with a political identity is based on common beliefs, shared values, and attitudes, which form the background for one common political system. Historical, cultural and political dimensions are largely connected with each other as parts of one shared collective identity. The belonging to a historical and cultural identity is mostly based on emotional and unconscious relations.

The invention and construction of a shared identity, culture and heritage among the European citizens has been based upon the theme of unity in diversity and since from 1990's. This shared identity, serves as a mechanism of establishing legitimacy in the European institutions by the bureaucratic elites. Moreover, the discourses about European identity have been centralized around the concept of culture to actualize this unity. It is a common argument that culture promotes European identity, which is

seen by the EU's elites as a way of advancing European integration and also as a remedy to the EU's legitimacy problem. According to Bellier and Wilson (2000), in order to overcome the problem of legitimacy or the so-called 'democratic deficit', the idea of European identity has been inculcated in various cultural policies since the 1970's. The arguable notions such as 'European identity' and 'common culture' have been continually mentioned in official community discourses related to cultural domain. The EU elites have been using these concepts as identity-building tools for developing the European citizens' self-identification with the society.

Delanty (2000) argues that a model of culture is not unifying point, but it is more conflictual and, nevertheless, the relation between culture and identity is getting more 'a basis of contentious action'. In a similar manner, in terms of European integration, Delanty supposes that the best model that can be followed should be one "that does not seek to reproduce on the transnational level that which has already decomposed on the level of the nation state". He continues to say that the missing cultural component of European social integration cannot be found in the national culture. He states, "a far more important project would be to embark on a program of Europeanization aimed to institutionalize cultures of contention built around new norms of public commitment and promote a self-critical European identity". Referring to the idea of 'constitutional patriotism', Delanty suggests, "a European cultural identity cannot be defined by reference to nationality, territory, geography or cultural heritage" (2000:234-235).

But it should be remembered that in context of international dimensions, cultural identities are more important than in the context of nation-states. This is, because nation-states may have ethnicity in most cases and European cultural identity is aimed to be based on shared experiences, memories, traditions, myths and symbols of several generations of the peoples of Europe. According to Wintle (1996) cultural identity is necessary idea in Europe and it should not be evaluated as reality because identity itself is symbolic rather than reality. So having European cultural identity is not an objective and also will not become so in the future, instead it is a set of aspirations and ideologies. As Wintle argues, "cultural identity largely remains at the

European level, even with a tendency to move down towards micro-national regional identity." (1996:69).

Irina (2012) claims that agreement is still needed upon the idea that we have to search for new sources of democracy and political unity in the common European culture. Although "expressive culture" is evidently considered of vital importance in the processes of globalization and in the political project of the European Union, with the exception of European cultural policies developed and implemented by the EU institutions alongside the appeal made to culture throughout official discourses encouraging the creation of a European identity, neither theoreticians nor empirical researchers in political sciences have focused specifically on culture.

However, despite political entities like the European Union culture, a common heritage, history are realities that affect identity formation. Another dimension of the process of the transition to nation-state is the creation of 'high culture'. Gellner describes the high culture as national, homogenous and produced by education systems, which are made compulsory by the state (Gellner, 1983: 18). Nevertheless culture has a great importance in forming a nation. A nation is a community of social communication based on a common culture

3.4   Common Values, Awareness and We-feeling: European Identity as Collectivity

In this part of the research, the main question is if the members of the European community are joined by a common European identity. According to Jacobs and Meier (1998) people in Europe feel European but it is questionable if this 'European' feeling is based on the elements such as "we feeling", "common values" or "common awareness". The European inhabitants consider "common values" to be important but how this shared values lead to collectivity is discussed here. In order to acquire an understanding about the collectivity of European identity, it is important to have

an understanding of identity as discussed in the first section but in this section, identity is reviewed as a collective identity.

European Union project integrates Europe as a whole with help of common points like democracy and Christianity or shared history. But, Europe, more than these is a cultural and political assimilation. These points are just the elements of Europe, which bind European nation states together.

Based on the identity formation process, scholars have been trying to find out if the European identity is built upon inclusive grounds like common culture and values. The European "we feeling" has to be based on shared similarities in addition to common values but many scholars have pointed to the uncertainty of the notion of 'Europe' and 'Europeanness' in terms of a shared culture, history, geography, language and religion. Even the European Commission ambiguously states that Europe "combines geographical, historical and cultural elements which all contribute to the European identity" without specifying the content of these elements (European Commission, 1992). The European Commission avoided from giving way to sharp political debates and stressed "it is neither possible not opportune to establish now the frontiers of the EU, whose contours will be shaped over many years to come" (European Commission). In the end, unity of Europe can only be conceived as multiple and complex, bringing together many contradictions such as law and force, democracy and oppression, spirituality and materialism, reason and myth. However as Jacob and Maier (1998) state, even if we conceive Europe as the unity of diversities and contradictions, it will not present any satisfactory answer but leaves the option of choosing among many complex elements of the past when we try to formulate a European identity.

It is important to emphasize here that European organizations such as the EU and the Council of Europe have a specific interest in the construction of European identity and both institutions define European identity in a different ways. (Soysal, 2002: 280) Although the institutions of the EU have been involved in identity-building efforts, some have been more powerful than others. According to Laffan (1996), the

capability of EU institutions for the creation of identity depends on their place on the institutional landscape, the roles, and identity-building policies. By separating supranational institutions from representative institutions Laffan argues that European Commission and the European Court of Justice as supranational institutions and the European Parliament as a representative institution are the more effective actors than other EU institutions on the construction of a European identity.

In addition, European values are generally thought to include respect for human rights, democracy, tolerance of the foreign and openness to other cultures. To put it in another way, the values that are proclaimed to be specifically European values are in fact universalistic, and one could rightly demand that non-Europeans respect them as well. Therein lies the entire difficulty that inevitably confronts those, who would like to define European cultural identity by means of such values or analogous ones: namely, these values are too general, too universal, to define a specific cultural identity and to differentiate it from other cultures (Groys, 2006). As regards to the cultural borders of Europe, Neumann (2006) claims that it is impossible to speak of a cultural trait shared by all Europeans or not shared by any non-European. The continent hosts many different cultural groups and the cultural borders of Europe have constantly expanded through enlargement waves.

Irina argues, the topic to be more different but simple than that because cultural treaties shared in Europe are not general at all. According to her these treaties do not lead directly to a European identity, but they are capable of fostering togetherness in Europe because it promotes a unity of action.

> *"The main arguments reside in the obvious Europeanization of everyday cultural trends, fashions, in arts, sports, and music and leisure-time activities. The lifestyles, clothes, consumer behavior and the everyday standards of the French, the Swedes, the British, the Germans and the Greeks are becoming increasingly indistinguishable and a common European everyday life culture is unmistakable. This is particularly evident among the younger generations for whom the dismantling of national borders throughout the EU no longer*

represents an achievement, but the natural starting position for their individual freedom of movement throughout Europe" (Irina, 2009:99).

What described above indeed is a type of Europeanization, sharing the differences as a collective way and this collectiveness is viewed as a necessary condition for the feeling of belonging to Europe. This belonging of individual European citizen and the creation of a common identity have been achieved by the assumption of a common culture in Europe. Thereby we understand these collective identities as cultural ones.

As stated in this thesis before, collective identities do not emerge from nothing. They need basic ground materials; and thus they do not emerge on their own. They are developed, advanced and shaped with initiatives in diverse fields such as politics or culture. One of the dimensions of collective identity, "we-feeling" is based on a "collective memory". According to Eder (2009) this memory mostly recedes to the past but is practiced in the present and influences the future. Members of a collective identity are aware of their shared history and their common points. Similarities like shared values; cultural traditions have to be constructed by assessing the past (2009). Noted from Schumacher (2007) Eder mentions that the past is strongly connected with the present. By acting in the present the collective also influences its future. Common actions and decisions have to be taken and common goals have to be set to continue the process of a collective identity. The community has to enhance historically developed economic, social, political and cultural circumstances in the present for the future.

Historical effect here should be mentioned widely because historical dimension emphasizes the common memory of a collective identity. These memories mainly consist of cultural characteristics. According to Somers (1994) historical traditions and common qualities expand over time and are strongly influenced by cultural prearrangements. So, the historical and cultural dimensions of identity complete each other. The cultural dimension of a collective identity involve the culturally orientated aspects, which form the self-concept of a community. Common priorities, mindsets and qualities establish an inner homogeneity (Kürşat, 2001). It is important for a

114

collective identity that the members recognize and understand the cultural features of their society. Moreover, they have to live and preserve the shared values in a common way. Both for the historical identity and the cultural identity, it is very important to communicate their similarities within the community.

Another aspect of collective identity is foreign policy, which in many ways plays a significant role in the socio-political imagination of a collective identity as a specific representation of 'we', in relation to outsiders and 'Otherness'. Wallace (1991) has argued that foreign policy is intimately linked to the issue of identity, in that the latter expresses that the core elements of sovereignty it seeks to defend are the values it stands for and seeks to promote abroad. Delanty argues that, the most significant and decisive external force in the formation of the modern European identity is the Ottoman Empire. Ottoman Empire was shaped by encounters with other civilizations. For more than 500 years "Europe defined itself partially in opposition to the Ottoman Empire (1995:84)." The historical European identity is based upon opposition to others such as the American, Arabs, Asian and the East European (Delanty, 1995). This shows that the "others" of European identity were not always sought outside the European continent. In certain periods of European history, Jews and communism were described as the "others" of European identity. With the end of the Cold War, communism and East Europeans ceased to be the "other." Triandafyllidou jumps on a same conclusion in her discussion of perceptions of Europe. (2008);

> *"European identity is relational—it is formed in interaction with national identity, but also in reference to Others…that offer benchmarks against which to test who is European or what it means to be European. Perhaps a solution to the EU legitimacy deficit lies in the need for national governments and European institutions to find suitable others in contrast to whom the distinctiveness and unity of European identity and a European polity can be forged (2008:280)".*

But Risse (2008) aims to show how the concept of 'other' adapts according to the needs of particular national groups. He calls this the "marble cake model of European

identity," based on the realization that European identity may be the result of different motivations, different conceptions, and different constructions and still form an identification with an entity to which they would grant political authority. Surely, 'other' is a necessary fact for constructing European identity. As we can observe from many examples, the role of other can be played by particular groups or by a nation's own history, but there many potential 'others' that have not been invoked in searching for an adequate definition of European identity. So to say, the criteria for 'other' may change.

Actually, it is not clear that all identities are formed in against external, non-European. According to Weaver, attempt to define European identity in terms of other could not be viable as a result of the absence of a significant external threats. (Weaver, 2004:204) Similarly, Neumann claims that the attempt to create a European identity could not be similar as demarcation of boundaries between 'self' and 'other' in the 'digital' and exclusionary manner of the nation-state. (Neumann, 2006) For him, to make a uniform European identity with a homogeneous group and clear boundaries might not be possible because the institutional structure of the EU is very graded and overlapping set of political entities. In this view, the new European identity formation and institutional demarcation occurs in an 'analogy way'. (Neumann, 2006) In the view of Weaver, European identity should be defined in its "internal characteristics and inherent principles" Therefore, it might be said that within the context of the EU the European identity implies "the idea of a European 'self' which is emerging to fill the space created by European integration" (Delanty, 2000:32) Yet, the idea of European other might not be needed in order to create and support European Self.

At the end, the idea of togetherness and common culture have been advanced to a more prominent status not only on the political agenda but also in the social and or educational area considering that fact that European Union has increased its geographical and demographical size in the last decades and leads to a diversity that have not been experienced before.

3.4.1 Unity in Diversity as Cultural Policy

Considering culture as a significant source of identity for many groups the EU's 'cultural policy' seems as the basis of notion of European cultural identity founded on the concept of 'unity in diversity'. Firstly, the concept of 'unity in diversity' was created in the process of making the community more popular for the peoples of Europe in the early seventies. (Wintle, 1996:5) At the same time, in the 1980s, 'unity in diversity' as the official cultural formula has been increasingly utilized for that cultural policy. The concept of 'unity in diversity' as motto of the EU has been used instead of 'European civilization'.

The notion of 'unity in diversity' as a concept is a controversial issue. At this point, it is valuable to give some explanations to understand what this concept is. Some argue that the theme of 'unity-in-diversity' as a simply 'empty rhetoric' in the imagination of European cohesion where it does not exist. (Pantel, 1999:52) Others suppose that as a rhetorical device 'unity in diversity' is based on the rejection the clash between 'unity' and 'diversity'. According to Michael Wintle, 'unity in diversity' means that "Europe is very diverse, but there is also some kind of common quality, if not unity, in Europe". (Wintle, 1996:5) In this sense, it means that various nations of Europe possibly would join together under the some common denominator.

> "A European identity would not equal giving up on the Europe but could mean accepting diversity, acknowledging different experiences and different conclusions from them. The basis for European politics thus would be the mere willingness to cooperate out of choice and necessity at the same time, to do so in a way that allows for diversity and in the understanding to aim for unity and peace Lars Klein (ed. Klein, Jong and Tamcke, 2013: 63)".

With the greater salience of the EU 'cultural policy' from the mid-1980's and onward, it is intended to increase the identification with the EU and legitimate the integration process as a whole. Thus, the theme of 'unity-in-diversity' has been employed as a legitimacy-building strategy (ibid). In other words, the EU's 'cultural policy' to create a European identity is the accumulation of the strategies used by elites to create 'Europe' as an imagined entity.

The rhetoric of 'unity in diversity' reflected in the Maastricht Treaty stress that "the Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the member states, while respecting their national and regional diversity" and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore. To sum up, the 'unity in diversity' approach at the level of rhetoric indicates that EU efforts to construct a common European identity based not only on 'shared culture' and history', but also 'cultural diversity'. The EU 'cultural policy' consists of two strategies of 'unity" and 'diversity' which are mutually reinforcing. (Pantel, 1999:56) Within this framework, it is significant to give a general explanation for two strategies to better understand the distinction between what 'unity' is implied and what 'diversity' is implied in the EU discourse.

According to Reif "European identity is becoming increasingly identified with a capacity to tolerate considerable cultural diversity" (1993:155). Indeed Wintle (1996) mentions that European identity not only tolerates but is also characterized by diversity as revealed by the Community discourse on 'unity in diversity'. However, the notion of 'unity in diversity' is regarded as an unnecessary rhetoric, as little more than a rhetorical exercise or a formal solution without substance.

Before all else, it should be mentioned that it is extremely challenging, to elaborate a European cultural project which embraces both the differences in European cultures and its common European roots." (Bekemans, 1990:59) Boxhoorn (1996:143) goes further and questions the possibility of reconciliation unification and diversity. However, until now, the Community discourse has included notions of both unity (common heritage, common cultural heritage, common roots, European culture,

shared history, European cultural identity) and diversity (mosaic of cultures, differences, linguistic, religious, national or local diversities) in its handling of cultural policy. For instance, the European City of Culture event was designed with the objective of strengthening "the expression of a culture which, in its historical emergence and contemporary development, is characterized by having both common elements and a richness born of diversity." According to the Commission, "the keystone of the ambitious construction which aims at European Union" is "the unity of European culture as revealed by the history of regional and national cultural diversity." (European Commissions, 1987) In the Parliament's view, cultural action involves making the most of all aspects of this diversity, thereby turning European culture into a culture of cultures by creating the most fertile environment possible.

It is known that the European Community shall make regulations, make decisions, deliver opinions and issue directives, but all of those implementations are different. Recommendations and opinions have no binding force. A regulation is binding on all member states, but the details of implementation, form and method are left to the member states. A decision is only binding on those who are addressed by it. It does not allow for the harmonization of laws and regulations. "Indeed, it may 'give a legal basis for protection against Community action which is harmful to the identity and language of a certain culture', explicitly preserving 'diversity'" (Brock and Tulasiewicz, 1999:24).

In conclusion, the European Union stresses on high level of cultural diversity among the peoples of European Union by highlighting the aim to integrate in diversity. This motto of the European Union may offer also a solution to the identity crisis of the Union. Not only it is impossible to differentiate the cultures from each other, but also comparing the cultures is somehow not a solution. As such, only a political, cultural identity of the European Union can establish a sense of us for peoples who have not a common nationality, language, ethnicity and culture and a consciousness of citizens as a sense of belonging to the European Union as a polity and certain basic values and political objectives that citizens of the European Union pursue jointly.

Nevertheless, such an identity, since it does not reference superior cultural values will neither substitute, nor compete with national identities.

3.4.2 Diversity of Europe

The EU policy has underlined not only the existence of a European identity, but also the resilience and importance of national, regional, and local identities. It might imply that "one of the distinctive features of Europe that is recognition of and accommodation of diversity". (Garcia, 1993:132) In 1992, in the Treaty of Maastricht it has taken obligatory decisions on "respect for the national identities of its Member States". This provision has been reinforced by the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights in its Article 22; "the Union shall respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity". This as an obligation or responsibility of the EU that has become one of the Union's formal objectives. Similarly, Article 3 of the Constitutional Treaty lists the following objectives: "The Union shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe's cultural heritage is safeguarded and enhanced."

As a result of the recognition of diversity, it is assumed that European cultural identity could not be regarded as a challenge to national identities; it could only be an alternative. In that respect, 'diversity' tended to reinforce a weak notion of cultural identity, as opposed to a strong one based on 'unity'. (Delanty, 2005) Therefore, it seems as a tendency of a weak notion of cultural identity rather than a strong cultural identity based on 'unity'. (Delanty, 2005)

Shore (2000) claims that EU policy elites of the Commission have repeatedly emphasized on the themes of promoting 'diversity in Europe' as well as respecting the 'mosaic of cultures' that together create European identity. According to its official narratives, the European Union seeks to develop a stronger sense of European identity and citizenship above the level of the nation state while

simultaneously contributing to the 'flowering' of local, regional and national cultures and identities below it.

In this sense, it is aimed to foster a sense of cultural 'unity' by supporting cultural exchanges and the promotion of visible European symbols. Besides, it is aimed to sustain an awareness of cultural diversity by supporting for regional and local cultures. Hence, the discourse of the EU cultural policy has underlined not only the existence of a European identity, but also the resilience and importance of national, regional, and local identities, each has its own rich history and symbols. (Pantel, 1999: 46) As pointed out earlier, the Commission utilizes this diversity as well as the common values that Europeans share in the construction of a European identity.

3.4.3 Construction of Europeans through Symbols

The European Commission started direct elections to the European Parliament in 1979. In 1984, the low turn-outs in European Parliament elections proved to the lack of popular support for European integration and provided the necessary environment for the introduction of a more determined cultural agenda and dissemination of a European consciousness among citizens to improve identification with the Community (Shore, 2000).

At the European Council meeting in Fontainebleau on 25th-26th June 1984, the European Council agreed to assign an ad hoc committee presided by Pietro Adonnino, an Italian representative, to propose measures "to strengthen and promote the Community's identity and its image both for its citizens and for the rest of the world." (European Commission Bulletin, 1985). This ad hoc committee was asked to examine symbols such as anthem, flag, European coinage or European sports team. The Adonnino Committee, which included public relations and marketing experts as well as senior Commission officials including its future Secretary General David Williamson, produced two reports in 1985 with the intention of forging a collective European identity and consciousness by Europeanizing the cultural sector (Banchoff

and Smith, 2005). These reports included proposals such as the mutual recognition of equivalent diplomas and professional qualifications, simplification of border-crossing procedures and the entitlement of those living in another member state to take part in local and European elections in the country of residence (ibid).

The report noted that "through action in the areas of culture and communication, which are essential to European identity and the Community's image in the minds of people ... support for the advancement of Europe can and must be sought." (ibid) These actions included the creation of a common audiovisual area with the launch of a European multilingual television channel, a European Academy of Science, Technology and Art that would accentuate the attainments of European science and originality of European civilization with its diversity and wealth, and a Euro-lottery the results of which could be expressed in European Commission Reports. The Committee also suggested the disclosure of information on issues important for the Community and its citizens, learning of at least one Community language in addition to native language, inauguration of school exchange programs and voluntary work camps for young people and the inclusion of a European dimension in education (ibid).

The Community's campaign for a "people's Europe" finalized in ambitious proposals by the Adonnino Committee that devised various symbols, through which the European people started to feel the existence of Europe in tangible forms in their everyday lives. According to the European Commission, a new set of symbols was necessary to communicate the principles and values upon which the community is grounded since:

> *"Symbols play a key role in consciousness-raising, but there is also a need to make the European citizen aware of the different elements that go to make up his European identity, of our cultural unity with all its diversity of expression, and of the historic ties which links the nations of Europe (European Commission, 1988)".*

Among these symbols for communicating the European idea were a European symbol and flag consisting of a circle of twelve gold stars on a blue background taken from the Council of Europe in 1986 by the European Council as "the symbol par excellence of European identity and European unification," (ibid) Gradually European passport, European driving license and car number plate in addition to the European anthem, were as well added. This anthem, as the "representative of the European idea," would be played at appropriate ceremonies and events and when there is a need to bring the Community into the attention of public. (ibid) The Committee also proposed the creation of European postage stamps commemorating important events in Community history such as the accession of Spain and Portugal, therefore used, according to Shore, as an instrument in the invention of Community history (Shore, 2000:48).

Other initiatives included the European Commission Youth Orchestra, Opera Center, the European Woman of the Year Award, the European Literature Prize and more than one thousand Jean Monnet Awards for the development of European integration studies at the universities. The Commission also introduced a new calendar such as Europe Weeks, European Culture Months and a series of theme-based European Years. Besides, May 9 - commemorating the anniversary of the Schuman Declaration was designated as the official 'Europe Day'. The underlying political objective behind these initiatives was "to reconfigure the symbolic ordering of time, space, information, education and the media in order to reflect the 'European dimension' and the presence of European Community institutions." (Shore, 2000:50).

3.4.3.1 The Importance of Symbols in the Construction of European Identity

Delanty (2005) argues that "Europe has been symbolically constructed as an imaginary" in various ways and that the symbolic form of Europe is cultivated when combined with wider social structures. It can be maintained that symbols play an important role in the construction of common frames of meaning and provide

orientations for the interpretation of the world. The European Union symbols have served for the internalization of the union as a social reality by the individuals. According to Hall (2003), myths of shared and distinctive identity that are in the form of "stories, symbols, images, rituals, monuments, historic events, typical landscapes" are necessary for the cohesiveness and meaningfulness of the imagined communities. Thus, visual productions and imaginations are central to shaping a sense of European belonging and to the EU's institutional communication. "People in general need clear and tangible concepts in order to develop a sense of belonging" which "is an indispensable factor in achieving and maintaining European integration" (Wistrich, 1994, 80).

However, Schlesinger and Foret (2006:70) argue that the modest success of the EU symbols indicate the intrinsic restraints of this type of identity-building initiatives. To illustrate, May 9, the anniversary of the Schuman Declaration, although retained its status as Europe Day, has not become a holiday for all Europeans. Against such arguments that symbols are of secondary importance or ineffective, it has been established by certain empirical studies that symbols of European integration increase individuals' European identity. For instance, Bruter (2003), distinguishing between civic, identification with the EU as a relevant political institutional system, and cultural, general identification with Europe, components of European identity, found that cultural identities of Europeans are more influenced by exposure to symbols of European integration.

In addition to political and cultural community symbols such as flag, anthem, passport, citizenship and so forth, Euro banknotes and coins were introduced on 1 January 2002 as one of the most significant EU symbols and identity markers. Just as a national currency contributes to the national identity of users (214:2007), Euro helps the enhancement of European identities. Between November 2001 and January 2002, the proportion of those agreeing with the following statement increased from 13 to 51-64 percent: "By using euros instead of national currencies, we feel a bit more European than before." (121:2002).

The relation between Euro and identification with the EU has been established in not only Eurobarometer surveys, but some empirical studies. Risse (2003) found that Euro, providing a visible connection from Brussels to daily lives and reifying Europe as a political order, enhances the Euroland citizens' identification with the EU and the belonging of the EU for its citizens. Luna-Arocas (et. al, 2001) also found that in an empirical study, the support of Spanish and Portuguese citizens for Euro stems more from European identity than economic expectations or knowledge of the consequences. (Luna-Arocas et. al, 2001). These two studies, when combined, may be taken to point out that there is a positive correlation between Euro and European identity. Further, in a Eurobarometer survey held in September 2007 to assess the public attitudes toward euro in new Member States, a weak majority (54% of the respondents) stated that they did not believe that adopting the euro would lead to a loss of identity for their country. (214:2007)

On the other hand, it is known that in the 19th and 20th centuries, national political elites have also forged frontiers, flags, national passports, national anthems, national independence days, and postage stamps in nation-building processes. In this context, Delanty (1995) approaches the EU's use of the tools of nationalism while trying to overcome nationalism as ironic. However, the symbols adopted by the EU should not be considered as part of a European nation-building project because nation-building symbols were employed by the European states then in different historical contexts.

Another criticism about the EU' usage of symbols is that the use of same symbols as national ones may be challenging to create competition. On the contrary, Pantel (1999) maintains that these symbols are not intended to replace or are in competition with national symbols. So, these symbols connote the coexistence of national and EU symbols, the interpretation and internalization of which depend on their compatibility with national symbols and individuals' attitudes toward the European project. In a similar opinion, Graham (1998:42-43) also argues that "the successful integration of Europe might demand an iconography of identity that would complement, but not necessarily replace national, regional and local identities." Within this framework, it can be said that the EU symbols might contribute to the creation and enhancement of

popular allegiance to the EU in case they do not substitute for national and sub-national symbols.

4 CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEANS THROUGH EDUCATION PROGRAMS"

4.1 Introduction to Topic

The relation between education and politics and the role of education as an instrument to implement changes in society has always been important. It is stated in Myers (2006) that global education seeks the ways of adapting students to live in a more globalized world and to be active, associated citizens who contribute to forming a better future. So, it can be inferred that one of the reflections of globalization is international education programs. Particularly in Europe education has constantly been used as a tool in the process of collective identity construction known as 'we feeling'. For this purpose in EU, during the years of 90s, there have been many efforts to create a European Community based on a sense of belonging to the European culture. Also, owing to the new policies introduced by European Union many opportunities has been come out that cannot be ignored.

Before going to these latest developments we should mention the previous education actions that occupied the European continent. Firstly, the gradual development of educational systems in European countries can be traced back to the middle ages. In the fifteenth century, there were cathedral schools, universities, and municipal schools in Europe. The first universities, the most prominent of which were the Bologna University (1158) and the Paris University (1180), had been founded in the late 12th century. In the late 17th century, there were more than a hundred of universities affecting intellectual life in Europe (Rothman, 1970). As a result of endless power struggle between the Ecclesiastic world and the Monarchs, these institutions were respected and supported by the both contesting sides. In this period, there were also 'professional schools' and 'secular institutions' seeking mostly general education goals (ibid: 236). All these educational institutions differed from modern schools in many major ways. For example, attending these schools was not compulsory, and only a limited group of people who were trained as priest or lawyer to work for the Church and the Monarchy could benefit from higher education (Ramirez and Boli, 1997:178-179).

It should be mentioned that here, none of the European countries have provided primary education to all its citizens until the middle of the 18th century when Austria and Prussia instituted systems of compulsory attendance. However, the results were short of expectations. Yet, the literacy rates increased to a certain extent due to the religious reformers attempts to teach the poor how to read and write. Their aim was to increase obedience to divine and secular authority. Therefore, it can be said that until the nation-building process of the states, there was no one type of mass education in any country which could have an impact on the construction of collective identities of all men and women from different classes. Instead education was both class and gender based strengthening the already existing 'type' and 'role' identities of people.

With the beginning of the late 19's, saw education gradually becoming an important policy field due to the severe economic crises in the '80s as well as rising economic challenges and competition. The Community that did not pay particular attention to the education at the beginning, started developing and implementing innovative projects in fields of education and training. The evolution of European education policy passed through succession of distinctive stages. To summarize the main points, in the 70s, the Community made a quiet promising beginning in this field by establishing two organizations centered on educational issues. In 1974, the Education Committee was founded by the Ministers of Education. In the 80s, 'Europeanization' was highlighted in the resolutions of the Ministers of Education. More importantly, the Commission was allowed to implement education programs, and thereby the first generation education programs known as Comett, Erasmus and Lingua were launched in this decade.

All these policies were not sufficient to reach the goals. Being restricted in supplementing and supporting the Member States in their education policy, the Community, on the other hand, sought to create alternative ways of adding a 'European dimension' to education. As for its content, European dimension in education encompasses the following purposes: 'exchange schemes and opportunities to learn abroad; multinational education, training and youth

partnerships; innovative teaching and learning projects; networks of academic and professional expertise; a framework to address across the-border issues, such as new technologies in education and the international recognition of qualifications; a platform for dialogue and consultation with a view to comparisons, benchmarking policy-making'.

In order to carry out these policy objectives, EU has developed a number of tools as previously mentioned such as 'Community action programs like Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci' and 'Community legislation' fostering cooperation between the Member States. The former is devoted to promoting the mobility of people, ideas and products within the Member States, and the latter intends to enhance cooperation between the Member States on preparing recommendations and communications, for example on assessing the quality of school or university education, work documents.

Another important point that should be mentioned regarding the education policy in the EU is that economic incentives and global challenges have stimulated demands for further cooperation on education. Considering the efforts to create a single European economic area the Member States are highly motivated by strong desire to make it as the 'most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion' as put forward in the Lisbon Special European Council (McCann, 2010).

The Community priorities in education policy are 'access to education, equality of opportunity, development of qualifications, training and retraining projects and the mobility of students and professional workers.' (Tulasiewicz and Brock, 1999:29). Consequently, the education–industry links are notably highlighted. For example, the action program aimed at encouraging mobility such as Lingua, which improves the foreign languages of students or workers can, and Leonardo, whose major concerns are improvement of the quality of vocational education, promotion of the innovative techniques in training programs and support for language skills in vocational training (Jones, 1996:228) are in the interests of the EU (Tulasiewicz and Brock, 1999:28).

However, despite the great efforts of EU to increase the mobility, the fact that qualifications and competencies obtained in other member states may not be accepted still remains a serious obstacle to enhancement of the Community-led programs for fostering mobility. Thus, to deal with these problems, the EU has developed new mechanisms such as the Network of National Recognition Information Centers regarding transparency and recognition of degrees and qualifications for academic purposes.

As a result, the member states have enhanced the cooperation areas, so that they could compete with their rivals by improving their educational standards; particularly in the field of higher education. In the beginning of the new millennium, the EU has included the Lisbon strategy in its long-term goal. Lisbon strategy aims at EU 'becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion'. To make a general assessment of the gradual development of the European education policy, it can be concluded that in each decade, the education policy was shaped in conformity with the key issues of that decade. In the 80s, there were economic motivations for cooperating in educational issues. In the 90s and the third millennium, the path-breaking globalization and the ambitious goals of becoming knowledge-based economy and information society have become the very determinants of education policy. As a last word, education until 21th century has rarely been addressed as a policy area contributing to constructing a common education identity. For this reason, the aim of creating an overarching European identity seems far from being an agenda setter in the field of educational policy.

4.2 European Identity and European Education Policies

Education is crucial to the further development of European political integration, which has been reiterated as an end goal since the mid-90s. At this point, it should be noted that this goal will be achieved to a great extent if both a sense of Europeanness and political identification of the peoples of Europe with the idea of politically

integrated Europe are created (Green, 2000). However, the concepts of European citizenship and European identity, which are both indispensable to the solution of legitimacy problem and of the fulfillment of European political integration, have been recently discussed. But education is of vital importance for the development of the concepts of European identity and European citizenship, which could be a solution to the legitimacy problem of the Union and the fulfillment of its political integration because the creation of 'demos' has remained as a missing ingredient in the political integration process of the Union (Toksoz, 2008)

Regarding the education issue, as mentioned in the previous section, education had played a salient role in the national identity formation during the 18th and 19th centuries. Its noteworthy impact on the political socialization process and on the national identity formation were indisputable. For this reason, this historical and functional connection between education and political socialization mechanism seems to have been ignored due to several reasons, mainly the reluctance of member states to share their excessive monopoly on educational matters with the European institutions (Walkenhorst, 2004). This connection should be used more effectively in the construction of an overriding European identity for the sake of the future of European Union. Firstly, as stated by Pantel (1999:46), "the existence of an overarching European identity is essential for its legitimation". Although the European integration has been gradually progressing, the creation of its people remained a missing ingredient in the process (Shore, 2000). Indeed, neither the question of public support nor the inexistence of a sense of Europeanness was the point under consideration for European elites. The very reason of this negligence was due to its characteristic as an elite–driven project (Ham, 2000). Accordingly, the distance between European institutions and the population results in questioning of the legitimacy of European policies.

Having realized this significant deficiency, European politicians have begun to pay particular attention to the culture and identity since the mid- 80s. In line with cultural reawakening, the importance of education has also gained ground since the 80s. For example, several educational programs and projects have been launched, they chiefly

focused on vocational education aiming at enabling workers to live and work in different European countries. However, as stated by Nevola (2001:340), "over emphasis on the educational dimension in this manner may lose sight of the objective creating a sense of European collective identity." The primary reason behind this preference is being a highly sensitive issue for nation states (Walkenhorst, 2004). As it is seen in the construction of national identities, schooling is vital to produce 'nationals' due to two reasons: development of feeling of being national and realization of political socialization (ibid). Given this important point, European Union lacks such a crucial instrument in identity building that it cannot compete with national education systems; therefore, it has to rely on a collection of initiatives instead of a structural approach in educational matters, which is solely dominated, by national systems of the member states (Walkenhorst, 2004:5).

Second, the schools have been patent instruments of political socialization among the young people. There are three underlying reasons behind the power of national education systems (ibid): first, pupils are given political education when they are at the right age to develop a political consciousness. Another reason is that education is compulsory for all which makes all the children participate in education. Lastly, the state can control the whole society by turning the children into politically conscious citizens, as today's children are tomorrow's adults. Thereby, each pupil who is obliged to learn national curriculum is supposed to assimilate both national values and national interests (ibid). As compared to the national governments, since EU does not possess a union-wide education system, European values and a European consciousness can be scarcely disseminated throughout the Union. Moreover, EU's influence on the formation of European citizenship lags behind that of national states. This is because, though the concept of European citizenship is introduced in the Maastricht Treaty in details, the active citizenship is not at the expected levels for the solution of the problem of democratic deficit (ibid).

On the other hand, with the establishment of the three pillars structure, EU has been going towards a fully-fledged political union, which requires a new regime and source of sovereignty (Schlesinger, 1994:38). The need for a higher political

identification of European people with EU has been steadily growing as the European competence extends to the touchy realms of state sovereignty (Ham, 2000). There is an increasing transfer of sovereignty from nation-states to the EU level, but people mostly remain loyal to their nation states rather than EU (Shore, 2000). In brief, the nonexistence of an accessible European identity puts the future of European integration into grave jeopardy.

The above literature clearly shows that adding a European dimension into national education system of the member states have not been very successful because of the fact education policies are focused on the nationalism approaches. However there have been many important attempts that should not be disregarded. One of the first projects was to rewrite the history books that aimed at eliminating the expressions narrating hatred and hostility towards other European nations. That was a substantial point to construct a new understanding built on peace. A sense of common fate and history are reproduced through history textbooks in which the past of that nation is rewritten from the point of European view.

Second important attempt was the language policy of European Union to seek to create a multicultural and multi linguistic space within the union. As mentioned, there have been many policies for both young and adults to learn or improve another European language, which led to more mobility of Europeans. In addition to the emphasis on the idea of a shared past, it was aimed to enable Europeans to express themselves in another language rather than their mother tongue.

And the most significant attempt was to introduce the Europeanization process. This process was initiated in higher education with the establishment of the Single Market due to the economic considerations of the member states. With this attempt, border controls between most European countries disappeared, and travelling to and living in other European countries became easier, Europeans have more chances than ever to interact with each other and, this in turn facilitates to develop a common identity.

Nonetheless European Union has long been interested in utilizing education-related policies in order to promote a sense of European identity amongst Europeans. Sigalas

(2010) claims that this initiative for an intra-European student exchange program sprang from the same pool of ideas, conceived in the 1970s and 1980s, that eventually led to a European Community strategy with the aim of a 'People's Europe'. Sigalas mentions of the aim of European Commission such as;

> *"By getting young Europeans used to the idea of living together and working towards the same goal, the Commission hoped to lay the foundations of a self-sustainable European integration process. It was anticipated that graduates with first-hand experience of life in another European country would not hesitate to cooperate in the future with their peers across borders, and they would come to accept 'intra-Community cooperation' as a natural line of action). Furthermore, it was expected that the study abroad experience would allow students to interact with other Europeans, which in turn would consolidate a 'People's Europe (2010:243)"*

According to Maastrich Treaty, the principal objective of the European Dimension is to stimulate the awareness of what is conceived as a European culture and common heritage, and to encourage the student body to feel inclined to identify itself as European. It was specifically mentioned in Marin's studies "particular efforts to introduce the European identity in education could not, by any means, be detrimental to the specific national or regional identities. The main purpose is to respect regional and national diversity as well as to promote a common cultural heritage (ed. Gomez, 2003:84)". Moreover, European education projects, identities and feelings play an essential role in the development of citizenship and the learning of an active citizenship (ibid).

Johansson (2007) explains that the main reason of starting all these education policies related to being "a good European". According to him, the quality of education will be raised if students and teachers partake in a mobility scheme and in addition they will become more competitive on the job-market and will contribute to the competitiveness of the Member State economy. The result of this idea of quality is that a 'Good European' is constructed to be a citizen who partakes in mobility to

gain quality education an issue which is further discussed in chapter six in relation to the construction of a civic form of European identity. Jacobs and Maier (1998) argues also that receiving education and even looking for a job in another European countries helps the creation of new Europeans and construction of European identity.

In conclusion, citizens from different member states can learn more from each other and feel more European as a result of European policies and nation-states efforts. International becomes more interconnected with intercultural; where crossing borders is no longer an absolute must but only a plus to get an international and intercultural experience. (De Wit, 2005). Krzaklewska and Krupnik (2007) argued, that European students should be prepared as early as possible to cope with cultural differences. And to aid this, students can be sent abroad through international Exchange programs. Mobility of people and resources in higher education of today has a distinct role to develop intercultural dialogue within academia, to discuss cultural values and confront the worldviews. This process of cultural exchange at the individual level has a huge impact on one's value system.

4.2.1 Socrates Program

Inspired by Socrates, the Greek philosopher with a humanist vision of the world and fighting against dogmatism, the Community's education program was given his name Socrates, the principal Community educational action program, was founded in 1995 under Articles 149 and 150 EC with a view to enrich "the European dimension in education at all levels so as to strengthen the spirit of European citizenship, drawing on the cultural heritage of each Member State" and to foster "a quantitative and qualitative improvement of the knowledge of the languages of the European Union ... leading to greater understanding and solidarity between the peoples of the European Union (European Parliament, 1995)."

The most remarkable changes of mobility under the Socrates were related in the field of management. With Socrates, each higher education institution had to present one application involving all its exchange and cooperation activities instead of presenting

the applications by networks of cooperating departments. Thus, the base for "Institutional Contract" between the European Commission and the individual institution of higher education constituted. Likewise, bilateral cooperation contracts between partner institutions substituted the inter-university contracts between networks of departments. As a consequence, higher education institution applying for Socrates was expected to keep and provide on request written traces of the cooperation that had been built between it and other European institutions. In addition to these, each higher education institution presenting an application for Socrates support was asked for including a European Policy Statement in its application with the aim of providing a framework for all the actual European activities to be implemented by the applying institution and describing the role Socrates support in this framework (Schomburg and Teichler, 2009).

The fundamentals of Socrates are life-long education and training as recognized by the extraordinary Luxembourg European Council on employment. Socrates, involves 31 countries including Turkey, and stresses "the multi-cultural character of Europe as one of the cornerstones of active citizenship" and seeks to create a "Europe of knowledge," to promote language learning and to encourage innovation and mobility (European Commission).

4.2.2 Comenius Program

Named after Comenius (1592 -1670), who was an educator and universalist working for peace and unity between nation the Comenius program aims at developing understandings of and between diverse European cultures and cultivating the notion of active European citizenship through enhancement of European dimension, improvement of the quality of education, exchanges and cooperation between schools in different countries, foreign language learning and development of use of Information and communication technology and pedagogical approaches (European Commission, 2014).

Projects funded under the Comenius program can be about learning the national history, culture, heritage, identity, customs, and language of another country through intercultural dialogue or art works; enabling the pupils and community living in an isolated rural area to meet their European neighbors and enlarge their horizons through intercultural educational activities; enhancement of regional identity and active citizenship; fight against racism and xenophobia via intercultural education and multimedia; and acquisition of a common cultural strategy leading to acceptance and reflection on European identity (European Commission, 2014).

4.2.3 Grundtvig Program

As a Danish theologian, writer, philosopher and educator, Nicolai Grundtvig had a profound influence on not only the Danish cultural life but also on the education system of this country. For him, education was an instrument both giving people their dignity and making them active participants in social life. Thus, he saw learning as an activity continuing one's entire life. Deeply affected by his far-reaching ideas, an adult education system called as 'folk high-schools' was established in Denmark (European Commission, 2014).

The last chain of the school education, named after Grundtvig, operates in the field of adult education. The subjects of projects financed under the Grundtvig program include, for instance, the promotion of intercultural awareness and active European citizenship through foreign language learning or through international voluntary service, further integration of immigrants or empowering women to active European citizenship by developing curricula on European politics and policies (European Commission, 2014).

The Grundtvig program is considered what can be done to help not only the well-educated, healthy and wealthy seniors but everyone aged 50 and over to remain more actively involved in their community and adopt healthier lifestyles. Access to continuing education and training is key for everyone including the over 50s. Special

attention will need be paid to those facing barriers to learning: women, informal careers, people with low education and low income, people living in rural areas, older migrants and others (ibid).

4.2.4 Lingua Program

The Lingua Program a multiannual scheme created by the European Commission in 1989, aimed at increasing the quality of language teaching and learning, promoting lifelong learning and encouraging and supporting linguistic diversity throughout the community by encouraging and facilitating the mobility of students and teachers to obtain foreign language education. The actions under Lingua sought to amalgamate language-learning methodologies with raising awareness of cultural and linguistic diversity. Besides, some projects targeted the promotion of European citizenship through language learning or arousing an interest in learning a foreign language (European Commission, 2014)

The national languages of the European countries and of the candidate countries participating in mobility program are also eligible to participate. Particular attention is paid to the development of skills in the less widely used and less taught official Community languages.

4.2.5 Minerva Program

Minerva is directed towards open and distance learning via information and communication technology. For example, the theme of one Minerva project was European citizenship and European identity which was to be promoted through teleconferencing between five schools in the UK, Greece, Denmark and Netherlands and thereby presentation of drawings, videos of the related countries to each other (European Commission, 2014).

The Minerva program aim is to promote access to improved methods and educational resources as well as to results and best practices in this field. According to European Commission the aims of the program are; to promote understanding among teachers, learners, decision- for education, as well as the critical and responsible use of ICT for educational purposes, to ensure that pedagogical considerations are given proper weight in the development of ICT and multimedia-based educational products and services and to promote access to improved methods and educational resources as well as to results and best practices in this field (European Commission, 2014).

4.2.6 Leonardo Program

Leonardo focuses on vocational education and training under Article 150 EC. The financed projects include themes such as vocational language training in specific sectors to provide employment mobility, multilingual and intercultural communication to facilitate mobility and integration of young graduates or use of advanced methodologies and self-assessment materials to increase language competencies of those people participating in international peacekeeping operations (European Commission, 2014)

The program aims to enhance the competitiveness of the European labor market by helping European citizens to acquire new skills, knowledge and qualifications and have them recognized across borders. It also supports innovations and improvements in vocational education and training systems and practices.

4.2.7 Jean Monnet Action

Jean Monnet Action gets its name from Jean Omer Marie Gabriel Monnet who was a famous French political economist and diplomat and an influential supporter of European unity as he is considered as one of the founding fathers of the European Union.

Jean Monnet Action, launched in 1990, was changed to a program under the lifelong learning program. Its' objective is to support European Integration Studies in higher education institutions in 72 countries through Jean Monnet Chairs, Centers of Excellence, teaching modules, multilateral research groups and so forth. Jean Monnet program contributed to increased knowledge of subjects like European constitutional law, various publications on European integration or taught modules on European identity. Between 1990 and 2011, the Jean Monnet Program has helped to set up approximately 3,700 projects in the field of European integration studies, including 165 Jean Monnet European Centers of Excellence, 879 Chairs and 2,139 permanent courses and European modules. (European Commission, 2014).

European integration studies are defined as the analysis of the origins and evolution of the European Communities and the European Union in all its aspects. They cover both the internal and external dimension of European integration, including the European Union's role in the dialogue between peoples and cultures and the European Union's role and perception in the world.

4.2.8 Eurydice

The Eurydice network supports and facilitates European cooperation in the field of lifelong learning by providing information on education systems and policies in 38 countries and by producing studies on issues common to European education systems.

European level decision-makers, in the form of the European Council, mentioned the need for a network for the exchange of information and experience in organizing higher education as early as 1976 but it was not until 1980 that Eurydice was created and became "one of the strategic mechanisms established by the Commission and the European Union Member States to boost cooperation by improving understanding of systems and policies. Further, on the issue of internal monitoring, in 1989 the Commission issued a communication where it mentioned the introduction of a computerized database concerning Erasmus students (European Commission, 2014).

4.2.9 Erasmus Program

As a theologian, philosopher and humanist striving for defeating dogmatism, Erasmus was the forerunner of cosmopolitan intellectuals. He spent most of his life in different parts of Europe in search of knowledge and experience, which could only be created through contacts with different cultures. Inspired by both his material and spiritual contributions to higher education, the first important community action program in higher education was named after Erasmus of Rotterdam (European Commission, 2014).

Erasmus is the world's most successful student mobility program. Since it began in 1987-88, the Erasmus program has provided over three million European students with the opportunity to go abroad and study at a higher education institution or train in a company. In 2012-13 students accounted for around 80 % of the annual Erasmus budget. The program offers students the possibility of studying at another higher education institution. Erasmus Student Mobility for Studies, which is the most common action, enables students to spend a study period of 3 to 12 months abroad. It aims to provide students with the opportunity of studying in another country, to promote cooperation between institutions and help enrich their educational environment, and to contribute to building a pool of well qualified, open minded and internationally experienced young people.

Although best known for providing university students the opportunity to spend one or two exchange semesters abroad at one of the universities participating in the program, Erasmus also offers other mobility activities such as university staff exchange, student mobility placements (internships in companies or organizations abroad) or teaching opportunities for business staff at higher education institutions. This is definitely worth mentioning, since a total of 300,000 staff exchanges have been supported during the past 15 years10. Concerning the placements, a total number of 125,000 students did an internship abroad between 2007 and 2011 (European Commission, 2014).

As Erasmus program is one of the cornerstone of this study, not only the effects of Erasmus program on identity but also the historical background of the Erasmus program, the role of Erasmus in higher education, the Erasmus teaching staff mobility program and prior studies related to Erasmus teaching staff mobility have been explained in detail in this part.

4.2.9.1 The History of the Erasmus Program

The European Economic Community was established in 1950s and at first it touched upon educational matters only in the fields of vocational and the transition from education to employment. When Higher Education became to take part in European agenda, one of the first activities was to support student mobility. To that end, as a pilot program, the Joint Study Programs was founded in 1976 and it remained in the agenda more than ten years. The Joint Study Programs gave financial support for only one year to the networks of departments and some funds on a moderate scale to the mobility students. The Joint Study Programs commonly was successful in terms of building a beneficial academic and administrative environment for student exchange between cooperating departments of higher education institutions in different countries. Nevertheless, the limited time span of institutional support and extra expenses during the study periods constituted impediments for an extensive success (Schomburg and Teichler, 2009).

Immediately afterwards, Erasmus program began in 1987. Its name is not only the name of the Dutch humanist, Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus (1466-1536), but also acronym for European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students. The aim of Erasmus is to increase the quantity of European higher education activities and to extend their scope (Schomburg and Teichler, 2009).

4.2.9.1.1   Erasmus Program after 2006

The European Commission adopted proposals for the new generation of programs in the education, youth, culture and audiovisual fields on 14 July 2004. The

Commission has been preparing the post-2006 future of the Community action programs because the existing programs in the field of mobility and co-operation in education and training were coming to a close at the end of 2006 (European Commissions, 2015). The Commission has offered to run the new generation programs from 2007 to 2013 and 2013 to 2018. The Council of Ministers and the European Parliament approved the proposal before the end of 2005 and before 2013. (ibid)

New approvals also brought new dimensions. Firstly, The Integrated Program divided into four sectorial programs: the Comenius Program for school education, the Erasmus Program for all forms of learning at the university level, the Leonardo da Vinci Program for initial and continuing vocational education and training, and the Grundtvig Program for adult education. The student participants of the Erasmus Program are projected to be at least three and half million by 2015.

The Bologna (higher education) and Copenhagen (vocational training) strategies, intended to strengthen the coherence and quality of European policies in their respective fields, recognize the role played by Community policies. In response to public consultation, which showed that current programs were too complicated, this integrated program will be more flexible and easier to access. It will be heavily decentralized, with 80% of the funds administered by national agencies in the participating countries (Graf, 2013).

The creation of a coherent, compatible and attractive European higher education area in accordance with the Bologna declaration of 1999 is the main structural means of meeting these challenges and increasingly has involved the Community in recent years. This is evident in fields such as quality assurance, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), the promotion of mobility and the European dimension of education.

The most visible proposed change to the Erasmus Program is a very substantial increase in student and teacher mobility. Before 2006, just over 200,000 students participate in Erasmus mobility annually. Under the new program, that rate increased

to some 375,000 per year, and hit the target of three and a one million Erasmus students by 2013 (European Commission).

At its meeting in Lisbon in March 2000, the European Council agreed on a strategic target "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion" for 2010. (European Commission). These programs also will contribute to achieving the Lisbon objective, namely of making Europe the most competitive knowledge-based economy by 2020.

These require many changes but especially on education programs. The approach in the area of education and training was stated as an open method of coordination. The idea behind the open method of coordination is improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems in the EU, facilitating the access of all to education and training systems, and opening up education and training systems to the wider world (ibid).

On 14 February 2002, an objectives report was adopted in Stockholm. This was the first official document sketching a comprehensive and coherent European approach to national education and training policies in the EU. Thirteen objectives were accepted as the future goals of the education and training as follows (ibid):

Improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems in the EU;

-Improving education and training for teachers and trainers,

-Developing skills for the knowledge society,

-Ensuring access to ICT for everyone,

-Increasing recruitment to scientific and technical studies, - Making the best use of resources,

Facilitating the access of all to education and training systems;

-Creating an open learning environment,

-Making learning more attractive,

-Supporting active citizenship, equal opportunities and social cohesion

Opening up education and training systems to the wider world;

-Strengthening the links with work and research and society at large,

-Developing the spirit of enterprise,

-Improving foreign language learning,

-Increasing mobility and exchange,

-Strengthening European cooperation.

The European Union already has a solid basis in this field. The Socrates, Leonardo and Youth Programs provide good examples of this, even though concrete experience shows that the potential of mobility as an instrument towards the Lisbon goals is still far from being used to the full extent. The mobility action plan approved by the Nice European Council, the recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council on mobility and the work on new European labor markets are signals showing that mobility now receives high political recognition.

However, it is the Commission's intention not to maintain the popular "Socrates" label, the umbrella name for the current Community action program in the field of education. Since the Socrates program includes sub-programs called Comenius, Erasmus, Grundtvig, Lingua and Minerva, this creates a degree of confusion through "double-branding." The other names, Lingua (language teaching and learning) and

Minerva (Information and communication technologies in education), also will disappear since the activities linked to language learning and ICT largely will be mainstreamed under the new Integrated Program.

In short, the Commission decided to avoid a specific label for the "umbrella program" and to focus on brand names for the specific sub-programs, which are relevant for applicants and future beneficiaries.

New actions were defined under the Erasmus Program. They were:

1. Special mobility to support students enrolled on Joint Masters programs abroad,

2. Long-term teacher mobility (new full teaching program combined with research),

3. New under Erasmus: Incorporation of advanced vocational placements formerly supported under Leonardo and development of links to industry. (Teichler, 2001:206)

The next generation of a EU program in the field of lifelong learning was proposed on 14 July 2004. The major changes were made based on the previous programs experience and taking into account new policy developments. Four programs in the field of lifelong learning were integrated and proposed for the period 2007-2013. The European Commission proposed to regroup its current activities into two frames in the field of Education and Training for 2007-2013.

One is a single and unique integrated program for education and lifelong learning for the Members States, EFTA countries and the candidate countries and the other one is the Tempus Plus. The Comenius Program on school education, the Erasmus Program on higher education, the Leonardo da Vinci Program on vocational training and the Grundtvig Program on adult education were stated under this group. The proposal also incorporates a Jean Monnet Program to support action related to European integration and European institutions and associations acting in the field of education and training.

The aim of the new program is to contribute through lifelong learning to the development of the Community as an advanced knowledge society, with sustainable economic development, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. It aims to foster interaction, cooperation and mobility between education and training systems within the Community so that they become a world quality reference.

In a new stage of Erasmus, introduced various education programs aimed at managerial effectiveness and based on mutual exchange of opinions on education activities from different sectors for mutual benefit. Besides student mobility, teaching staff mobility and curricular innovation were encouraged in order to improve European dimension in higher education and make non-mobile students benefit from the program. The center of the higher education institutions called Inter-University Co-operation Programs was responsible for administrating student mobility instead of the networks of cooperating departments previously and European Commission and individual education institutions put an ended for Institutional Contracts and became partners (Enders, 1998).

Another aspect of program is financial. This type of support for study in Europe has been the most notable component of the Erasmus program. More than half of the Erasmus funds were allocated to student mobility grants, which cover the additional expenses for study abroad. In addition to this, the European Commission supported the departments included in student exchange by giving some funds. There was also support for additional actions such as staff exchange, especially teaching staff mobility, as well as for curriculum development, short intensive programs and some other activities. 1989/90 provided funds provided to departments cooperating in the establishment of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) (Schomburg and Teichler, 2009). As the flagship among the various newly emerging educational programs of the European Union, Erasmus became the best student mobility program comparing the other programs established previously, despite the fact that at first the financial base did not achieved the volume required for realizing the ambitious purpose at first set by the European Community of giving support for a temporary

148

study period in another European country of 10 percent of students in higher education.

4.2.9.2 Erasmus Program and Contribution to European We-Feeling

The most obvious proof of the existence of a common European Union higher education policy are the several education programs which have become very important symbols for European integration. As was expressed in the beginning of the chapter, Erasmus students contribute to shaping a common European identity or a European awareness. Students who participate in exchange programs come from different environments and cultures. These differences sometimes create intercultural barriers, which shall be reviewed in detail in this study and also stereotypes and prejudices. On the other hand, little is known about the effect so this development on the attitudes of the students involved. Positive outcomes are assumed rather than established. Moreover, even at the higher education level, the number of students involved is still very much a minority of the total population. According to Swing "at the lower level so education and in relation to non-formal education, the direct impact of the exchange programs has so far remained marginal, to say the least" (Swing, 2000:258).

The European Union has been widening its borders continuously and now it has 33 countries including candidates. From all these countries, a great number of individuals participate in European Exchange programs like Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci, Grundtvig and Jean Monnet. S i n c e, the start of Erasmus, more than 3 million people have been part of the program. Every year, over 300,000 students take advantage of this mobility program. This program is an example of an educational program with clear objectives to bring about a higher degree of the European dimension across cultures. The achievements of the program, in search for a quality European higher education coupled with the ability to attract people from all over the world - clearly relate to the issue of European identity.

The Erasmus program is now well established. Every year a greater number of higher education institutions enroll and higher number of departments within the institutions are created. As a result, the number of higher education students studying part of their courses in at least one European Union country other than their home base has increased during the past decade. Erasmus exchange program, which provides a great chance for mobility in Europe is a proof of a successful way of stimulating higher education cooperation. Erasmus has shown constant growth and development ever since its foundation, including an increasing number of universities and other institution so higher education (Ryba, 2000).

Erasmus mobility program is the most important community program in the field of higher education. Some scholars question the positive effects of Erasmus on the strengthening of European identity and argue that such contact through exchanges only increases sympathy towards the country of Erasmus partner institution. However there have been several studies showing that Erasmus participants tend to identify as European (Jacobs and Maier 1998, Sigalas 2010, Mitchell 2012). Erasmus students use their time abroad to engage in meaningful contact with other Europeans and they become more aware of and interested in Europe and other Europeans. As a result, they identify themselves as European. Moreover because of the cultural interaction that students experience at the center of foreign study sojourn, participation has often been defined as a civic experience. Bringing students together from all over the Europe to have a shared experience is eventually contributing in shaping participants' attitudes about Europe and they will improve their own sense of European identity.

Erasmus experience truly promotes cross-border interaction and deep relationship between different national groups so it is acceptable to believe that it might be linked with identity change. Fligstein explains that Erasmus creates opportunity to interact with other European students: "when students go abroad and form friendships with other Europeans, they recognize the commonalities they share, boundaries between in-group and out-group are blurred and ultimately they see themselves more as European and less as having merely national identity" (2008:139).

Mitchell (2012) claims that in context of Erasmus program, fewer studies have investigated the civic aspects of the program in contrast to wealth of scholarship on the academic and economic aspects. According to her "Erasmus study affects participants' European attachment and identity. Even with absence of conclusive empirical evidence, several works on European identity have argued that Erasmus participation is a means of enhancing European identity and support for the EU (2012:493)." However in the last couple of years, there have been studies on the subject especially in the perspective of European identity.

Emmanuel Sigalas (2010) investigates the effects of an Erasmus exchange program on the student's experience abroad and if this experience and interpersonal contact promotes a European identity. He studied the effect using a two-wave longitudinal survey performed on two Erasmus students who studied in Europe and England. Sigalas discovered in his paired sample test, that studying abroad led to increased socializing with other Europeans, while contact with host country students remained limited. The result showed that Erasmus does not strengthen participants' European identity; on the contrary, it can have an adverse effect on it. Nevertheless, the analysis revealed increased socializing with Europeans has a positive impact on European identity. He also found that Erasmus sojourn promotes high-quality communication mostly between students of the same nationality.

Another study conducted by Murphy-Lejeune (2002) has also found same results. She analyzed mobility of the Erasmus students by using semi-structured interviews to generalize about the personal-psychological impact of a foreign study sojourn. She concluded that those participants she interviewed rarely interacted with students from their host country. Instead, they often associated primarily with their ethnic group or co-nationals.

From the statements and researches until now, we understand that Erasmus participation as a civic experience has important theoretical grounding but it has been weakly verified by empirical evidence. Most of the studies have explored the relationship between Erasmus participation and European identity or attachment to

European Union but the findings are not so clear to comprehend. Some studies find correlation between Erasmus experience and European identity while others oppose this claims.

But this experience has very important role on destroying stereotypes and prejudices through contact not only with the nationals of the country of the host Erasmus Partner University but also other Europeans coming from other partner universities including those in non-EU states. It may be cliché but the Erasmus youth of today will shape the reality of tomorrow and this generation is called Erasmus Generation already. They will create the Europe of coming few decades. They are soon to be European elite shaping the future of the continent and yet we know very little about their views on this future.

No doubt, European Union educational and training policies and programs have a major cultural aspect. The inclusion of European dimension, active European citizenship, European identity, intercultural dialogue, foreign language learning, mobility of cultural practitioners, respect for minority cultures, eradication of racism and xenophobia into the themes of Community activities demonstrate that such policies and programs are not only directed towards an advanced knowledge-based economy and increased mobility and employment in the union, but also have important inclinations of and implications for European cultural integration.

5 CASE ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to specify the research's objectives, methodology and methods, to explain how data collection and analysis have taken place, to make the role of the researcher and his relationship with the interviewees clear, and more clarify the categories that were used for analyzing the data. In this chapter, the study delineates the type of the research that was intended in relation to its researches questions, the reasons why this study needed a qualitative method, necessity of the research and the characteristic of this study.

The study basically makes an attempt to fill some of the missing points of the current literature by identifying the core, theoretically achieved assumptions about the relations between European identity and Erasmus students –e.g. that Erasmus students engage in substantive contact with other Europeans, become more interested in Europe and other Europeans as a result, they self-identify themselves as Europeans – and investigate if empirical evidence supports these claims.

Until now, Erasmus has become the largest and the most successful exchange program organization in Europe and it is expanding to all over the world. Officials and scholars agree that it is and it was always more than just an educational program. Exchange journeys have reached the status of a social and cultural phenomenon (Sigalas, 2009). Just in 2012-2013 academic year 268.143 student have participated in the program (European Comission, 2014) and they had the opportunity to meet and interact with different people from different cultures, to improve their talents on language and intercultural skills, to enrich their lives in the academic, personal and professional fields.

As this research mentioned in the chapter two, there have been many studies (Jacobs and Maier 1998, Sigalas 2010, Mitchell 2012) related with the positive effects of Erasmus sojourns as well as some studies that claimed effect of the program is little known especially when it comes to original idea of Erasmus program which is to construct a European identity and the obstacles to keep this target straight (Swing,

2000). As being aware of these studies, this study has aimed to investigate different opinions and motivations by examining not only incoming students but also outgoing ones, in this case Catalan Erasmus students, based on the concepts of European identity, stereotypes, prejudices, nationalism.

It is a new and very important approach adding outgoing Catalan exchange students to the study to reveal the relation between national feelings and European identity as Catalan community is currently on the verge of independence. Theoretical part of this study has already presented whether national identity is conflictive with European identity or coexists and empirical part of this research wished to add Catalan students who have been Erasmus exchange student in his research to understand the effect of national identity on European one and to have a comparison between incoming and outgoing students. Not surprisingly the study unveiled some interesting facts from Catalans' national identity relations with European one but also found out the perspective of incoming students on the subject based on the stereotypes and prejudices.

In addition to incoming and outgoing students data the study also uses the recent Eurobarometer surveys to complement the results of the qualitative study. These surveys means great deal for the studies related to Europe because what passes for public opinion and public support in the European Union consists largely of the answers of European Union citizens to question regularly posed to them in these surveys commissioned and controlled by the European Commission. Besides, Eurobarometer surveys not only enquire about general problem perceptions and attitudes towards the EU but also include diverse of questions about specific policy topic, ranging from nuclear waste disposal to food safety, childcare to feeling of Europe which are somehow the key source of knowing what the European public thinks about specific policy issues and the appropriate political level to deal with them.

As mentioned in the theoretical part, Eurobarometer surveys compose the general aspect for much research as plenty of scholars conducted their studies by taking

advantage of them (Irina, 2012; Antonsich, 2010; Agirdag, Houtte and Phalet, 2015). In this context, this research too benefit from these surveys as a complementary source, which also enable this study to see the compatibility of obtained data.

Main aim of this study is to understand the European identity concept from the perspective of Erasmus exchange students and the research questions guiding the analysis refer to identity-organization, as an identity builder, as highlighted by the identity theories such as: If European Union has been a successful on building identity with its Erasmus program or if European are aware of the identity etc.

In order to answer these questions the research has chosen the qualitative paradigm. This research argues that qualitative approach is more sensible than quantitative approach in studies such as social or communication based because it helps understanding the prospects that are not explicit through statistic or questionnaires. More than that, there are not several qualitative studies on Erasmus students' identity abroad comparing with quantitative ones particularly when it comes to outgoing student experience. Especially financial or institutional perspective of Erasmus experience became the theme of many studies but issues regarding with nationalism, identity and other topics have been ignored.

From this point, the necessity for this study is essential for several reasons. Firstly; there are few empirical qualitative studies to reveal why some people feel more European than others and why some people do not feel even if they live in Europe. The study tries to unveil this gap by investigating many facts starting from European Union to intercultural communication barriers such as stereotypes and prejudices. Besides, the way in which European identity functions in relation to the national sense of self other possible identifications is also analyzed. As discussed in the previous parts of this study, it is believed that social interaction among Erasmus students might lead to attitudinal change and this thesis actually intends to discover if Erasmus students engage in important cross-cultural interaction during their time in accordance with the expectations of European Union.

Secondly the research focus on identity subject from the perspective of young Erasmus exchange students' point of view and tries to understand how Erasmus program has an active role in building European identity. It might be assumed that interaction between exchange students always brings positive outcomes but the awareness of Erasmus students on identity is still unknown. Other than these reasons the study focus on the outgoing Catalan students and unveils their feelings and opinions about identity concept. The study hopes to reveal the close relation between national identity and European one versus Spanish identity as Catalan community recently takes steps on their way to independence. Finally, stereotypes and blatant-subtle prejudices have always been a topic of intercultural communication by the scholars such as Hofstede (1991); Matusitz (2012) but focusing on young educated people, particularly examining subtle prejudices is quite new.

5.2 Objectives

This thesis aims to analyze the identity-building dimension of the process of European Union by using its education programs such as Erasmus exchange sojourn. Education programs of European Union and European identity has been inextricable concepts in the last decades considering the fact that cultural policies play an important role on the construction of identity. It is true that Exchange programs have an effect to strengthen relations among European societies and cross-border mobility has been very effective method to this process especially among young population as stated by Commission (2013) numbers of students participated in the program top over the 3 million but yet still little known about the effect of the program (Swing, 2000). Besides, there is few investigative research has been done in the area of education on European dimension and European identity that involves an explorative approach.

In this context, research questions presented by the study are:

- What are the reasons for participating in the Erasmus exchange program?

- What do Erasmus students think about their own identity?
- What do Erasmus students think about European identity?
- What does being European mean for the Erasmus students?
- What are the positive and negative experiences that participants live through in this program?
- What kinds of changes have happened on students' behavior and opinions as a result of experiencing a different culture?

In this study, the identity issue is not argued separately from Europe and its institutions. Even though identity is a complicated concept, it will be discussed from the students' perspectives. The intention is to derive an aspect of identity from the students' statements in general and also a concept of European identity. According to these purposes, the main and specific objectives as written below.

Main objective of the study:

- To understand European identity concept from the perspective of Erasmus students.

And the specific objectives are:

- To find out if Erasmus students are conscious of European identity
- To discover how Erasmus students see their national identity in relation to a European one.
- To find out students' satisfaction and understanding of Erasmus program to have a clear opinion about outcomes of exchange program.
- If stereotypes and prejudices as intercultural communication barriers are obstacles in the identity construction process based on the fact that Erasmus students live in the intercultural community.
- To investigate if Erasmus, as a most important exchange program, has an effect to build European identity.

- To reveal if Erasmus program is a successful identity builder and fulfills real expectations as targeted by European education programs based on the reflections of students.

5.3 Participants

While more complete and vivid introductions to each participant are provided in the findings and discussion chapter, the basic information about participants is summarized in this part. Primarily the participants of the study are 26 Erasmus exchange students from 9 EU member states and a EU membership candidate country.

It is discussible to include participant from Turkey as a candidate country but it must be said that there are currently 5 candidate countries (Albania, Montenegro, Macedonia, Serbia and Turkey), which are all, accepted European countries and have right to participate in mobility programs. More than that integration policies, as mentioned before is a vital part of togetherness in Europe thus participants from candidate countries should be investigated in the researches regarding Europe and European Union. Besides, one Eurobarometer (European Comission, 2011) surveys revealed that on average, nearly 6 people in 10 (59%) in the Candidate Countries feel that being part of Europe would be a 'good thing' for their country. These numbers showed that support levels tend to be significantly higher in the Candidate Countries than they are in the EU where the average support level is 49%. There is an even clearer difference between the Candidate Countries and the EU in the proportion of people who view membership as a bad thing: three times as many EU citizens (29%) feel this way as in the Candidate Countries (10%).

Correspondingly, 20 of the interviews are incoming students to UPF and 6 of them are outgoing Catalan Erasmus students from UPF. The number of interviews was not predetermined but 24 participants for Triandafyllidou (2008), 26 participants for Grundy and Jameson (2007), 20 participants for Milner and Sinclair (2005) and 35

participants for Abell, Condor and Gibson (2006) who have studies on identity with interviewing method set a precedent for the researcher.

The participants in this study all fit within the demographic category the Eurobarometer surveys classify as "young Europeans," between ages 20-26 which is seen in the list below.

INCOMING STUDENTS

NAME	SEX	COUNTRY	AGE	HOST UNI
BR	F	NETHERLANDS	20	UPF
CL	F	FRANCE	21	UPF
KAR	F	POLAND	23	UPF
FAR	F	ENGLAND	21	UPF
DAN	M	ENGLAND	20	UPF
MAR	F	ITALY	21	UPF
STE	F	ITALY	21	UPF
FLOR	M	GERMANY	24	UPF
BIA	F	ITALY	21	UPF
LUC	F	ENGLAND	21	UPF
YA	M	FRANCE	20	UPF
CI	M	ITALY	21	UPF
DAV	M	ITALY	23	UPF
SHA	F	BELGIUM	23	UPF
MEI	F	GERMANY	22	UPF
MAT	M	GERMANY	26	UPF
VER	F	ENGLAND	20	UPF
FRE	F	ENGLAND	21	UPF
AY	M	TURKEY	24	UPF
GOK	M	TURKEY	21	UPF

Figure 1: Demographic structure of incoming students

OUTGOING STUDENTS

NAME	SEX	COUNTRY	AGE	HOST UNI
OR	M	CAT-SPAIN	22	ST ANDREWS-SCOTLAND
MAR	F	CAT-SPAIN	20	REGENT UNI-ENGLAND
DAN	F	CAT-SPAIN	22	MUNICH BUS-GERMANY
AN	F	CAT-SPAIN	20	ERASMUS UN-HOLLAND
VIC	F	CAT-SPAIN	21	REGENT UNI-ENGLAND
CAR	F	CAT-SPAIN	22	MUNICH BUS-GERMANY

Figure 2: Demographic structure of outgoing students.

5.4 Sampling

Purposeful sampling within qualitative research allows for the in-depth study of the concepts and relationships primary to the project. The selection of information-rich cases is a key factor in qualitative sampling procedures. Indeed, one of the primary distinctions between quantitative and qualitative methods centers on sampling procedures: while quantitative methods rely on representativeness, qualitative methods are driven by the research questions (Patton, 1990:230). As Gay, Mills and Airasian mention, "many potential participants are unwilling to undergo the lengthy demands of participation; sampling in qualitative research is almost always purposive." (2006:230).

As for this one, the sample of this study was defined as the students who were participating in the Erasmus Program. The research separated the samplings of this study according to two scales. First one is European Erasmus students who come to

University of Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona between the years of 2013-2015 and the other one is Catalan students from University of Pompeu Fabra who have been to other European countries between the years of 2014-2015 for their Erasmus experiences.

Making this separation in this research was compulsory for many reasons. First of all Catalan students represent a community with high national feelings but not a country and they have been going through a independency process so it should be evaluated differently and as aimed for this research, Catalan representation offers better answer to question of national identity-European identity relations.

5.5 Method and Instrument

The research described in this study is based on the qualitative paradigm. The purpose of applying qualitative methodology is to describe the nature of a situation, as it exists at the time of the study and to explore the reasons and the results of the particular situation. This attempt allowed the opportunity to gain multiple perspectives of the participants.

One goal of this sort of research is to explore what people think and which variables are important for them. As Gay (et. al, 2006) state, the main idea of qualitative research is to understand the phenomena from the perspectives of the research participants. The research findings are described from that perspective.

But, the real purpose of the qualitative research is defined by Gaskell (2000:41) as "not just counting opinions or people but rather exploring the range of opinions, the different representations of the issue"

> *"Qualitative research is concerned with matters of meaning. Meaning is an elusive term, and one way to treat such elusive matters is to neglect them entirely. Behaviorism took this road. What matters most in behaviorism is what people or animals do, not what doing means to*

162

them. For qualitative researchers and evaluators meaning, though
elusive, still counts. In this sense qualitative researchers are interested
in matters of motive and in the quality of the experience undergone by
those in the situation studied" (Eisner, 1998:35).

Meaning is used in a broad sense, but for this study it can be called the perspectives of the participants. According to Maxwell (2005) the matter is how the participants make sense of the physical events and behavior taking place and how the participants' understanding influences their behavior.

Qualitative inquiries usually study very small numbers of individuals or situations because it is necessary to understand the particular context within which the participants act, and the influence that this context has on their actions. Patton (1990:14) also takes this approach and writes that, "Qualitative methods typically produce a wealth of detailed information about a much smaller number and cases. This increases understanding of cases and situations studied, however reduces generalizability".

It is important to figure out how unique circumstances shape the actions and attitudes of participants or events. The focus is on the process rather than outcomes. The success of a qualitative inquiry is judged by its coherence, insight and instrument utility. The strength of a qualitative inquiry is measured not by described cause and effect relations; qualitative studies employ multiple forms of evidence, and they persuade by reasons (Eisner, 1998). In a qualitative study, "the literature is used to 'frame' the problem in the introduction to the study" (Creswell, 2003:30). That is to say, in a qualitative inquiry, the assumption is learning from the participant so it is important to underline that a researcher should not answer the questions from his or her own standpoint.

According to Maxwell (2005) the goals motivating a study are an important part of qualitative research. The goals help the researcher not to lose sight of what he or she wants to accomplish, as well as shape the study, from the beginning to the end of all steps. Maxwell emphasizes the openness and flexibility of the qualitative inquiry. A

163

researcher can modify his or her study during the research to understand new discoveries and relationships.

As regards to this research, the study is an exploratory one so the aim was to listen to the participants and build an understanding based on their ideas, as Creswell (2003) emphasized for qualitative studies. The conceptual framework of this study was formed while the data were gathered. This framing with contingent and available studies and background literature was the intent to provide a broad look at the themes that were discussed in the study.

Another framework for this study encompasses a broad scope of theories that consider identity in general, the European identity and also the European Union in the construction of the European identity. Education in the European dimension is also largely worked out. Then the Erasmus Program is studied since it is essential for understanding students' perceptions about the Erasmus Program and the European identity. In this case, the situation is to discover the mutual connection between European identity and Erasmus student experience. According to Reymond (1998) qualitative research in particular is very well suited for the task of unfolding the different dimension of a European identity.

In many studies, we observe that data comes from the European Commission's public opinion survey, namely Eurobarometer, deliver some quantitative knowledge about the idea of European identity, but it has not been very successful to give more depth knowledge of what it might mean or not mean to feel European. Surely the analysis of Eurobarometer survey present an important way to gain insight into which people in which countries identify with Europe but still it gives a little clue to understand what being European means. When it comes to European identification, these kinds of surveys can be seen as only surface of what is hidden beneath the surface. For this reason, researcher here focused on more in qualitative method approach and Eurobarometer surveys plays a role in this study to complement existing qualitative research (e.g. Semi-structured interviews).

Sinnot (2005) as well criticized using this survey to get perspective of a bigger picture. He claims that Eurobarometer surveys are not sufficient in terms of measurement and continuity. But these surveys remain an important point of reference because of the fewness of the qualitative researches in the area. Therefore, additional qualitative research is necessary. King and Ruiz-Gelices explained the importance of obtaining the knowledge on Erasmus students' perception and identity by using qualitative approach as they claimed: "a more sophisticated analysis of the personal, social and academic experiences that students undergo during their mobility can be achieved only by in-depth interviewing of international student" (2003:247).

From these aspects, researcher both examined the data from semi-structured interviews and Standard and Flash Eurobarometer surveys and utilized both qualitative content analysis and grounded theory for the research as aspect of collected data to comply with it. Qualitative content analysis is a way as Babbie defines "the study of human communication" (Babbie, 2007). This analysis is a methodology in the social science for studying the content of communication.

This analyzing method started with using the first newspapers at the end of 19th century and analysis was done manually by measuring the number of lines and amount of space given a subject. With the rise of common computing facilities like PCs, computer-based methods of analysis are growing in popularity. Answers to open ended questions, newspaper articles, political party manifestoes, medical records or systematic observations in experiments can all be subject to systematic analysis of textual data. By having contents of communication available in form of machine-readable texts, the input is analyzed for frequencies and coded into categories for building up inferences. Robert Philip Weber (1990:38) notes: "To make valid inferences from the text, it is important that the classification procedure be reliable in the sense of being consistent: Different people should code the same text in the same way".

Qualitative content analysis can involve any kind of analysis where communication content is categorized and classified. According to Holsti (1969:14) this analysis

offers a broad definition of content analysis as "any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages. Holsti groups 15 uses of content analysis into three basic categories:

- Make inferences about the antecedents of a communication
- Describe and make inferences about characteristics of a communication
- Make inferences about the effects of a communication.

More systematic one is introduced by Kimberly A. Neuendorf (2002:44) offering six criteria for content analysis: "Content analysis is a summarizing, quantitative analysis of messages that relies on the scientific method (including attention to objectivity, inter-subjectivity, a priori design, reliability, validity, generalizability and hypothesis testing) and is not limited as to the types of variables that may be measured or the context in which the messages are created or presented."

Weare and Lin examined the potential methodological issues of content analysis and identified problems existing in the processes of sampling, unitization, categorization, and coding. In particular, they recommended that researchers investigate the validity of multiple sampling methods on the web. The goal of sampling is to generate a manageable subset of data from a large population or a sampling frame to represent this population. An ideal sample is a tradeoff between the ease for study and the representativeness of the population. Thus, content analysts should determine how to define a tangible sampling frame, how to draw a representative sample from the sampling frame, and how large the sample size must be to be not only effective but also efficient.

Researcher used this method basically because the data that has been collected was based on knowledge of everyday lived experiences and in this experience communication occupy the first place regarding the changing issues tasted by participants.

As mentioned before, researcher has also applied grounded theory, as it has emerged that summarizing data, which is collected from process line, is important. Grounded

theory is a kind of process analysis method that has the ability to be used extensively over a variety of basic science disciplines. The basic belief that formed this theory is that the theory comes from the data. We also can say in other words, a theory would be grounded in the data that is the reason it is called grounded theory. The method has the meanings of inductive rather than deductive. Hence, the grounded theory approach is a qualitative research method that uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a process. The aim is to develop a process that identifies the major constructs, or categories in grounded theory terms, their relationships, and the context and process.

Grounded theory requires that data is stated as a whole not separate. Data collection, analysis and theory formulation are in relation, and the approach incorporates exact procedures to guide (Charmaz, 2006). Analysis involves three processes, open coding, where data is identified under relevant categories; axial coding, where categories are refined, developed and related; and selective coding, where the core variables, or central category that ties all other categories in the theory together, is identified and related to other categories. Data collection derives from theoretical feedbacks, or sampling on the basis of theoretically relevant subjects. In the early stages of a project, feedbacks of people, sites or documents are used to discover and identify data, which is relevant to the research. These feedbacks involve purposive and systematic procedures. Rather than purposive or systematic feedbacks, later stages involve relational or variational feedback to locate data, which confirms, elaborates and validates relations between categories. The final stage of a project involves separating variables, with deliberate and directed selection to confirm and verify the core category and the theory as a whole (Clarke, 2003).

Grounded theory aims to be an intense method by providing detailed and systematic procedures for data collection of analysis and theory, but it is also concerned with the quality of theory. According to Charmaz (2006) there are some central criteria for a good-grounded theory: it has to be derived from various data and has to be faithful to the everyday reality of the area. It should provide understanding, and be comprehensible to the both people studied and others involved in the area. It should

provide generality and the given data are comprehensive, the comments are conceptual and broad and the theory includes extensive variation (ibid). Theory should have enough to be applicable to a wide variety of contexts in the area. And it should provide control in the sense of stating the conditions under which the theory lies and should provide a basis for comparison in the area.

Grounded theory approaches for generating hypotheses are characterized by the use of a data coding and writing the related information, as well as the use of the comparison method analysis. In the comparison method, the objective of the process is to allow for comparisons of differences and similarities among the units of analysis. The aim is to analyze the similarities and differences of this process and the variable development essential to grounded theory development. Minimizing the differences between these comparisons increases the similarities of information available for developing the basic steps. The variables are explained logically by identifying similar data of comparisons on the diagram steps. To include these variables into theory requires investigating the reason, results and difficulties of these variables (Clarke, 2003).

The basic idea of the grounded theory approach is to read a database and discover variables (called categories, concepts and properties) and their interrelationships. The main objective is achieving the ability to perceive variables and relationships. This ability is affected by a number of things including someone's reading of the literature and someone's use of techniques designed to enhance sensitivity.

As to instrument of the research, the study has been built on model, which used semi-structured interviews with students as a sample of representative of a big universe and the main source of data obtained from semi-structured interviews. A semi-structured interview is flexible, allowing new questions to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says and how each interviewer used follow up questions to elicit further description (Roulston, 2009). The method used in the study is to capture individual differences and also variations from one person to another. According to Patton (1990:278), "qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable and able to be

made explicit". This type of interviews provided to this research a better knowledge and understanding of what these perceptions are, how images and ideas about Europe and the Europeans are formed, analyzed and interpreted, and how people connect them with a European sense of identity.

There are many advantages sides of using this kind of interview method for the studies. Dörnyei (2007:143) argues that with the presence of the interviewer, mutual understanding can be ensured, as the interviewer may rephrase or simplify questions that were not understood by his/her interviewees. As a result, more appropriate answers and, subsequently, more accurate data will be reached. Additionally, this data can be recorded and reviewed several times by the researcher (when necessary) to help producing an accurate interview result.

But there are also some disadvantages as argues by scholars. For instance Hermanowicz (2002:498) remarks that "while semi-structured interviewing is among the most central, revealing and enjoyable methods that one can use in research, it is deceptively difficult". Besides, Hammersley and Gomm (2008:100) add that researchers should remember that: "what people say in an interview will indeed be shaped, to some degree, by the questions they are asked; the conventions about what can be spoken about; by what time they think the interviewer wants; by what they believe he/she would approve or disapprove of".

According to Marshal and Rossman (1989) semi-structure are predetermined questions, and order can be modified based upon the interviewer's perception of what seems most appropriate. Question wording can be changed and explanations given; inappropriate questions for a particular interviewee can be omitted, or additional ones included. According to them, definition of this type of interview provides the advantages or disadvantages.

Strength sides	Weak sides
It is face to face encounter with informants.	Data are open to misinterpretation due to cultural differences.
It obtains large amount of contextual data quickly.	It is dependent upon the cooperation of a small group of key informants.
It facilitates cooperation from research subject.	It is difficult to replicate, procedures are not always explicit or are dependent upon researcher's opportunity or characteristic.
It facilitates access for immediate follow-up data collection for clarification and omissions.	Data are often subject to observer effects; obtrusive and reactive.
It is useful for discovering complex interconnections in social relationship.	It is especially dependent on the honesty of the interviewees.
Data are collected in natural setting.	It is highly dependent upon the researcher's ability to be resourceful, systematic and honest, to control bias.
It is good for obtaining data on non-verbal behavior and communication.	
It facilitates analysis, validity checks and triangulation.	
It facilitates discovery of nuances in culture.	

<table>
<tr><td>It provides background context for more focus on activities, behaviors and events.</td></tr>
<tr><td>It provides flexibility in the formulation of hypotheses.</td></tr>
</table>

Figure 3: Advantages and disadvantages of semi-structured interview method.

To deal with some of the presented weakness above, the research used different techniques. For instance a pilot study has been conducted by using participant observation and semi-structured instruments to get a good grasp of methods. Pilot study has consisted of 3 months of participant observation and 8 semi-structured interviews. It should be mentioned that 5 of these interviewees also used afterwards for the main interview data but none of the others have been used again as a research sources later.

It had to be admitted that during the pilot study the observation process was less systematic and the attention was given to participants who will be interviewed afterwards. In a later stage participant observation became the some sort of core of research planning. During observations it was focused on how participants talked to each other during dinner sessions; what kind of topics were raised in general; how these were discussed; if and what kind of identity claims emerged and in what ways participants related to their 'roots' - in terms of what language they spoke, how they related to their nationality or their country, and how they related to their host country.

The reasons of including participant observation are to see how participant behave and think as they normally do thus evidence will be valid. Besides this method allowed seeing the viewpoint of the participants rather than the researcher. In addition, thanks to participant observation, social interaction of the participants has been observed and the research gained new insights. Applying semi-structured

interview in pilot study also allowed researcher to organize the structure of the questions better to be asked later and allowed bringing up new questions into topic. Thanks to the experiences gained by this work, content of question has been improved as well.

To get over the weakness of semi-structured interviews, the research included more than one interviewee with some of the candidates and researcher checked with interviewees the results of their interviews as well. This process also showed re-contacted participants was more knowledgeable for the questions of the research.

The questions in the interviews were designed considering that peoples' European identity comes from their perceptions of Europe as they are affected by the images that they form as consequences of their personal experience. And the interviews were used to obtain a better understanding of what these perceptions are and how ideas about Europe and Europeans formed and how people connect with a European sense of identity.

Students were asked about their personal experience as Erasmus students. They were asked about living in a different culture and country, their interaction, stereotypes, prejudices by holding the aspect of identity. Different from incoming students Catalan students, as outgoing ones were asked more deeply about their national feelings to find out the relation between national and European identity because of the current situation of Catalonia.

To collect main source of data in semi-structured, researcher utilized convenience sample. As it argued by Dörnyei (2007) convenience sample is a kind of non-probability or nonrandom sampling in which members of the target population, as are selected for the purpose of the study if they meet certain practical criteria, such as geographical proximity, availability at a certain time, easy accessibility, or the willingness to volunteer. Moreover Dörnyei explains that, this sample is chosen mostly by researchers because students of these researchers become the prime examples of convenience sample. In this technique the research uses any subjects that are available to participate in the research study. By applying this sample

technique, the research wished to use the correct definition of everyone in the population having an equal chance of being selected. Thanks to this technique volunteers constituted a convenience sample (American Statistical Association, 2012). Furthermore, all participants were assured that their responses will be kept confidential and will never be used anywhere except for this study.

The interviews focused on incoming and outgoing European students aged between 20 and 26, who were enrolled in the Erasmus exchange program in the last 3 years.

Country	Number of students	Male	Female	Incoming	Outgoing
England	5	1	4	5	0
Catalonia / Spain	6	2	4	0	6
Italy	5	1	4	5	0
Germany	3	2	1	3	0
France	2	1	1	2	0
Turkey	2	2	0	2	0
Poland	1	0	1	1	0
Belgium	1	0	1	1	0
Netherlands	1	0	1	1	0
TOTAL	26	9	17	20	6

Figure 4: Demographic structure of the participants

Most of the students (17) participated in the research voluntarily and the interviews lasted between 14 and 42 minutes, they were recorded and carefully transcribed. (see annexes). They were all conducted in Barcelona, Spain.

First questions focused on student's history and background and what were the reasons of choosing the countries that they wanted to participate as an Erasmus experience. Students then asked about their past experience in abroad in the term of school and learning. Later in the interviews, the participants were asked to speak about on the meaning of their experiences and how were their expectation and

impressions about Erasmus sojourn. They were later asked about their personal experience of Europe, with a prominence on their experience as Erasmus students. Besides they were asked about meeting and interacting with other Erasmus students or locals, noticing the differences and similarities from the point of traditions, culture, customs, history etc. All the students underhand were encouraged to talk about the prejudices or stereotypes they had against people from different nations thanks to living in intercultural environment. They were also asked about their reactions and the changes they have as a result of spending months abroad. The most important questions were asked after they were comfortable to talk about the issues they have not before. Researcher then asked about the questions about meaning of Europe and identification process.

As previously mentioned, the complementary source of data comes from the Eurobarometer surveys. The EB (Eurobarometer) is a set of surveys, which regularly carried out by the European Commission in all member states and sometime with potential and candidate members as well. In each country more than 1.000 interviews are done. The surveys started in 1973 and since 1976 they were conducted at least biannually (European Commission; 2016). Besides regularly changing topics a number questions have been repeatedly asked over time including the issue of European identification. As the changes of trendy topics happen often with these studies, it is not easy to catch up the dates issues but some matters such as sense of belonging to Europe, is possible to make comparisons.

There are four different types of EB surveys that are The Standard Eurobarometer which consists of approximately 1000 face to face interviews per country, Special Eurobarometer which are based on in-depth thematic studies carried out for various services of the European Commission or other EU institutions, Flash Eurobarometer which are thematic telephone interviews conducted at the request of any service of the EC, and the qualitative studies which investigate in-depth the motivations, feelings and reactions of selected social groups towards a given subject or concept (European Commission, 2006).

For this study, researcher has chosen Special Eurobarometer and Flash Eurobarometer surveys by investigating deeply the relativity of the surveys according to main topic of this research. The surveys used in this research such as;

SUR. TITLE	SUR. DATE	SUR. TYPE	SUR. CONTENT
New Europeans	April 2011	Special EB	Language, belonging, national identity
EU Citizenship	August 2010	Flash EB	Citizenship, rights, values
Youth on the Move	May 2011	Flash EB	Education, mobility, abroad experience
Future of Europe	April 2012	Special EB	Individualism, nationalism, values
Discrimination in EU 2012	November 2012	Special EB	Discrimination, social circles
Europeans in 2014	July 2014	Flash EB	Values, citizenship and happiness in EU
The Promise of EU	September 2014	Flash EB	Meaning of EU, integration, unity
Discrimination in EU 2014	October 2014	Special EB	Attitudes, discrimination, policies
EU Citizenship	March 2015	Flash EB	Citizenship and unity

Figure 5: Eurobarometer Surveys used as a complementary data.

In conclusion, the data information presented here is both large thanks to EB surveys and multinational by reason of interviews conducted with different nationalities to avoid some of the issues related with small or same sample size. One problem is here there is no data available to researcher specifically about Catalan people as EB surveys do not classify Catalans as different nation yet however perspectives of Catalans in this study is considered has been gained through Spain aspect.

5.5.1 Procedure

After a long period of pilot study work using the participant observation and semi-structured methods, it has been found some opportunities to conduct interviews with students since he continued to have a good relations with Erasmus students. Thus, for the first interviews, the researcher organized the interviews by contacting with phones students. However, researcher had difficult time to get in touch with people in following year since he did not have any contacts and he could not create a chance even if he enrolled Catalan and Spanish courses in the university. To solve this issue, It has been decided to publish an announcement declaring that 10 euros will be paid for every interview that researcher could make. Thanks to this announcement researcher has managed to arrange interviews with Erasmus students via e-mail or telephone number.

Interviews were conducted in spaces suggested by the researcher or interviewees, typically in a quiet, public venue or school library and the language of the almost all interviews were English (23). Two interviews were Turkish as researcher is a native Turkish speaker and only one interview had to be done in Spanish and researcher used a person as a translator for this special case. Researcher always presented himself as a researcher and an outsider to Europe and he sufficiently explained that he was interested in the experiences of students' Erasmus personal journeys in the context of Europe and European identity.

As a part of the research process, here it should be stated again that interviews as a result of many expected and expected consequences (as seen below), have been expanded in two years.

- Researcher has done a pilot study to make sure the feasibility of the study.
- Researcher primarily has conducted interviews with incoming exchange students in a long period to catch the changes on the behaviors.
- Researcher tried to explore how the participants created and recreated their own personal meanings in the light of new challenges and experiences abroad.

176

- Researcher has done interviews with outgoing Catalan students as a last part of the research to make a better comparison with the incoming ones.

Qualitative interviews continued to be conducted until saturation point was reached and no new findings emerged from interviews. To limit biases and to be sure of that all possible facts were identified and explored, all the theoretical models related with research subjects compared several time with the findings of the interviews.

As mentioned before, qualitative content analysis and grounded theory method have been implemented to reach and deconstruct the data. In studies where no theories are reachable, research generates categories from the data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) as this research did. First, the transcripts of the data has been read and copied, brief notes has been made when interesting and relevant information found. Second, notes has been went through and different types of information has been revealed. Third, through the list, each item has been categorized (coded) and sub-categorized. In categorizations research has identified whether or not the categories can be linked any way and list them as major or sub-category.

CATEGORY A:	ERASMUS PERSPECTIVE
Sub-categories	Context of participation Context of expectation and impression Context of education
CATEGORY B:	EUROPEAN IDENTITY
Sub-categories:	Context of European Union Context of we-feeling, togetherness Context of European identity
CATEGORY C:	NATIONALISM
Sub-categories:	Context of identity relations (National and European) Context of European nationalism Context of Catalan identity

CATEGORY D:	CULTURAL DIFFERENCES
Sub-categories:	Context of cultural differences Context of Stereotypes and Prejudices Context of transformation

Figure 6: Content analysis categorization.

Main elements education, location, worldviews and social relations have played the main role in all categorizations. Besides, various major and sub categories has been compared and contrasted.

The process of content analysis and grounded theory are lengthy and require the researcher to go over and over the data to ensure that it has been done a complete analysis. From this point of view, as we explained before, the primary data of the study comes from semi-structured interviews and these interviews have explored the issues such as nationalism exposure, beliefs on European Union, advantages of Erasmus, misusage of education programs, relations between students with different backgrounds and cultures, awareness of European identity, etc.

The content analyzing and grounded theory method enabled the research to move beyond just counting how many students has a sense of European identity and gave him an opportunity to analyze the types of European identity that are emerging and if there any identity clashes between national and European one. These process allowed to research detect the meaning of 'being European' in the term of identity construction phase. Thanks to this analysis, research had a good sense of understanding of each participant's feelings about identity including their relationship to local, regional and national domains. This was firstly achieved through interviews and then EB surveys.

The interviews were transcribed word by word from digital recorder then it has been started to examine the EB reports and tried to figure out the matched and prober content for the data. Later on content analysis method has been applied the to

identify the themes according to research questions. Firstly, content analysis, together with grounded theory has been conducted across the interviews, seeking similarities and patters then it has been continued by competing ideas and contradictions. The data were then reduced to themes for the descriptions of experiences to be collected.

Research has been gradually carried on with reexamining EB surveys results and interviews according to each of the individual narratives in the light of the newly developed understanding. By doing that, it has been achieved to reanalyze and reinterpret the lived experiences of international students and their personal stories. Finally, everything related to research questions such as international students experience, learning, feelings, emotions and actions were stated and explained by the researcher to be suitable for the purpose of the research.

5.6 Results

In this part, researcher organizes the findings of the study concluded from the interviews and the examined EB surveys by corresponding to the main research questions and objectives of the study. First part of the findings introduced and discussed the data about participants' front feelings, aims and the results when they started to participate in the international experience. The second part investigated the relationship between Europe, national feelings of the students, European identity and other identifications processes in regard to stereotypes and prejudices. And the last part focused on investigating the final perceptions of the students and main changes in order to find out if Erasmus, as an identity builder, has been successful.

In an attempt to figure out how participants framed European identity, researcher initially tried to explore what kind of experiences students had before their Erasmus experiences in the term of living or studying abroad.

- **Erasmus experience in the context of participation**

It is not new that Erasmus sojourn brings positive incomes to students' life as revealed by many studies such as done by Teicher (et. al, 2006). According to their study, the experience abroad not only enriched students' professional lives but also promote openness, adaptability or language learning (Teichler et al. 2006). According to Murphy and Lejeune, one of the main motivations for students to enroll on a study abroad program is to learn or practice a foreign language (Murphy and Lejeune, 2002).

One of the long term study done by EC is Erasmus Impact Study' (2014). This qualitative study was carried out in a selection of countries to identify significant similarities and differences. The goal was to represent the diversity and variability between countries in order to understand better the underlying tendencies, facts and perceptions about the impact of Erasmus mobility on the institutional development. One findings of this study revealed that more than 90% of the mobile students want to go abroad to live there, to improve their language abilities, to form new relationship and to develop skills such as adaptability.

EB survey claims that social circles of Europeans are becoming more diverse thanks to integration or travelling or mobility purposes (393, 2012:19). Europe's cultural, ethnic and religious diversity will increase in a transformative way in the years and decades to come. Namely, participation of the students in the mobility experiences in different countries will help to deal with diversity and the gains from mobility experience will help students to comprehend the issues better.

The answers given by the students for this study were sharing similarities with these researches. Most common comments on reasons of participation were meeting with new people, getting into new culture and experiencing new things. Some of the students mentions about new language or improve the one they have. Incoming students occasionally speak about learning Spanish and Catalan. Other reasons of participation were generally related to career. While couple of students said they chose Barcelona because of similar culture and close to their hometown, some of them were stating the fact that Spain and Barcelona have nice weather and beaches and these reasons made them chose the host country. Different from incoming

students, some outgoing Catalan students specifically addressed that they have chosen to participate in the program to improve their language. For them, being fluent in the language was one of the priority matters. Chomsky (2000) claims that the phenomena the language inserts every part of human life, thought and interaction.

> *"Language is a process of free creation; its laws and principles are fixed, but the manner in which the principles of generation are used is free and infinitely varied. Even the interpretation and use of words involves a process of free creation (Chomsky, 200).*

According to Eurobarometer surveys, having foreign language skills may be the cause or result of feeling connected to another country (346, 2011:40). Investigating the case of Europe in the perspective of language is interesting because even if shared set of beliefs, values, behavior, history or geography and attempt to create a common flag and a shared anthem, it is clearly not possible to create a language comparable to a national language to symbolize the European identity or embody the shared beliefs and values in the way that a national language does.

I have chosen especially Barcelona because of the good weather. I did not know how was the school or people; I just need to spend some time in a nice city since I come from very little village (Bia, Italy).

I always wanted to go somewhere else. I live with my parents and I wanted to live and experience myself and I wanted to go somewhere around Europe and I chose to go to London because of the city. I also wanted to improve my language (Vik, Catalonia).

I chose Germany because I wanted to learn German. I knew some German so I wanted to improve it. German language is really important for the future (Da, Catalonia).

There is nothing surprising with the answers provided on reason of participation and choosing the cities they have been. Erasmus program is seen a way of discovery of

new culture, new experiences, new language but program is also perceived a way of break in the life of the students when it is about Barcelona or Spain. Even if researcher did not obtain direct data which present the correlation between European identity and Erasmus, Neil Figstein's findings proves that citizens of Europe who interact with each other are more frequently likely to view themselves as European (Fligstein, 2009). He relied basically on travelling behavior and language proficiency as indicators of such interaction. More than that interculturality and open-mindedness may facilitate an individual a new language that will help for adaption anyway.

- **Erasmus experience in the context of expectations**

Students who choose to participate abroad program are making a huge step in setting in motion their own individual life projects and it can be assumed that they dream of having a great experience.

Researcher continued to his questions by asking about the expectations of the students before they arrived to destination. By doing that, researcher wished to have a chance to compare their experience to impressions. Most of the students had the feeling of excitement about Erasmus program. They have met and lived with new people and got familiar with new culture but some of the student had fears and doubts in the beginning about how to survive in the city mostly because of the language barrier. As observed from the data, language is one of the big barriers in this experience and student might have prejudices before their sojourn.

Since I have lived in France three months before Barcelona, I had some experiences about how French people are unorganized and difficult and I was hoping that people here would be more organized and friendly. But I did expected it would be more difficult than France. Actually I was too generalist about Spanish culture but I figured out I was wrong (Luc, England).

I was really excited but when the days are close, I was nervous because I thought I don't know anybody and I can't speak the language (Bia, Italy).

In the beginning, I wasn't excited. I was relaxed also. I expected to meet a lot people from different countries but it didn't happen because there were a lot of Spanish students. Later I met some people who aren't Spanish but at the end, I stuck with Spanish people and spoke a lot of Spanish. I also expected many parties and more fun. It was really different from Spain (An, Catalonia).

I was expecting good parties, nice weather and nice people. I actually found all those things as I expected (Mei, Germany).

I was worried about not finding a place and not having enough money to live. I was also worried because of the different environment. But I ended up living with another Catalan girl from Barcelona and one girl from Valencia. That's why I didn't have a chance to speak a lot of English. I didn't hang out with locals so much (Vik, Catalonia).

Briefly, expectations were general but included some kind of prejudices or stereotypes when students particularly talk about language barriers. For outgoing Catalan students' situation was unsatisfactory as they were compelled to speak their own language even if they were there to improve their foreign language. The growing effect of English as a common language of European Union, is perceived by the Erasmus students as an important fact. But the language is not the only necessary tool for the students to feel more European. As Hall (2003) argued, supranational communities cannot simply be political, economic or geographical entities, they also depend on how they are represented and imagined. Hall refers here the bounds, which will be gained by cultural identity, and for Erasmus students' language is the first step for this.

- **Erasmus experience in the context of impressions**

Interviewees were asked to talk about their impressions of life as an Erasmus in a general way in order to reveal the first stereotypes and prejudices and to catch the changes compared with their expectations.

Most of the students were not happy or comfortable when they started to live abroad because of the lack of friends and language abilities. But they were capable of getting over these issues as the days passed. Moreover, meeting with new people and getting used to environment were considerably important in reducing the stress in the sense of otherness and in the long run has led to help to promote to feeling of belonging.

I think the most important barrier is the language. There are so many people who can't speak English so in a way you communicate with only Erasmus students then you understand that you should try to learn the language which will be a lot easier to make friends. (Mei, Germany)

In my first month, I hated it. I didn't know anyone, and Catalan language was a barrier to communicate, because you know speaking Catalan is kind of obligation here, then I took Catalan classes and now I am used to speak at least trying to speak and I kind of like it now. (Ver, England)

It's really cold place and not just weather also people. They are so distant, not like here (Barcelona) but I was used to that at the end and I like it. But again, it was really expensive also. I didn't know that. It was really small city and many people from different nationalities. They didn't talk English (An, Catalonia).

It is interesting to see that while incoming students complain about they could not mix with locals in Barcelona, outgoing Catalan students as well were making these claims about the people they have lived with. We can easily made an assumption that language is the main reason for negative impression but here another point is needed to be explained. Europe represents the most intercultural society in the world and particularly universities have the leading number. I am specifically interested in the idea of multiculturalism of the students' minds and actions as Erasmus students live and get in touch with other nations than every other student. They meet with different

cultures but despite the differences they share the same space with people and get along with people without necessarily having contact with each other. Even if social contact is the main way to have mutual understandings, we can conclude from the data that students were not so bothered from the absence of contact and they were motivated to look forward.

- **Erasmus experience in the context of education**

Griffiths (2012) noted that people find value in education due to three linked reasons: (1) instrumental reasons that provide access to some desired job, high status, social or financial power, (2) inherent reasons that aim to cultivate critical thinking, autonomy and imagination, and (3) "integral" reasons that are about present educational experiences in formal education. She argued that the focus on lived experiences as "part of the good life" was missing in the usual account of social justice in formal education (Griffiths, 2012:665). She then provided examples of educational experiences that brought "joy" to learners as part of an intense pedagogic relationship where the learning and teaching of difficult and important things happened. She suggested that such learning was likely not to be purely fun.

In this context, Erasmus as an exchange education program is adding this joy dimension to education format. Data proves that many students have evaluated Erasmus program, as a fun experience. Students' claims were related to different reasons such as discovering new cultures, finding new friends or even having a holiday opportunity. Thus on the one hand we can discuss that Erasmus is bringing the joy fact which according to Griffiths, missing point of formal education system but on the other hand some obstacle is still challenging in the context of education.

As we can see the results from below, language barrier is again an issue when we talk about school environment. Incoming or outgoing students stick with their hood and even if they want, they do not get mixed with locals. This is also revealed by the study of Sigala (2010) when he was investigating the relations between European

identity and cross border mobility. Sigala's results showed despite the fact that studying abroad led to increased socializing with other Europeans, contact with students of host country remained limited.

Another empirical study done by Kristine Mitchell (2012) also indicated that Erasmus students primarily socialized with other nationalities while abroad for their sojourn. Her study has shown that 78% of Erasmus students socialized with other nationalities but only 10% of the Erasmus students have socialized with people from host country.

The data of this also showed that the issue is stronger between incoming students rather than outgoing Catalan students. When they asked about the education they have gotten, they concluded that they were quite satisfied with the education even if the lack of contact with locals.

It was hard and different. People were rich in this school because it was a private school. When I went there people already knew each other and they were in their groups. And the education was different and less work than here (Vik, Catalonia).

School is fine but students are not so friendly, I never thought Catalans would be that cold (Bia, Italy)

There are so many unnecessary classes but it is easy to get better grades. Definitely too easy but generally I am happy with the university and teacher. People are nice and friendly (Sha, Belgium).

I sometimes hear from Erasmus students that they don't like the locals so much but if you hang out with Erasmus students all time and if you don't integrate how can you like them? I think is about not trying enough. You cannot just come here and take four economy classes. You have to get out of your way. You should learn more about the place you live. You can have classes such as Catalan identity or history. (Far, Italy).

According to the new generation of the community and education and training programs after the 2006 report, one of the future needs is defined as "the people-to-people" contacts forming part of the external dimension of education and training are increasingly understood as contributing to intercultural dialogue. It is possible to say that this becomes more important as the societies in the EU continue to become more culturally diverse and intercultural understanding and respect become a need for the people in European Union. Moreover, it is claimed that there is an increasing need to deepen understanding among European citizens of the nature of the European identity.

Studying abroad creates a challenge for students' identity as they are stumped in the new sociolinguistic and cultural context. The findings has presented one of reasons of the lack of contact with the locals were the language. One of the recent study done by Lidia Gallego Balsa (2014) on experiences of international students in Catalan University found out most international students know some Spanish on arriving in Catalonia, they often have no experience of Catalan, the dominant official language in education in Catalonia and in general they show little interest in learning it However the notable presence of Catalan existence in higher education and the high symbolic value ascribed to Catalan in local context might lead students to reconsider this option and they may end up learning not only Spanish but also Catalan.

Mitchell (2012) study also proved that students tended to socialize with the people who can speak the same language. She found out only 45% of the students have spoken the language of the host country. For this study, situation for the incoming students were harder as only one of them tried to speak Catalan but for outgoing students was more comfortable since many of them could speak the language of the country they have been. Besides, for some international students coming to Catalonia without knowing the importance of the Catalan language and pushed to speak the Catalan by teacher and students was challenging.

I had some problems learning the language here. I had some problems to connect with other students. I need people to study the topic but it is difficult finding Catalan

classmates. They even don't want my help but it is of course this is my experience in UPF (Dav, Italy).

Students' complaints about school and education were too similar with complains they made in the impression section. Interestingly when they were asked to talk about education they got, they did not have structured idea of the education that they were getting. Marin (ed. Gomez, 2003: 83) notes that "necessity of building a European Union which would not only be based on an economic or political union but also on the social and cultural, favored the granting of a relevant role to education". According to her, citizens of the European Union has not been aware of the importance of this role and they have lack of awareness of belonging to this new transnational reality. The findings of this research verify the claims made by Marin. In many universities, special classes are designed for Erasmus students to get interact with both other students and local students. Furthermore educationists try different methods for students to mix with each other but most Erasmus students seems to not inform or pay attention to point. In the interviews, two students had the sense of it and they argued remarkable ideas how to deal with the situation. These types of awareness are providing one of the answers to our research question.

Maybe there should be compulsory programs or lessons that will teach students what Erasmus about and why they are in a different country (Far, England).

Problem here Erasmus people do not know about that. They know a lot about their culture and they do not know about Europe and Erasmus. They have no idea what Erasmus is about, maybe they should learn in the classes. (Dav, Italy).

The second part of the findings have been classified and organized according to research questions related with terms such as Erasmus, Europe, European identity, stereotypes, prejudices and cultural issues which are the main structure of the research. When interviewees asked students to think about Erasmus, answers mostly were focusing on positive outcomes. When researcher made the connection with Europe, students tended to fall into two categories, which are the integration and European Union.

- **Erasmus program in the context of Europe and European Union**

This research mainly tries to understand the European identity concept from the perspective of Erasmus students and this is not the only one on the field. Some scholars question the positive effects of Erasmus on the strengthening of European identity and claim that such contact through exchanges only increases good feelings towards the host country. Others argue that this kind of feelings should not be ignored given the importance in eradicating stereotypes through intense contact and not only nationals of the host country but also other Europeans coming from other partner universities including the ones in non-EU states.

To understand the concept of the students on Europe and Erasmus for this research, students firstly asked to talk about what generally they think of Europe and Erasmus program with follow up questions like if student had any idea on the purpose of the program. Many of them said expectedly positive effects about program but more surprisingly almost all students were mentioning about the points such as integration, which somehow is the objective of the program.

If everyone basically can contain his traditional, original identity and original culture but also will gain something as well, integration can be positive and should be supported. As Shore (2000) has stated, the integration process strengthens the "European identity" and "European consciousness". One of the participants indicated European integration should be deepened and widened, may be open. Armingeon writes that the support for the European integration will increase as more citizens become aware of it; however it is likely to happen "behind the backs" of citizens. (2004: 241)

It (Erasmus) is a very good idea. I don't think I would do something like that if there were no such a program. I met many people from different countries that I never thought I could meet. But here I don't live like Erasmus people; I live normal student life because I can adapt the culture better this way. I communicate Spanish and I live with Catalan students. Actually what I observe also, people hang out with another

189

people but generally they stick with people from their culture or country (Luc, England).

It is a really good program. People should do it more often. Studying in the other universities or living in the other cities make you more understanding and Erasmus makes it easier to integrate to other countries. I think most important thing about Erasmus is to study in the other university. People think it is just for fun and having parties but you can have this life in your own country (Mar, Italy).

It is great for integration and I think it is happening I mean it helps European people get closer. Even for me it is working because I meet many people from different cultures (Dan, England).

Being in Europe and being united is really good opportunity but I feel like we need more integration (Ci, Italy).

One of the long-term comprehensive studies done for European Commission in order to investigate effects of Erasmus student mobility in relation to studies and placements on individual skill 'Erasmus Impact Study' (2014) unveiled that more than 80% of the students who have participated in Erasmus felt strong relations to Europe. The findings of the interviews verify the Erasmus Impact Study as well. Moreover data present that for some students Erasmus experience have led to self-identification as European. So Being European as another theme, raised from interviews. This theme is described as a political identity and participants underlined this as a function of their identities. Being European is defined by Wallace (2002) as to share European values, history, and identity, to have political, security-related and economic consequences.

Erasmus is really good thing for the people who see another culture and adapt new cultures. Erasmus basically changes people but I am sorry that now it is kind of bad reputation, it is known just for parties and most of the financial support are getting decreased. But to be honest most of the students have no idea about the purpose of Erasmus. It has a duty to combine Europe better and get to know other cultures

closer and you get better insight of the other cultures so it is an idea of integration and togetherness (Fl, Germany).

My Turkish identity is strong but I am defending that I can be Turk and European at the same time. Eventually the longer I live here the more I feel European and I guess this is what Erasmus makes (Gok, Turkey).

One of the recent studies done by Van Mol (2013) investigated the influence of European student mobility on European identity. According to findings, students perceive this experience as a personal project more than a political subject. This research has gained similar findings. Some of the students were not fancy of politic sides of the program and they claimed it is all personal development.

I don't believe of the policies of Europe like giving us identity or togetherness. Maybe there should be other policies rather than Erasmus project because Erasmus is more personal and it is about personal development (Mar, Italy).

I don't think because of Erasmus people are getting more European. I mean Erasmus does not do that. Erasmus makes people closer so you understand that differences are not that big and it is about people themselves, not because of the program's purpose (Br, Netherlands).

I, as a researcher for this study, strongly believe that studying and living abroad with the people from different nationalities increase students' ability to understand people from other cultures on the personal level but it also increased students' awareness of the problems and challenges that European project might confront. Erasmus actually helps to create European identity and it does not has to be perceived as political-ideological project even if at the end, it is one of the real purpose of the European Union's education policy.

When the same questions asked to Catalan students in the core of Erasmus experience, there was another perspective of participating in the exchange program. Living alone without parents and feeling like a grown up came up in the conversation

including with the language aspect. These kinds of intended changes are common in youth of European as a result of their potential and new competencies. Maso (et. al, 2014) address that this potential in Catalonia is fed by both formal education and informal learning. Advanced technologies and permanent connection with other cultures make youth highly informed and connected to public opinion, thus youth are prepared to participate in their surroundings (Maso et. al, 2014).

You learn a lot about life like how to live without your parents. It is a good experience to grow up. You go to another country and you have to do everything yourself. And also it is good for improving your language skills (An, Catalonia).

I think it makes you grow and changes your life. I mean it changed my life in a positive way and my colleagues told the same. It actually changed my lifestyle like how I live (Car, Catalonia).

It has changed my point of view almost about everything. I live with my parents and I now understand I have to stand on my foot by myself. I also had many experiences with people from different cultures like people from North of Europe. It was difficult to get to know them because they are colder than us and I didn't want to feel that way but I did and it's okay. Erasmus is actually really diverse program, you see that everybody is different and they have their own way of doing things and I think it's great on the perspective of Erasmus. It is just pity that some people just come for partying. And also it depends on how you take it (Mar, Catalonia).

One of the advantages of researcher was not to be stranger to some of the students whom he did the interviews with as he conducted a pilot study before by using participant observation. This has given more comfortable space to interviewees to talk sincerely for their Erasmus experience and helped to researcher to prepare himself better for the interviews. The other advantage for this research is using face-to-face interview method as an instrument to discover students' opinion. Many study worked on Erasmus students conducted survey method to collect data by at the end of students' experience and reached positive findings. This research conducted interviews with students when they were in the middle of the sojourn.

Based on the information given above, researcher unveiled the some negative feelings of the student for Erasmus. Even if numbers are few and students mentioned that it is a fun experience they were not satisfied with their stay. We should take into account that the answers naturally dependent on the dissatisfaction of expectations but it might affect the promoting the European identity.

I thought Erasmus would be more fun, I thought Spanish people would be friendlier, but of course I did not know that Spanish or Catalan people would be that different. Without speaking the language communication is difficult here and there are not many people who can speak English (Ay, Turkey).

Erasmus is fun but I am not sure if money worth to spend for something like that because EU is funding this program and we, students are spending the money for doing nothing. Of course everybody has good intentions but I don't think it is useful (Far, England).

Erasmus is a good thing but I don't feel like learning here, it is fun but not so productive. You don't feel like at home and you are like always some kind of tourist here (Mat, Germany).

Even if this is an Erasmus, actually everybody is so individual, and selfish. (Sha, Belgium)

- **Erasmus experience in the context of we-feeling**

When the interviewees got more familiar with content of study, they were asked more about Europe to discover the 'we feelings' and belonging. Researcher asked as a general question 'what does Europe mean to you'. But the concept of Europe differs hugely according to Michael Bruter. In his experimental study on European identity, he argues that "to better understand what most respondents mean when they say that they feel European and to understand whether they identify primarily with European Union as a relevant institutional context defining them as citizens, or to

Europe as a cultural community or civilization to which they identify socially (Bruter, 2005:104).

According to Bruter's suggestion, there are many and different ideas about Europe that students might have in mind when answering questions such as indicated above. It should be considered that the answers are also shaped by the public discourses especially generated by European officials. Moreover it is important how EU present itself and how it is displayed on the media. Many debate on immigrants, European values or on the complex relationship with Islam, made national version of European identity more visible. This is a way positioning the 'other' and 'us' and that kind of perspective proves as well how people create their existence by creating their contrast.

More than that As Wallace (2002) has mentioned, a geographical definition of Europe hardly can be given because there is no idea of Europe common to all European states and therefore there also is no agreement on where Europe ends. He writes that in reality it must be said that the drawing of the geographical boundaries around "Europe" is also a matter of political process and engenders much debate. Although it is claimed that boundaries enabled social systems to relate to their environment in a regular and predictable way, Europe might have no clear boundaries. "Europe as a set of values or as a region of shared history, has no clear outer limits, and many competing claims to constitute its historical core" (Wallace, 2002:82).

According to Oner (2011) the lack of clear geographical boundaries weakens the efforts of the EU to be seen as a real entity by its citizens; because clear boundaries are important for "entitavity" which affects people's level of identification. Thus, an increase in the entitavity of the EU will lead to an increase in the identification of its citizens with the EU. Entitavity differs according to the EU elites and public opinion. For the elites, especially for the officials working at the EU institutions, the entitavity of the EU is much more than for the general public. The EU has to acquire a psychological existence in the minds of its citizens to increase their identification with the EU. The EU has become much more visible in people's daily lives with the

effects of the establishment of the single market, the Euro and Schengenland. If this kind of measures will be introduced more, this will lead to an increase in the "entitavity" of the EU among the peoples of Europe, which may lead to an increase in their level of identification with the EU (ibid).

Even though Europe cannot be reconstructed without drawing boundaries, without bringing some states in and leaving the others out, when it comes to defining "Europe," it becomes an imaginary space. Geographically, there is not a unique description of Europe's boundaries. There are many different boundary descriptions because of political and cultural reasons.

People should know why E.U. is important then they will realize some things about European Union and its success. (Ci, Italy).

I know many people from other cultures, Muslims, people from United States. I think we are better. We are different (Kar, Poland).

For me, it is really important. Here Erasmus European people, we were closer between each other than other nationalities. We have our own conception of the life It is a really good thing because we are closer with our institutions and our values (Cl, France).

Europe is home. I am Polish but I am a citizen of Europe. Europe is like all the countries are together. But if you go to Poland you can see many people saying that Poland belongs to polish people but I have never been like that. I think I was travelling a lot so I became like that. It was always my home (Kar, Poland).

Even if study revealed that young people still trust European Union and think European values are important, according to Eurobarometer survey, majority of people think the European member states are distant in the terms of shared values. Surveys unveiled that only four out of ten people consider that European nations are similar in the term of values. (415, 2014:7)

The perception of people from England mark a dissident point in regard to European belonging. When they were asked the question 'what does Europe mean to you', they all answered that they may be European but not a part of Europe. Majority of the British citizens tend to have predominant cultural European identity contradictorily not being part of the Europe.

It is known that Britain's role and position in the European Community and European Union is evaluated as a more different one. Britain is famous for being "the awkward partner" in the European Union or it might be referred as "detached" or "semi-detached" (Bailey, 1983). England is a democratically governed country; however, it also has the royal family as many of the European countries. The British give great importance to its national symbols the royal family being one of them. The history of the United Kingdom and its all institutions that are preserved until today are marked as the vital elements of the British nation-state identity. The British nation is very sensitive about its symbols, values. One other reason why they do not accept that they do not belong to European continent is also because they are not completely integrated to European Union and its policies such as Schengen or Eurozone. It is an important fact that Europe is perceived as European Union for many people.

One empirical study has tested British approach on European identity. Results introduced that the British are the least euro-enthusiastic citizens of the Europe and they feel also distant from symbolic values (Jimenez et. al, 2004,). In the light of given facts we might claim that Erasmus program can rise the feeling of belonging to Europe for British people but it has no effect on construction European identity.

As a British, we don't identify ourselves as European like others. We say, I am going to Europe for holiday. I am European as well but we say Europe is just a place to travel in a cheap way. I kind of grew up in a society, which tells me there are us, and there are Europeans. You know even our money is different (Far, England).

I think we are different from Europe but people from America are more different from people in Europe. And I think I have a European identity, it is nice to be in

196

some big groups like European Union but I don't think it is necessary (Dan, England).

Another nation like England, Turkey is not considered as a part of Europe by majority of people in Europe (Jimenez and Torreblanca, 2007) and people in Turkey (Edam, 2013) even if Turkey is a candidate country. It is a known fact that Turkey has different tradition and values on many subjects but the real separation according to Paksoy (2013) comes from having different religion. He claims that distinction generated from religion between Muslim Turkish identity and Christian European identity makes the Turkish accession to European Union almost impossible. But he also argues that if there will be a common future based on European values such as human rights, democracy, economy etc. there will be a chance.

Besides, EU membership has had significant constitutive effects on European state identities. While the states in Europe increasingly have been defined as EU members, it should not be disregarded that the status of nonmembers, or would-be members, depends on these categories. That is to say, those states cannot ignore the EU even though they are not included in the EU. For the individuals living in those states, it can be suggested that a European identity is attached to the part of the individual's self-concept so that the value and emotional significance of being a member of a social group cannot be disregarded

> *"To the extent people identify Europe with the EU; this would be a remarkable achievement of forty years of European integration. If Europe and the EU are used interchangeably, it means that the latter has successfully occupied the social space of what it means to be European. One could then not be a "real" European without being an EU member. This point appears to contradict the notion of Europe as an empty identity category. At least, it would mean that the EU increasingly fills the meaning space of Europe with a specific content (Risse, 2004:255)".*

Delanty (1995) has stated that Europe is more than a region and it is a set of values and has no clear outer limits. According to them, it is possible to state that a specific definition of European would be difficult to delineate.

197

Here it is very interesting to see that one Turkish person identify himself with Europe and more than that with European values after spending couple of month in Barcelona as an Erasmus student. Risse (2003) also discuss that shared values and common fate leads to attachment to European Union. In this case, it sounds reasonable why Turkish person identify with himself with European values to get portrayed as European.

I am happy to be here. I feel myself as a European, at the end I share the same values with them and I am open-minded person like them. I think these values make me define as a European (Gok, Turkey).

But here we should also mention about one EB (2005:63) survey that found out the low attachment level of Turkish people to Europe. According this study; among Turks, the sense of belonging to a locality is stronger than a sense of European identity. Compared to EU Member States, Turks indicate a higher sense of belonging to their province, region or country. When asked about their degree of belonging to Europe, 66% of respondents in EU Member States indicate that they feel 'attached' to Europe compared to only 30% in Turkey. These facts might prove that how attachment level changes as a result of mobility experiences.

In some cases, Europe was simply identified as European Union by the students. It is unexceptional European youth might have an understanding of European Union as a ruler. Some scholars (Risse 2010; Bruter 2005) have claimed that identifying with a supranational political institution like European Union means that positioning oneself with regards to what this institution is aiming to success and have already succeeded. The findings of the study in the favor of this argument. As we mentioned earlier, some students directly identify Europe with European Union and some students perceive their Europeanness by favor of economic benefits that they can use.

I can feel the presence of Europe and its union in my life easily but I am not a big fan of European Union (Mar, Italy)

For me, I look at the topic more personal. I am not affected by the idea of togetherness. And I think we are not informed by European Union very well about these kinds of subjects. I am an Italian and I am proud of what Italy gave it to me but I must say I am not happy right now about the situation that Italy has been (Sil, Italy).

Nowadays we are in the crisis so it's normal they see Catalans independence movement as a threat. But I want to be in the European Union. Being European is important (Or, Catalonia).

I receive scholarship from governments from both Catalan and Spain thanks to EU. Even if it's not enough, it is great opportunity (Mar, Catalonia).

We might say that, identity has always importance on both individual and social life. Identity what's more is the result of interaction between personal values and social values. One individual gets integrated in one society with his/her own values thanks to the interaction with people who have different values from him/her. Thereby identity is formed with many other identities. Behaviors, reactions, habits of individual are determined by his/her identity. Apart from that, in order to get accepted to community that he/she lives, individual choose to integrate to values of society along his/her identity construction process because identity is one of component which connects individuals. From this point, we can easily say that in order to construct a European identity, there has to be coalescence between European common values and universal ones.

Ronald Inglehart (2000) has conducted a long-term study on World values and European values. The main implication of the study was; despite some regional contrast, most European tend to stay together and they distinguish themselves from those in other parts of the world. But the study presents also, some students' sees values even inside of the Europe is different and this differentiation happens because of nationalism.

I must say even if all Erasmus people mix, nationalities tend to stay together. Like German people, they don't easily mix and they stay together even though they go abroad people want to stay together with the people that share their own values, cultures (Ya, France).

Well when I was Erasmus, many people asked me about independence of Catalonia and what my opinions are. Well I actually I feel really Catalan but for me it should be part of the Europe as well. Unfortunately Europeans do not know the differences between being Spanish and being Catalan. (Car, Catalonia).

In EB surveys, when people asked about the story of Europe, many of them responded Europe in the term of history, starting with Ancient Greece and its relation with values and many respondents agreed that being European is much more than geography, its tolerance, peace, etc (Aggregate Report, 2014:5) Besides, even if we can observe some negative thoughts on European Union, students were happy to be inside of the Union. This is a subject also has been approached by EB surveys. According to surveys, even if EU has a bad reputation, people do not want to leave the Union. 73% percent of the respondent said, they choose to be citizen of the EU.

- **Erasmus experience in the context of identity**

Is there a European identity, what does it include, what is the general view in the public opinion? As we have seen in the historical perspective the European identity has existed in a way. What changes is the form and density of the phenomenon. It changes from country to country from region to region. The identity perception of countries depends on their history, the homogeneity of their culture, their size, and their economic welfare or the length of EU membership. Here Eurobarometers can be referred as a source, which shows the social and psychological dimension of the issue.

One of the research questions of the study is if Erasmus makes European identity stronger and in what degree this experience makes students to realize their own identity. Recently many studies focused particularly on mobility experiences of

people as an encouraging method of promoting European identity. Before that it is important to mention if there is a thing such called European identity. Many studies prove that there is a European identity and one of them is Eurobarometer survey. According to one survey, only 3% of the respondent said there is no European identity. It should be mentioned that even if 97% of the respondents said there is European identity, 40% percent of the participants indicated that having European identity do not matter to them (346, 2011:99).

As researcher mentioned earlier, one of the important study is done by Sigala (2010) on cross border mobility and European identity. Sigala investigated the Erasmus students who have spent time abroad by conducting surveys. He found out that Erasmus student experience abroad and a direct interpersonal contact with other nations promote a European identity. Another study on the same topic done by Mitchell also claimed in her surveys, 73% of the students reported that studying in another country made them feel more European. Erasmus impact study (2014) also revealed that more than 83% of the students felt more European after their stay in abroad. All these studies, together with this one are the indication of important attitudinal change. We should mention that here several studies have chosen young exchange students simply because younger people are more likely to develop European identity than older people (Citrin and Sides, 2004) and flexibility to social change is strongly related to age.

For me it is really important to participate in this program. It is the European feeling (Dav, Italy).

When you live in your country, you don't realize these kinds of things but when you live in international environment, you start to feel more European because you also realize other possibilities (Ci, Italy).

Erasmus is a great thing. It is so useful for integration of different individuals and nationalities. When you mix with other nations you realize that you have to get rid of some opinions because it is a program to destroy prejudices. People have many prejudices without knowing the other cultures (Gok, Turkey).

Sigala (2010) argues that in his study, cross border mobility promotes European identity but he also claims that experience acquired through the Erasmus program does not seem to strengthen students' European identity. This study discuss that he might be wrong if students were given some information on the purpose of Erasmus program and why European Union apply these type of education policies.

When researcher introduced new input about the relation between Europe, Erasmus and European identity students' answer were much more knowledgeable and it seems that some of the student were even aware of the relation between identity and organizations without given any idea by researcher.

First of all, I feel more European here than Italian. I study political Science and I believe the concept of Europe. And yes, Erasmus is making me more European because we are the young people and we are the future and one day maybe we will realize we are the same as Europe. Maybe Erasmus is a good starting point for that (Dav, Italy).

The way we German choose is different but actually I was not so aware of my German culture or identity before I came here, I realized how German I am, how goal oriented (Flor, Germany).

Erasmus program is about uniting the nations in Europe by getting the students together and if we look from this way, it is helpful. But if you hang out with Erasmus students you don't integrate the community, which you live as an Erasmus, so it might have different effect. But Erasmus purpose, I guess broadening students' horizon and letting them meeting another cultures or people. Yes, I think Erasmus makes European identity stronger because you make links between countries or people. I live with Austrian and Italians and I had some stereotypes about their culture but now I am planning to go and see them later. So if you think this way (Far, England)

I think it is a great program. You can know different cultures, countries and educations. You can compare your things with the country that you have been. It has changed my perspective about life and I think this is great. This program is great. It is necessary and it can be an obligation for everyone. If we are talking about being a union, people should know about different countries and cultures. And if the person wants the same thing as much as you do, Erasmus is helping to create one union or one identity (Sil, Italy).

It is working actually because you have to adapt to culture you are in. In my case, small example; I have to have dinner at six because people generally eat at that time and you are learning to adapt this because you have to respect that. For this experience I met also some Arabic people and I learnt a lot from them as well. Some people find other customs weird but we should know that it's normal for them (An, Catalonia).

When the outgoing students asked about what Europe means to them, many of them put forward their national identity even if it was not the initial question. According to Castells (2009), Catalan identity is strong and comes in the perspective first in the people because of all the efforts of Spanish centralism to eradicate the Catalan identity. However Gomez (2003) explains, European identity is a dynamic concept. It implies communicating our historical and life referents and establishing a dialogue permitting the collective construction of this notion and developing and encouraging otherness and coexistence with our own identity.

To take advantage of the situation, researcher continued with follow up questions about Catalan identity and how outgoing students compare their national identity with European one. Thus, students began to identify themselves with Europe and defined themselves as European but they all have given a priority to Catalan identity.

I am initially Catalan not European in the beginning. I feel European but I have my own identity first (An, Catalonia).

I feel Catalan firstly, not Spanish or nor European. (Da, Catalonia)

If we talk about this Erasmus experience, I feel like totally European, I firstly feel Catalan but at Erasmus I met many people outside of Europe. Maybe I can say when I met people from Europe I feel we are same but people from like America or other places I feel some distant. I feel European but I feel more Catalan not even Spanish. I and my other Catalan friend were trying to explain to people that we are Catalans and we come from Barcelona (Vik, Catalonia).

But according to Eurobarometer survey done in 2014, this situation is not special for Catalan people even if it might be stronger for them. According to surveys, most people identified with their nationality before feeling European. However surveys claimed that young people would consider themselves more European in the future if they will study and travel abroad (Aggregate Report, 2014:5). But our findings revealed that even if they study abroad, national identity stay powerful.

There are many ways to promote nationalism and this phenomena can appear in any time, in any place and in any condition but it is important to know that one of the main reason why nationalism appears is mostly known as sense of belonging and language. One of the scholars Joan Pujolar who study on Catalan youth, identity and Catalan language explains the power of the language for Catalan people as he calls 'cultural catalanisation' (Pujolar, 2008). According to him, language is the expression of the collective identity, which connects them with certain origins and plays the main role to become a nation.

Moreover, it is believed that there are emotional ties between the national language and the people who speak it. According to Toksoz (2008) the primordialists and the constructivists show different viewpoints regarding these emotional ties. The primordialists argue that the characteristics of the people and the nature of that national language are coincidental whereas the constructivists state that identification with that group was taught through a common language. The common ground for both sides is their insistent on the necessity of developing a unified language for the construction of a national sense of belonging. It is through the bridging function of language that the past of a nation was brought to the present, which helped nation states to create a sense of national identity.

EB data shows that this is as well not just a case for Catalan outgoing students. Majority of the Europeans (70%) feel that they belong to a group and the reason of belonging to a group is the ability to speak the same language (346, 2011:76)

When researcher analyzed the data about Catalan outgoing students he revealed that Catalan national identity becomes stronger when students experienced exchange program not only because of speaking their own language but also social interaction of the students. It is a known fact that social interaction might expose new traditions or oppositions and individuals may begin to protect given identities or to form new ones. This is also about needs for belonging a group. The sense of belonging to a national group is acquired and maintained in social interaction through language and this fact emphasizes that language is not just a symbol of national identity but also embodies it.

In my Erasmus experience for the first time I felt European when I sat down with my American friends. But I feel Catalan and what makes me Catalan is the language firstly. Language affects your identity. And we have some traditions and we have our own culture and I really fancy all these things. When I was with friends I didn't realize about European identity so much mostly I have thought about my Catalan identity. So if you ask me if Erasmus made my European identity stronger, I guess no but it made my Catalan identity stronger (Mar, Catalonia).

One of the principles of the EU was actually to overcome nationalism and national based dangerous incidents, especially when the idea of united Europe was developed. But in last decades, most extensive question in the identity studies if national and European identities coexist or conflicting. As long as nationalism keeps its importance and integration raises nonfunctional questions, it will probably remain like that.

Researcher Georgina Udrea (2012) also conducted a study on Romanian exchange students and revealed that there are rising number of Europeans who claim to have both European identity and national identity. In the term of relation between national identity and European identity, answers given by the students presented that not one

identity against the other one but these identities help to reveal the other one and they can exist together.

I think it makes people realize their own identity. Of course it helps people to know about other culture and makes them more open minded but when you are with people from different countries you feel your national identity stronger (Mar, Italy).

Europe is a place that people learn about other cultures, a place that people can mix and live together. Europe is freedom but all economy things are little bit crazy. You know people have to use Euro. In England people are strong with their identity and I feel like Europe force people to mix. I think it is nice to be mixed but it is wrong to force people about it. It should be okay if you want to keep your identity having some boundaries (Luc, England).

I was not really aware of my identity and my ideas about other culture, but I got some ideas when I came here especially about other cultures and some of them are true (some stereotypes). But I realize you get to know people not only from their attitudes but also more part of their life (Fl, Germany).

The findings of EB surveys on nationalism and Europe verify the data we have. The surveys showed that respondents of the study see themselves as a national of their own country and a European. According to results majority of Europeans sees themselves as being both their own nationality and European in the near future (379, 2012:56)

The embracing European identity is not only seen adequate but also necessary for dealing with the challenges originated by the multinational character of the EU. One of the main findings of the data was to discover how outgoing Catalans students provide a different role for themselves in order to tell the people about Catalonia and Catalan identity by emphasizing how they also belong to Europe and how they feel European. Clearly different from the incoming students, the national identity plays the main role here. Guibernau (2002) in his book on Catalan nationalism notes that

the Catalan independence is also one social movement and Catalan people provide a social role for themselves to promote Catalan nationalism.

In London I always say, I am from Barcelona and Europe. I never say I am from Spain and I used to explain the situation about independency to people all the time when the subject were brought up (Mar, Catalonia).

Actually I felt more Catalan. I always like to talk about and I told many people about everything that is going in Catalonia. I am Catalan and I tried to explain people about the situation in Catalonia but they don't understand it (Da, Catalonia).

I say I am from Catalonia. They didn't know where it is but when I say Barcelona they know the city but not too much about Catalans so I tried to explain it. We had some conversation with my friends about who we are because there are many things to explain not only one thing. Like identity topic. I am explaining every occasion. I feel like to talk about it, I have to say its different (Or, Catalonia).

- **Erasmus experiences in the context of cultural differences: Effects of stereotypes and prejudices to European identity**

All cultures seem to make a fundamental separation between 'us' and 'them' and it appears universal that they favor 'us' over 'them' for many purposes. Consequently it might be said that all cultures reflects a bias that could be regarded as cultural differences. For instance, in the language of some cultural groups the word for a member of the culture is the same as that for 'human being', which may carry the implication that members of other cultures are somehow weak. It definitely seems that a degree of cultural bias is a feature of most cultures that have been studied.

For this research it was one of the main point to reveal the how cultural differences plays a role on the construction of European identity. One of the research questions of the study is to find out how cultural differences, stereotypes or prejudices affect the Erasmus experiences of the student regarding to European identification process.

It is a known fact that ignorance leads to stereotypes and prejudices and the best way to solve the issues is to know more about others which can help people to quit their stereotypes and prejudices. Here, that should be mentioned that opinions on stereotypes and prejudices differ quite importantly among EU Member States, as a result of national specifies such as recent political developments, cultural and historical considerations, etc. (437, 2015:57).

It is also important to talk about Gordon Allport's (1994) contact theory as the theory represents the situation of Erasmus students of this study. According to this theory, interaction between members of different identified group is important as communication between groups reveal the similarities and provides knowledge of the other. Besides theory claims that true knowledge of another group is very likely to reduce prejudice and stereotypes.

To find out if cultural differences are obstacle to construct to European identity by creating stereotypes and prejudices, researcher asked people what their perceptions are about host country and other cultures and if they were disturbed by any differences. Answers presented that even if students' detected differences and little bothered by them, they noticed, these are not big challenges as a result of contact or understanding.

I think myself and people from north of Europe are really similar with hobbies or things we do but here or some other cultures like Italians we are different, I feel different from them but it is Erasmus and when you get together you don't see any differences (Mat, Germany).

Of course your mind gets expanded. But at the same time, when you are abroad you feel that you are somebody from somewhere. Its nice to be there with people but you feel like you belong to somewhere. You have to have your own culture. Yes we are different from like Norwegian people or other Europeans and I have more similarities like British people but I have differences from others like Indians and it's not a bad thing at all (Lu, England).

Yes I had some and I see that some of them are true but these things are not really important. I don't feel anything about them. I am not annoyed by them (Ci, Italy).

Sometimes you see something that upset you from other cultures like how my Italian friends are relax are for not keeping their promises or not being on time but eventually you realize that this is a cultural differences (Far, England).

Yeah. It super different but some things are not that important even if they are different. But when you understand that you are different then you can have built a relation by taking these differences into account. For example when my Turkish friend didn't want to drink alcohol we went to somewhere else. You can always find something in common and Erasmus makes it easier (Car, Catalonia).

I am very open person so I cannot say I have stereotypes or prejudices, people are same to me and I don't think about this stuff, when I see some small differences I say okay and forget. I see my roommates are not so clean but I don't make it a problem. (Ste, Italy).

I know the differences but I didn't feel any because I think staying in USA for a year helped me a lot. I know other people feel it because for most of them it was first time they left home. But I feel the difference from people who aren't European such as Turkish or Chinese people (Da, Catalonia).

In this study researcher also tried to figure out if subtle prejudices has an effect on student's behavior about other cultures. Subtle prejudices are hard to detect but there are ways to reveal such as lack of eye contact or exclusion from conversation, etc. But we should bear in mind that subtle form of prejudices is mostly related to culture rather than racism. Thus, even if the results have caught some form of subtle prejudices, they were issues regarding to culture. It might have caused to create stereotypes on few examples though.

I feel like people here not so knowledgeable like German or French people. I feel like siesta is making this effect. I realized here. I realized from observations and

209

behaviors of the people. It is like because of the Catalan nationalism, people force you to adapt here not like respect your differences. I have always thought Germans are cold but they are not, Catalan people are colder. Germans are actually friendlier (Ay, Turkey).

Generally I really like learning. It is difficult but I like it. People are open-minded, I travel a lot. I just don't like some habits of my colleagues. In my home university people are close and they respect other exchange students but here Catalan identity is strong and they don't contact with us even in the group work with them. It is really difficult make a Catalan friend. I am sure there are many friendly Catalan people, it is not right to make generalization (Dav, Italy).

There are some small differences like things you see in the restaurant while they serve or people from England are little different. They are not so social and they behave not well when they get drunk. But little differences (Br, Netherlands).

In his Erasmus study Sigala (2010), discovered what he called 'adverse effect'. He argues that, surprisingly Erasmus experience has an adverse effect on incoming British students. According his research European identity declined among British students as a result of Erasmus experience. In this research, some findings revealed that students might have generate negative feelings on some cultural issues as well but I discussed before, negative feelings of some students derived from not meeting with their expectations and that does not necessarily mean that they will not have the feeling of European.

I actually realize that Russians are really different than us. But maybe you see when they talk about their culture it's not good for you but its good them so it's okay (Or, Catalonia).

If we look here Spanish people are not very work-oriented like us. But yes it is true they are happier than Germans but they have some habits, which can be annoying such as you have to ask for them to do again and again (Fl, Germany).

210

The 1973 Commission's Report for a Community Policy on Education (Janne, 1973) mentioned the introduction of European dimension in education and noted that education must be used in order that European people know each other better and more accurately with disappearance of stereotypes and prejudices. To achieve that many actions executed in education program from that time to this day.

The interviews actually have proven that Erasmus action to disappear stereotypes and prejudices is functioning. Erasmus is playing an important role to get over the stereotypes and beyond the doubt this role has substantial effect for the European identification process. That is true that many students have benefited from the program in different way but findings below show that many students destroyed their stereotypes or prejudices thanks to this program, which eventually lead to togetherness.

I had some stereotypes against French people you know, these people never want to speak English and they think they are better than everyone but here I realize that it is only a stereotype. I see that Spanish people from South are more open and Catalan people are the closest but maybe Catalans who live abroad are friendlier (Dav, Italy).

I had lots of stereotypes that I didn't know before I came here but they disappeared, because Erasmus does that, because I understood here where stereotypes come from. Because I understand now sometimes you think that's a stereotype but maybe just how other culture is (Far, England).

I don't think I am different culturally but when people know me they feel more different but I don't. I think it is because of lack of information, when they know about our cultural things, stereotypes or prejudices disappear (Gok, Turkey).

Germans are really funny, I didn't know that. I expected they were really serious. I didn't know that Catalan people so nationalist. But in culturally everyone is kind of same but of course we have different habits. But European people are very good to me (Dan, England).

You go to buy stuff and the store is closed and people started to say that, there is a crisis, it should be open or people should work but they sleep. But when you meet them, for example in my case at school, you see that they are really hardworking people. They put a lot of effort into things. They just want to do it together (Br, Netherlands).

Yeah, especially against French people. It is just Spanish and French people do not get along well because they are rude and they do not smile like we do but I have met with my boyfriend in Munich and he is French. So it has completely changed my mind against French people (Car, Catalonia).

- **Erasmus experiences in the context of transformation**

In the last part of the interviews researcher centered upon the changes that might happen to students after the Erasmus experience. Previous researches of students' mobility discovered important common grounds that exchange experience presents various opportunities for substantial personal change. For example a research conducted by Shaftel (et. al, 2007) on the impact of abroad experience on undergraduate students who have participated in professional education program introduced that there have been significant improvement in basic characteristic such as open-mindedness, appreciation of diversity, intercultural adaptability. Besides exchange students come to the realization thanks to this experience, they need more for the study of another language and culture. This research also found out that how Erasmus helped them to get better in many ways and how the changes have taken place in their characteristic.

Erasmus made me an open person and I became more communicative. It also helped me to destroy stereotypes that I had before and made me questions about my culture (Ayin, Turkey).

Yes, I feel more independent, stronger and more confident now and actually as you asked me, I think Erasmus makes my European identity stronger because especially here I mixed with more people. It helped a lot for me to know many people such as from Estonia or other countries. And it is true actually; Erasmus helps to get over barriers. You realize for example, Germans are nice and funny not like what they thought about them. It made me not so stereotypical (Luc, England).

I learnt to adapt to a new culture and I think this is what Erasmus about. To be more social or open-minded. But Erasmus is more about personal interest not like for my future. It is a journey about you (Ya, France).

I was actually very shy person but I became very social here and I am not afraid of saying my ideas anymore (Fre, England)

One of the analytic reports published as Eurobarometer surveys has investigated the young people who went abroad as a part of education process. In this EB survey findings support the data researcher has achieved. Data shows that 6 in 10 (57%) respondent said that they have improved foreign language skills and second most important benefit of their mobility period abroad was awareness of another culture. Moreover after the mobility experience, respondent also listed that they have better ability to adapt to new situations and they have better interpersonal skills (319, 2011: 6). There is no better way to enhance young people's skills and employability than by studying, abroad. At the same degree, by uniting young Europeans in common values across national borders, it can be fostered understanding and solidarity. No other EU program has been as effective as Erasmus in achieving both of these goals. As Murphy-Lejeune explained "mobility is a sub-component of human capital, enabling individuals to enhance their skills because of the richness of the international experience gained by living abroad (2002:51)".

5.7 Discussion

In an economic and political crisis, talking about deepness of European identity and European's attachment to the EU is giving us notable points of view. It is presumed that bringing students from across Europe together for a shared university experience is held to reshape participants' attitudes about Europe and other Europeans and to enrich their own sense of European identity. But this study claims that investigating European identity is offering much more complex results than it is assumed.

Before going further, it must be stated that Exchange programs not only aims to influence the people who participated but also effect the participant nations. Internationalization helps to create a process of reconsidering the social, cultural and economic roles of higher education institutions and their form in their national higher education system. Thus, it should be discussed firstly how participant countries and European Union and its institutions has been influenced as a result of ongoing mobility programs. To give different viewpoints regarding the effectiveness of the education and Exchange programs, we should mention the about them in terms of their influence on the national education systems as one of the real purposes of implementing mobility programs was to evade national influences of the nations to create togetherness in the area of education. At this point, it is arguable that exchange programs have little impact on the education systems of the member states on account of several factors. Firstly, it might be claimed that the programs at the same level do not influence different levels of governance. That is to say, the dependence of peripheral authorities such as local authorities and individual institutions on the national centers have quiet decreased thanks to the encouraging programs. However, given from the data, it is observed that challenges of participants in the programs such as absence of language and more importantly absence of what Erasmus about pose a question mark.

On the other hand, scholar, Ertl (2003) claims that the EU programs and policies have a shaping influence on the national education systems. To Ertl, EU faces a dilemma while the main pressure is coming from increasing global competitiveness regarding the formation of education policy; member states have been acting as foot-

dragger rather than fence-setter in this field. Thus, the Union has recently focused on both increasing the mobility and fostering the information with a view to creating a borderless education space free from national influence and control. In addition to this creeping unionization in educational arena since the member states have confronted with the same problems arising out of global competition, they have begun to converge their educational systems by participating in and implementing the same programs: Leonardo da Vinci and Socrates (Ertl, 2003).

In conclusion, taking into account the evaluations of the interim reports prepared by the Commission as well as the different arguments and comments on the impacts of the programs, it can be concluded that the second generation of programs do have a limited but promising affect on the member states due to several reasons. First, it should be reminded that the participation in these programs is on a voluntary basis. More importantly, it is a well-known fact that the member states are still against making policies and involving in programs which may challenge their national interests, notwithstanding the recent steps attempting to deepen the political integration. Second, both the complex bureaucracy of the institutional mechanism and the distance between the ordinary people and the union policy makers restrain people from joining the Community-led actions. Consequently, the success of the programs on member states should not be underestimated. The education, training and youth programs have a great potential to contribute to the goal of creating a people's Europe. Unfortunately, its capacity for strengthening the social dimension of the integration is not appreciated yet. Bearing in mind the need for creating a sense of Europeanness for the political future of the Union, their efficiency and effectiveness should be enhanced with a view to promoting the European integration.

Another aspect of the program should be based on the participants and effect of the program. In we speak generally; there is quite a strong interest in studying abroad. Students are attracted to the program primarily because of the opportunity to live abroad, improve a foreign language, meet new people and learn "soft" skills. But are all these reasons sufficient to consider Erasmus is a successful identity builder?

Firstly, much evidence suggests that, Erasmus experience is helping to construct European identity as a result of the interaction between the students but interaction with the host country is limited both for incoming and outgoing Catalan students. It is crucial that the places where the students lived showed parallelism with their interaction with the other exchange students. This proves that Erasmus is helping to create an intercultural environment between students to get interact with each other but not enough to contact with the people of the host country. Moreover because of the language barrier high-quality communication takes place mostly between students of the same nationality. It might be argued that lack of communication with host country affects the strength of the program on the identity construction but the data clearly showed even limited interactions between plays a role on the way of togetherness.

Second, the data clearly indicate that socializing with other Europeans not only promotes European identity and but also national identity. Some of the incoming students have claimed that their identity stronger as a result of observing differences with other cultures and majority of the Catalan students felt themselves more Catalan when they had to talk about situations in Catalonia and Catalan independency. The data also revealed that participants do not see European identity as a threat to national identity. Conversely, especially Catalan students were eager to emphasize that they belong to Europe and they are Europeans. However, in some cases, the feeling of national identity is stronger than the feeling of a European identity and this will likely to continue in the foreseeable future because of the events that happens in the present day. More importantly, available data confirm that European identity has not existed beyond or outside national identities since national identities contain the elements of a European identity in varying degrees. Thus, European identity has not transcended national identities.

Third, the empirical data have indicated that European exchange programs has affected perceptions and feelings of the participants and contributed to have collective identities in the people of member states but in different degrees among communities and countries. Education policies of the Union have, at least to some

extent, affected and changed people's perception of 'who they are' and 'what political communities they belong to'. By this way, European self-understanding has been affected by the education programs; the EU has come to define what it means to be European. The concept of Europe and the EU has come to be used interchangeably, which could be seen as one of the considerable successes of the European exchange programs.

Even if students had problems to adapt and to satisfy their expectations, this did not create a problem to promote European identity. Students were aware of the cultural differences among countries and they specifically mentioned they were not affected by these differences. The data also found out stereotypes and prejudices are not obstacles to European identity and actually Erasmus is helping to destroy these issues and helping to promote Europeaness.

Research also presents majority of the Erasmus students are conscious of being European but most of them are aware of European identity especially when they are informed about it. The more researcher introduced the relations between European Union and European education programs, the more they were presenting the experiences regarding to European identity and how the Erasmus actually works on their personal case by indicating the changes happened to them. Here interestingly enough, it must be stated that level of effect of the Erasmus exchange program depends on the knowledge of the participants. For instance, in this study, majority of the exchange students were not aware of the real purpose of the Erasmus program which mean they were participating in the program without realizing the real objectives of the program. However even if participants did not have the knowledge of real purpose, they knew that they have participated in the program for the reasons such as opportunity to live abroad, improve a foreign language, meet new people which are indirectly lead to promote European we-feelings as shown in the data. Surely, it should be claimed that Erasmus program would be more effective if the participants would have more knowledge about the program.

In sum, empirical evidence confirms that the growing power of the European feelings as a result of the initiating different education actions such as Erasmus student

mobility in the late 1980s has created 'dual identification'. This means that political loyalty in Europe has been dependent on the combination of a European identity and national identities. Moreover, the results of the analysis suggest that the relationship between national, and European identity is complex. Future researches might investigate the dynamic implications of national identity and European identity and the reasons behind them by also adding stuff mobility into context rather than just student mobility.

In the light of these considerations, the question is no longer whether European identity exists or not. The debate is now revolving around the content of such an identity. What is the essence of this vague notion of 'being European' continues to be unclear. Despite the uncontroversial success of the European education policies, the EU has been facing enormous challenges stemming from enlargement, deepening and the question of its own identity. European enlargement is one of the major challenges facing the union because of increasing diversity and the risk of fragmentation.

At the end of this study, there are some points to be mentioned which have come into prominence in the debate of the possibilities and limitations concerning the EU's education policies and European identity. This thesis has not attempted to find a conclusive definition on European identity; it has tried to find some constitutive elements of the concept.

6 CONCLUSIONS

"Theories emanate from real life, with an attempt to organize political data and historical experiences. They are developed by examining facts, to simplify and categorize the flood of information, and to make predictions about possible outcomes that are to follow. While these theories are quite diverse, "there are also obvious signs of convergence. Most realists recognize that nationalism, militarism, ethnicity, and other domestic factors are important; liberals acknowledge that power is central to international behavior; and some constructivists admit that ideas will have greater impact when backed by powerful states and reinforced by enduring material forces (Walt, 1998:42)"

The principal motive behind writing this challenging dissertation is to have a look at Europe and its constructed identity from Erasmus` student's perspective. This study does not specify its research into a selected phenomenon of Europe, but rather wants to observe and reverberate what all its parts appear, function, and make others behave accordingly. It consists of different sections such as historical, political, sociological, and empirical research altogether, and aims at coming up with a fresh, original outlook that would also qualify for a PhD dissertation. The ideas here are an alignment of the researcher's educational and personal accumulation; and objectivity has always been a concern in every word presented in this study. In this final section, first, what has been claimed, supported, and connected in a certain fashion in the previous chapters will be encapsulated. Then, some random thoughts about the possible ways to place European identity and the Erasmus students into this picture will be briefly extrapolated for future possible studies.

This thesis has investigated the question of European identity within the context of the Erasmus exchange program, the strategies of identity building, the results of these strategies and the European education policies on collective identities in Europe from the aspect of stereotypes and prejudices. By reviewing the literature and conducting an empirical research, this thesis has examined some elements of the so-called 'European identity project'.

The starting point of this thesis has been that the issue of European identity is interconnected to the construction of the EU since desirability and possibility of a collective European identity are directly linked to the issue of legitimacy of the European Union. As argued throughout the thesis, the issue of legitimacy has become an important reason for the interest in the construction and the fostering of a European identity at the European level of governance. Therefore, European institutions have come to use the idea of a "European identity" and actively involved in constructing a common identity for the last three decades.

From the point of the constructivist approach, the developments in European cultural and political sphere continually are being transformed by the dynamics produced by national and European policy-makers through top-down and bottom-up approaches. It is reasonable to assume that the realness of the EU as an "imagined community" in people's lives, the perception of shared values and clearly defined boundaries could help to increase the sense of belonging of the citizens with the EU in the long term.

However the concept of European identity is multidimensional, ambiguous and dynamic phenomena. Moreover, it is constantly changing content depends on its social and political context. Briefly, there is not an agreed and static meaning of the concept. Moreover, the project of European integration and process of European identity formation are open-ended. All of this contradictory approaches- as a result, about "what European identity is" and "what it should be" at European, national levels highlight that there is no clearly defined European identity with its substance and content. Whether understood as a consequence of the political identity, as a result of the institutional processes, or as the outcome of conscious constructive efforts, European identity has been experienced by the citizens of the EU.

On the other hand, European education policies have impact on the European identities and national identities in Europe. As the process of European integration has evolved, nations' identities and interests have changed. It should be mentioned that there remain certain conceptual ambiguities concerning the concept of European identity. Moreover, the lack of a common definition of European identity makes it difficult to understand the complexity of the perceptions of people concerning the

nature of their attachment to their political community. The multiplicity of voices on the debate reflects the complex and contested nature of the subject matter. European identity has not a clear and distinctive set of identity characteristics because of enduring power of national identities.

Starting from this context, at the end of this study, researcher arrives following conclusions, which are inferred as a conclusion of the four chapters.

In chapter one, the concept of identity is discussed in detail. There are simply so many different definitions of concepts of identity and these different types are related to one another. First of all, it is stated that a person can hold more than one concept of identity and the results of this study proves that. Students in the empirical part show that they all have collective identity, a national identity or a political identity. We observe that their cultural identity includes the common history, traditions and ethnicity and sometimes very strong national identity, which is included in cultural identity because some national identities centered on the ethnic commonness.

There is also different type of identity formation and this thesis specifically mentions construction-based settings. In this type, two main players 'other' and 'political institutions' come to the forefront. Researcher explains these types in details in the first chapter and tries to give some example of this process by using Erasmus exchange students. Surprisingly enough, for the youth 'other' does not play the significant role but institutions does, even if students are not completely aware of it.

Second part of the thesis aims to investigate the European identity in dept. All these identity definitions and identity settings made in the first section are of great significance in the case of European Union as the concept of European identity aims to be as a supra identity concept either political or cultural. However, it can be concluded that to be successful and to be accepted by the members of European Union, European identity must be a cultural phenomenon and based on the common cultural traits of Europe. These cultural traits are common history, traditions, religion and geography.

European identity is a key provision for the completion of European integration. Just economic integration together with the common market and political integration started with the common policies in foreign affairs and in other fields will not be accepted easily by the people of Europe without cultural integration, which can be carried out by constructing European identity. Due to this fact, European Union focuses on more cultural parts by implementing policies on Europeans and more particularly European youth.

Even if cultural policies would implement successfully, another dilemma might arise out of the fact that national identity may dominate European identity as a result of up-to-date problems such as economic, political crises, or terror incidents, etc. Most of the academic have been centered on the idea that European identity could not replace the national identities, on the contrary, it should supplement to national identity. These opinions totally verify with the results of this study. Both findings from interviews conducted with the Erasmus students and Eurobarometer surveys obtained by European Commission reports present that national identity is stronger than European identity almost in every case. However it is also mentioned that national identity is not an obstacle to European identity in many states. Many respondent argued that national and European identity coexist and not conflicting.

To understand the explanation better, we should discuss the education policies of European Union here as the third part of the thesis focused on. The construction of a common European identity is of vital importance for the accomplishment of European political integration. In this long-standing process, education could be the key instrument for the creation of a supranational European identity serving as a psychological cement of the EU. But education has only remained a priority topic of the European Union in the identity policies until last decades due to the fact that nationalized education policies played a very significant role in the nation-building process seen during the 19th and 20th century in Europe.

Even if European Union is late to implement education policies to promote European we-feeling, mobility programs such as Erasmus had a substantial effect to create togetherness. Results were so effective, European Union have started to apply

different mobility programs and the Union now is more reluctant than ever to develop and implement the identity-led education policies seeking to create a European identity. Actually exchange programs have proven its strength in the term of coalescence, not only Europe but also all countries started to implement exchange programs with countries from all over the world.

The data section of this study, as the last chapter, revealed the European identity from the concept of Erasmus students. There have much criticism of Erasmus programs implying that it has lost function and aim but according to this concept, Erasmus still playing an important role to construct European identity by bringing students together and destroying the cultural differences. Moreover it increases to attachment to Europe and its institutions. It should be stated that British people represent a different example (as stated below) for this case as they feel European but not having a European identity. This research discuss the reason of that as well but more importantly at the end of research, researcher came to the awareness that, even in the European Union, many countries should be evaluated differently because the perceptions of Europe differ from country to country. Inspired by their strong state traditions, the French see Europe as an entity reflecting the main features of France in which elements of separateness are to be kept under control by both state institutions and a leading cultural policy within the clearly defined borders of state. In this view, a strong European identity serves to strengthen the European integration. To the contrary, Germans who have tended to regard state mechanism as a problem after the war prefer a low profile state system, which allows Germany to establish good economic and cultural relations with other countries. For Germany, Europe serves to question the meaning of borders, not to define them. Finally, the British, who have traditionally counted on their Atlantic ties more than her partnership with the Continent, prefers a watered-down European integration

The challenges and the limitations of existing conceptual framework on European identity and articulating a theoretical framework for European identity more or less stem from the novelty and complexity of the European project. As identities are formed in a long-term period rather than in response to short-term policy, empirical

effects of increasing power of the EU institutions which will pave the way for the intensified policies and initiatives of the EU with regard to the European identity should be considered in the long term.

In the light of theoretical framework, institutional discourse of European identity and the empirical data with regard to the debate over European identity is far from reaching an end. Thus, the problem of forging of a collective European identity will remain in the foreseeable future. The EU's persistent attempts to construct European identity and consciousness at the level of public opinion will also continue. It can be anticipated that the political priorities of elites and the expectations of masses will shape the substance, content and debt of European identity.

6.1 Limitations

Research and analysis conducted with participants from a particular cultural situation should not be generalized to other cultural settings. It cannot be assumed that the experience and perceptions of the students in this study can be applicable to the all Erasmus students.

In this study, due to the difficulties in reaching the participants, convenience sample became unavoidable to use. On the other hand, it can be considered as a source of bias that British and Italian students were more representative in the sample than students from other European countries.

The interviews were conducted during the different semesters. The participants had then spent between one and seven months in their host institution in different European countries. It is therefore possible that their impressions were limited and could have been different after spending more time in these countries. As stated in the conceptual framework, the Erasmus Program allows the participants to live within a culture different culture. The participants acculturate into another culture and become a part of that culture. Therefore, the time they spend in the host country

is important. It is recommended to repeat this study by conducting interviews at the beginning and at the end of their exchange experience. The study can be extended to include the participants' entire stay in the host country.

Lastly, the researcher in this study is also the research instrument as Patton indicated (1990:14), therefore the data collected may reflect biases of the researcher. There is an interaction between the researchers and researched, so the researcher bias enters into the picture even if the researcher tries to stay out of it. It was hardly possible to keep own feelings and personal reactions out of the study when there was relevance in the researcher's feelings to the matter at hand.

The methodological limitations of a study based on interviews must be also mentioned. Among them, the most significant are: the relatively reduced number of participants and the subjective, personal character of the collected data. It is important to acknowledge that even if the information obtained at this level is accurate and relevant for the category it represents, it is always private and the result of a context. Another limit of the present study is the money challenge. Researcher had to offer some amount of money to Erasmus students as he was in trouble having enough interview so participants of the study might have attracted by money offered.

This study was motivated by the researcher's values and interest in assuring that higher education does not intentionally aim to homogenize knowledge and thought to a European perspective. However, the researcher approached this study from a identity construction perspective based on the views of social and cultural reproduction. The higher education institutions and higher education programs might have the potential to be manipulated by a certain approach whether intentially or unintentionally. The underlying aim was then to determine the educational approach that may exist for Erasmus program in order to improve European identity in Erasmus students' attitudes.

7 REFERENCES

Abizadeh, A., (2005). "Does collective identity presuppose an other? On the alleged incoherence of global solidarity", *American Political Science Review*, v. 99, no.1, pp. 4

Agirdag, O., Phalet, K. and Houtte, M. V. (2015). "European identity as a unifying category: National vs. European identification among native and immigrant pupils", *European Union Politics Sage Publication,* pp.1-19.

Akbaba, S. (2007). "Gerard Delanty Speech at Marmara University", *Marmara Journal of European Studies,* v.15, no. 2. pp. 35 – 57.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge: Addison- Wesley Publishing Company.

Anaç, H. (2005). *AB'Entegrasyon Sürecinde Türkiye'nin Kimlik Problemleri,* Ankara: Adres Publishing.

Anderson, B. (1989). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso Publishing.

Andersson, H. E. (2010). "What Activates an Identity? The Case of Norden." *International Relations*, v. 24 no: 1, pp. 46–64.

Antonsich, M. (2010). "Exploring the correspondence between regional forms of governance and regional identity: The case of Western Europe." *European Urban and Regional Studies,* v.17, pp. 261-276.

Ariely, G. (2012). "Globalization, immigration and national identity: How the level of globalization affects the relations between nationalism, constructive patriotism and attitudes toward immigrants?", *Group Processes Intergroup Relations,* pp. 15: 539.

Armingeon, K. (2004). *From the Europe of nations to the European nation: Introduction.* Kriesi, H. P., Armingeon, K., Siegrist, H., and Wimmer, A. (eds). *Nation and national identity: the European experience in perspective.* Zurich: Purdue University Press.

Ashmore, R.D., and Del Boca, F.K. (1981). *Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping.* Hamilton D.L. (eds), *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior Hillsdale*, NJ: Erlbaum.

Austin, M. R. (2008). "Perceptions of European Identity among EU Citizens: An Empirical Study", *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*, Master of Arts for the Trans- Atlantic Masters Program in the Department of Political Science retrieved 13 December 2015 https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/indexablecontent/uuid:1c48d569-8952-4506-954c-cd2142e620ca

Babbie, E. (2007). *The Practice of Social Research*. California: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning Belmont.

Banchoff T, Smith P. M. (2005) *Legitimacy and The European Union: The Contested Polity*, New York: Routledge.

Bailey, R. (1983). *The European Connection: Implications of EEC Membership*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Baraldi, C. (2006). "New Forms of Intercultural Communication in a Globalized World." *Sage Publications*, London: vol. 68, pp. 53–69.

Baun M. (1996). *An Imperfect Union: Maastricht Treaty and The New Politics of European Integration*, Boulder: Westview Publishing.

Bausinger, H. (1999). *Intercultural Demands and Cultural Identity* Torben Vestergaard, eds, *Language, Culture and Identity*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Bekemans, L. (1990). "European Integration and Cultural Policies: Analysis of a Dialectic Polarity", *EUI Working Paper in European Cultural Studies,* Florence: no. 90, pp. 1

Bellier, I. and Wilson, T. M. (2000). *An Anthropology of the EU: Building, imagining and experiencing the new Europe*. Oxford: Berg.

Bellier, I. and Wilson, T.M. (2000). *Building and Experiencing Europe: Institutions and Identities in the European Union*, Bellier, I. and Wilson, T.M. (eds.), *An Anthropology of the European Union: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the New Europe*. New York: Berg Publication.

Billig, M. (1991), *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology*, Great Britain, Worcester: Billing and Sons publications

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: SAGE Publications.

Billig, M. (1996). "A social identity perspective on European integration." Breakwell, G. M and Lyons, E. (eds.), "Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change.", *Oxford Publication*. Butterworth-Heinemann.

Bizimana, L. (2003). "European Pacifism and the Construction of Transversal and Globalised Identities" Gómez-Chacón, M. I. (eds.) "Individual, Group and Society", *HumanitarianNet.*

Bloom, W. (1990). *Personal Identity, National Identity and International Relations*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boer, P. (1993). *Europe to 1914: The Making of an Idea*, Wilson, K. and Dussen, J. (eds.), *The History of the Idea of Europe*. New York: Routledge Pres.

Bodenhausen, G.V., Kramer, G.P., and Susser, K. (1994). "Happiness and stereotypic thinking in social judgement". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* v. 66, pp. 621- 32.

Bondebjerg I, and Madsen P. (2008). Media, Democracy and European Culture, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boneu, M. S. (2003). "What do we mean when we say Europe" Gómez-Chacón, M. I. (eds.) "Individual, Group and Society", *HumanitarianNet.*

Boxhoorn, B. (1996), *European Identity and the Process of European Unification: Compatible Notions?,* Wintle, M. (ed.), *Culture and Identity in Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Breakwell, G., (2004) *Identity Change in the Context of Growing Influence of European Institutions,* Herrmann, K. Risse T. and Marilynn B. (eds), *Transnational Identities*, New York: Rowman publishing

Brock, C and Tulasiewicz, W. (1999). *Education in a Single Europe,* London: Routledge.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1961). "The mirror image in Soviet- American relations: A social psychological report". *Journal of Social Issues,* v. 17, pp. 45- 46.

Brown, R. (1965). *Social Psychology*. New York: Free Press.

Bruter, M. (2003). "Winning hearts and minds for Europe: the impact of news and symbols on civic and cultural European identity." *Comparative political studies*, v.36 no: 10, pp. 1148-1179.

Bruter, M. (2005). *Citizens of Europe? The emergence of a mass European Identity.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bulcsu, B. and Zsolt, A. (2014). *Transfiguration of European identity*. Newcastle: Cambridge scholar publishing.

Byram, M. (1989). *Cultural studies in foreign language education*, Philedelphia: Multilingual Matters

Calhoun, C., (2001) *The Virtues of Inconsistency: Identity and Plurality in the Conceptualization of Europe*, Cederman L. (ed.), *Constructing Europe's Identity the External Dimension, Boulder London*: Lynne Reinner Pub.

Campbell, D.T. (1967). "Stereotypes and the perception of group differences". *American Psychologist,* v. 22, pp. 817- 29.

Caporaso, J. A. (2005). "The Possibilities of a European Identity." *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, v. *12*, 65–75.

Carey, S. (2002). "Undivided Loyalties: Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?", *European Union Politics Sage Publication,* v.3 p. 387 retrieved 12 April 2015 http://eup.sagepub.com/content/3/4/387

Castells, M. (2009). *The Power of Identity.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cerutti, F. (2006). "Why legitimacy and political identity are connected to each other, especially in the case of the European Union." *ECPR Joint Session of Workshops*. Retrieved 12 September 2016 http://www3.unifi.it/dpfilo/upload/sub/Garnet/PaperCeruttiforfinconfSept06.rtf

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Chomsky, N. (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cinnirella, M. (1997). "Towards a European identity? Interactions between the national and European social identities manifested by university students in Britain and Italy", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, v. 36, pp. 19-31.

Citrin, J. and Sides, J. (2004). *More than nationals: How identity choice matters in the new Europe.* Herrmann, R. K., Risse, T. and Brewer, M. B. (eds.), *Transnational Identities. Becoming European in the EU.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Clarke, E. A. (2003). "Situational analysis: Grounded theory mapping after the postmodern turn". *Symbolic Interaction,* v. 26 no: 4, pp. 553-576.

Coffin, J. G. (2002). *Western Civilizations*, New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.

Cowles, M.G. and Curtis, S. (2004), *Developments in European Integration Theory: The EU as 'Other'*, Cowles, M.G. and Dinan, D. (eds), *Developments in the European Union*, Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave MacMillan Publication.

Çırakman, A. (2001). "Avrupa Fikrinden Avrupa Merkezciliğe". *Doğu Batı Düsünce Publication.* v. 4. p. 14.

Condor, S., Gibson, S. and Abell, J. (2006). "English identity and ethnic diversity in the context of UK Constitutional change". *Ethnicities Sage Publication,* v. 6, pp. 123 – 158.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed approaches.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications

Crocker, J., Voekl, K., Testa, M., and Major, B. (1991) "Social stigma and self-esteem: The affective consequences of attributional ambiguity". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, v. 60, pp. 218-228.

Dana, I. (2012). "Rediscovering Culture: The unexplored Dimension of European Democratic Identity", *Journal for Communication and Culture 2*, no. 1: pp: 88-104.

Dell O. F. (2005) *The Europeanization of Citizenship: Between The Ideology of Nationality, Immigration, and European Identity.* Burlington: Ashgate.

De Wit, H. (2010). *Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe and its assessment, trends and issues*, Den Haag: Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie.

Declaration on European Identity (1973) retrieved 30 December 2015, http://www.ena.lu/declaration_european_identity_copenhagen_14_december _1973-020002278.html

Delanty, G, Rumford, C. (2005). *Rethinking Europe- Social Theory and The Implications of Europeanization* Great Britain: TJ International Ltd.

Delanty, G., (2005) *The quest for European identity,. Eriksen E. (eds), Making the European Polity: Reflexive Integration in the EU*, London: Routledge.

Delanty, G. (1995). *Inventing Europe, Idea, Identity, Reality.* London: Macmillan.

Delanty, G. (2000). "Social Integration and Europeanization: The myth of cultural cohesion." *Yearbook of European Studies*, v.14 pp. 221-238 http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.527.3871&rep=rep 1&type=pdf

Dickinson, K. M. (2012). "Student mobility and European Identity: Erasmus study as a civic experience?" *Journal of Contemporary European Research* v. 8, no. 4.

Diekman B., Eagly, A. and Amanda H., (2005), "What is the Problem? Prejudice as an Attitude-in-Context",. Dovidio, J., Glick F. P. and Laurie A. Rudman (eds), "On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport", Malden: *Blackwell Publishing Ltd.,* pp. 1-16.

Diez, T. (2004). "Europe's Others and the Return of the Geopolitics". *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*. v. 17. no. 2: pp. 319-335.

Diez, T. (2004). "Europe's others and the return of geopolitics", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, v.17, no.2, pp. 322.

Ditto, P.H., and Lopez, D.A. (1993). "Motivated scepticism: Use of differential decision criteria for preferred and nonpreferred conclusions". *Journal of Social and Personality Psychology*, v. 63, pp. 568- 84.

Dörnyei, Z. and Skehan, P. (2003). *Individual differences in second language learning.* Doughty C. J. and Long, M.H., (eds), The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* Malden, MA: Blackwell. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch18

Du Bois R. M. (1998). "European identity in the young and Dutch students images of Germany and the Germans", *Comparative Education Studies*, v. 34 no: 1, pp.27-40.

Duff A, Pinder J, Pryce R. (2002). *Maastricht and Beyond: Building the European Union,* London and New York: Routledge.

Dwyer, M. (2004). "More Is Better: The Impact of Study Abroad Program Duration, Frontiers", *The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, v. 10, pp. 151-163.

Eagly, A., and Kite, M. (1987). "Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to women and man?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, v. 53, pp. 451- 62.

Edam (2013) "Public opinion surveys" retrieved 12 May 2016 http://www.edam.org.tr/en/AnaKategori/edam-public-opinion-surveys

Eder, K. (2009). "A Theory of Collective Identity Making Sense of the Debate on a European Identity", *European Journal of Social Theory,* p. 434.

Eisner, E. W. (1998). *The enlightened eye: qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice.* New Jersey: Pearson Education Prentice Hall.

Enders, J. (1998). "Academic staff mobility in the European community: The ERASMUS experience. Comparative Education Review". v. 42 no. 1, pp. 46-60.

Eriksen, E.O. and Fossum, E. (2002). "Europe in search of its legitimacy: Assessing   strategies of legitimation", *ARENA Working Papers*, v. 02 no. 38, pp. 1-29, retrieved 02 April 2016 http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp02_38.pdf

Eriksen, T. H. (1995). "We and Us: Two Modes of Group Identification." *Journal of Peace* v.32 pp. 427-436

Erikson, E.H. (1963). *Childhood and Society.* New York: Norton.

Ertl H. (2003). "European Union Programs for Educational and Vocational Training: Development and Impact", Skope Research Paper, no: 42, pp. 1-39

Ertuğrul, K. (2001). "AB ve Avrupalılık", *Doğu-Batı Düşünce Publication*, V. 4, No. 14. Ankara. pp.144 -155.

European Commission. (1998) "Communication on people's Europe" retrieved 02 May 2015 http://aei.pitt.edu/56107/

European Commission Bulletin (1985) "Reports from the ad hoc committee" retrieved 02 May 2016
http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10234/49877/Suplemento7-85en.pdf?sequence=1

European Commission (1987), "Communication on a fresh boost for culture in the European Community", pp.9 retrieved 01 May 2016 http://aei.pitt.edu/6854/1/6854.pdf

European Commission (1992). "Europe and the Challenge of Enlargement Report" Bulletin of the EC, Supplement 3/92, p. 11. retrieved 10 April 2014 http://aei.pitt.edu/1573/1/challenge_of_enlargement_June_92.pdf

European Commission (2001) "Conclusions of the Presidency: Laeken Declaration On the Future of the European Union", European Council in Laeken, retrieved 16 June 2016 http://www.cvce.eu/en/obj/laeken_declaration_on_the_future_of_the_european_union_15_december_2001-en-a76801d5-4bf0-4483-9000 e6df94b07a55.html

European Commission (2007), "Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on A European Agenda for Culture in A Globalizing World", p. 4. retrieved 11 March 2016 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/GA/ALL/?uri=celex:52007DC0242

European Commissions (2009) "Access to European Law" retrieved 02 May 2016 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:c11328

European Commissions (2010) "Erasmus program" retrieved 01 May 2016 http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmusplus/sites/erasmusplus/files/files/resources/erasmus-plus-programme-guide_en.pdf

European Commission (2012) "Eurobarometer Survey: Candidate Countries" retrieved 25 May 2016,
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/cceb/2001/cceb20011_en.pdf

European Commissions (2014) "Facts and Figure of Erasmus Program" retrieved   http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/statistics/erasmus-plus-facts-figures_en.pdf

European Commission (2014) "Erasmus impact study" retrieved 01 June 2015   http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/study/2014/erasmus-impact_en.pdf

European Commission (2015) "Comenius program" retrieved 10 May 2015 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/comenius/comenius_en.php

European Commission (2015) "Da Vinci Actions" retrieved 10 May 2015 http://ec.europa.eu/education/tools/docs/da-vinci-actions-2013_en.pdf

European Commission (2015) "Erasmus facts and figures" retrieved 10 April 2015   http://ec.europa.eu/education/library/statistics/ay-12-13/facts-figures_en.pdf

European Commission (2015) "Eurydice program" retrieved 10 May 2015
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/about_eurydice_en.php

European Commission (2015) "Grundtvig program" retrieved 10 May 2015 http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/grundtvig/grundtvig_en.php

European Commission (2015) "Jean Monnet Projects" retrieved 10 May 2015   https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/actions/jean-monnet/jean-monnet-projects_en

European Commission (2015) "Lingua program" retrieved 10 May 2015
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/static/en/overview/lingua_overview.htm

European Commission (1992) "Maastricht Treaty Article 17"retrieved 23 May 2016
http://europa.eu/eulaw/decisionmaking/treaties/pdf/treaty_on_european_union/treaty_on_european_union_en.pdf

European Commission (2015) "Minerva program" retrieved 10 May 2015
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/static/en/overview/minerva_overview.htm

European Commission (2015) "Socrates Phase II" retrieved 10 May 2015
http://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/BG/ALL/?uri=URISERV:c11043

European Commissions (2016) "Curriculum Development Project" retrieved 01 January 2016
http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/static/en/erasmus/documents/compendium-CD-2004.pdf

European Commission (2016) "Public Opinion, Europebarometer Surveys" retrieved 29 April 2016
ttp://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/PublicOpinion/index.cfm/General/index#p=1&instruments=QUALITATIVE

European Parliament and Council (1995), 'Decision 819/95/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 1995 establishing the Community action program 'Socrates'', retrieved 09 May 2015
http://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A31998D0576

Figel J (2006) "My vision for European student mobility in the next decade". Speech at the UK Erasmus Student Committee Conference, EUROPA Press Releases no. 06/398.

Fischer P. (1998) "Is There A European Identity In The Field Of Law? Some Considerations On The Nature and Scope Of Euroepan Law" Hafber G, Loibl G, Rest A, Sucharipa L, Zemanek K, *Kluwer Law International,* Netherlands, pp: 159

Fiske, S.T. (1993). "Controlling other people: the impact of power on stereotyping". *American Psychologist,* v. 48, pp. 621- 28.

Fligstein, N. (2008). *Euro-Clash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fligstein, N. (2008). *The EU, European Identity, and the future of Europe.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Follesdal, A. (2004). "Legitimacy Theories of the European Union", *Arena Working Papers,* Centre for European Studies, no. 04-15, pp. 3.

Fossum, E. (2001). "Identity-Politics in the European Union", *European Integration Publication*, v.23 no.4, pp. 373-405.

Friis, L. and Murphy, A. (2000). *And Never the Twain Shall Meet?: The EU's Quest For Legitimacy and Enlargement*, Kelstrup, M. and Williams, M.C. (eds), *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration: Power, Security and Community,* London: Routledge

Garcia, S. and Wallace, H. (1993) *'Conclusion',* Garcia S. (ed.), *European Identity and the search for legitimacy*, London: Pinter Publishers.

Gaskell, G. (2000). *Individual group interviewing.* Bauer, M. W. and Gaskell, G. (eds), Qualitative *researching with text, image and sound*, London: Sage Publications.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G.E., and Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications.* New Jersey: Pearson Merill Prentice Hall.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nation and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Gergen, K. (1991). *The Saturated Self. Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life.* New York: Basic Books.

Gherghina, S. (2012). "Changing Borders, Stable Attitudes: The National and European Identity Before and After the Most Recent EU Enlargements", *Romanian Journal of European Affairs* v. 12, No. 2.

Giampapa, F., (2001). "Hyphenated identities: Italian-Canadian youth and the negotiation of ethnic identities in Toronto." *International Journal of Bilingualism*, v. 5 no: 3, pp. 279- 315.

Gilbert M., (2012). *European Integration: A concise history*, Toronto: Rowman Littlefield publishing.

Gillespie, P. and Laffan, B. (2006). "European identity: Theory and empirics", Cini, M. and Bourne, A. K. (eds) "Palgrave Advances in European Union Studies", pp. 131–150. Basingstoke, UK: *Palgrave Macmillan.*

Glaser, B.G., and Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine

Gleason, P. (2011). "Identifying Identity : History." *Organization*, v. 69 no: 4, pp. 910–931.

Graf L. (2013). "The Hybridization of Vocational Training and Higher Education" *Budrich UniPress Ltd.* Opladen, Berlin and Toronto retrieved 27 May 2016 http://www.budrich-verlag.de/upload/files/artikel/00000904_010.pdf

Graham, B. (1998). *The past in Europe's present: diversity, identity and the construction of place,* Graham, B. (ed.), *Modern Europe: place, culture and identity*, London: Arnold,

Griffiths, M. (2012). "Why joy in education is an issue for socially just policies?" *Journal of Education Policy*, v. 27, no: 25, pp: 655-670. retrieved 12

June2016http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2012.710019#.V2PC5Y-cGUk

Grimm, D., (1995) "Does Europe Need a Constitution? ", *European Law Journal,* v.1, no.3.

Green, M. (2000). "On Being European: The Character and Consequences of European Identity." Smith, M (ed.), "Risks, Reforms, Resistance or Revival:The State of the EU", Oxford: *Oxford University Press*, pp: 293-322.

Groys, B. (2006). *Europe and Its Others*. Toronto: Symposium Signals in the Dark.

Grundy, S and Jamieson, L. (2007). "European Identities: From absent-minded citizens to passionate Europeans." *Sociology BSA Publication,* v. 4, pp. 663 – 680.

Grzegorz, P. (2013). "Individual, Collective, Social Identity as (Most) Contested Social Science Concept in the Symbolic Interactionism Perspective", Tamcke, M., Klein, J. J. L. and Waal, M. (eds.) *Studies in Euroculture* pp. 294.

Guibernau, M. (2002). *Francoism, transition and democracy*. London: Routledge Publishing.

Guleç, C. (2004). *Politik Psikoloji Penceresinden Siyaset Ahlakı, Kimlik Ve Laiklik*. Ankara: Umit Publication.

Gürbüz, C. (2012). *Kartal Gözüyle Milliyetçilik*, Asya Safak Publication. Istanbul.

Güvenç, B. (1996). *Türk Kimligi,* Remi Publishings, Istanbul

Hagendoorn, L. and Hraba, J. (1989). "Foreign, different, deviant, seclusive and working class: anchors to an ethnic hierarchy in the Netherlands". *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* v.12 no: 4, pp. 441- 68.

Hailbronner K (2006); "Nationality in Public International Law and European Law", retrieved 11 June 2016 http://www.law.ed.ac.uk/citmodes/files/NATACCh1Hailbronner.pdf

Hale, H. (2004). "Explaining ethnicity" *Comparative political studies* v. 37 no. 4, p. 458-485

Hall, S. (1996). "The Question of Cultural Identity." *Modernity,* v. *4*, pp. 596–632.

Hall, S. (2000). *Who needs identity.* Sage Publications*.*

Hall, S. (2003). "In but not Of Europe. Europe and its Myths." *Soundings Publishing,* v.22 pp. 57-69.

Hall, S., Held, D. and McGrew, T. (1992). *Modernity and its Futures.* London: Polity Press, Open University.

Ham, P. (2000). "Identity Beyond the State: The Case of the European Union", retrieved 18 October, 2015 http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/vap01/

Hammersley, M. and Gomm, R. (2008). *Assessing the radical critiques of interviews.* Hammersley, M. (ed.), *Questioning Qualitative Inquiry: Critical Essays* London: Sage.

Hermanowicz, J. C. (2002). "The great interview: 25 strategies for studying people in bed". *Qualitative Sociology*. v. 25 no: 4 pp. 479-499. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021062932081

Hewstone, M. (1986). *Understanding Attitudes to the European Community: A Social-Psychological Study in Four Member States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hilton, J.L. and von Hippel, W. (1996). "Stereotypes". *Annual Review of Psychology*, v. 47, pp. 237- 271.

Hobsbawm, E. (2003). *Kısa 20. Yüzyıl 1914-1991 Aşırılıklar Çağı*. Alogan, Y. (ed.), Istanbul: Sarmal Publication.

Hofstede G. (1991) *Cultures and organizations Software of the mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. London: McGraw-Hill publication.

Hogg, M. (2006). *Social Identity Theory*, Burke, P. J. (ed.), *Contemporary Social Psychological Theories*, USA: Stanford University Press.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Addison-Wesley

Hortobágyi, I. (2009). "The role of identity in intercultural communication", *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov* , v. 2, pp. 51

Howarth, C., Permanadeli, R., Sen, R. and Wagner W. (2012). *The Veil And Muslim Women's Identity: Cultural Pressures and Resistance To Stereotyping.* Sage Publications.

Huntington, S. (1998). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: Touchstone Books.

Inglehart, R. (2000). "World values surveys and European values surveys, 1981-1984, 1990-1993, and 1995-1997", *Ronald University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. Political and Social Research,* pp. 3-10

Islam, M. R., and Hewstone, M. (1993). "Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude": *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, v. 19, pp. 700- 710.

Jackson, R. (2003). *Citizenship, religious and cultural diversity and education.* Jackson, R. (ed.), *International Perspectives on Citizenship, Education and Religious Diversity.* London and New York: Routledge Falmer, 2003, pp.2. 494

Jacobs, D. and R. Maier, R. (1998). "European identity: construct, fact and fiction", *Maastricht Shaker Publishing,* pp. 13-34.

Jameson, D. (2007). "Reconceptualizing cultural identity and its role in intercultural business communication", *Journal of Business Communication*, v. 44 no. 3, pp. 199-235.

Janne, H. (1973). "For a Community Policy on Education." *Bulletin of the EC*, pp. 10-73.

Jenkins, B. and Sofos, S.A. (1996). *Nation and identity in contemporary Europe*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social Identity.* New York: Routledge.

Jensen, I. (2001) .*The Practice of Intercultural Communication - reflections for professionals in cultural meetings*. University of Roskilde, Denmark. retrived 3 february 2015. www.immi.se/intercultural/nr6/jensen.pdf

Johansson, J. (2007). "A Critical Analysis of the Official European Union Discourse on European Identity and Higher Education", Linköping Studies in

Arts and Science, retrieved 11 April 2014 https://www.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:623656/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. (1984). "Relationships between black and white students in intergroup cooperation and competition". *Journal of Social Psychology,* v. 125, pp. 42-428.

Johnstone, B. (1999*). Communication in the Multicultural Settings: Resources and Strategies for Affiliation and Identity*, Torben Vestergaard, eds, *Language, Culture and Identity*, Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Judd, C.M., Ryan, C.S., and Park, B. (1991). "Accuracy in the judgment of in-group and out-group variability". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* v. 61, pp. 366- 79.

Kaltenthaler, K. and Christopher, J.A. (2001). "Europeans and Their Money: Explaining Public Support for a Common European Currency", *European Journal of Political Research*, v. 40, no. 2, pp. 139-170.

Katz, D., and Braly, K.W. (1933). "Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* v. 28, pp. 280- 290.

Kelo, M., Teichler, U. and Wächter, B. (2006). "EURODATA: Student mobility in European Higher Education." Lemmens. http://ec.europa.eu/education/Erasmus/doc/publ/eurodata_en.pdf.

King, R., Ruiz-Gelices, E. (2003). "International Student Migration and the European 'Year Abroad'. Effects on European Identity and Subsequent Migration Behavior". *International Journal of Population Geography*, vol. 9, pp. 229-252.

Klein, O. (2003). "How european am I? Prejudice expression and the presentation of social identity" *Service de Psychologie Sociale* pp. 251–264.

Kohli, M. (2000). "The Battlegrounds of European Identity", *European Societies*, v. 2, no. 2, pp. 113-137.

Kostakopoulou, T. (2001). *Citizenship, Identity and Immigration in the European Union: Between Past and Future*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kramer L. (2011). *Nationalism in Europe and America,* Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.

Kraus, P.A. (2003). "Cultural Pluralism and European Polity-Building: Neither Westphalia nor Cosmopolis", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, v. 41, no. 4, pp. 683.

Krueger, J. (1996). "Probabilistic national stereotypes". *European Journal of Social Psychology,* v. 26, pp. 961- 80.

Krupnik, S. and Krzaklewska. E. (2007). "The Role of the Erasmus Program in Enhancing Intercultural Dialogue", *International Barcelona Conference*. Barcelona

Kundera, M. (1999). *Immortality*. USA: HarperCollins Publishers.

Laffan, B., (1996) "The Politics of Identity and Political Order in Europe", *Journal of Common Market Studies,* v. 36. No: 4. pp. 82-102

Lee, L. S. (2003). "Identity/Identities in a Plural World" Gómez-Chacón, M. I. (eds.) "Individual, Group and Society", *HumanitarianNet.*

Lepsius, M.R. (2001). *The European Union: Economic and Political Integration and Cultural Plurality*, Eder, K. and Giesen, B. (eds), *European Citizenship between National Legacies and Post-national Projects*, New York: Oxford University Press.

LeVine, R.A., and Campbell, D.T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories and conflict, ethnic attitudes and groups behavior.* New York: John Wiley publishing.

Linssen, H., and Hagendoorn, L. (1994). "Social and geographical factors in the explanation of the context of European nationality stereotypes". *British Journal of Social Psychology*, v. 33, pp. 165- 82.

Lipmann, W. (1922). Public Opinion. New York: Harcourt publishing

Lodge, J. (1995). "Democratic Legitimacy and the EC: Crossing the Rubicon", *International Journal of Public Administration*, v. 18, pp. 1595-1637.

Longo M. Murray P. (2015). *Europea Legitimacy Crisis*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillian Publishing.

Luna-Arocas, R., Guzman, G., Quintanilla, I. and Farhangmehr, M. (2001). "The Euro and European Identity: The Spanish and Portuguese Case", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, v. 22, no. 4, pp. 441-460

Lunn, K. (1996). "Reconsidering Britishness: The construction and significance of national identity in twentieth century Britain", Jenkins, B. and Sofos, S.A. (eds.), "Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe", *London Routledge*, pp: 86-87.

MacCann D. (2010). *The Political Economy of the European Union,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mak, C. (2009). "Common Market Law Review." *Nature*, 277–295.

Marín, M. A. (2003). "The European Dimension of Education", Gómez-Chacón, M. I. (ed.) "Individual, Group and Society", *HumanitarianNet.*

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*., Sage Publications. London.

Matusitz J. (2012). "Relationship between Knowledge, Stereotyping, and Prejudice in Interethnic Communication" *Revista de Turismo y patrimonio cultural* v. 10 no: 1 pp. 89-98

Mauleon, X. (2003). "Borderline Europeans: Nationalism and Fundamentalism." Gómez-Chacón, M. I. (eds.) "Individual, Group and Society", *HumanitarianNet.*

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). "Qualitative research design: an interactive approach". *Applied Social Research Methods Series* Sage Publications, California: v. 41. pp.22

McLaren, L. (2002). "Public Support for the European Union: Cost/Benefit Analysis or Perceived Cultural Threat?", *Journal of Politics*, v. 64, no. 12, pp. 551-566.

Merkel, W. (1999). "Legitimacy and Democracy: Endogenuous limits of European integration", Anderson, J. (ed), "Regional Integration and Democracy: Expanding on the European Experience". US: *Rowman & Littlefield Publishers*, pp.45-67.

Meyer, T. (2006). "European Identity", Seminar of Summer School, University of Graz, retrieved 16 May 2016 http://www.unigraz.at/en/bibwww/bibwww_strategicfocus/bibwww_see/bibwww_see_projects/bibwww_soe_seggau/bibwww_soe_seggau_program/bibwww_soe_ seggau_meyer_inhalte.html

Mitchell K. (2012). "Student mobility and European Identity: Erasmus study as a civic experience", Journal of Contemporary European Research, v. 8, no: 4, pp. 490-518

Moes, J. (2008). "European identity compared A mixed methods approach", *ECPR fourth PAN-European conference on EU-Politics.* Riga.

Murphy-Lejeune E. (2002) *Student mobility and narrative in Europe,* London and Newyork: Routhledge publication.

Myers, J. P. (2006). "Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the US", Theory and Research in Social Education, v. 34 no: 3, pp. 370-394.

Neuendorf, K. A., Atkin, D., and Jeffres, L. W. (2002). *Adoption of Audio Information Services in the United States.* Hampton Press.

Neumann, I. B. (2006). "Changing others" . *Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt* p. 710.

Neumann, I.B. (2006). "European Identity and Its Changing Others", *Norwegian Institute of International Affairs*, no. 710, pp. 6.

Nevola, G. (2001). "Education and Political Socialisation between National Identity and European Citizenship", Haller, M. (Ed.), "The Making of the European Union": Contributions of the Social Sciences European and Transatlantic Studies, Germany: *Springer,* pp. 331-359

Obradovic, D. (1996). "Policy Legitimacy and the European Union", *Journal of Common Market Studies,* v. 34, no. 2, pp. 193.

Oner S. (2011). *Turkey and the European Union,* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Orchard, V. (2002). "Culture as Opposed to What? Cultural Belonging in the Context of National and European Identity", *European Journal of Social Theory,* v. 5 no: 4, pp. 419-433.

Öner, S. (2004). "The limits of European integration: The question of European identity" *Avrupa Çalışma Journal* v. 3 no. 2.

Paksoy, F. (2013). "Turkey and the Issue of European Identity: An Analysis of the Media Representation of Turkey's EU Bid within the Framework of Religion and Culture", *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations,* v. 15, no. 1, pp. 28.

Pantel, M. (1999). *Unity-in-Diversity: Cultural Policy and EU Legitimacy*, Banchoff, T. and Smith, M.P. (eds.), *Legitimacy and the European Union: The Contested Polity*. New York: Routledge.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Peabody, D. (1985). *National Characteristics.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pehrson, S., Brown, R., and Zagefka, H. (2009). "When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist in-group definitions." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, v. 48, pp: 61-76.

Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V. L. and Brown, R. (2009). "National identification and anti- immigrant prejudice: Individual and contextual effects of national definitions." *Social Psychology Quarterly*, v. 72 no: 1, pp. 24-38.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). "Intergroup contact theory". *Annual Review of Psychology*, v. 49, pp. 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., and Tropp, L. R. (2005). "Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups". *Psychological Science*, v. 16, pp. 951-957.

Poppe, E., and Linssen, H. (1999). "In-group favoritism and the reflection of realistic dimensions of difference between national states in Central and Eastern European nationality stereotypes". *British Journalof Social Psychology*, v. 38, pp. 85-102.

Pujolar, J. (2008). "Youth, language and identity", *Revista de Sociolingüística.* Retrieved 20 May 2016 http://www.gencat.cat/llengua/noves

Ramirez, F.O. and Boli, J, (1987). "On the Unions of States and Schools." G.M. et al. (eds.), Institutional Structure: "Constituting State, Society and the Individual." US: *Sage Publications*, pp. 173-197.

Reicher, S. and Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London: Sage Publication.

Reif, K. (1993). "Cultural Convergence and Cultural Diversity as Factors in European Identity", García, S. (ed.), "European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy". London; New York: *Pinter Publishers*, pp. 131.

Risse, T. (2003). "An emerging European Identity? What we know, and how to make sense of it." *Lecture at the University of Helsinki*.

Risse, T. (2004). *European Institutions and Identity Change: What Have We Learned?* in Richard K. Hermann, Thomas Risee, and Marilyn B. Brewer, eds. *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU.*

Rothberger, H., and Worchel, S. (1997). "The view from below: Intergroup relations from the perspective of the disadvantaged group". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, v. 73, pp. 1191-1205.

Rothman, S. (1970). *European Society and Politics, US:* The Bobbs-Merrill Company

Roulston K. (2009). *Asking questions and individual interviews*. Georgia: Sage Publications.

Ruiz-Jiménez, M. A. and Torreblanca, J. I. (2007). "European public opinion and Turkey's accession making sense of arguments for and against." *Networking the future of Europe,* pp. 52.

Ruiz, A. M., Górniak, J. J., Kosic, A., Kiss, P. and Kandulla, M. (2004). "European and National Identities in EU's Old and New Member States: Ethnic, Civic, Instrumental and Symbolic Components." *European Integration online Papers,* v. 8, no. 11 retrieved 05 May 2016 http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-011a.htm

Russello, G. (1998). *Christianity and European culture,* New York: American Press.

Ryba R. (2000). *Developing the European Dimension in Education: The Roles of the European Union and the Council of Europe*, Greenwood Publishing Group. Connecticut; London.

Saggar, S., Somerville, W., Ford, R. and Sobolewska, M. (2012). "The impacts of migration on social cohesion and integration." *Migration Advisory Committee report.* Retrieved 02 May 2016 http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/workingwithus/indbodies/mac/

Sally J. M., (2000) "The Challenge of Applying Content Analysis to the World Wide Web." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, v.77 no: 1 pp. 80-98

Sassatelli, M. (2002). "Imagined Europe: The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity Through EU." *Sage Publications European Journal of Social Theory*, v. 5, pp. 435-451.

Schmidtke, O. (1998). "Obstacles and Prospects for a European Collective Identity and Citizenship", Hedetoft, U. (ed.), "Political Symbols, Symbolic Politics: European Identities in Transformation", *Brookfield*, v. Ashgate, p. 57.

Schomburg, H., and Teichler, U. (2009*). The Professional value of Erasmus mobility: The impact of international experience on former students' and on teachers' Careers*. ACA Papers on International Cooperation in Education. Bonn: Lemmens

Shaftel, J., Shaftel T. and Ahluwalia, R. (2007). "International educational experience and intercultural competence", *International Journal of Business & Economics*, v. 6, no. 1, pp: 25-34.

Schlesinger, P. (1994). "Europeaness'- A new cultural battlefield", Pohoryles, R.J. and Giorgi, L. (eds.), "European Transformations: Five Decisive Years at the Turn of the Century": An 'Innovation' Reader 1988-1992, *Aldershot: Avebury,* pp. 33-49.

Schlesinger, P. and Foret, F. (2006). "Political Roof and Sacred Canopy? Religion and the EU Constitution", *European Journal of Social Theory*, v. 9, no. 1, pp. 59-81

Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*, London: Routledge.

Sigalas, E. (2010). "Cross-border mobility and European identity: The effectiveness of intergroup contact during the ERASMUS year abroad", *European Union Politics,* v. 11: p. 241.

Simon, B., Aufderheide, B., and Kampmeier, C. (2001). "The social psychology of minority-majority relations". Brown R., and Gaertner S. (eds.). "Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes" Berlin: *Blackwell.* pp. 303-323.

Simon, B. (1992). "The perception of ingroup and outgroup homogeneity: Reintroducing the intergroup context". *European Review of Social Psychology*, v.3, pp 1-30.

Sinclair, J. and Milner, D. (2005). "On being Jewish: A qualitative study of Identity among British jews in emerging adulthood", *Journal of adolescent Research Sage Publication,* v. 20 p. 91.

Sinnot, R. (2005). "An evaluation of the measurement of national, subnational and supranational identity in crossnational surveys", *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, v.18 no: 2, pp. 211-223.

Smith, A.D. (1995). *The Formation of National Identity* in Harris, H. (ed.), *Identity*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, C., and Hopkins, R. (2004). "Mitigating the impact of stereotypes on academic performance: The effects of cultural identity and attributions for success among African American college students." *Western Journal of Black Studies*, v. 28 no:, pp. 312–321.

Soares, M. (1999). "European İdentity and Political Experience", Reflections on European Identitiy, ed.Thomas Jansen, Brussels, *European Commission, Forward Studies Unit,* retrieved 20 February 2015 http://ec.europa.eu/comm/cdp/workingpaper/european_identity_en.pdf,

Soler, P., Novella, A. M. and Planas, A. (2015). "The structures structures of youth participation in Catalonia since the democratic transition", *Catalan social sciences review,* v.5 pp. 107 – 128. Barcelona, retrieved 12 May 2016 http://revistes.iec.cat/index/CSSr

Somers, M.R. (1994). "The Narrative Constitution of Identity", *Theory and Society v.* 23: pp. 605–49.

Soysal, Y. N., (2002) "Locating Europe", *European Societies*, v.4, no.3.

Stavrakakis, Y. (2005). "Passions of Identification: Discourse, Enjoyment, and European Identity in Discourse Theory", Howarth, D. and Torfing, J. (eds.), "European Politics: Identity, Policy and Governance". New York: *Palgrave Macmillan*, pp. 68-69.

Stepanoviené, A. (2011). "Exchange Students' Experiences in Intercultural Communication", *Studies about languages*. No. 18 retrieved 13 July 2014. http://www.kalbos.ktu.lt/index.php/KStud/article/view/410/733

Strath, B. (2002). "A European Identity: To the Historical Limits of a Concept." *European Journal of Social Theory*, v. *5* no: 4, pp. 387–401.

Stråth, B. (2000). *Introduction: Europe as a Discourse,* Bruxelles: Peter Lang Publishing.

Swing, E. S. (2000). *Problems and prospects of European Education*. Greenwood Publishing Group. Connecticut; London.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., and Turner, J. C. (1986). *The social identity theory of intergroup behavior.* Worchel S. and Austin W. G. (eds.), Psychology of intergroup relations. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Teichler U., (2001). "Changes of Erasmus under the Umbrella of Socrates" Journal of Studies in International Education, v. 205 pp. 201.

Toksoz F., (2008). *The European Educational Space and The Construction of European Identity*, Istanbul: Marmara University EU Relation.

Torben Vestergaard, (1999). *Language, Culture and Identity,* Aalborg, Aalborg University Press.

Tornos, A. (2003). "The Meaning of European Identity: Past, Present or Future Project" Gómez-Chacón, M. I. (ed.) "Individual, Group and Society", *HumanitarianNet.*

Toulemon, R. (1998). "For a democratic Europe", Westlake, M. (ed.), "The European Union beyond Amsterdam: New Concepts of European Integration". London: *Routledge Publication*, pp.116-129.

Trauch, G. (1999). "Conscious of European Identity after 1945" Reflections on European Identitiy, Ed. Thomas Jansen, Brussels, European Commission, *Forward Studies Unit*, retrieved 20 February 2015 http://ec.europa.eu/comm/cdp/workingpaper/european_identity_en.pdf

Triandafyllidou, A. (2008). "Popular Perceptions of Europe and the Nation: the case Of Italy" *Nations and Nationalism v.* 14 no: 2 pp. 261-282.

Tzeng, O. C. S. and Jackson, J. W. (1994). "Effects of contact, conflict, and social identity on interethnic group hostilities". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, v.18, pp. 259-276.

Udrea, G. (2012). "European Identity and Erasmus mobility: Insights from Romanian students' experiences." *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations, v.* 14 no. 5, pp. 21-32.

Udrea, G., Udrea, M. and Tugmeanu, A. E. (2012). "National and European Identity: An empirical research on how Romanian students experience identities during their long-term studies abroad", *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*. v14 no: 5, pp. 21-32.

Von Ehrenfels, V.R. (1961). "A trend in the development of national units". *Tamil Culture*, v. 9, pp. 1- 12.

Van Kersbergen, K. (2000). "Political Allegiance and European Integration", *European Journal of Political Research,* v. 37, no. 1, pp. 11.

Van Mol, C. (2013). "Intra-European student mobility and European Identity: A successful marriage?" *Population, Space and Place,* v.19, no.2, pp. 209–22.

Venn, C. (2006). "The Enlightenment." *Theory, Culture & Society*, v. 23, no. 2 p. 478.

Vestergaard, T. (1999). *Language, Culture and Identity,* Aalborg: Aalborg University Press

Von Busekist, A. (2004). "Uses and Misuses of the Concept of Identity." *Security Dialogue*, v. 35 no: 1, pp. 81–98.

Walkenhorst, H. (2004). "The Construction of European Identity and the Role of National Educational Systems- A Case Study on Germany", retrieved 3 January,2015
http://www.essex.ac.uk/government/Essex_Papers/Number_160.pdf

Wallace, W. (1991). "Foreign Policy and National Identity in the United Kingdom", *International Affairs, v.* 67 no: 1, pp. 65-80.

Wallace, W. (2002). *Dilemmas of inclusion and exclusion.* Zielonka, J. (eds). *Europe unbound: enlarging and reshaping the boundaries of the European Union*. London; New York: Routledge.

Walt, S. (1998) "International Relations: One World, Many Theories", *Foreign Policy publication*, pp. 29-46. retriewed 20 June 2016
http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/hpschmitz/PSC124/PSC124Readings/WaltOneWorldManyTheories.pdf

Weare C. and Lin W. Y. (2000). "Content Analysis of the World Wide Web: Opportunities and Challenges" *Social Science Computer Review,* pp. 18

Weaver, O. (2004) Discursive Approaches, European Integration Theory, New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, R. P.(1990) *Basic Content Analysis*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Weiler, J.H.H. (1995). "Does Europe Need a Constitution? Demos, Telos, and the German Maastricht Decision", *European Law Journal*, v. 1, no. 3, p. 227.

Whitman, R. G. (1998). "From Civilian Power to Superpower? The International Identity of the European Union". Houndmills: *Macmillan Publication*, p. 144.

Wiener, A. (1997). "Making sense of the new geography of citizenship: Fragmented citizenship in the European Union", *Theory and Society Publication*, v.26, no.4, pp. 532 retrieved 05 May 2016 http://www.jstor.org

Wiener, A. (1997). "Assessing the Constructive Potential of Union Citizenship - A Socio-Historical Perspective." *EIop publication* v.1 no: 017 pp. 13.

Wilder, D.A. (1986). "Social categorization: Implications from creation and reduction of intergroup bias". Berkowitz L. (eds), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* v. 19, pp. 291- 355.

Wintle, M. (1996). *Introduction: Cultural Diversity and Identity in Europe*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Wintle, M. (2000). 'The Question of European Identity and the Impact of the Changes of 1989/1990", Shahin, J. and Wintle, M. (eds.), "The idea of a United Europe: Political, economic and cultural integration since the fall of the Berlin wall", London: *Macmillan*, p. 12.

Wistrich, E. (1994). *United States of Europe,* London: Routledge

Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Liebhart, K. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Woodward, K. (1997). *Identity and difference.* London: Sage publications.

Yurdusev, A. N. (2003), *Identity question in Turco-European relations*., Tariq Ismail and Mustafa Aydın (eds.) *Turkey's Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: A changing role in world politics*. New York.

Zetterholm, S. (1994). *Why is Cultural Diversity a Political Problem? A Discussion of Cultural Barriers to Political Integration*, in Zetterholm, S. (ed.), *National Cultures and European Integration: Exploratory Essays on Cultural Diversity and Common Policies*, Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Zimmer O. (2013). A Contested Nation And Nationalism in Europe, New York: Palgrave Publihings

Eurobarometer Surveys

Flash Eurobarometer (2002). "Euro attitudes, Euro Zone" October 2002.

Flash Eurobarometer (2007). "Introduction of the Euro in the new member states" November 2007

Flash Eurobarometer (2010). "EU citizenship" August 2010.

Flash Eurobarometer (2011). "Youth on the move" May 2011.

Flash Eurobarometer (2014). "Europeans in 2014" July 2014.

Flash Eurobarometer (2014). "The Promise of EU" September 2014.

Flash Eurobarometer (2015). "EU citizenship" March 2015.

Special Eurobarometer (2011). "New Europeans" April 2011.

Special Eurobarometer (2012). "Discrimination in European Union", November 2012.

Special Eurobarometer (2012). "Future of Europe" April 2012.

Special Eurobarometer (2014). "Discrimination in European Union", October 2014.

Standart Eurobarometer (2005). Public Opinion in the European Union: National Report on Turkey", spring 2005.

8 ANNEXES

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

For his interview;

Your responses will be only used for interviewer Ph.D research project

Your identity information will be kept confidential

By signing this document, you will have been accepted that you have participated in this research interview

<u>Signature</u>

SURNAME - NAME		
NATIONALITY		
GENDER		
AGE		
SCHOOL - DEPARTMENT		
ARRIVAL DATE		
RETURN DATE		
E-MAIL		

SEMI-STRUCTRED INTERVIEW FORM

1. Have you ever participated any abroad program before?

2. What are the reasons of your participation?

3. Why did you choose Spain and why did you choose Barcelona?

4. Did you know that Catalan language is spoken here more than Spanish?

5. How long have you been here and how long are you going to stay more?

6. What were your expectations before you came here?

7. Are you satisfied with your stay until now?

8. What were your impressions?

9. What do you generally think about Erasmus program?

10. Are you pleased with the education you get here?

11. Do you know anything about the purposes of Erasmus program?

12. What does Europe mean to you?

13. What do you think about the national identity of yours if you accept one?

14. Have you ever felt that your identity is different from others?

15. Do you think European identity different from others if so how or in what

aspect?

16. Do you know anything about the relation between Erasmus and European

identity?

17. If European identity exists, do you consider Erasmus makes this identity

stronger?

18. Did you realize any differences between your culture and others?

19. If you felt, how do these feelings affects your stay here?

20. Have you had any difficulties during your stay here?

21. Do you know anything about stereotypes and prejudices?

22. Did you have any stereotypes or prejudices about any specific cultures before

you came here?

23. Have your thoughts changed after this experience especially in the positive or

negative way?

24. Do you feel changed after this experience?