

MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
AVRUPA TOPLULUĐU ENSTİTÜSÜ  
AB SİYASETİ VE ULUSLAR ARASI İLİŐKİLER

**THE ROLE OF EDUCATION  
IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY**

MSC. THESIS

ÖZÜN KOCA

İstanbul, 2005



MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
AVRUPA TOPLULUĐU ENSTİTÜSÜ  
AB SİYASETİ VE ULUSLAR ARASI İLİŐKİLER

**THE ROLE OF EDUCATION  
IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY**

MSC. THESIS

ÖZÜN KOCA

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Pof. Dr. ÇiĐdem NAS

İstanbul, 2005



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ÖZET</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I. EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND EUROPEAN IDENTITY</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION</b>	<b>5</b>
1.2.1 The origins of the Idea of United Europe	5
1.2.2 The Idea of Unified Europe before and after the War Periods	7
1.2.3 From an Economic Integration to Political Integration	9
<b>1.3 CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY</b>	<b>12</b>
1.3.1 Legitimacy Problem of the EU	13
1.3.2 Major Aspects of European Identity	18
1.3.3 Theoretical Framework of European Identity	19
1.3.4 Nation State and European Identity	23
1.3.5 Importance of the Formation of a European Identity	25
<b>II. EDUCATION POLICY OF THE EU</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>2.1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>2.2 THE EVOLUTION OF EUROPEAN EDUCATION POLICY</b>	<b>31</b>
2.2.1 Historical Development of Education in Europe	31
2.2.1.1 The British Model	32
2.2.1.2 The French Model	33
2.2.1.3 The Prussian (German) Model	34
2.2.2 Legal Basis and General Aspects of European Education Policy	<b>36</b>
2.2.3 Development of European Educational Policy in the Historical Perspective	<b>39</b>
<b>2.3 EDUCATION, TRAINING AND YOUTH PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>2.3.1 EDUCATION PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>45</b>
2.3.1.1 The First Generation of programmes: 1974-1995	45
2.3.1.1.1 Comett	45
2.3.1.1.2 Erasmus	46

2.3.1.1.3	Lingua	46
2.3.1.1.4	Assessment of the first generation programmes	46
2.3.1.2	The Second Generation of Programmes : 1995 - present	47
2.3.1.2.1	Socrates Programmes	48
2.3.1.2.2	Comenius	49
2.3.1.2.3	Erasmus	50
2.3.1.2.4	Grundtvig	51
2.3.1.2.5	Lingua	52
2.3.1.2.6	Minerva	53
<b>2.3.2</b>	<b>TRAINING PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>55</b>
2.3.2.1	A Brief History of Vocational Training	55
2.3.2.2	Vocational Training in the EU	56
2.3.2.3	Recognition of Qualifications	59
2.3.2.4	Leonardo da Vinci Programme	60
2.3.2.5	Cedefop	62
<b>2.3.3</b>	<b>YOUTH PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>2.3.4</b>	<b>THE IMPACT OF THE SECOND GENERATION PROGRAMMES</b>	<b>67</b>
2.3.4.1	Interim Evaluation of the Socrates Programme	66
2.3.4.2	Interim Evaluation of the Leonardo Da Vinci Programme	67
2.3.4.3	Interim Evaluation of the Youth Programme	69
2.3.4.4	Concluding Remarks	70
<b>III.</b>	<b>EUROPEAN IDENTITY AND ITS RELATION TO EUROPEAN EDUCATION</b>	
	<b>POLICY</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN THE IDENTITY-BUILDING PROCESS</b>	<b>73</b>
3.2.1.	National Identity and Education	73
3.2.2.	Nationalization of Education Systems	78
3.2.3.	European Identity and Education	81
3.2.4.	Persistence of National Education	83
<b>3.3</b>	<b>EUROPEANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION</b>	<b>86</b>
3.3.1	Historical origins of Higher Education in the Middle Ages	89

<b>3.3.2.</b> Changes and Trends in Higher Education	89
<b>3.3.3.</b> Formation of a European Higher Education Area (Bologna Process)	92
<b>3.4 FINAL REMARKS ON THE EUROPEANIZATION     OF HIGHER EDUCATION</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>109</b>

## ÖZET

Avrupa bütünleşme projesi, Avrupa'nın sosyal ve ekonomik yıkımına ve milyonlarca insanın yaşamına mal olan II. Dünya Savaşı'nın ardından, kıtada bir başka topyekün savaşın çıkmasının önlenmesi ve Avrupa ülkelerinin ortak hedef ve çıkarlar doğrultusunda bir araya getirilmesi amacıyla ortaya konulmuştur. Bu süreçte, Avrupa bütünleşmesi önemli başarılar kaydetti. Gerçekten de, Tek Pazar'ın ve Ekonomik ve Parasal Birlik'in tamamlanmasıyla, 1990'lardan itibaren Avrupa'nın siyasi geleceği daha yoğun tartışılmaya başlanmıştır. Öte yandan, Merkez ve Doğu Avrupa ülkelerini içine alan son genişleme dalgasıyla AB'nin 25 üyeli bir birlik haline gelmesi kurumsal yapıyı ve karar alma sürecini son derece karmaşıklaştırmıştır. Hem bu soruna bir çözüm bulmak hem de ulusal düzeyden AB düzeyine giderek artan yetki transferi ve ciddi şekilde eleştirilen demokratik eksiklikten kaynaklanan meşruiyet meselesine bir yanıt bulmak amacıyla ilgili tarafların büyük gayretleri sonucu Avrupa Anayasası hazırlanmıştır. Ancak Anayasa'nın Fransa ve Hollanda'da düzenlenen referandumlarda reddedilmesi AB'nin siyasi geleceği ile ilgili ciddi şüphe ve endişelere yol açmıştır. Bu noktada Anayasa'nın Fransa ve Hollanda halkı tarafından reddedilmesinin ardında yatan nedenler iyi incelenmelidir. Şöyle ki, bu sonucu işsizlik ve kontrolsüz göçe duyulan korku gibi ekonomik ve sosyal sorunlar bağlamında açıklamak AB'nin kendini bütünleşmiş bir Avrupa hedefi ile özdeşleştiren gerçek bir Avrupa halkına sahip olmadığına dair asıl sorunu gizleyerek meseleyi basite indirgeyecektir. Sonuçta, ekonomik hedeflere bütünleşme sürecinin en başından beri öncelik verilmesi neticesinde kültür politikası ve kimlik meselesi ulusal devletlerin bir önceliği olarak kalmış, bu da kaçınılmaz olarak Avrupa bütünleşmesine halk desteğinin eksik kalmasına yol açmıştır.

Bu çerçevede Avrupa kimliğinin tartışılması ve bir Avrupalılık hissini uyandırılması son derece önemlidir. Ancak AB'nin henüz gelişmekte olan benzeri görülmemiş bir siyasi birlik modeli olduğu unutulmamalıdır. Bu nedenle, AB projesi onun benzersiz yapısını azımsamayacak yeni bir anlayış yaratmak üzere yeni terimler ve farklı bakış açıları ile tartışılmalıdır. AB, bütünleşme süreci ile ilgili tartışma ve söylemler bir AB-ulus devlet ikilemine indirilmediği takdirde eğitim ve kültür politikaları gibi geleneksel olarak ulusal devletlerin kontrolünde olan alanlarda yaratıcı ve cesur girişimlerde bulunabilecektir .

Bu bağlamda, 'Eğitim Politikasının Avrupa Kimliğinin İnşasındaki Rolü' başlıklı yüksek lisans tezi, AB'nin ortak bir eğitim politikası oluşturmadaki rolü ve etkinliğini, işsizlik



sorunu ve gittikçe artan küreselleşmeden kaynaklanan teknolojik ve ekonomik rekabet gibi iç ve dış etkenleri göz önünde bulundurarak açıklamayı amaçlamıştır. Kapsamlı bir değerlendirmeye ulaşabilmek için Avrupa eğitim politikasının oluşumu ve başlıca araçları, hem tarihsel arka plan hem de üye ülkelerin ilk ve orta öğrenim yerine mesleki eğitim ve yüksek öğrenim alanlarında işbirliği yapmadaki istekliliklerinin ardındaki nedenler verilerek incelenmiştir. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma üye ülkelerin ortak bir Avrupa eğitim politikasının oluşturulması söz konusu olduğunda bir Avrupa üst-kimliğinin yaratılmasına yönelik gerçek bir isteklilikten çok ekonomik hedef ve öncelikler doğrultusunda harekete geçtiklerini ortaya koymaya çalışmıştır.

## **ABSTRACT**

European integration project was put forward following the WWII, which caused social and economic destruction of Europe and claimed of millions of peoples lives, with the aim of preventing outburst of any total war in the Continent and also bringing European countries together in pursuance of common interests and objectives. The European integration has made great strides in this process. With the accomplishment of the Single Market and the Economic and Monetary Union, the political future of Europe has been widely discussed since the '90s. On the other hand, as EU became a union of 25 member states with the last enlargement covering the Central and Eastern European countries, the institutional management and decision-making process became extremely complicated. In order to find a solution to this problem, as well as to meet the issue of legitimacy caused by the increasing sovereignty transfer from national to EU level and the growing problem of democratic deficit, the European Constitution was prepared thanks to the great efforts of the concerned sides. However, the fact that the Constitution was rejected in referendums held in France and the Netherlands give rise to the serious doubts and considerations regarding the future of Europe. At this point, the reasons behind the rejection of the Constitution by French and Dutch people should be studied carefully. Explaining this result in terms of reaction against the integration process due to economic and social problems such as unemployment and fear of uncontrolled immigration will oversimplify the situation while veiling the basic point that EU does not have a genuine European demos identifying with the aim of a united Europe. As a result, since the economic objectives have been given the priority from the very beginning of the integration process, the cultural policy and the issue of identity have remained a priority of national states, which inevitably led to the lack of public support for European integration.

In this context, discussing European identity and inspiring a sense of Europeanness are of critical importance. One should be reminded that EU is a unique political unity which is gradually evolving. For this reason, the EU project deserves to be discussed in new terms and from different perspectives so as to create a new understanding of Europe which does not underestimate its unique character. EU will be able to take innovative and courageous initiatives in the areas which are traditionally dominated by national states such as education and cultural policies provided that discourses and discussions about European integration process are not reduced to a nation-state-EU dilemma.

In this regard, this MA thesis, titled as ‘The Role of Education in the Construction of European Identity’, aims to examine the role and influence of EU in shaping of a common educational policy by taking into account the external and internal incentives such as the unemployment problem and the technological and economic competition stemming from increasing globalization. In order to reach a comprehensive assessment, the evolution of European educational policy and its major instruments are examined by providing both the historical background and the main motives behind the willingness of member states to cooperate in vocational training and higher education areas instead of primary and secondary education. As a conclusion, this study attempts to reveal that the member states have been driven by economic aspirations and priorities rather than a genuine enthusiasm for the creation of a supranational European identity considering the formation of European educational policies.

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

BA	Bachelor of Arts
CEDEFOP	European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
COMETT	Community Program for Education and Training in Technology
CoR	Committee of the Regions
EC	European Community
ECTS	European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students
EEA	European Economic Area
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
EMU	European Monetary Union
EP	European Parliament
ERA	European Research Area
ESIB	The National Unions of Students in Europe
EU	European Union
EUA	European University Association
EUROSTAT	Statistical Office of the European Union
EVS	European Voluntary Service
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IGC	Intergovernmental Conference
LINGUA	Language and Training Programme
LDV	Leonardo da Vinci Programme

NARIC	Network of National Recognition Information Centres
ODL	Open and Distance Learning
SEA	Single European Act
TEU	Treaty on European Union
UK	United Kingdom
WWII	Second World War

## INTRODUCTION

The present work explores the impact of education in gradual evolution of a European identity that may play a role in the political integration of the Member States of the EU. EU is a unique political integration project with an end goal of being a political integration. In fact, EU is neither a simple free trade area nor an intergovernmental institution pursuing limited objectives regarding a specific issue. EU differs from international organizations on two basic aspects. First, there is a sovereignty transfer from nation-state to EU in a number of policy areas such as economy and monetary policies and customs union. Member states are supposed to pursue EU common policies in these areas. Second, EU law has supremacy over the domestic law of the member states that makes member states implement the EU law even if the Community law conflicts with their internal law. Nonetheless, given the traditional reluctance of member states to take necessary steps towards deepening of the political union, it is rather difficult to claim that the goal of political union is likely to be achieved. It has become obvious that a transformation from an economy-based integration to political-based integration will be more difficult than it is anticipated. There are some underlying reasons for this long-lasting stagnation. European people who are discontented with the unsolved unemployment problem as well as with the high cost of living stemming from euro can be easily manipulated by nationalist politicians keen on a weakening political integration. Problems related to the immigrant workers further aggravate the situation by giving rise to xenophobia and racism. As a result, rising nationalism has emerged in Europe as a seriously challenging obstacle to the goal of political union.

More importantly, the issue of democratic deficit raised the questions of EU legitimacy in the last years. While the European project was trying to complete the Single Market, it was far from touching the sensitive issues for member states, such as identity, education, culture, e.g. However, with the successful completion of the Single Market and the introduction of single currency, the need for providing a political framework for what was achieved until that time has revealed itself as 'sine qua non'. At this point, the importance of a European identity should not be underestimated.

It is the construction of European identity that should be given priority during the building of European political union. The idea of European identity is in dispute on the grounds that there is not an exact definition of European identity. The political and cultural dimensions of

European identity have to be discussed in different terms. While cultural identity is based on the Greek-Roman origins, on Judaco-Christian elements and on the Renaissance, Reform and Enlightenment movements, the political identity essentially addresses the concept of European citizenship. Stressing too much on the European cultural origins will be result in the exclusion of other groups such as Muslims, immigrants, cultural and religious minorities that have a strong feel of belonging to their own cultural values. Another issue regarding the idea of European identity is that EU does not pursue a common identity policy because of the national resistance to the creation of an overriding European identity. The construction of a European identity by using the old methods of nation-building can have a limited success since the EU and the nation-state are entirely different political formations.

As regards to the education-identity formation relation, the educational policies that played a pivotal role in the construction of national identities do not have the same impact on the creation of European identity. The main reason of the inefficiency of European authorities is that the domain of educational policy is highly regarded as the best way of inculcating a national awareness in young people. EU does not also have strong instruments such as compulsory primary and secondary education based on a common curriculum implemented by central and local authorities nationwide. Instead of this, European education policy have been developed so as to create a fairly loose educational space in which the member states are involved on a voluntary basis. The key issues such as unemployment and economic crises in the '70s and '80s, and global economical and technological competition in the last decades have shaped the creation of European educational space. The member states have enhanced the cooperation areas in the field of vocational training and higher education that have close ties with the free market seeking qualified workforce as well as the production of commercialized knowledge and technology. Europeanization of higher education was launched with the Bologna Declaration which has been the most ambitious initiative taken in the construction of a European educational space so far .

This MA thesis, titled as 'The Role of Education in the Construction of European Identity', aims to provide a comprehensive assessment of the gradual evolution of European education policy within the framework of European identity creation which in turn strengthen political integration in Europe. The thesis consists of three chapters. The first chapter centers on historical origins of the idea of European political integration and major aspects of the concept of European identity with reference to its theoretical background. In this chapter, the

issue of legitimacy problem and the underlying reasons behind the need for European identity are also discussed in details to reveal the close relation between a supranational European identity and the prospective political integration .

In the second chapter, educational development in Europe is examined in a historical perspective. In addition, evolution of European educational policy, its legal bases and its major aspects are given in order to highlight the main drawbacks of educational policies. In the second section of this chapter, three pillars of European educational policy, namely Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci and Youth programmes, are scrutinized in terms of their legal bases, instruments, objectives and efficiencies within a historical integrity.

In the last chapter, the role of education in identity creation is analysed since it has a remarkable influence on the construction of national identity. As to the European identity formation, it remains rather limited since the member states had strongly entrenched national education systems. In the following section of the third chapter, Europeanization of higher education area (Bologna Process) is examined with reference to its historical roots of higher education traced back the Middle Ages as well as to the changes and trends in higher education in the era of globalisation.

The thesis, which intends to reveal the fact that the success of political integration increasingly depends on the creation of a supranational identity as an indispensable cultural and psychological component, essentially concentrates on the evolution of European educational policy in terms of its role and its impact on the construction of European identity. To provide a comprehensive framework, the historical background of the related subjects is given in each chapter. In addition to the books and articles of several authors interested in nationalism, European identity and nation-state formation, educational journals, primary sources such as communications, the founding treaties, commission reports and finally internet resources such as educational web sites were utilized with a view to scrutinize the issue from different perspectives and within a historical integrity .



# **I. EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND EUROPEAN IDENTITY**

## **1.1. INTRODUCTION**

Today, the European Union, which started as an economic integration, stands at a crossroads. Despite the great efforts to strengthen the political integration, the future of the political integration is highly unclear and uncertain, as it was seen in the recent constitutional crises. The aim of creating a politically united Europe traces back to the early Middle Ages. The different parts of Europe had been conquered by the ambitious leaders such as Charlemagne, the Frankish Emperor, Napoleon and Hitler in the different periods of history. However, these attempts were doomed to fail due to the fact that these short-lived victories were attained at the expense of other people's freedom. Until the end of the Second World War, Europe experienced apocalyptic wars which claimed millions of people's lives. In that regard, the WWII was a turning point not only in the world history but also in the European integration history. Being totally destructed economically, politically and socially, the European states came together under the supervision of the United States; and the European Economic Community seeking to complete the political integration as an ultimate goal was established in 1951. In short, the aim of being a political union, which has been intensively discussed in the last years, is a long-lasting political aspiration. In this respect, the reasons behind the recent crises should be read as the alarming results of the lack of identification of the European people with the political integration process. The strongly entrenched national identities can be considered as one of the very reasons of this public apathy about European politics. In addition to the national reservations, the distance between the European people and the European policy-makers have resulted in questioning of the legitimacy and even the long-term objectives of the EU. In this context, it is absolutely essential that an overarching European identity be constructed.

## **1.2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION**

### **1.2.1 The origins of the Idea of United Europe**

The idea of Europe as a political entity has its roots in the very Ancient ages. It is thought that the term 'Europe' comes from Greek. The Greek philosopher, Aristoteles used the term 'barbarians' of Europe while he pointed out the distinctions between the Greeks and the rest of the world (Mc Cormick, 1999).

A considerable part of Europe was firstly united under the Roman rule. Although it was not purely European due to the imperialistic character of the Roman Empire, a common system of government was established during this period. In the last decades of the fourth century AD, the collapse of the Roman Empire provoked the division and invasion of Europe by various tribes. Despite its fall, it had lasted as a political model for Europe. There had been a long period between the end of Roman rule and the commencement of 'the Age of Europe'. According to Lukacs (1965), the complementary emergence of the Western Christendom was the very reason of this intellectual gap. The success of the Church in creating a common civilization based on the Christian philosophy overshadowed the idea of Europe. In the Early Middle Ages (500-1050), the Church had been so influential that its universal authority summoned conspicuously more people than the worldly kings attained. The Church was also inspired by the Roman soul. Rome was the spiritual capital and Latin was the language of the education (Mc Cormick, 1999).

In 800 AD, The Frankish Emperor, Charlemagne was enthroned as the Holy Roman Emperor by the Pope in Rome. His empire, which was composed of a wide geography from the Pyrenees to Danube and from Hamburg to Sicily fell after his death. Despite his short-lived attempts to unify Europe, he was described as 'the King and father of Europe' in poetry (Mc Cormick, 1999). Two centuries after the disintegration of the Frankish Empire, the Church as the strongest representative of the religious and political authority in Europe, began to lose its power due to the division of Christianity into the Western Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. After 1054, a number of religious wars triggering fragmentations in Europe had occurred. On the other hand, since the mid-11th century the growing population and the flourishing commerce in the towns and the city-states of Europe revitalized intellectual and commercial life. A new class of merchants, which later

supported the intellectual and the artistic activities leading Renaissance, appeared. The monarchs gained a greater control over their territories that enabled them to provide a safer area for trade and prevent the invasion menace from outside (Mc Cormick,1999). Between 15th and 18th centuries the term 'Europe' had been used interchangeably with the term 'Christianity' (Lukacs, 1965). However, the latter was replaced with the former as a result of a number of events such as geographic and scientific discoveries, religious wars stimulated by the Reformation, the groundbreaking impacts of the Renaissance and the rise of sovereign states (Seton-Watson,1985). With the end of the Middle Ages, 'the old idea of the Christendom' came to an end whereas 'the idea of new Europe' emerged (Lukacs, 1965). Although the term Europe had obtained a new 'political connotation' in that period, 'the idea of political Europe' had been solely issued in the 17th century (Lukacs, 1965).

Throughout the 17th and the 18th centuries, statesmen and thinkers had put forward schemes for Europe. In the 'Grand Design' the Duc de Sully proposed the creation of a European Senate and the design of an administrative structure in which power was equally distributed. As a prominent thinker, Jean Jacques Rousseau favoured the concept of 'a United States of Europe' (Mc Cormick, 1999).

The political figures who strived to actualize a 'political integration' in Europe generally resorted to force. Not only the old emperors like Charlemagne and Philip the Second of Spain, but also the authoritarian leaders of the Modern Eras such as Napoleon and Hitler could only manage to bring some parts of the European continent under the same rule. However, their victories were not long lasting now that they could only be reigned at the expense of the other people's and nations' liberty.

Napoleon was the first leader to establish his hegemony over the Europe. He gathered France, Belgium, the Netherlands and a great part of Italy under his direct authority. What he imagined for Europe was 'a European association with a common body of law, a common courts of appeal, a single currency and a uniform system of weights and measures' (Mc Cormick, 1999).

His 20th century successor, Hitler had no plan for unified Europe. According to him, the Germans had the very right to break the chains of the Versailles Treaty that repressed

German resurrection. The German foreign policy was based on the elimination of the hindrances and the creation of the new living spaces, namely 'Lebensraum'. Hitler had conquered remarkable part of Europe in pursuit of establishing 'German Reich' during WWII. Contrary to Napoleon who conceived of a European association, Hitler's imagination of Europe was a 'nazified edition of Holy Roman Empire' (Schmitt, 1962: 10).

### **1.2.2. The Idea of Unified Europe before and after the First and Second War Periods**

In the beginning of the 20th century, the great powers like France and Britain had overseas colonies. On the other hand, Italy and Germany that recently completed their own political unification were also in the search of prosperous lands to conquer so as to acquire raw materials and natural resources. However, they were inhibited by the colonial powers of that period. Together with the high militarism and the fierce nationalism, the competition for colonies resulted in the first great war in the Continent (Mc Cormick, 1999). Despite the ongoing war, thinkers and politicians continued to plan for a perpetual peace in Europe. The reactions against the nationalism- which was accused of triggering the war-paved the way for the ardent debates on federalist solutions. A leading figure, Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi who was the founder of the Pan-European Union advocated a political union by which a permanent peace could be sustained in Europe. Although his movement failed, some artists and politicians influenced by his ideas conveyed his ideals to several platforms. French Prime Minister, Aristide Briand argued for a European Confederation as a part of the League of Nations and wrote in favour of an organized Europe with a 'Common Market' and common policies. He even used the term of the 'European Union' (Mc Cormick, 1999).

The outburst of the WWII swept away all the prospects of an ever lasting peace. The German forces occupied a great part of Europe within a remarkably short time while the national governments could only do little to stop the Nazi expansion. The failure of the national governments to prevent the second total war surfaced the public distrust and rekindled the federalist objectives. A prominent figure in the wartime period, Altiero Spinelli championed the necessity of constructing a federal Europe in order to surmount international anarchy (Dedman, 1996). The federalist movements had been also backed up by the non-Communist Resistant movements which benefited from the abovementioned

objectives to sustain a resolute revolt against Nazi occupation. As a result of the high mood for a political change instead of the nationalistic governments, the federalist anticipations regarding the post-war European order were also fervent. A federalist congress was held at the Hague on 7-10 May 1948. A list of proposals including a common market, a Human Rights Convention, a European Assembly and a Council of Europe was formulated at that conference. The Council of Europe was established in 1949. However, it was far from the original projects of the federalists. Its Parliamentary Assembly was designed as a consultative body whereas its Committee of Ministers was given the role of decision-making. It is crucial to indicate that the initiatives of the federalists were obstructed by the national governments at the very beginning of the process. The federalists' attempts at reformulating the post-war political order of Europe were restricted to the establishment of the Council of Europe. Nevertheless, their campaign aroused the long standing concerns about the reconstruction of Europe (Dedman, 1996).

After the WWII, on the way of European integration the first step was taken by the Foreign Minister of France, Robert Schuman. In his speech on 9 May 1950, he proposed to pool the coal and steel industries of Germany and France under a high authority. The head of the French Economic Planning Commission, Jean Monnet was the father of the idea. The German Question which was demanding a comprehensive solution was the motive behind his proposal (Borchardt, 1995).

In 1951 France, Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries had signed the Treaty of Paris founding the European Coal and Steel Community. It was followed by the Rome Treaties establishing the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Community in 1957. Britain, Ireland and Denmark in 1973, Greece in 1981, Portugal and Spain in 1986 and Austria, Finland and Sweden in 1995 became members of the Community. With the last enlargement on May 2004, the Central and Eastern European countries, Malta and Cyprus (Greek Cypriot Administration) also became EU members.

Throughout the integration process, nearly in every decades the union had passed through critical phases. For example, pro-nationalist and intergovernmental policies of the French President De Gaulle caused crises within the Community in the '60s. Its unfavourable effects could only be lessened by means of the new policy initiatives launched in the 70s such as the European political cooperation and the creation of the European Monetary

System (Borchardt, 1995). The steps taken by the Commission under the Presidency of Jacques Delors regarding the creation of the single market boosted the integration process after the years of ‘Euro- pessimism’ during the late 70s and the early 80s (Fontaine, 1998). The Single European Act, signed in 1986 and entered into force on 1 July 1987, laid the groundwork for a single market and for a closer political cooperation in the environment, research and technology (Borchardt, 1995). The Maastricht Treaty, signed in 1992 and entered into force on 1 November 1993, created the European Union and introduced the three pillar structure consisting of the European Communities (the EC) and two intergovernmental pillars, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (the CFSP) and the Justice and Home Affairs (known as the JHA).

### **1.2.3. From an Economic Integration to Political Integration**

The aim of ‘creating an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe’ has been reiterated in several treaties. In the second article of the Treaty on European Union, it was stated that ‘This Treaty marks a new stage in the process of creating an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe’. However, national politicians and European bureaucrats have refrained from explaining the end goal of the European Project in concrete terms and naming this evolving entity. The approach of the politicians was a part of a greater unwillingness of the member states to share their sovereignty. Accordingly, the moves towards promoting supranationalism were hindered by the national governments. The supranational organs of the Community were tried to be weakened via institutional arrangements. For instance, the Commission of the EEC was charged with making proposals to the Council of Ministers (Stephen, 1996). In addition to the institutional arrangements, some political figures known for their pro-nationalist and conservative policies, undermined the supranational dimension of the Community. Charles de Gaulle was a leading politician who did not have any sympathy for the idea of federal Europe. As a wartime resistant leader witnessing the humiliation of France under the Nazi occupation, he aimed at providing the reawakening of France as a mighty member of the international community. Thus, he opposed to the strong community institutions at the expense of the weakened national positions of member states within the Community. As a result of his opposition, the Qualified Majority Voting could not be put into practice in the Council of Ministers. Furthermore, he blocked the expansion of the budgetary powers of the European Parliament. According to Stephen (1996: 18), his

anti-federalist stance mostly affected the European Commission by undermining ‘the morale and spirit of the Commission’.

Margaret Thatcher, the British Prime Minister between the years of 1979 and 1990, was also against the goal of a united Europe. According to her, the EC would be successful as long as the national identities were respected and preserved. She was in favour of a Europe as ‘a family of nations’ rather than ‘a single, bureaucratized European super –state’ (Nelson & Stubb, 1994: 45).

If the European integration process is to be scrutinized in terms of economic and political integration, it can be concluded that economic and political integration have not gone hand in hand for several years. The Economic and Monetary Union was fulfilled step by step. The internal customs, duties, and quotas were abolished in 1968, the Single Market was completed in 1992. Further integration including the introduction of the single currency was determined in the same year. The Euro went into circulation on 1 January 2002. On the other hand, concerning the political integration only few steps could be taken. Although several proposals were formulated regarding further cooperation on political issues, implementation could not be realized. For example, in his report to the European Council, Leo Tindemans, the Belgium Prime Minister, proposed the completion of the union by 1980 through the establishment of economic and monetary union, the implementation of common policies in the areas of foreign policy, regional and social policies and the realization of institutional reforms. However, its envisaged deadline seemed to be so unrealistic due to the fundamental distinctions between the member states (Borchardt, 1995).

Bearing in mind the new risks and opportunities coming with the age of globalisation, it is clear that the Union stands at a crossroads. Although the union developed on the basis of an economic integration from the very beginning, this model has lagged behind responding to the challenges of the new age which makes a closer cooperation between the member states on a wide range of areas from economic relations to security problems necessary more than ever. Moreover, the use of a single currency Union-wide introduced a new horizon to the integration process. Obviously, it has entailed the transfer of sovereignty from the member states to the Community institutions. Thus, international challenges and internal problems that Euro may confront can only be surmounted by means of strong community

institutions. The stability of Euro depends on the complementary political integration. The questions concerning the internal issues such as employment, democratic deficit, immigration and the global threats of terrorism have urged the European politicians to enlarge cooperation areas and develop common policies. In that sense, the speech given by Joscha Fisher, Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs and Vice Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, about a 'Federation of Nation States' is a turning point in the European political integration process (Joscha Fisher, 2000).

In his speech on 12 May 2000, Fisher maintains that,<sup>1</sup> 'the transition from a union of states to full parliamentarization as a European Federation' consisting of a European Parliament and a European government acting as legislative and executive power under the structure of a European federation would be a reasonable solution to the new challenges stemming from external and internal pressures. He also underlines the vitality of a European Constitution by stating that 'This federation will have to be based on a constituent treaty'. After his speech, the debate on the future of Europe resulting in the preparation of the first European Constitution commenced .

The important phases in the preparation of the European Constitution are the Treaty of Nice, the European Convention ending in July 2003, and the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) 2003\2004<sup>2</sup>. The number of member states increased to 25 with the last enlargement, which inevitably complicated the institutional process running through a series of founding and amending treaties. The fact that the Nice Treaty did not bring forth practical solutions to the problems stemming from the complex institutional process paved the way for the debates on the institutional reform and on the future of the Union. The Final Act of the Treaty of Nice addressed four important issues as 'delimitation of powers between the EU, the Member States and reflecting the principles of subsidiarity, the status of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, a simplification of the Treaties, the role of the national parliaments in the European architecture'.<sup>3</sup> Considering these problems, in the Nice Treaty, a declaration on the future of the Union was annexed to the Final Act of the 2000

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.europeanaffairs.org/archive/2000\\_summer/2000\\_summer\\_23.php4](http://www.europeanaffairs.org/archive/2000_summer/2000_summer_23.php4) (retrieved on 3 August 2005) .

<sup>2</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/roadtoconstitution/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/roadtoconstitution/index_en.htm) (retrieved on 4 August 2005) .

<sup>3</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/C\\_2001080EN.007001.html](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/C_2001080EN.007001.html) (retrieved on 4 August 2005)



Intergovernmental Conference with a view to formalizing the initiatives to reform the institutional framework.<sup>4</sup>

The next year, in the Laeken Summit in December 2001, the European Convention, whose members consisted of the representatives of the Member States, the European Parliament, national parliaments and the Commission was set up with the aim of preparing proposals to reform the institutional structure.<sup>5</sup> The Convention under the presidency of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing<sup>6</sup> worked between February 2002 and July 2003 on a draft Treaty founding a constitution for Europe on which the IGC negotiations lasting from October 2003 to June 2004 were based.<sup>7</sup> The draft Treaty was seeking to create a Europe, which was 'more transparent, more comprehensive and closer to European citizens'.<sup>8</sup> However, a consensus on the European Constitution could be attained after a long and difficult period of negotiations. That is to say, Heads of State and Government did not come to an agreement on the final text of the constitution at the Brussels Summit (12-13 December 2003).

Finally, the European Council reached an agreement on the first European Constitution on 18 June 2004. As a last step, the Member States were asked to ratify the Treaty through their parliaments or via popular referendums within two years.<sup>9</sup> Of those countries holding referendums including Denmark, Ireland, Portugal, Spain, the UK, Poland and the Czech Republic, the Constitution was rejected in the referendums in France and the Netherlands, which undoubtedly brought about a profound political crisis within the Union regarding the future of the EU.

### **1.3. CONSTRUCTION OF EUROPEAN IDENTITY**

Defining European identity in concrete terms is rather difficult due to the two main reasons. First, the EU is a unique political entity. Being a peace project designed after the WWII, the EU is remarkably different from international organizations. The member states of the EU transfer a part of their sovereignty to the Community institutions. Moreover, the

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/introduction\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/introduction_en.htm) (retrieved on 4 August 2005)

<sup>5</sup> *ibid* .

<sup>6</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/constitution/futurum/constitution/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/constitution/futurum/constitution/index_en.htm) (retrieved on 4 August 2005)

<sup>7</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/introduction\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/introduction_en.htm) (retrieved on 4 August 2005)

<sup>8</sup> *ibid* .

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-130616-16&type=Overview> (retrieved on 4 August 2005)

Community law has a supremacy over the domestic laws of the member states. With these features, the EU is more than a collection of states (Murphy, 1999). Second, the European political integration, just like the European identity formation, is a dynamic and open-ended process ; that is, the result of it, if such there will be, can not be anticipated. The EU is ‘one of the largest and most important imagined communities to have emerged in the post-colonial era’ (Shore, 2000: 33). Thus, the construction of its identity requires not only a long term and vigorously pursued identity-politics but also a broad-based social participation. Another point is the entrenched national identities of the member states, which tend to weaken the supranational identity construction in Europe. In fact, development of a sense of ‘Europeanness’ is retarded 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 and 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 reluctant to share their authority in the areas of state sovereignty. As a result, identity-formation remains a challenging issue considering both national concerns and supranational goals of the member states. Given all the hindrances and opportunities, we are going to discuss the process of European identity construction in this section.

### **1.3.1. Legitimacy Problem and EU**

It is a well-known fact that the EU suffers from a legitimacy problem (Fossum, 2001). Evidently, being a technocratic and elite-driven project, EU has confronted with considerable public distrust since the beginning of ‘90s. On the other hand, given the efforts to deepen and widen the European integration, it 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& Fossum, 2002). However, especially after the Maastricht Treaty, it has become clear that the legitimacy of Member States are no longer sufficient for the justification of EU acts. At this point, the lack of European demos as a ‘recognizable category’ (Shore, 2000:19) aggravates the situation by adding to the democratic deficit problem. Despite the

attempts at creating a sense of Europeanness the public support is lower than the expected levels. Considering the great endeavours of the European institutions to construct an overarching European identity, the persistency of well-established national identities can be regarded as a crucial reason behind the failure of making a people's of Europe.

As to the reasons for legitimacy problem, it has mainly arisen from asymmetric distribution of power between EU institutions, lack of check and balance mechanism and absence of mediatory structures between social and political interests (Merkel, 1999). In addition, the uniqueness of EU as a political entity and efficiency-legitimacy dilemma should be mentioned in order to discuss the legitimacy problem in a comprehensive framework. In this section, the legitimacy problem of EU will be discussed in terms of widely accepted reasons behind it by also taking into consideration of the possible factual results.

To begin with, it is difficult to describe EU in precise terms as there was no precedent in the political history. Furthermore, it has been gradually developing, so we are unable to anticipate its final stage. The crux here is that EU was founded through multilateral treaties negotiated by the national governments and approved by the supranational institutions such as the European Commission and the European Parliament and intergovernmental bodies such as the European Council and the Council of Ministers. Thus, the EU is neither an intergovernmental organisation nor a fully-fledged supranational entity. Nevertheless, the Maastricht Treaty is regarded 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, sui generis political system' (Merkel, 1999: 48).

Another point regarding the legitimacy issue is that EU faces with 'legitimacy-democratization dilemma' whilst the integration is deepening (Merkel 1999, Eriksen&Fossum 2002). The EC/EU has proceeded on the way of further integration, most of the time at the expense of democratization. Indeed, if the democratic mechanism had functioned properly, the integration project could hardly develop. As stated by Merkel (1999: 54) 'If the governments had been required to confer with the European Parliament, the national and regional parliaments, or directly with the citizens, a reciprocal blockade of the EC decision making would have resulted'.

With regard to the asymmetric distribution of power, the EU institutions act as the bodies of a parliamentary democracy. The European Commission functions as an executive body, both the European Parliament and the Council of Ministers perform a legislative power, finally the European Court of Justice fulfills its function as a judiciary power. However, as opposed to the parliamentary democracy, the allocation of power between these institutions is not balanced (Lodge 1995, Chryssochoou 1997).

Generally speaking, both the European Commission, the leading supranational institution, and the European Parliament, the most democratic institution, have been overridden by the Council of Ministers, the fortress of intergovernmentalism. In particular, the Council of Ministers is more powerful and dominant than the European Parliament in the legislation process. Even though the European Parliament's position was strengthened vis-a-vis that of Council of Minister's by asking its approval for the creation of the Commission and for the appointment of the President with the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties (Toulemon, 1998: 123), the legislation process is still shaped and controlled by the Council of Ministers (Merkel, 1999). Second, as stated by Lodge (1995), democratisation requires both 'holding direct elections' and 'making the Council of Ministers accountable to the European Parliament'. In this regard, electing the EP members through direct and universal suffrage does not provide a solid democratization unless the EP is empowered to control the activities of the Council of Ministers. An additional point is that as being the 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 account of the fact that the appointment of Commission members is in the hands of member states, and the Parliament's approval which has been asked since the Maastricht Treaty is far from providing a genuine democratic control over the executive process (Merkel, 1999: 50).

Considering the fact that there is a growing legitimacy transfer from the nation-states to the EU lessening national influence on the EU decision-making, the EP's competence should be enhanced in order that a real check and balance mechanism could be established regarding the decision-making process in the EU level.

Finally, political parties, interest groups, social movements and the mass-media have played a crucial role in mediating between the society's interests and the governments'

policies in a wide range of areas, in the Western democratic political systems. On the other hand, in case of EU, it is difficult to agree that any of these actors has a considerable impact on EU decision-making process. Despite the fact that the members of EU Parliament are directly elected by the EU citizens, an integrated European party system is not established yet. With regard to the European interest groups, since the issues as taxation, welfare, employment and wages are still being negotiated at the national levels, the Europeanization of the interest groups is unsatisfactory. The EU also lacks significant instruments for moulding public opinion, namely mass-media, common language and multilevel communication network (Merkel, 1999: 49-52).

As to the problems stemming from the national identity- European identity dilemma as well as the issue of democratic legitimacy, the most apparent one is the low level of the public support for a politically united Europe. When we look at the results of public surveys made in 1999 and 2002, we see that feelings of attachment to the EU were not as high as the followers of the neofunctionalist approach, which anticipated a growing interest in European integration as the success and benefits of the economic integration spread over the other sectors, had expected .

In the Eurobarometers 51.0 (1999), the participants were asked whether they felt geographically attached to Europe. The responses to this question indicate that nearly 6 in 10 EU citizens feel very or fairly attached to Europe. According to the results of this survey: Luxembourg is most likely to feel very or fairly attached to Europe with a percentage of 78 % , and the UK least likely to feel attached with a percentage of 37 %.

Three years later, the following question was asked to the participants in the Eurobarometer 56.3 (2002) : ‘People may feel different degrees of attachment to their town or village, to their region, to their country or to the EU. Please tell me how attached do you feel to the EU ?’. Responses to these question display that 4 Europeans out of 10 express of belonging to the EU. 9 percent of those interviewed feel very attached and 30 percent of respondents feel fairly attached. If we look at the rest, we see that 35 percent of participants feel not very attached and finally 21 percent of those interviewed feel not all attached. These results show us that the numbers of those who express attachment to the EU diminished as the political integration has been going further.

An even more serious and alarming situation than these Eurobarometers result reflecting the high numbers of people who do not feel as the real citizens of a united Europe is that a remarkable majority of people is discontented with the deepening of political integration. Now that the political integration moves into the areas which are at the very heart of the national politics, discontented people will raise their objection as they did in the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty (Edwards, 2000). The Maastricht Treaty could be ratified with the narrow margins of 'yes' votes in countries such as Denmark and France. During the 90s, EC faced with serious crisis dealing with economic and political issues, whereas it also attempted at deepening the integration through completion of the Economic and Monetary Union. The Maastricht Treaty establishing the EU on the basis of three pillars structure, consisting of the supranational EC pillar and of the intergovernmental Justice and Home Affairs as well as the Common and Security Policy pillars, could hardly be ratified in those countries mentioned above. The reasons<sup>10</sup> underlying the difficult ratification process were mainly arisen from economic problems necessitating a full concentration on solving the crisis, serious monetary tensions challenging the goal of the economic and monetary union, and finally the crisis of Yugoslavia revealing the incapacity and political unwillingness of the European states to intervene an ongoing civil war claiming thousands of people's lives in the heart of Europe . Under these circumstances, the rejection of the Treaty in the Danish referendum gave rise to the eurosceptical tendencies in the other member states. While the Maastricht Treaty was ratified with a narrow margin on 'Yes' votes in France, Denmark that was given a right of being opt-out considering the third phase of the EMU accepted the Treaty in a second referendum held in 1993.

The recent severe political crisis burst out on the ground that French and Dutch voters spurned the European Constitution in the referendums held in France and the Netherlands on 29 May 2005 and 01 July 2005. The most apparent result of the turn down of the Constitution in these countries is that it can not be put into force unless it is ratified by all the member states. Up to the present, including Luxembourg, the Constitution has been ratified by thirteen nations as Austria, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and Spain,<sup>11</sup> which means that despite the rejection of the the first European Constitution by the French and Dutch people, a good number of member states have approved the Constitution. In this regard, in the last European Council

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.historiasiglo20.org/europe/maastricht.htm#Ratificación> (retrieved on 3 July 2005) .

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.euractiv.com/Article?temuri=tcn:29-130616-16&type=Overview> (retrieved on 4 August 2005)

meeting on 18-19 June 2005, it was decided that the ratification process would continue until the rest of the countries planning to ratify the Constitution through popular referendums completed their national referendums. However, it should be made clear that even though the death of the Constitution has not been declared officially up to now, it is an undeniable fact that the deep dissatisfaction with the political future of the Union coming to the surface is a great challenge to political integration of the European Union.

### **1.3.2. Major Aspects of European Identity**

European policy-makers have not consciously pursued a policy of identity-building since the early years of the Community on account of several reasons. Firstly, it was the preference of the founding fathers who were highly influenced by the Neofunctionalist theory. According to the Neofunctionalist argument, political integration would be a by-product of economic integration (Rosamond, 2000). In this logic, public support to a further integration would grow to the extent that people were satisfied with the benefits of economic integration. In addition, people were not seen as ready to accept a deep political integration. Consequently, identity-formation was not a high priority for the early policy-makers (Shore, 2000). It was assumed that it gradually evolve in later stages of integration as the allegiances of political elites shift to the supranational level. Secondly, as stated by Fossum (2001: 375), 'the contemporary context of identity-formation may be quite different from that which existed at the time when the notion of national identity first emerged and when the national identities of the European member states formed'. To illustrate, replacement of regional and local identities with a national identity was an indispensable instrument for nation-building (Pantel, 1999). However, EU is an entirely different political entity with its multifarious collective identities, including local and regional ones. Since Europe has always been based on diversities, it is obvious that an exclusive European identity can not supplant well-established existing ones. Accordingly, the construction of European identity modelling national identities is inappropriate to the realities of the Union. Rather, the European identity is being constructed by the European institution, and the single market, Euro, the exchange programmes such as Erasmus and Socrates which are all significant elements of this ongoing process (Shore, 2000). Finally, identity-formation will take a long time due to widely divergent national and ethnic groups in Europe. Smith argues that there are historical ties, collective memories, shared traditions

as well as a cultural heritage in the historical evolution of which all European communities have taken place to some extent. He further states that ‘traditions like Roman law, political democracy, parliamentary institutions, and Judeo-Christian ethnics, and cultural heritages like Renaissance, humanism, rationalism and empiricism, and romanticism and classicism’ have all contributed to the formation of ‘a family of cultures’ which is a combination of all these partly shared traditions and cultural inheritance (Smith, 1997: 334). Another intellectual, Seton-Watson (1985) claims that the notion of European culture expresses itself in the belief of European people who regard themselves as natural inheritors of a common European culture. He continues that ‘... the main strands in European culture have come through Christendom, from Hellas, Rome, Persia and the Germanic north as well as from Christianity itself’ (ibid: 16). However, it should be also noted that although there is a common cultural background to which almost all the European countries contributed, building Europe merely on cultural values and religious references will result in exclusion of other groups that do not share both this cultural kinship and Christian origin. Hence, inculcating a sense of ‘Europeanness’ by creating a common living space based on European values will be a more constructive policy.

### **1.3.3. Theoretical Framework of European Identity**

The collective identity formation involves two significant stages. First, it is an active process of the identity-building which brings about the division of ‘us’ and ‘other’. Second, it involves common traditions and a collective memory that are gradually developed throughout time. In addition, collective identity usually refers to a spatial entity such as ‘a religious diaspora’ or ‘an ideocratic Community’ (Schlesinger, 1994: 40). Individuals have several identities, and they tend to reckon on their multiple identities for various situations. That is to say, different components of the identity such as gender, religion and origin can coexist and people tend to evince their different identities in accordance with the changing circumstances. Conversely, collective identities are constant and widespread, so they are unlikely to change in different situations (Smith, 1997).

Since the ‘90s, the idea of political integration has been gaining ground with the accomplishment of the economic and monetary union, common foreign and security policy and justice and home affairs, which inevitably gave rise to the debates on a collective



European identity. Since the member states have their own entrenched national identities, the national identity and the European identity are closely related concepts. In addition, the nationalist theory has such a persistent influence on the literature that the debates on the formation of European identity essentially take place between the opposite schools of Nationalist thought, namely Primordialism (Ethnonationalism) and Modernism. Therefore, we are going to discuss the theoretical background of the idea of a collective European identity with special reference to the main arguments of nationalism.

To begin with, Primordialists mainly argue that both nationalism and nation-state have their very origins in the social organization of mankind. Nations are seen as 'an ancient, necessary, and perhaps natural part of social organization, an organic presence whose origins go back to the mists (or myths?) of time' (Spencer&Wollman, 2002). Regarding the nature of identity formation, similar to the Primordialist, the Essentialist approach, whose logic is based first and foremost on the primacy of cultural elements, argues that primitive units have the potential of creating political identities. According to the Essentialists, the role of nationalist politicians in the identity building process is to rediscover ethnic cores and reformulate cultural background in order that a political identity can be created (Cederman, 2001).

Anthony D. Smith, who can be named as an ethnonationalist and essentialist, defines nation as 'a named human population sharing a historical territory, common memories and myths of origin, a mass standardized public culture, a common economy and territorial mobility and common legal rights and duties for all members of collectivity' (Smith, 1997: 323). He particularly underlines the importance of ethnic origin, myths and memories. For him, behind the power of nationalism 'the myths, memories, traditions and symbols of ethnic heritage' lie (Smith, 1999: 9). He believes that premodern history and collective memories of a nation are essential to the recreation of collective identity in each generation (Smith, 1997). Smith stresses the importance of the role of nationalist politicians by describing them as 'political archeologists rediscovering and reinterpreting the communal past in order to regenerate the community' (Smith, 1994: 18-19).

As for the European integration, Smith compares the possibility of the construction of an overarching European identity to the supremacy of existing national identities. According to Smith, a common European cultural identity, if such there be, does not yet have its

counterpart on the political level (Smith, 1997: 319). Moreover, he argues that Europe lacks a common historical background made up of shared memories, myths and symbols. Even though he mentions that there are traditions and heritages common to all Europeans as 'Roman law, political democracy, parliamentary institutions, Judeo-Christian ethnics, and cultural heritages like Renaissance humanism, rationalism and empiricism, romanticism and classicism' (ibid: 330), he claims that they are 'partially shared historical traditions and cultural heritages' (ibid: 334). He concludes that common memories and cultural background of Europeans contribute to 'a family of cultures' rather than 'a unity-in-diversity' as formulated by the European institutions (ibid: 334). Major thinkers of the Modernist theory, on the other hand, see national identity as a product of modernity penetrating and changing all sections of social, economic and political life (Spencer & Wollman, 2001). In the modernist view, nation is considered as a historically and culturally artificial construction. Benedict Anderson, the author of 'Imagined Communities', defines nation as 'an imagined community' on the grounds that 'the members of even the smallest nation will ever know most of their fellow members, meet them or hear of them, yet in the mind of each lives the image of their communion' (Anderson, 1991: 6). Another intellectual Ernest Gellner, considering the primitive definitions of nation as mythical, argues that nationalism serves to the transformation of pre-existing cultures into the invented nations (Gellner, 1983). Finally, Eric Hobsbawm, an historian and the writer of 'The Invention of Traditions' claims that belonging entirely to the recent period of history, the nation is a completely modern concept (Hobsbawm, 1990).

As regards the nature of identity formation, the Constructivists, in contrast to the Essentialists, see this process as a highly politicized activity entailing the reformulation of cultural symbols (Cederman, 2000). Regarding the European integration, Cris Shore, one of the outstanding intellectuals in the area, argues that the collective identity, which is still being built by the EU itself, is indispensable for the future of the Union (Shore, 2000). For him, an overriding European identity, essential to the political integration, can be constructed in a different manner from the that of national identities.

First of all, Shore claims that EU suffers from a legitimacy problem due to the lack of European public. He argues that the absence of 'European demos' as a 'recognisable category' endangers the political integration by raising the questions of 'democratic deficit' (ibid: 18-19). Accordingly, he points out that a new sense of Europeanness transcending

national loyalties is crucial to the fulfillment of the goal of ‘ever closer union among the peoples of Europe’ (ibid: 21).

Secondly, seeing Europeanization as an ‘inherently circular and self –reinforcing process’, Shore believes that the European institutions and common policies of the EU such as the Euro, the Single Market and the invented European symbols and traditions, all have served to the imagination of Europe as a political reality. In this respect, he responds the critics, considering the invention of the European symbols and traditions as ‘of secondary importance’ and even as ‘cosmetic’, by arguing that ‘political reality is itself symbolically constructed’ (ibid: 36).

In conclusion, the Primordialist-Essentialist approach, seeing nation-state as a God-given constitution whose identity is based on shared memories and myths and a common cultural background, displays a negative stance dealing with a supranational identity construction. The Modernist-Constructivist view, on the other hand, stresses that the nation-state itself is both an artificial construction and a modern phenomenon. It can be argued that of the two opposite standpoints explaining European identity within a theoretical framework, the latter seems a more positive approach to the notion of supranational identity than the former. Yet, it should be noted that the key points to the both sides are nation-state and national identity, which indicates nationalism as a starting-point. However, the EU and the nation-state differ in many respects. Although they were both products of the changing economic, political and social conditions in Europe, the EU and the nation-state are completely dissimilar formations for different necessities. Whereas the nation-state was a product of the 19th century which had required a political entity established on a homogeneous culture and population within the definite borders of a territorial state, after the WWII the EU was designed as an economic community with an end goal transcending the hegemony of nation-state. Thus, unlike the national identity, whose basic elements are language, culture and ethnic origins, the European identity deserves to be discussed in new terms. Indeed, the European identity is being constructed by the EU itself. The European institutions, common policies and the symbolic initiatives such as European passport, flag and anthem are the important actors behind this process. It should be also emphasized that despite its ambitious object, for today the future of the political integration is not foreseeable. The nation-state still provide the most competent political infrastructure for the economic and social organization of the masses. Therefore, a sudden disappearance of the nation-state

seems an unrealistic expectation as the political integration is in its first decades. As a result, if we regard this ongoing process as a transition period between the world of hegemonic nation-states and a supranational political organization in Europe, the role and function of the nation-state should be tailored in conformity with the necessities of the new structure. Development of the new perspectives on the European identity, independent from the basic arguments of the nationalism, will be a noteworthy step in this context.

#### **1.3.4. Nation-State and European Identity**

The nation-state has been in decline due to the increasing globalisation of economic and political matters. As for the European integration, it has two important results: enhanced international cooperation on cross-border issues and increased resistance to supranational influence on domestic issues regarding the areas assumed directly related to the national sovereignty.

First, free movement of capital and workforce transcending national borders has weakened nation-state's role as an economic actor. Nation-state has no longer had necessary financial and human resources to regulate economic activities as it could do in the '60s (Moller, 1995). The economic and monetary union completed in the '90s gives EU the advantage over its competitors. Besides the economic challengers, the need for cooperation on cross-border issues such as illegal migration, drug trafficking, international terrorism and ecological disasters inevitably urge national policy-makers to extend their cooperation areas. Regarding the EU, the formation of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Justice and Home Affairs pillars with the Maastricht Treaty are the very examples of European governments' quest for finding common solutions to regional and international problems. In addition to the intergovernmentalist efforts, many European non-governmental organisations and pressure groups such as trade unions and business lobbies, independent of state intervention, have been producing policies and acting as noteworthy actors in the international arena for years.

Another dimension of globalisation is the re-awakening of regions and ethnic identities. The cross-border regions which feel themselves being oppressed and alienated under the strict rule of state have been striving for creating new political arenas. The European institutions have been playing a significant role in the redefinition of existing political ties

between regions and backing their multilateral relations with other political players (Laffan, 1996).

Losing its privileged status and seeking to foster cooperation areas from economic matters to security issues due to the increasing interdependency as well as ground-breaking effects of globalisation, the nation-state, on the other hand, has been strengthening its sovereignty in the areas of internal politics. With regard to European integration, despite the fact that member states have transferred a part of their sovereignty to the supranational European institutions, they have avoided sharing their authority with the institutions in sensitive areas of policy-making, particularly in the areas of education, mass-media and foreign policy making. As stated by Cederman (2001:158), 'Despite several innovative mobility-enhancing reforms, education continues to be almost entirely national within the European Union'. Considering the nation-state as a determining authority in making of European identity after the war-time period in Europe (Brewin, 2000), it is obvious that national education policies of the member states towards maintenance and reproduction of national identities would impede development of European identity, notwithstanding efforts of the EU institutions.

Another obstacle during the evolution of European identity arisen from the nation-state is that national identity has been regarded as the unquestionable sole criterion for the evaluation of a common supranational identity. First of all, since the European identity is not a 'territorial identity', it complements the local, regional and national identities without undermining them (Bellier & Wilson, 2000). Furthermore, in view of the fact that it is not peculiar to a specific geographical area, the perception of European identity differs from country to country. For example, original six members of the EU are more attached to the idea of Europe, so identification with the European Project in these countries are higher than those in the other members joining the Community later (Green, 2000). Therefore, making a generalization on the European identity will not be conducive to development of a supranational identity for Europe.

It should also be emphasized that Europe has always been based on diversities. As Veen pointed out (2000), 'Europe is the region of the world with the highest diversity of different languages, ethnic groups and nations, cultures and forms of life to be found in what is, comparatively speaking, an extremely restricted area ..' There exist too many points that

divide and unite European peoples. A common cultural heritage, Judeo-Christian origins and a common cultural history including the Enlightenment period, Romanticism, Realism and Idealism have brought Europeans together. In addition, the separation of powers, the creation of modern human and civil rights, the rule of law and the parliamentary democracy are all contributions of European intellectuals and policy-makers to the universal values (Veen, 2000). On the other hand, there are many dividing lines among peoples of Europe, namely, the old division between North and South, Germanic and Latin, Protestant and Catholic as well as between lifestyles and traditions such as the divide between beer and wine drinking (Brewin, 2000).

In addition, 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 (ibid: 70-71).

### **1.3.5. Importance of Identity Formation for European Integration**

Despite the fact that it has been overshadowed by the economic priorities from the very beginning, the construction of a collective supranational European identity is crucial to the future of the European Union. On the 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 and ethno-national identity crises throughout Europe, which may be result in perilous social and political fragmentations. As being aware of the significance of the identity formation for the sake of integration process, European institutions have taken initiatives in awakening a sense of Europeanness (Bellier&Wilson, 2000). In general terms, the efforts to create a European identity have developed in two ways: European cultural identity and European political identity. In this

section, first, the importance of making a European identity will be discussed. Afterwards, the steps taken towards building a common collective identity will be examined.

Firstly, if EU aims to further political integration, it needs a 'European soul', which will strengthen public support. Actually, the integration process has not faced with a serious opposition as long as it has not intruded on the touchy realms of national policies. The first stage of the integration process, the Economic and Monetary Union, has been successfully completed. Although this ambitious goal has been accomplished, the cultural and social structures of the Western Europe have remained unchanged (Howe, 1995). Indeed, today, it is difficult to define 'a European public' or 'European demos' as 'a recognisable category' (Shore, 2000: 19). There were few problems with the legitimacy so long as the EC remained an intergovernmental organisation. As the founding and amending treaties have been ratified through national referendums, the legitimacy of the Union has not been questioned. Considering the increasing sovereignty transfer from national to EU level, the EU has gained a supranational character; therefore, 'one-time treaty ratification' does not provide an unquestionable basis for the legitimacy of EU policies (Merkel, 1999: 49). As stated by Bellier and Wilson (2000); 'The building of the EU is not only a process of harmonization and integration, but one of legitimization, in which the structures and aims of the EU must find approval and meaning among its people'. Nevertheless, since a genuine European public is far from reality yet, the enhanced authorities of EU institutions lack a popular control, which brings about the concerns of 'democratic deficit' (Chrysochoov, 1997: 73). In short, an overarching European identity inspiring a sense of belonging in European people leads them to be more interested in the EU activities, and thereby contributes to the solutions of problems arisen out of the lack of public support and of the so-called democratic deficit.

Secondly, the nation-state is losing its power as a result of the ground-breaking effects of globalisation. On the one hand, the increasing interdependencies and the global threats that are difficult to cope with force the nation-states to strengthen their ties with the other states. On the other hand, the weakening of the nation-state gives rise to national crises, ethno-nationalism, extreme right movements, and even racism and xenophobia within the national borders of those countries. As for the EU member states, the situation is the same. In the last years, while the EU has taken successful steps in the integration process, several member states, such as France and Austria, have witnessed the rise of extreme right

movements in their political spectrum. As stated by Laffan (1996: 89), ‘The populist parties play on people’s fears of being swamped by non-nationals, of losing their national lifestyles and identities, of being less at home in their countries and of being challenged for housing and employment’. Remembering the tragic memories of the second world war, it should not be forgotten that the EU was founded as a peace-project with the aim of combating against all kinds of racism and also against fierce nationalism. Thus, creating a supranational identity that encompasses all the other collective identities such as local, regional and national identities is of vital importance if the continental peace is to be preserved and the political integration is to be strengthened. Given these undeniable facts, the identity construction should be regarded as the essential part of the European integration process.

Remembering the cultural inheritance of Europe which was built on the ancient Greek and Roman past, on the Judeo-Christian elements and on the world-shaking experiences of Renaissance, Reform and Enlightenment Periods, culture is the integral part of the aspired common European identity. With regard to the development of European cultural policy, first of all, from the outset, the EC did not pay specific attention to the cultural policy. The Rome Treaty only referred to culture ‘as a factor capable of uniting people and promoting social and economic development’.<sup>12</sup> Between the 50s and the 80s, formulating a cultural policy was not a high priority for the Member States. The lack of interest in the cultural issues was the result of the dominance of intergovernmentalism and the relatively weakness of supranationalism within the EC (Pantel, 1999).

The then President of the Commission, Jacques Delors revived the process in the 1980s. Accordingly, the idea of European cultural unity began to win more attentive ears thanks to the new enthusiasm for the completion of the Single Market and for accomplishment of the Economic and Monetary Union. In the late 80s and the early 90s, some important steps were taken regarding the European Cultural Policy. First, the importance of cultural policy as ‘political necessity’ was stressed in the Commission’s 1987 Report ‘A Fresh Boost for Culture in the European Community’ (Pantel, 1999). The Maastricht Treaty, most importantly, provided a legal basis for ‘action aimed at encouraging, supporting and supplementing the activities of the Member States, while respecting national and regional

---

<sup>12</sup>[http://www.europarl.eu.int/facts/4\\_17\\_0\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.eu.int/facts/4_17_0_en.htm) ( Retrieved 22 April 2005 ) .



diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore'<sup>13</sup> with the Article 151. Following the adaptation of the Maastricht Treaty, the EU launched several cultural programmes. The Kaleidoscope, Ariane and Raphael Programmes constituted the first phase of the implementation of EU action on culture. The other activities include 'Languages, European Capital of Culture, Cultural Goods, Rights of the artist and artistic work, copyright, Cultural Industries and Town-Twinning'.<sup>14</sup> Taking into account divergent identities in Europe, a theme of European cultural identity, whose motto was 'unity-in-diversity' was created (Pantel, 1999). For instance, 'The European City of Cultural Programme' approved by the Council of Ministers of Culture was a notable example of the efforts to foster unity through diversity (ibid: 57). As a last word, the Commission and the Parliament have played a significant role in development of the European cultural policy up to the present.

With respect to the European political identity, several authors have drawn attention to the importance of European identity for the future of the EU project (Pantel 1999, Green 2000, Questiaux 2000). Even though the EU competence increasingly extends to the areas of state sovereignty (Ham, 2000), European people still feel more attached to their national states instead of EU (Shore, 2000). The perception of Europeanization as an 'elite-driven project' (Ham, 2000: 19) has a negative impact on political identification of the peoples of Europe (Shore, 2000). The distance between professional Eurocrats and ordinary people brings into question the *raison d'être* of the European project. In short, the fact that EU suffers from a legitimacy deficit (Fossum, 2001) is detrimental to the political integration.

Given the lack of the sense of 'Europeanness', it can be claimed that the attempts to create a common European identity in cultural realm will fail unless it is complemented by equivalent efforts at forming a European political identity, which brings us the concept of European citizenship.

In the political terms, citizenship establishes a contract based on mutual rights and obligations between the subjects and the state (Schnapper, 1997: 200). In view of the fact that the nation-state enjoyed its status as being the dominant power in the internal and external politics, it was the sole authority in this contract ensuring citizens' rights and

---

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.europarl.eu.int/facts/4\\_17\\_0\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.eu.int/facts/4_17_0_en.htm) ( Retrieved 22 April 2005 ) .

<sup>14</sup> *ibid* .

defining their obligations for a long time. However, the power of nation-state has been on decline due to the challenging globalisation and growing interdependencies. Actually, it is an undeniable fact that it has no longer been able to provide all the services for its citizens. As for the European integration, Meehan<sup>15</sup> argues that European Union creates a ‘new citizenship’ based on economic activity instead of political participation. She also claims that (1997), the EC law contributes to the formation of European citizenship since it possesses a binding authority over national laws. That is to say, according to Meehan (1997: 75), as a result of judicial interpretations of the Treaty of Rome, individuals had a distinctive European status for twenty years before the creation of the new creature, the citizen of the Union.

Despite its introduction in the Maastricht Treaty, the concept of European citizenship was referred to in several documents. To illustrate, Leo Tindemans was referring to this problem in his report on European Union as early as 1976<sup>16</sup>:

No one wants to see a technocratic Europe. European Union must be experienced by the citizen in his daily life. It must make itself felt in education and culture, news and communications...It must protect the rights of the individual and strengthen democracy through a set of institutions which have legitimacy conferred on them by the will of our peoples. The image of Europe...must demonstrate to those within and without the solidarity of our peoples and the values of our society.

The Adonnino Report (Commission, 1985) also underlined the importance of strengthening and promoting a European identity for its citizens.

The Maastricht Treaty<sup>17</sup> established the ‘citizenship of the Union’ (Art 8). Thereby, every citizen of the Union was granted the rights of free movement and residence (Art 8a); the right to vote and to stand as a candidate at municipal elections and in elections to the EP in the Member State where he resides (Art 8b) ; the right to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member States where his own state is not represented (Art 8c) ; the right to petition the EP and application to the ombudsman (Art 8d). With regard to the citizenship, the Amsterdam Treaty mostly centred on the freedom, security and justice as well as the Union citizenship (Closa, 1998). In the first place, new guarantees were

---

<sup>15</sup> Meehan cited by Schnapper ( 1999 ) .

<sup>16</sup> Leo Tindemans, European Union: Report by Mr. Leo Tindemans to the European Council, *Bulletin of the EC*, Supplement 1/76, p.12 cited in Geoffrey Edwards, “The Problems and Possible Future Development of a European Identity in the European Union”, P. J. Anderson, G. Wiessala, C. Williams eds. *New Europe in Transition*, (London: Continuum, 2000), 66-80, p.67.

<sup>17</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/en/record/mt/title2.html> ( Retrieved on 30 April 2005 ) .

provided by the Amsterdam Treaty concerning fundamental rights such as gender, equality, non-discrimination and data privacy. It also dealt with the changes regarding freedom of movement within the EU. As to the Union citizenship, the national citizenship was strengthened by stating that EU citizenship was complementary to the national citizenship. In this part, a number of provisions regarding employment, social policy, public health and consumer protection were also added.<sup>18</sup>

The Maastricht Treaty was criticized in the sense that the European citizenship was only limited to the EU nationals whereas the non-EU nationals were excluded from being full members of the evolving European society. Furthermore, the Amsterdam Treaty did not improve the situation of third-country nationals since ‘the personal scope of citizenship’ remained unchanged (Kostakopoulou, 1988: 166).

In conclusion, the debate on European identity has been greatly intensified since the 80s. The revival of academic interest in the European identity has been paralleled by the EU efforts to create a common European culture. Even though EU does not have a clearly-defined identity formation policy, the European institutions, particularly the European Commission (Bellier&Wilson, 2001) have taken great strides in promoting a sense of ‘Europeanness’ by designing and implementing EU-funded projects like educational exchange programmes and inventing European symbols and traditions such as European flag or passport (Shore, 2000). Furthermore, the introduction of the European citizenship with the Maastricht Treaty and the circulation of the single currency, Euro, with the aim of creating a common European living space for Europeans, are the great milestones in the integration history. However, whether the efforts to create a European cultural space complements the aim of building a European political identity is not clear yet. In the words of Veen (2000: 43) ; ‘The virtual cultural identity of Europe does not lead to a political identity, nor to a unity of action which might promote the integration of Europe towards political union’. As a last word, a common European identity has a pivotal role in pursuit of the ambitious goal of political integration .

---

<sup>18</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/a09000.htm> ( Retrieved on 05 August 2005 ) .

## **II. EDUCATION POLICY OF THE EU**

### **2.1. INTRODUCTION**

Education is among the socio-economic issues such as health and consumer protection, which have been included in the interest areas of the Community in the '90s (Tulasiewicz & Brock, 2000). Since it is a non-economic policy realm, education has not been regarded as an independent field for common policies until the Maastricht Treaty (Beukel, 1993). Therefore, even though education has always been regarded as critical in Europe, it is a new policy area in which supranational tendencies conflict with national interests. To make a general evaluation of the education policy of the EU, first, the evolution of the European education policy will be scrutinized from an historical perspective; and second, three pillars of the education policy (education, training and youth) will be examined in terms of their objectives and effectiveness.

### **2.2. THE EVOLUTION OF EUROPEAN EDUCATION POLICY**

#### **2.2.1 Historical Development of Education in Europe**

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 12<sup>th</sup> century. In the late 17<sup>th</sup> 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&Boli, 1997, b:178-179).

Despite the political fragmentations and religious strives as well as the contest between the worldly authorities and the Papacy for political power, education had always been considered as important throughout the Continent (Hearder, 1988). Evidently, the power struggle among the Church, the local and central authorities played a significant role in the development of educational systems in European countries. In addition, the intellectual movements supported this development. Firstly, the Renaissance contributed to the weakening of church control over educational issues. Secondly, as opposed to the Renaissance period, during the Reform and Counter-Reform, a battle for the control of education took place between the rival religious groups (Rothman, 1970). At this point, it should be reminded that Protestantism had a very considerable influence on the spreading of literacy. With the invention of printing, the Bible, translated into mother languages, was read by millions of people. More importantly, the notion manifested itself in Protestantism that basic education must be compulsory helped the Protestant countries improve their education levels (Flora, 1973). Thirdly, in the Enlightenment Period, the idea that even the members of lower classes should be given, at least, basic education gained ground (Hearder, 1988: 381). Lastly, the coming age of nationalism became the milestone in the formation of education systems by eliminating all equivalent players in this field. Indeed, the belief that there was a strong connection between national power and education enabled the national authorities to nationalize education systems (Rothman, 1970). In the light of these factors, educational development in Britain, France and Germany, the three major European countries, will be summarized within the historical perspective.

**2.2.1.1. The British Model:** The British education system was largely affected by the aristocratic approaches to the educational matters (Hearder, 1988). More importantly, both the local authorities and the Church were more active than the central authority in running of educational policy. Apart from the state's intervention dealing with the structure, implementation of educational policies remained under the control of local authorities (Rothman, 1970). Consequently, nationalization of British education system took a longer time than those of the other European countries. In general, the state has never taken the sole power to regulate all the educational activities in Britain.

Before 1833, there were mainly three types of schools regarding the education of different social classes. The poor was given education by the charity schools, the middle-class children preferred to attend the newly founded academies of the Non-Conformist groups. Finally, the

rich were either taught by special teachers or they attended private or church schools. In 1839, the Committee of Privy Council, which was superseded by the Department of Education in 1856, was established with a view to handling the issue of education. The Education Act enabled the state to create school boards in the regions where the number of primary schools was not sufficient. The primary education ultimately became compulsory in 1880.

In the mid-twentieth century, in accordance with the new Educational Act of 1944, the educational system was divided as elementary and secondary schools. The students were to take 11+ examinations before attending the secondary school, which was also regrouped as 'grammar schools', 'modern schools' and 'technical schools'. As a response to the critics regarding 11+ examinations on the ground that they prevented the children of working class from getting an academic, these examinations abolished. In addition, in the '60s the government formed a new type of school copying the American pattern, called as comprehensive schools. Another step taken by the government was that the period of compulsory education was raised to 16 in the early '70s.

In British education system, the most prestigious type of secondary schools has been the public schools. The graduates of those schools, first examples of which can be found in the late Middle Ages such as Winchester (1382) and Eton (1440), were the prospective students of Cambridge and Oxford, the well-known British universities. Most of them also served as high rank officials after their university education, and became the elites of the country (Rothman, 1970: 238-243).

**2.2.1.2 The French Model:** The French national education system, one of the most centralized systems in Europe, has its roots in the reign of Napoleon I. Besides, several politicians who served as the Minister of Public Instruction, played significant roles in the construction of a nationalized educational system (Header, 1988).

Before the Revolution, the educational activities were largely run by the Catholic Church, and mostly reserved to a small elite group and those in religious communities. Consequently, the literacy rate was rather low among the adults. The plans, which were designed to create a centralized national education system during the Revolution, were implemented in the reign of Napoleon I (Rothman, 1970). In accordance with the law of 1806, the primary and

secondary schools and universities constituted the educational activities (Hearder, 1988). Moreover, the system of national examinations providing a uniform curriculum as well as uniform standards was created. Another development was the establishment of lycées as public secondary schools under the control of the national government. As to the university organization, the faculties remained as the centers of traditional professions, and the Grandes Écoles were formed for technical professions.

Regarding the phase of primary education, Guizot, the minister of Public Instruction under the July Monarchy, proposed a solution based on the coexistence of private and public primary schools. Another initiative dealing with this issue was taken by Victor Duruy; the Minister of Public Instruction in the period of Napoleon III, and the elementary education became compulsory in 1881. In addition to the efforts at reorganizing the primary education, a more comprehensive and modern curriculum was created for the secondary education.

As to the higher education, the organization which composed of several faculties specialized in different fields as established by Napoleon I, was preserved. All the faculties were brought together under the single administrative framework in 1896 with a university reform.

Despite some attempts to modernize the curriculum and efforts to promote democratization, the highly limited and traditional curriculum, insufficient dialogue between university and students and critics about overcentralization were among the reasons behind the student revolt in 1968. De Gaulle, the then President of France, pursued a policy enhancing decentralization of the university organization. Regarding secondary education, the school-leaving age raised to 16. Also, the examination taken by students at the age of 11 was abolished. With the new reforms, the students enrolled at a comprehensive school and after the age of 15 they attended a lycée or technical school according to their records they received during the secondary education (Rothman, 1970: 243-247).

**2.2.1.3 The Prussian (German) Model:** Prussian education system was formed in the beginning of the 19th century. As to the general features of the system, firstly, taking into account that the German political unification attained to the end of the 19th century, the regional authorities rather than the central authority were responsible for running of educational activities. Secondly, in general there had been a constant struggle not only

between the central and local authorities but also between the secular and religious ones for education (Harder, 1988).

With regard to the organization of education in that century, the Prussian education was based on a two-phased system in which most of the school-aged children attended a common elementary school for acquiring vocational skills until age of 14. In some states of Prussia, those who graduated from these schools could enter a continuation school for getting additional courses related to vocational training . On the other hand, a very limited number of pupils, who would get a university education, first attended a three-year preparatory school before going to a Gymnasium .

During the period of Weimar Republic, the state authority over the educational policies was enhanced. Despite some new regulations regarding general issues, a sovereignty transfer from federal units to the centre could not be achieved.

Under the rule of National Socialism, the state held the power to control educational policies. Indeed, Hitler's policy undermined the former system to a great extent that they were old-fashioned. While while the chances of girls to take a good education were curbed, new boarding schools were founded so as to create a Nazi elite.

After the collapse of Hitler regime in Germany, the Western alliances undertook all the government activities. Despite the attempts at re-organizing education system in a different manner, the former system that practiced during the Weimar Republic revived in the Federal Republic, the part under the control and influence of the Western alliances. Even though the federal units (Länder) regained their authority over educational activities, the centre took the responsibility for coordination. As to the school system, the traditional two-phased structure retained as well. The German pupils went to a common school before attending secondary education. While most of them tended to choose vocational training after the primary education, those who would get a university education were expected to continue their education in an academic secondary school and passed the Abitur exam (Rothman, 1970: 248-251).



### **2.2.2 Legal Basis and General Aspects of European Education Policy**

In the Rome Treaty, establishing the European Communities in 1957, education was not addressed. The Articles 118 and 128 in the Treaty of Rome referred to vocational training and common vocational policy, and Article 57 was related to mutual recognition of diplomas and qualifications. From the Rome Treaty (1957) to the European Union Treaty (1992), education remained a national issue in which the Community could interfere through several action programmes launched by the European institutions and decisions made by the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council. With the Maastricht Treaty founding the European Union, education became a concern of the Community; accordingly, the union has gained new competencies and responsibilities in the field of education and training. Article 126 of the Treaty of Europe was designed to provide a legal basis and general framework regarding the education policy; the Article 127 of the TEU was explicitly concentrated on the vocational training. The crucial point here is that the aim was to create different legal bases for education and training (Field, 1998) with a view to helping the Commission to act without being restricted by the member states which were traditionally reluctant to cooperate in the field of education though they were enthusiastic about converging their vocational education policies. Therefore, naturally, the provisions concerning the vocational training enabled the Commission to develop and implement a common vocational training policy provided that the EU 'shall support and supplement the action of the member states for the content and organisation of vocational training'. On the other hand, with a cautious wording in the Article 126 regarding the education policy, the Community's competence in education matters was restrained by the member states; that is, the role of Community was reduced to contributing to 'the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between the Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversities'. Yet, as a positive assessment of the Maastricht Treaty, it can be claimed that the TEU contributed the development of the education policy in three ways. First, the responsibility and competence of the EU were enhanced regarding the education policy since its legal status was made clear. For example, the EU was permitted to act in the other areas of education policy such as pre-school, primary and adult education. As the competence and responsibilities of the Community in the fields of education and training policies specified, the Commission gained

the right to initiate and pursue more ambitious and innovative schemes in these separate areas. Finally, with the introduction of the education as a policy field in the TEU, the EU has begun to create educational projects that are not necessarily economic goal-oriented (Field, 1998: 58-62).

As for the subsequent Amsterdam Treaty, in which some articles of the Maastricht Treaty were amended, there was little progress with regard to the improvement of the EU competence in making educational policies since Article 149 indicated that the Member States retained the full responsibility regarding content of teaching and the organisation of education systems by stressing their cultural and linguistic diversity. With respect to vocational training, Article 150 of the Amsterdam Treaty was mainly about determining a general vocational policy which ‘shall support and implement the action taken by the Member States, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organisation of vocational training’.

In the light of these articles regarding the prospective education policy as well as considering the principle of subsidiarity under which member states retains full responsibility for the content and organizational structure of their national education, it can be argued that education policy of the EU is essentially based on voluntary participation of the member states in the Community action programmes and ‘cooperation between the member states on education matters. As a consequence, as stated by Tulasiewicz & Brock (2000: 22), ‘There can be no interference in the structure and content of schooling and no attempt at harmonisation, for which full consultation and agreement among member states and the approval of the European Council, the executive arm of the Union, would be needed’.

Being restricted in supplementing and supporting the Member States in their education policy, the Community, on the other hand, has 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-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 such as ‘Community action programmes like Socrates (for education) and Leonardo da Vinci for vocational training)’ 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.<sup>19</sup>

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 (March 2000)<sup>20</sup>. As a result, 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 & Brock, 2000: 29). In this regard, the education– industry links are notably highlighted, so the action programmes aiming at encouraging mobility such as Lingua, by which students or workers can improve their foreign languages, and Leonardo, whose major concerns are improvement of the quality of vocational education, promotion of the innovative techniques in training programmes and support for language skills in vocational training (Jones, 1996: 228) are in the interests of the EU (Tulasiewicz & Brock , 2000: 28) . However, despite the great efforts of EU to increase the mobility, that the qualifications and competencies obtained in other member states may not be accepted still remains a serious obstacle to enhancement of the Community-led programmes fostering mobility. Thus, to deal with these problems, the EU has developed new mechanisms such as the Network of National Recognition Information Centres (NARICs) regarding transparency and recognition of degrees and qualifications for academic purposes. In addition to the NARICs, there are three other instruments for the transfer and transparency of qualifications and skills. First, with regard to vocational qualifications, the European Community Course Credit Transfer

---

<sup>19</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c00003.htm> (Retrieved on 16 January 2005) .

<sup>20</sup> *ibid.*

System (ECTS) was developed for recognition of periods of study abroad. Second, the Common European format for Curriculum Vitae was created for presentations of individual qualifications and skills and last, Europass training, a kind of education certificate, was designed to validate the knowledge and experience obtained in formal and non-formal training. With regard to the decision-making process, the co-decision procedure has been applied to the education and the training policy. In this process, first, the Commission makes a proposal, then the Council after consulting with the Committee of Regions and with the Economic and Social Committee and asking for the Parliament's approval makes a decision with Qualified Majority Voting (Tulasiewicz&Brock, 2000). As a significant point, for the proposals in the area of vocational training, the Parliament has a right to introduce amendments (Field, 1998). Given the role of institutions in the decision-making process, it can be concluded that the Commission and the Council are the most influential bodies in the formation and implementation of educational and training policies.

### **2.2.3. Development of European Education Policy in the Historical Perspective**

Education policy of EU has been gradually developing since the 70s. Even though there was no reference to 'education' in the Rome Treaty, education policy has taken precedence as it has been closely related to economic growth. Moreover, in view of the fact that the Member States are confronting economic competitiveness and global challenges, they are eager to enhance cooperation areas in education. In this context, while the economic incentives were the driving force behind the educational cooperation and programmes launched in the 80s, since the 90s challenges brought by increasing globalisation have begun to play a decisive role not only in reconstructing of national educational systems but also in widening of cooperation areas between the member states in the field of education. In this sense, 'structure, quality and consequences of education are of the highest for the development and the solid management of knowledge and service based societies' (Kühnhardt, 2003: 55). Furthermore, with the objective of political integration declared in the Maastricht Treaty, the conceptions of European identity and European citizenship have begun to be intensively discussed since then. Although this policy objective does not have a significant effect on educational cooperation between the member states, it is clear that the future of the Single Market is definitely based on the creation of a peoples Europe. In the words of Jacques Delors, 'Who will die for a Single Market?'. Economic incentives and global challenges have been in the foreground of educational cooperation between the member states. In this section,

a brief historical background of the development of European Education Policy in each decade will be discussed with special reference to the important resolutions of the Council and the action plans designed to implement education programmes by the Commission.

Considering the noteworthy steps taken in the field of education, the 70s proved a hopeful beginning of the Europeanization of the education policy. In 1971, first the Commission founded two organizations working on educational issues. They were 'Working Party on Teaching and Education' which was directly responsible to a Commissioner, Altiero Spinelli, and 'Interdepartmental Working Party on Coordination' (Beukel, 1993: 157). Second, the Council adopted a number of general guidelines regarding vocational training. Third, and the most significant step was the first meeting of the Ministers for Education. In the Resolution of that meeting it was stated that educational provisions mentioned in the Rome Treaty should be fulfilled through a widened cooperation on educational issues. Besides, it also underlined that definition of a 'European model of culture correlating with European integration' was the 'ultimate aim' (European Educational Policy Statements 1988: 11 cited by Beukel, 1993).

After 1971, education was regarded as a common policy issue which in turn revealed the need for common solutions to the problems confronted. At this point, the Janne Report was a good example of the search for a coordination between the education systems of the member states. As previously mentioned, this attempt at harmonizing the diversified education policies throughout the Continent was obstructed by the member states on the grounds that it would threaten their national sovereignty.

In 1974, the Education Committee was set up by the ministers of education whose first task was to prepare the Community Action Programme. This action plan mainly included 'studies, research, visits, compilation of up-to-date documentation and statistics in a number of educational fields' (Hingel, 2001: 5). Generally speaking, the Commission as the most supranational organ in the Community had played a very active role regarding education issues in this decade. However, the member states inspired by the tentative educational provisions in the Treaty of Rome were not keen on strengthening educational ties. As a consequence, the efforts of the Commission were not effective enough to realize a full institutionalization in European educational policy (Beukel, 1993: 157-161).

As to the 80s, two significant changes regarding the decision-making process and the organizational framework were adopted in the middle of the decade. Firstly, it was accepted that the Commission would put into effect independent education programmes in co-ordination with intergovernmental institutions in pursuance of specified objectives. Secondly, a new wording stressing 'Europeanization' was espoused in the resolutions of the Ministers of Education. Following the approval of the Council for the education programmes, three important programs were launched: COMETT (Community Program for Education and Training in Technology); ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students); LINGUA (the Language and Training Program). Then, the turning point regarding the European dimension in education came with the Resolution adopted in the Council and the Ministers for Education meeting within the Council in May 1988. Briefly, the Resolution put emphasis on giving young people a sense of European identity by teaching them to value the virtues of European democracy, social justice and human rights. To summarize the main points in development of the education policy during this decade : first, institutional structure became increasingly complex in order that the new education programmes reaching a much broader group of people could be carried out. Second, this increasing educational institutionalization also stemmed from the structural changes in the international economy witnessed in this period, which made European states redefine their economic strategies. Both to tackle the economic crises and to transform their societies into knowledge society, European states strengthened their cooperation in the field of education (Beukel, 1993: 161 -169).

With regard to the 90s and the new Millennium, it can be argued that 'globalisation' had such a tremendous impact both on the international systems and internal structures that education was inevitably effected by the challenges of globalisation. In response to these challenges, a new policy objective was designed to create a 'knowledge-based economy and society'. In fact, the idea of knowledge economy was essentially a global idea and the Europeanization of education appeared to be a part of wider globalisation (Lawn & Lingard, 2002). Another stimulus to foster educational cooperation was the increasing economic competitiveness. In addition to economic incentives, deep-seated unemployment problems undoubtedly forced the member states to converge their education systems. It should be also noted that the Single European Act signed in 1987 introduced 'the central importance of human resources in the treaty', so social cohesion gained significance as a major policy objective (Hingel, 2001: 6).

Accordingly, the scope for educational cooperation remarkably extended as a result of a number of internal and external problems.

In the beginning of the 90s, the Maastricht Treaty (1992) announced the involvement of education policy in the interest areas of the EU. In 1993, the White Paper on 'Growth, Competitiveness, Employment' was published. The Chapter 7 of the Report emphasized that a convergence between the national educational systems was necessary. Education and training was put in the centre of a 'new mode of development' in the Chapter 10 (ibid : 6). In the same year, the Green Paper on the European Dimension of Education was issued. As for the European citizenship, this report particularly made clear that education systems were responsible for educating young people 'for democracy, for the fight against inequality, to be tolerant and to respect diversity' (COM (93) 457: pg 7). In 1996, the White Paper on 'Teaching and Learning-Towards the Learning Society' was prepared. The main objectives stressed in the report were 'encourage the acquisition of new knowledge (recognition of skills, mobility, multimedia educational software), bringing schools and business sectors closer together (apprenticeship, training schemes, vocational training), combat exclusion (second chance schools, European voluntary services), proficiency in three community languages, and three capital investment and investment in training on an equal basis .' (Hingel, 2001: 7) . In 1997, the European Employment Strategy was declared in the Luxembourg Job Summit. In accordance with the economic priorities, 'employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability and equal opportunities' were accepted as the main pillars (ibid:7). Finally, at the end of the decade, a Rolling Agenda (1999) regarding the reform of the decision-making process was endorsed, which provided both a continuity and an exchange mechanism for information, experience and good practice between the member states (ibid:10).

To meet the challenges of globalisation and the information society, EU has begun to pursue a more active policy with the beginning of the new millennium. First, a new strategy was adopted in the Lisbon European Council (March 2000). The Lisbon goal was mainly about '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'. A year later, 'Report on the concrete future objectives of education systems' was approved in the Stockholm European Council. Three main objectives were 'improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems in the EU; facilitating the access

of all to lifelong education and training; opening up education and training systems to the wider world'<sup>21</sup>. Besides, it was the first document to provide an overall approach to the national educational systems in the context of the EU. With regard to the ways and means of achieving these aims, a new strategy consisting of several dimensions were espoused. One of them was defined as 'an open method of co-ordination which provides a new cooperation framework for the Member States with a view to convergence of national policies and the attainment of certain objectives shared by everyone'. 'Lifelong learning' was another pillar which is crucial both to economically oriented issues and social and personal development. The latter was adopted as a guiding principle for the development of education and training policies after the Communication on Making a European Area of lifelong Learning a Reality was endorsed by the Commission on 21 November 2001. Finally, in the Barcelona European Council (March, 2002) these aspirations were reiterated while the importance of education was highlighted for the success of European social model, and making Europe's education systems 'a world quality reference' by 2010 was put forward as a long term objective.<sup>22</sup>

As a conclusion, education has gradually become 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 has been developing and implementing innovative projects in fields of education and training since the 1970s. The evolution of European education policy has 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 centred 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 programmes, thereby the first generation education programmes known as COMETT, ERASMUS and LINGUA were launched in this decade. For the 80s, the economic crises that the Community confronted forced the EC to take the necessary steps in the educational field. In the 90s, the challenging technological race and the global economic competition had a very significant impact on the national governments. As a result, the member states have enhanced the cooperation areas, particularly in the higher education, in order that they could compete with their rivals by improving their educational standards. In the beginning of the new millennium, the EU has

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c00003.htm> (retrieved on 16 January 2005) .

<sup>22</sup> Ibid .



put its long-term goal as Lisbon strategy aiming at ‘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 globalisation 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 has rarely been addressed as a policy area contributing to construct 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.

### **2.3. EDUCATION, TRAINING AND YOUTH PROGRAMMES**

In the light of related articles on education<sup>23</sup> and taking into account the conduct of education policy both by the European institutions and by the national governments, it can be argued that education policy of the EU is being performed through voluntary participation of the member states in the EU-funded education and training programmes as well as co-operation between the member states in the field of education. In this framework, the three pillars on which European education policy rest, namely education, training and youth programmes are going to be examined with reference to past and present of these programmes.

The first generation of programmes covered the period of 1974-1995, and the successive period has been still continuing. The preceding programmes before 1995 were Erasmus, Lingua, Comett, Force, Petra and Eurotecnet (Jones, 1996). In 1993 the Commission adopted two proposals for setting up a new generation of programmes on vocational training (Leonardo) and youth (Youth for Europe III) and a year later another proposal for creating a community action programme in the field of education was approved.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> See Article 128 of the Rome Treaty , Article 127 -128 of the TEU , Article 149-150 of the Maastricht Treaty .

<sup>24</sup> Bliss : General Report on Education Activities, 1994 , point : 292 .

## **2.3.1. EDUCATION PROGRAMMES**

### **2.3.1.1. The First Generation of programmes: 1974-1995**

Following the two Resolutions on cooperation in education in 1974 and 1976, also inspired by the Article 128 of the Rome Treaty, the first Action Programme for education was introduced in 1976. Since youth employment was a major problem in those years, the successive programmes had a particular aim of decreasing high rates of youth unemployment (Ertl, 2003). In the next decade, important steps were taken in the field of education. For example, the European Court of Justice reinterpreted Article 128 of the Rome Treaty in a way that enabled the European institutions to adopt binding legislation regarding vocational training and education. In addition, the 1963 general principles on vocational education and training were accepted as a part of the EC Treaties, which gave regulative powers to the EC in vocational training. Accordingly, the Commission and the Council, encouraged by the Court decisions, launched a series of education and training programmes which were comprehensive and much more goal-oriented. In the 80s and 90s, the COMETT (European Community Action Programme in Education and Training for Technology), ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) and LINGUA (the Language and Training Programmes) spent almost the entire budget of the Commission for education (Beukel, 1993:162). In 1994, the Council agreed to regroup the former generation of programmes, so Socrates including universities, schools and institutions of higher education and Leonardo for vocational training and education for a five-year period were established (Jones, 1996: 228).

**2.3.1.1.1. Comett :** The legal basis of the first phase of the programme (1986-1989) was based on Article 128 on vocational training and Article 235 on supplementary actions of the founding treaty<sup>25</sup> while the resolution on the COMETT II (1990-1994) was only based on Article 128<sup>26</sup>. The Comett had four aims: ‘to foster joint development of training programmes; exchange of experience and optimum use of training resources at Community level; to improve the supply of training at local, regional and national levels; and to develop the level of training in response to technological and social changes.’ (Beukel, 1993: 162).

---

<sup>25</sup> European Educational Policy Statements 1988 : 157-163 in Beukel , Eric (1993) . Education . In : Making Policy in Europe The Europeification of National Policy-making . Sage Publications : London

<sup>26</sup> *ibid* : European Educational Policy Statements 1990 : 57-63

**2.3.1.1.2. Erasmus :** The first stage of ERASMUS Programme (1987-1989) was approved by the Council on the basis of Art. 128 and Art. 235. The ERASMUS II (1990-1994) was also adopted by the Council with reference to Art. 128.<sup>27</sup> The ERASMUS programme mainly aimed at both ameliorating the quality of education and training and increasing the number of students who spent a part of their study in another member country (ibid: 162-163).

**2.3.1.1.3. Lingua :** The programme had an object of promoting language skills and training. It was also adopted by the Council by referring to Art.128 and 235<sup>28</sup>.

In addition to Erasmus, Comett and Lingua, the other education and training programmes implemented during the 90s were Arion, Eurotecnet, Force, Petra and Yes. While Arion (1991-1992) and Yes (1988-1991) aimed to promote ‘study visits for educational specialists and youth exchange in EC’, Force (1991-1994), Petra (1988-1992) and Yes (1988-1991) concentrated on the vocational training with the aim of supporting innovations and continuing training in the field of vocational education (Ertl, 2003: 9).

#### **2.3.1.1.4. Assessment of the first generation programmes**

To evaluate the first generation of education programmes in general terms; first, they did not have a sole and exclusive legal basis; that is, until the Maastricht Treaty education remained, first and foremost, a national responsibility. Thus, the Community’s involvement in the field of education was mainly based on the Art.128 of the Rome Treaty, the general principles on the vocational education and training of 1963, and finally, the 1974 agreement on co-operation in education in the aftermath of the first meeting of the EC Ministers of Education (McMahon, 1995: 17).<sup>29</sup> Therefore, this ambiguity regarding the legal basis of the programmes led the European Court of Justice to take a decision on demarcating the competencies of the Community and the member states in the field of education (Ertl, 2003).

Another point is the limited impact of the first generation of programmes due to several reasons. First, as the member states opposed to the EU-led reform proposals and innovations,

---

<sup>27</sup> ibid : : European Educational Policy Statements 1990 : 109 -113

<sup>28</sup> ibid : : European Educational Policy Statements 1990 : 89-97

<sup>29</sup> McMahon , Joseph A. ( 1995 ) in Ertl , Hubert ( 2003 ) . European Union Education Programmes for Education and Vocational Training : Development and Impact . SCOPE Research Paper No.42 Spring 2003 pg: 10 .

the participants in the projects suffered from the lack of support and also had to deal with bureaucratic obstacles not only at EU level but also at national level. Second, the successful patterns of EU-funded programmes could not be standardized, so their impact was restricted in the area of implementation. Third, the project outcomes were not evaluated and disseminated sufficiently. Finally, from the outset, the financial assistance to the first generation programmes was so limited that they had a little impact on the national administrations (ibid: 10-12).

If it is assessed in positive terms, it can be claimed that the EU initiatives gained effective results especially in the areas in which national regulations were not strict. For example, given the high participation rates in exchange schemes, Erasmus programme for higher education proved to be more successful than those for vocational training as well as general education (ibid: 10-11).

#### **2.3.1.2. The Second Generation of Programmes : 1995 - present**

The second generation of programmes began in 1995, and has been still continuing. The first phase of the programmes was completed in 1999; the second phase has been effective since 2000. If the second generation of programmes is evaluated in general terms, a number of differences regarding its legal basis as well as its way of implementation can be found. First, after the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, education has become a policy concern of the Union. Thereby, Socrates and Leonardo programmes were introduced on the basis of the Art 126 for the general education and Art 127 for the vocational training. In addition to their strengthened legal basis, the new generation programmes have been implemented in a more user-friendly manner; that is, the role of the participants (the social partners and the member states) has been enhanced. Moreover, a bottom-up approach, which promotes the submission of projects, has been adopted. Finally, the application procedures of projects have been simplified (ibid: 13-14).

These programmes mainly concentrate on the enhancement of mobility, encouragement of the cooperation supporting the innovations in all levels and the promotion of basic values such as equal opportunities, idea of active citizenship and lifelong learning. The new generation programmes consist of Socrates for general and higher education, Leonardo da Vinci for vocational training, Youth and Tempus for youth (IKV, 2004: 43).

The fact that the programmes and action areas named after Socrates, Erasmus, Comenius, Grundtvig and Leonardo da Vinci, who were very well-thought-of as philosopher, humanist, artist, theologian and educator making a great contribution to the European culture as well as its intellectual and educational life was a conscious choice of the Commission aiming to emphasise the cultural inheritance of Europe (Field, 1998).

#### **2.3.1.2.1. Socrates Programme**

Inspired by Socrates, the Greek philosopher with a humanist vision of the world and fighting against dogmatism, the Community's education programme was given his name<sup>30</sup>. The primary goals of the Socrates Programme are to foster language learning and to promote mobility and innovation<sup>31</sup>. Socrates supports European cooperation through 'mobility (moving around EU), organising joint projects, setting up European networks (disseminating ideas and good practice), and conducting studies and comparative analyses'<sup>32</sup>.

The second phase of the Socrates Programme, covering period 2000-2006, aims at improving knowledge of European languages, promoting cooperation and mobility throughout education, strengthening the European dimension of education, encouraging innovation in education, promoting equal opportunities in all sectors of education<sup>33</sup>. In pursuing its goals, Socrates has activated eight action programmes: Comenius (school education), Erasmus (higher education), Grundtvig (adult education and other education pathways), Lingua (learning European languages), Minerva (information and communication technologies in education), observation and innovation of education systems and policies, joint actions with other European programmes and supplementary measures<sup>34</sup>.

As to the legal ground of the Socrates programme, Article 149 and 150 of the EC Treaty as well as Decision No 253 \ 2000 \ EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24

---

<sup>30</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf) (Retrieved on 7 August 2005).

<sup>31</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/depl\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/depl_en.pdf) (retrieved on 16 February 2005).

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*.

<sup>33</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf) (retrieved on 18 February 2005)

<sup>34</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/depl\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/depl_en.pdf) (retrieved on 17 February 2005).

January establishing the second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education provide a clear legal basis (IKV, 2004: 49).<sup>35</sup>

With regard to financial sources and participating countries, the EU budget of Socrates for 2000-2006 amounts to 1. 850 € (IKV, 2004 : 49). It is open to the participation of 31 countries : the 25 Member States of the European Union, the three European Economic Area Countries (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway), the three candidate countries (Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey)<sup>36</sup>.

#### **2.3.1.2.2. Comenius**

Named after Comenius (1592 -1670), who was an educator and universalist working for peace and unity between nations<sup>37</sup>, this action centres on the the first stage of education, from nursery and primary to secondary school. The Comenius action involves all the participants concerned (teachers, pupils and education staff). It also aims to reach organisations outside the school, such as parents' associations, NGOs, local authorities, the business sector, social partners, etc. Comenius consists of three parts: school partnerships, language projects, school development projects<sup>38</sup>.

As for the objectives of Comenius, it is intended to improve the quality of teaching, to consolidate the European dimension of school and to encourage language learning. Considering the importance of learning in a multicultural environment for European citizenship, it puts special emphasis on intercultural education. Comenius also contributes to the improvement of conditions for disadvantaged groups and the fight against xenophobia and exclusion<sup>39</sup>.

---

<sup>35</sup> See Socrates – Legal Basis

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/legal\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/legal_en.html) ( retrieved on 18 February 2005 )

See also OJ L 28 of 3 . 2 .2000

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/decsoc2\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/decsoc2_en.pdf) ( retrieved on 18 February 2005 )

<sup>36</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf) ( retrieved on 18 February 2005 )

<sup>37</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/comenius/moreabou\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/comenius/moreabou_en.html) ( retrieved on 28 April 2005 )

<sup>38</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf) ( retrieved on 18 February 2005 ) .

<sup>39</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/comenius/moreabou\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/comenius/moreabou_en.html) ( retrieved on 28 April 2005 ) .

### 2.3.1.2.3. Erasmus

As an 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 programme in higher education was named after Erasmus of Rotterdam (1465 -1536)<sup>40</sup>.

The first phase of the Erasmus programme was introduced in 1987. As for today, it embraces almost all the universities in Europe. Despite its reputation as a university exchange programme, it also includes non-university organisations. The member states, the EEA countries (Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein) and the candidate countries (Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey) can participate in Erasmus action programmes<sup>41</sup>.

Erasmus programme was designed to foster the mobility and exchange of students and teaching staff. With regard to the students, those who want to study for a period of 3–12 months at a university or higher education institution in another participating country are given student grants. Another advantage of the programme is that the part of study spent abroad is fully recognised by the home institution. The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) is the key instrument for the academic recognition of study periods in a foreign higher education institution. For the students who do not take part in Erasmus exchange programmes, universities are encouraged to add a European perspective to the courses, which is also an integral and instrumental part of the long-term objective of the Socrates programmes as ‘developing a European Dimension within the entire range of a university’ academic programmes<sup>42</sup>.

Apart from student mobility grants, Erasmus supports the teachers who give short courses within the official curriculum of a participant university in another country through teacher exchange programmes. Besides the mobility enhancing schemes for the students and

---

<sup>40</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/what\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/what_en.html) (retrieved on 18 February 2005).

<sup>41</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/what\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/what_en.html) (retrieved on 18 February 2005)

<sup>42</sup> *ibid.*

teachers, Erasmus also supports joint preparation of courses, intensive programmes and thematic networks.

As to the application and participation procedure, the higher education institutions seeking to take part in Erasmus programme have to apply for an Erasmus University Charter, which enables them to apply to the Commission and to their National Agencies. The former gives ‘centralised Erasmus funds’; the latter provides ‘decentralised mobility funds’<sup>43</sup>. An additional note regarding the implementation procedure is that a prior agreement between the home and the host universities must be signed before a student exchange programme is activated<sup>44</sup>.

#### **2.3.1.2.4. Grundtvig**

As a Danish theologian, hymn 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<sup>45</sup>.

The last chain of the school education, named after Grundtvig, concentrates on the adult education and lifelong learning with the aim of promoting the development of concrete products and valid results and European cooperation between bodies providing adult education, of contributing to the improvement of the quality of teacher training related to persons involved in the teaching of adults, of furthering the debate on lifelong learning and of contributing to the dissemination of good practice<sup>46</sup>.

Grundtvig programme supports four types of activities<sup>47</sup>:

---

<sup>43</sup> *ibid* .

<sup>44</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf)  
(retrieved on 18 February 2005) .

<sup>45</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/grundtvig/overview\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/grundtvig/overview_en.html)  
(retrieved on 7 August 2005) .

<sup>46</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/grundtvig/overview\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/grundtvig/overview_en.html)  
(retrieved on 20 February 2005)

<sup>47</sup> *ibid* .



1. Transnational Projects: These are the projects in which several organisations and institutions from different European countries work together and combine their knowledge and experience with a view to obtaining tangible results and to creating functional projects.
2. Learning Partnerships: The learning partnerships target organisations at local level in order to support them for cooperation, and meet adult learners and teachers from different countries for further development in learning of different languages.
3. Mobility for training of educational staff : The trainers who plan to participate in a course in another European country with the aim of enhancing their understanding of lifelong learning and of developing their adult teaching skills are provided grants.
4. Networks: Grundtvig Networks seeking to reinforce the ties among several players engaged in adult learning is twofold : Thematic networks provide a forum for discussion on key issues and projects networks provide a basis for ongoing communication between institutions participated in projects.

#### **2.3.1.2.5. Lingua**

Learning and teaching of foreign languages have remarkably gained importance due to the free movement of labour, goods, services and capital within the Single Market (Noh, 2004: 19). Language teaching is also crucial to the accomplishment of the aim of creating a people's Europe. First, with the introduction of the Single Market in 1992, it became clear that enhancement of labour mobility depended to a great extent on having required competence and foreign language skills, which enabled individual workers to work and live in other countries.

Hence, knowing foreign languages is an advantage for finding better jobs within the Union. Second, as the ultimate goal of the EU is to create the people's Europe, foreign language teaching contributes to development of the understanding of a common Europe.

In order to realize both the long term objective of integrating Europe politically and increasing labour mobility in the Single Market, Lingua programme supports projects in two categories<sup>48</sup>:

- The promotion of language courses: A good number of projects concentrating on ‘awareness raising, motivation, information and access to language resources’ are funded by the Commission.
- The development of teaching tools: aims to increase the number of alternative methods in language learning and teaching.

Lingua programme also encourages the learning of the languages which are not widely used and taught in the EU. It should be noted that the funded projects in the language teaching must fulfill some conditions. That is to say, these projects must be based on the partnerships of at least three participating countries. In addition, they must be non-profit seeking to contribute to the European dimension.

#### **2.3.1.2.6. Minerva**

The Minerva programme centres on the encouragement of open and distance learning (ODL) and the promotion of multimedia and the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in education . It consists of four types of activities <sup>49</sup> :

- Projects to better understand and support innovation (e.g., research actions).
- Projects to design new teaching methods and resources for the development of innovatory environments in learning.
- Activities intended to communicate and to provide access to the results of projects in order to increase their dissemination and share best practice.
- Projects intended to network and encourage the exchange of ideas and experience connected with ODL and the use of ICT in education.

In addition the above-mentioned action programmes, the Socrates programme also includes some measures (observation and innovations, joint actions, accompanying measures) seeking to enhance the effectiveness of these programmes. Firstly, with regard to the measure of observations and innovations, Europe has a wide range of diversity in education systems. In

---

<sup>48</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf)  
(retrieved on 18 February 2005)

<sup>49</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf)  
(retrieved on 18 February 2005)

order to benefit from this diversity and richness stemming from both traditional and cultural origins and daily practices, the Commission has launched a series of actions given below<sup>50</sup>:

- provision of reliable and comparable information on national education policies and education systems through the network of information on education in Europe (Eurodice);
- field visits to allow decision-makers and those responsible for education policy to acquire direct experience of education systems and reforms in other countries (Arion)
- use of the Naric network of national centres for the academic recognition of qualifications .
- pilot projects, e.g., on the evaluation of quality in education.
- Initiatives to promote exchanges of experience and the transfer of good practice at European level.

Thereby, the action of ‘observation and innovation’ as a part of Socrates programme encourages, first and foremost, to create a genuine area of dialogue and cooperation in which not only the key players in education sector like teaching staff but also interested parties such as social partners and associations can be involved.

As to the joint actions, generally speaking, the best results can be attained through close cooperation between the different parts in the field of education. In this connection, the projects in educational policy (Socrates programme), youth policy and vocational training (Leonardo da Vinci Programme) must be interconnected so that their results can be complementary. In order to create a coherence, ‘joint projects common to the different programmes’ as well as ‘projects which meet the criteria of one programme but relate to themes defined in common across the different parts’ are promoted<sup>51</sup>.

With respect to the accompanying measures, while pursuing its ambitious objectives, the Socrates programme seeks for a number of supportive measures as following<sup>52</sup> :

- awareness-raising activities to promote cooperation in education (conferences, seminars);
- dissemination of project results;

---

<sup>50</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf)  
( retrieved on 18 February 2005 , pg : 9 )

<sup>51</sup> ibid . pg :10 .

<sup>52</sup> ibid . pg : 10 .

- improving programme implementation by producing training in project managements and in tackling objectives;
- supporting synergy between the different actions of the programme;
- ‘horizontal’ priorities such as the promotion of equal opportunities and intercultural education.

## **2.3.2. TRAINING PROGRAMMES**

### **2.3.2.1. A Brief History of Vocational Training**

With the evolution of the common market vocational training became a significant consideration mostly due to its link with labor market policies. The evolution of vocational training, which can play a key role in fight against unemployment, can be explained in three periods with reference to different economic and social conditions in each period: pre-industrial, industrial and knowledge-based societies.

Firstly, training in the traditional societies was generally on-the-job training that took place within family business; that is, youngsters who began to work at early ages acquired necessary skills for the job without a special training. On the other hand, the master and apprentice relation was more apparent in the craft trades since a period of training was essential for being a master. Considering the unchanging social order as well as the static economic model in the pre-industrial societies, the conclusion can be drawn that training in the traditional societies was to a great extent undertaken by social partners of that society instead of formal institutions (Pair, 1998: 232).

However, with the commence of the industrial revolution, which took place between the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe and the North America, there occurred a great transformation from a rural-based society to an industrial society whose population worked for mass production in the newly established factories (Sander, 1999: 187). As a matter of fact, this profound change necessitated reorganization of social order. At this point, schools took on new responsibilities because labour force was asked to have at least a minimum level of basic education. As for the practical knowledge for the job, workers were given vocational training on the job though it was also at a basic level.

During and after the Second World War, the economic, social and political order of Europe had totally changed. Accordingly, in order to rebuild the Continent, a series of initiatives and actions were launched, which inevitably undermined the former economic and social structures. Evidently, it was crucial to reconstruct economic infrastructure so that an economic take off could be achieved. The most significant results of economic reorganization were economic growth and emergence of new jobs, which indeed enhanced social mobility.

In this context, given that the notion of productivity gained ground, vocational training became increasingly important in this period (Pair, 1998: 234). Although many countries were faced with economic and cultural crises after these boom days, the problem of unemployment which appeared on the agenda as a long term issue to be dealt with gave rise to a constant interest in educational matters, particularly with regard to vocational education and training. Once again, economic turbulence brought about a radical change in social and economic relations (ibid: 235). At this time, a transformation from an energy-based economic model to knowledge-based economy opened the debates on redefinition of competence and skills required for employment. Technologic innovations as well as developments in computer and information technologies have altered the fact that vocational education and training were limited to a period within or after the school years. In other words, to adapt to rapid changes and advances in technology and science, continuing vocational training has become a matter of priority.

#### **2.3.2.2. Vocational Training in the European Union**

As it is closely related to its priorities regarding economic development and integration, the Community has always been interested in vocational education and training (Tulasiewicz, 2000: 18). Taking into account the tentative steps taken in making of the education policy, it can be claimed that the member states have been willing participants in both shaping and implementing programmes regarding vocational training. Unlike the field of general education, convergence between national policies is not regarded as a threat to national sovereignty. From the early years of the Community, vocational training was mentioned in several treaties. For example, there were provisions for vocational training (Art.41, 118 and 128) in the Rome Treaty (Beukel, 1993: 155). In 1963, based on the article 128 of the Rome Treaty, general principles on vocational training were set up (Ertl, 2003: 6). In addition,

Article 127 of the Maastricht Treaty and Article 150 of the Amsterdam Treaty provided a solid legal basis for the conduct of vocational training schemes.

In the 1990s with the accomplishment of the Single Market object, the Community intensified cooperation in the field of vocational education and training with the aim of both achieving its ambitious goals and coping with the problem of rising unemployment. In this regard, the Commission developed an action plan in order to respond the challenges brought by the new period. In summary, this programme aimed at (Collins, 1993: 13);

- Facilitating access to and participation in the programmes
- Increasing investment in training and improving the quality of training
- Providing equal access to training
- Guaranteeing the recognition of all qualifications acquired anywhere within the Union.

In the Maastricht Treaty, education was added as a policy field. Article 127 of the TEU regarding vocational training states that <sup>53</sup>:

1. The Community shall implement a vocational training policy which shall support and supplement the action of the Member States, while fully respecting the responsibility the responsibility of the Member States for the content and organization of vocational training.
2. Community action shall aim to:
  - facilitate adaptation to industrial changes, in particular through vocational training and retraining;
  - improve initial and continuing vocational training in order to facilitate vocational integration and reintegration into the labour market;
  - facilitate access to vocational training and encourage mobility of instructors and trainees and particularly young people;
  - stimulate cooperation on training between educational or training establishments and firms;- develop exchanges of information and experience on issues common to the training systems of the Member States.
3. The Community and the Member States shall foster cooperation with third countries and the competent international organizations in the sphere of vocational training.
4. The Council, acting in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 189c and after consulting the Economic and Social Committee, shall adopt measures to contribute to the achievement of the objectives referred to in this Article, excluding any harmonization of the laws and regulations of the Member States."

In the light of this article, it can be claimed that the Community pursues a low-profile policy in the vocational training and education despite its great interest in this area in view of the fact that the member states retain the control over the formation and implementation of

---

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.essex.ac.uk/info/Maastricht.html> (retrieved on 17 May 2005)

vocational training policies. In this context, the Community actions centre on the improvement of vocational training schemes as well as on the facilitation of the access to mobility enhancing programmes and vocational training with the aim of supporting the member states in their efforts to cope with the drastic changes in the labour market as a result of global economic competition.

Before the Maastricht Treaty was signed, the Community established the first phase of Leonardo da Vinci Programme covering the period of 1990-1995 to realize its principal objectives including creating a ‘multi-cultural and multi-lingual Europe, a mobile workforce, a Europe of training for all, a Europe of skills and a Europe open to the world’ (Collins, 1993: 15).

As for the new millenium, the elements that affect the formation of vocational training policy are<sup>54</sup>:

1. The need for providing better education opportunities for European citizens in order to decrease high level of unemployment.
2. Increasing demand for skilled workforce capable of dealing with rapid scientific and technological changes in a competitive world.

In the light of these factors, first, ‘becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based society in the world’ was set as the strategic objective of the EU in the Lisbon European Council (March 2000). The following Barcelona Council declared the goal of ‘making European education and training a world reference by 2010’ and also underlined the importance of closer co-operation in vocational training <sup>55</sup>.

Finally, the Copenhagen Declaration on 29 and 30 November 2002 articulated some points regarding vocational education and training<sup>56</sup>. It was stressed that the economic and social changes took place in Europe during the last decade underscored the need for an enhanced and intensified European dimension in education and training. In this regard, the principle priorities can be summarized as: strengthening European dimension in vocational education and training by promoting intra-institutional and transnational initiatives, developing

---

<sup>54</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/leonardo\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/leonardo_en.html) (retrieved on 17 February 2005)

<sup>55</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c00003.htm> (retrieved on 17 February 2005)

<sup>56</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/copenahagen\\_declaration\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/copenahagen_declaration_en.pdf) (retrieved on 18 February 2005)

common principles and common measures concerning the recognition of different levels of skills and competencies acquired in different countries, and finally encouraging cooperation in quality assurance and developing common criteria and principles for quality in vocational education and training.

### **2.3.2.3. Recognition of Qualifications**

The close cooperation between the EU members in the field of vocational education and training continues as regards recognition of vocational qualifications within the Union, no matter where they are obtained. Actually, the recognition of vocational qualifications and skills is essential that free movement of labour force to be ensured. Thus, a system for recognition of qualifications has been created since the Rome Treaty (1957). For instance, Article 57 of the Rome Treaty was related to mutual recognition of diplomas and qualifications. General principles for implementing a common vocational education policy were adopted in 1963. In the 70s and 80s, CEDEFOP conducted some technical comparisons. Another initiative was that common standards of qualification were approved in two different ways : harmonization or mutual recognition. Sectoral Directives including some group of professionals such as doctors, surgeons, nurses, dentists and architects were adopted. However, it was not practical to follow a profession-by-profession approach; thus, a General Directive was espoused with the proposal of the European Commission in 1988. According to this Directive, all the professions which were acquired by attending at least three years higher education in one country in the EC would be recognized by all the member states. The General Directive included a wide range of professions such as engineering, law, teaching. The Second Directive introduced in 1992 was not limited to higher education, it also covered post-secondary education plus training as well as recognized work experience (Collins, 1993: 15-17).

The Certificate Supplement for vocational qualifications has been tried out in the Member States. Another step is Europass training seeking to help and encourage mobility by creating Euro-wide links of records of vocational experience gained in different member countries. As a response to the Barcelona mandate which declared the goal of making European education and training a world reference by 2010, the Bruges process of enhanced cooperation in vocational education and training aimed to bring together all the instruments of recognition including certificates and diplomas within an integrated system. Furthermore, the Bruges



process has been carried out by adopting a bottom-up approach enabling the social partners to be included in the process<sup>57</sup>. Regarding the latest developments in the mutual recognition of vocational qualifications and skills, the European Community Course Transfer (ECTS) was adopted for recognition of periods of study abroad. In addition, the common European format for Curriculum Vitae was designated to present individual qualifications and skills throughout the EU<sup>58</sup>.

#### **2.3.2.4 Leonardo da Vinci Programme**

LdV, the key instrument of the Community for implementing its vocational training policy, was set up following the Council Decision of Dec 6. 1994 (OJL 340, 29 Dec 1994, pg: 8-24)<sup>59</sup>. Thereby, the former action programmes in the field of vocational education and training, Petra, Comett, Force, Eurotencent were replaced by Leonardo da Vinci Programme (Brock & Tulasiewicz, 2000: 27).

The first phase of the programme (1995–1999) supported both innovative actions in the Member States and the development of policies. To realize its objectives, it furthered the projects planned and conducted by transnational partners.

The second phase of the LdV programme, Leonardo II, covers the period between 2000-2006. Before going further into details of the Leonardo II, it will be useful to mention the differences between two periods. First, it is seen that there is a significant reduction in the number of objectives and measures in Leonardo II. Since the complex nature of the former programmes resulted in complaints about application and implementation procedures, Leonardo II mainly focused on limited objectives.

Secondly, the complicated application and implementation procedures were simplified. Thirdly, the role and responsibilities of the National Agencies in the selection and management of the EU-funded projects were extensively promoted. Consequently,

---

<sup>57</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/rec\\_qual/rec\\_qual\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/rec_qual/rec_qual_en.html) (retrieved on 25 March 2005) .

<sup>58</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c00003.htm> (retrieved on 25 March 2005)

<sup>59</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/old/leonardo\\_old.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/old/leonardo_old.html) (retrieved on 25 March 2005) .

decentralization of the management of the programme mitigated the criticisms and contributed to the attractiveness of the programmes (Ertl, 2003: 20).

For the legal ground and financial sources of the LdV programme, Article 150 of the Amsterdam Treaty and Council Decision of 26 April 1999 (OJL 146 of 11.06.1999 p.33) provide a legal ground for the second phase of Leonardo da Vinci programme (IKV, 2004: 44). The total budget for Leonardo II is € 1.15 billion (ibid: 44). It is open to the participation of the Member States of the European Union as well as to the European Economic Area Countries (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway) and to the three candidate countries (Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey)<sup>60</sup>.

The main objectives of Leonardo II can be summarized as following<sup>61</sup>:

- improvement of skills and competencies of people in initial vocational training with a view to promoting employability and facilitating vocational integration,
- improvement of quality of, and access to continuing vocational training and lifelong acquisition of skills and competencies,
- reinforcement of the contribution of vocational training to the process of innovation with a view to improving competitiveness and entrepreneurship.

The measures taken to achieve the above objectives are ‘mobility, pilot actions including thematic actions, language competencies, transnational networks and reference material’. To sum up the main points <sup>62</sup>:

Mobility promotes transnational mobility actions for people in training. Its target groups include young people in initial or further training, young employed workers, graduates, and higher education students. The major types of actions are transnational placement projects, transnational exchange projects and study visits. Pilot projects aim to promote innovation process as well as to improve the quality of training and vocational guidance. The projects must seek to create concrete solutions by using new information and communication technologies. Language competencies aim to promote language skills within the context of

---

<sup>60</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/part-countr\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/part-countr_en.html) (retrieved on 19 May 2005)

<sup>61</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/guides/en\\_1.doc](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/guides/en_1.doc) (retrieved on 25 March 2005)

<sup>62</sup> ibid : 6–8 .

vocational training by paying particular attention to teaching and learning of less widely used languages.

Transnational networks has three functions:

- to assemble, combine and build on European expertise and innovatory approaches,
- to improve the analysis and anticipation of skills and requirements,
- to disseminate outputs and project results throughout the Union.

Reference Material is accessible to comparison of data, surveys and analyses in collaboration with the statistical Office (Eurostat) and the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop), can be used for observation and dissemination of good practices.

**2.3.2.5. Cedefop :** The European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training was founded in Berlin in 1975. It is a European agency that seeks to promote and develop vocational education and training. Furthermore, it works for creating a genuine area of lifelong learning for an enlarged Europe. The tasks of Cedefop are compilation of selected documentation and analyses of data, contribution to development and coordination of researches, dissemination of information, encouragement of joint efforts to solve the problems in vocational education and training, formation of a forum for debate and exchange of ideas<sup>63</sup>.

## **2.3.2. YOUTH PROGRAMME**

The Youth Policy is the third chain of the European policies in the field of education, training and youth, and it mainly concentrates on non-formal education activities. It was the Maastricht Treaty that provided a clear legal basis for developing new programmes for young people.<sup>64</sup> The following Amsterdam Treaty reiterates the main points regarding education policy, and creates a legal basis for cooperation at European level that reaches young people in one way or another. Accordingly, The Youth Programme was established on the basis of

---

<sup>63</sup> <http://www.cedefop.eu.int/inbrief.asp> (retrieved on 25 March 2005) .

<sup>64</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c00003f.htm> (retrieved on 17 March 2005)

Decision No 1031\2000\EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 April 2000 ( OJ L 177, 18.05.2000 ). The budget allocated to the Youth Programme is € 520 million.<sup>65</sup>

There were two former programmes in the field of youth. Youth for Europe established in 1988; European Voluntary Service launched in 1996. They were included in the Youth Programme for the period 2000-2006<sup>66</sup>. The participant countries in these programmes can be grouped as 'Programme Countries and Partner Countries'. The former includes EU Member States, EFTA\EEA Countries and candidate countries (Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey). They can participate in all action areas of the YOUTH Programme. The latter involves countries from the regions of Mediterranean, Eastern Europe and Caucasus, South East Europe and Latin America. The countries in the second group can only take part in Actions 1,2 and 5 of the YOUTH Programme.<sup>67</sup>

The aims of the Youth Programme<sup>68</sup> can be summarized as the following<sup>68</sup>:

- Promotion of active contribution of young people to the construction of Europe through their participation in transnational exchanges within the Community or with third countries with a view to fostering an understanding of Europe based on cultural diversity and common values.
- Support for initiatives and creativity of young people so that they can have a chance of playing an active role in society as well as encouragement of their acquiring non-formal education.
- Reinforcement of cooperation in the field of youth by fostering the exchange of good practice, the training of youth workers and leaders, as well as the formation of innovative actions at Community level .

A number of measures and action plans were designed to achieve these aims. The action plans are: Youth for Europe and European Voluntary Service (the former Youth programmes merged into the new programme), youth initiatives, joint actions and support measures. The measures taken to implement these actions primarily centre on 'transnational mobility of young people, the use of information and communication technologies in the youth field, development of cooperation networks at the European level permitting mutual exchange of

---

<sup>65</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11603.htm> (retrived on 17 March 2005)

<sup>66</sup> *ibid* .

<sup>67</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/guide05\\_en.doc](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/guide05_en.doc) (retrieved on 23 May 2005 , pg : 12 -13)

<sup>68</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec\\_1031\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec_1031_en.pdf) (retrieved on 28 March 2005 , pg : 3 - 4)

experience and good practice, transnational projects to promote citizenship of the Union and the commitment of young people to the development of the Union, promotion of language skills and understanding of different cultures, pilot projects based on transnational partnerships designed to develop innovation and quality in the youth field, development at a European level, of methods of analysis and follow-up of youth policies and their evolution, and of methods of disseminating good practice'<sup>69</sup>.

The action plans in the field of Youth Policy consist of Youth for Europe, European Voluntary Service, Youth Initiatives, Joint Actions, and Support Measures. Firstly, Youth for Europe programme is divided into two sub-groups: Intra-Community exchanges for young people and Exchange of young people with third countries. The first group aims to promote mobility activities, which last for at least one week on the basis of joint projects within the Community. The target group is the young people aged between 15 and 25 who legally reside in a Member state. The principal aim of those activities based on transnational partnerships between groups of young people is to inspire them to discover social and cultural richness of Europe.

Secondly, the Exchange of Young People Programme pursues the same objectives as the first programme. There is a slight difference between two programmes in terms of their target group and participants. This programme is directed to the young people between the ages of 15 and 25 who reside in a Member State or in a Third Country. In addition, the Project in question must involve at least two Member States. Furthermore, these activities help to the development of youth work and associations in the third countries by giving them the opportunities of being involved in these kinds of projects.

Thirdly, in the European Voluntary Service programme, young volunteers, aged between 18 and 25 legally residing in a Member State, join in the activities on a voluntary basis in another Member State or in a Third Country. The activities of European Voluntary Service are also divided into two: Intra-Community European Voluntary Service and European Voluntary Service with third countries. Both activities aim to promote transnational projects in which young people participate in meeting the needs of society in a wide range of areas from social to environmental. By this way, young people from different social and cultural

---

<sup>69</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec\\_1031\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec_1031_en.pdf) (retrieved on 28 March 2005, pg : 4)

backgrounds are brought together in a multicultural environment, and they gain experience in living and working with others from different cultural origins.

Regarding the Youth Initiatives and the Joint Actions, the former encourages the projects in which young people both take initiatives and show their creativity solutions to problems to find solutions to problems. In the context of Joint Actions, the Commission cooperates with the Member States in order to develop a common system of information, observation and dissemination of good practice in the field of knowledge and lifelong learning.

The last action plan in the implementation of the youth programme, Support Measures, essentially seeks to further ‘training and cooperation in relation to those involved in youth policy, information for young people and youth studies, information and visibility of measures and support measures’<sup>70</sup>.

The Youth Policy is of crucial importance in the sense that it essentially targets non-educational activities reaching different groups in society having fewer opportunities for joining in the EU activities. Despite the growing interest in the EU-led programmes, young people are still attached to their local and national traditions and cultural values. Moreover, the European perspectives of young people display a great diversity from the North to the South stemming from geographical and educational differences. While in the North Europe, Germany and Austria, the European idea is less favoured due to the ‘critical’ and ‘skeptical’ approaches, in the South Europe and Ireland, people seem more sympathetic to the idea of Europe with their ‘positive’ and ‘optimistic’ approaches<sup>71</sup>. In view of the need to convince youth for the idea of united Europe, the Youth Policy deserves to be supported. In this context, the White Paper on Youth (COM (2001) 681) firstly, addresses the economic and social changes taking place after the Enlargement; and secondly, points out the need for making young people more active citizens by providing them opportunities and means for participating in the public life. The White Paper puts forward a new framework based on ‘increasing cooperation between Member States’ while taking greater account of the youth

---

<sup>70</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec\\_1031\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec_1031_en.pdf) (retrived on 29 March 2005, Annex Part, pg : 6-10) .

<sup>71</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/doc/studies/iard/summaries\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/doc/studies/iard/summaries_en.pdf) pg : 27-28 (retrieved on 29 April 2005) .

factor in sectoral policies with a view to contributing to the actions of the Member States and the regions of Europe for young people<sup>72</sup>.

## **2.3.4 THE IMPACT OF THE SECOND GENERATION PROGRAMMES**

### **2.3.4.1. Interim Evaluation of the Socrates Programme**

The second phase of the Socrates Programme was assessed within the related interim of Commission (COM(2004)153 final). Borrowing from this report, all the activities and measures were evaluated in terms of their efficiency and effectiveness below.

With regard to the evaluation of Comenius activities, according to the Commission Report (COM(2004)153 final, pg:18), Comenius is relevant as regards both the requirements of European education systems and the general objectives of the programme. The efficiency of the action is good on the whole. On the other hand, it was also stated that the decreasing numbers of language projects and projects for children should be taken seriously in order that the situation could be rectified<sup>73</sup>.

Regarding the evaluation of Erasmus programme in general terms, the Commission Report (COM (2004) 153 Final) states that while the individual mobility has been enhanced through Erasmus exchange schemes -between 1987 and 2004 more than one million students participated in these programmes- short term intensive programmes, especially joint curriculum projects, have gradually fallen behind<sup>74</sup>.

With respect to the overall performance of the Grundtvig programme, the concerned Commission Report (COM (2001) 153 final) states that the Grundtvig actions proved successful in adopting Europe's new policy objectives regarding lifelong learning and in winning participant countries confidence. On the other hand, due to the recently adopted new

---

<sup>72</sup> <http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11055.htm> (retrieved on 30 March 2005).

<sup>73</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates_en.pdf)  
(retrieved on 28 April 2005)

<sup>74</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates_en.pdf)  
(retrieved on 19 February 2005)

Financial Regulation, complicated management procedures have discouraged some institutions, for example NGOs, from preparing small-scale projects<sup>75</sup>.

As for the impact of Lingua programme, it is difficult to arrive at a conclusion on account of the fact that Lingua has a wide range of objectives. Furthermore, the levels of language knowledge vary from country to country as a result of several factors. As a general assessment, it has been evolving according to the pertinent aims. To illustrate, the first action regarding the promotion of language learning both complements the second action aiming at development of tools and materials and funds different and interesting projects in this area. As regards the dissemination of information, it should be developed with a view to providing the exchange of information and experiences.<sup>76</sup>

As regard the impacts of Minerva action programme, its success is highly significant for the general objectives of Socrates programmes since the ICT has been becoming an indispensable instrument for promoting the use of innovative methods in a wide range of areas from regulation of market conditions to development of new teaching techniques.

If the observation and innovation action is evaluated in general terms, it can be drawn two conclusions. First, it is closely related to the long-term objectives of education programmes. Second, provided that the supported activities in this framework are concentrated on the policy priorities in the field of education, this action can play a crucial role in carrying out these objectives.<sup>77</sup>

#### **2.3.4.2. Interim Evaluation of the Leonardo da Vinci Programme**

For a general assessment of the Leonardo da Vinci Programme in the related report on the implementation of the second phase of the LdV covering the period between 2000-2006 (COM(2004) 152 final), it was evaluated in terms of its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency<sup>78</sup>.

---

<sup>75</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates_en.pdf) (retrieved on 19 February 2005)

<sup>76</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates_en.pdf) (retrieved on 19 February 2005)

<sup>77</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates_en.pdf) (retrieved on 19 February 2005, pg : 26 -27)

<sup>78</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intleonardo\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intleonardo_en.pdf) (retrieved on 22 June 2005).



To begin with, according to the external evaluation and national reports, the programme was in concordance with the objectives regarding the field of the vocational education and training, for it was closely related to the needs of its target group. Despite this positive assessment, it was also underlined that there were deficiencies dealing with some measures. While ‘the mobility’ and ‘pilot projects’ using almost the entire budget were regarded as highly relevant for the accomplishment of goals, those measures accessing only a small percentage of the overall budget were regarded as less relevant.

As to the efficiency of the LdV programme, it was stated that an evaluation regarding its efficiency could only be made on the basis of the ‘the administration cost / effectiveness ratio of the programme’ since all the projects have not been completed yet. According to the external evaluation, this ratio appears to have improved significantly compared with the previous phase of the programme. On the other hand, it was also added that given the absence of efficient tools for collecting information on an ongoing basis, a number of rather ‘heavy’ and ‘time consuming administrative procedures and reporting mechanism’, there remained a number of measures to be taken with a view to improving the efficiency.

With regard to the effectiveness of the LdV programme, for an overall evaluation, the Leonardo da Vinci Programme was regarded as ‘an effective programme’ according to the national reports and the external evaluation. Here again, the effectiveness of the measures using the major part of the budget, mobility and pilot projects, were regarded as very effective while the other measures funded with a small percentage of the budget were considered as less successful. In brief, it was concluded in the interim report on the second phase of the Leonardo da Vinci Programme (2000-2006) that ‘At this stage of the implementation of the programme, it is premature to measure the impact of the programme. Nevertheless, the external evaluation and the national reports are optimistic vis-a-vis the ‘ anticipated impact’ of the programme’<sup>79</sup>.

---

<sup>79</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intleonardo\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intleonardo_en.pdf) (retrieved on 22 June 2005) .

### **2.3.4.3. Interim Evaluation of the Youth Programme**

As for the general assessment of the Youth Programme, in the related Commission Report (COM (2004) 158 final)<sup>80</sup>, it is stated that the programme is positive in general. Regarding the programme management, it is important that the problems related to ‘transparency and coherence of procedures, particularly for the selection of transnational projects, the simplicity and flexibility of those procedures and the need to bring the programme closer to beneficiaries by supporting them in preparing project’ to be solved.

As regards the action 1, it is noted that this action has a high number of beneficiaries and contributes to the European dimension through its multilateral exchanges and its profound impact on young people. In particular, the need to improve the quality of exchange projects by giving the National Agencies a more active role is stressed.

For the action 2, European Voluntary Service action is labeled as the ‘flagship measure for the programme’. In general, the EVS is considered as ‘functioning satisfactorily’. The improvement of the quality of projects and procedures as well as the enhancement of accessibility to the service for young volunteers are two basic points underlined.

With regard to the action 3, it is divided as: group initiatives, networking projects and Future Capital. While the first and second measures are considered as complementary and relevant to the priorities defined in the White Paper on Youth, the third measure as Future Capital designated to help young people to make their own projects after their voluntary service is regarded less effective in the sense that it has loose connections with the follow-up to EVS.

As to the action 4, the main comments centre on the difficulties stemming from implementation by arguing that ‘action 4 suffers from tripartite management which involves particularly complex procedures’.

With regard to the action 5, the overall evaluation states that this measure is highly ‘relevant to the creation of a favourable environment for the development of youth activities in general

---

<sup>80</sup> [http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/eval/report\\_interim\\_evaluation\\_youth\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/eval/report_interim_evaluation_youth_en.pdf) (retrieved on 29 June 2005).

and the programme in particular'. It is nevertheless added that this action should play a more significant role in 'the dissemination of good practice'.

#### **2.3.4.4. Concluding Remarks**

Before going further, to give different viewpoints regarding the effectiveness of the education and training programmes, a number of scholars have assessed them in terms of their influence on the national education systems. To begin with, Field (1998) argues that the programmes have little impact on the education systems of the member states on account of several factors. Firstly, he claims that different levels of governance are not affected by the programmes at the same level. That is to say, the dependence of peripheral authorities such as local authorities and individual institutions on the national centres have quiet decreased thanks to the encouraging programmes. On the other hand, since the competence of local governments in making proposals for educational issues is restricted with being consulted through the Committee of the Regions, they do not have a right to participate in decision-making.

Secondly, Field states that while smaller countries have been more motivated by the programmes, for the larger states, this impact has been rather 'limited and uneven'. To illustrate, by giving the Dutch and the German experiences reflecting a success story and the an attempt to prevent the concerned party to get an EU fund by the regional authorities, Field concludes that 'in the larger member states Europeanisation has usually been less dramatic' (ibid: 108). Given these factors, he maintains that ' the Union remains a relatively minor player in most areas of education and training. Wider and more powerful tendencies towards globalisation have eclipsed its attempts to become a significant supranational force in the field' (Ibid: 115).

On the other hand, another scholar, Ertl (2003) claims that the EU programmes 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 ICT 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 programmes: Leonardo da Vinci and Socrates (Ertl, 2003: 23-26).

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 programmes, it can be concluded that the second generation of programmes 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 programmes 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 programmes 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 programmes should not be underestimated. In short, the education, training and youth programmes 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. As a last word, 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.

### **III. EUROPEAN IDENTITY AND THE FORMATION OF EUROPEAN EDUCATION POLICY**

#### **3.1. INTRODUCTION**

The nationalisation of education systems became an indispensable instrument for the nation-building in Europe in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. National education systems played an active role in the awakening of national consciousness especially through history and language education concentrating on the rediscovery of glorious past and unique features of that country. Nationalisation of education systems started in the peripheral countries such as Austria and Prussia, which were not economic and political leaders of the time. The point here was that national concerns rather than economic incentives shaped the formation of education policies in these countries.

The invention of printing and the influence of Reform movements on the individual-God relations paved the way for the educational enlightenment and for the awakening of national consciousness in Europe. On the other hand, the education policies playing a crucial role in the nation-building process, unfortunately, have lagged behind in the construction of a common European identity. The fact that the member states see the education policy as a sensitive subject directly related to the rights of national sovereignty rendered formation of an independent European education policy impossible for a considerable period of time in the integration process.

Even today, although the Maastricht Treaty introduced the education as a new policy area, European education policy is far from having a supranational character. Having based on the legal ground provided by Art 126 and 127 of the TEU, the EU launched several projects under the names of Socrates (general education), Leonardo da Vinci (vocational training) and Youth (non-formal education). Needless to say, these Commission-led programmes, in which the member states participate voluntarily, seek to contribute to the efforts to create a European culture. However, at this time, economic incentives stemming from technological and economic competition force member states to take part in these programmes and to converge their education policies rather than the interest in construction of European identity. Europeanization can be observed in the higher education area that is directly related to the economic and technological development. In brief, the traditional approach of the member

states to the integration process have not changed regarding the education policy and economic interests became the key to the unionization of education policy.

### **3.2. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN THE IDENTITY-BUILDING PROCESS**

#### **3.2.1. National Identity and Education**

Mass education policies were an important tool of nation building in the emerging nation-states of Europe. Taking into account the mass education policies in pursuance of nation state building, the role of education in the construction of national identity is remarkable. The political developments, emergence of nationalism and economic take-off seen in the 17th and 18th centuries had given rise to the emergence of nation states in Europe. However, these newly established national states did not consist of purely ethnic communities. Thus, nation state formation usually went hand in hand with nation building. The crux here was the production of nationals, which required specific conditions such as a ‘cultural homogeneity’ and ‘national identification with a central political authority’. At this point, education served as a valuable contributor to the realization of psychological dimension in this process (Nevola, 2001). In other words, the artificially constructed nation state also recreated its people by using some instruments such as ‘compulsory military training and a unified system of public, mass education’ (Smith, 1995: 51). The mass education was a tremendously effective policy; that is, children at their very early ages were thought to be a member of nation state by means of elaborate history and literature lessons inculcating the sacredness of nation state. Given the historical background of nation state formation in Europe, the importance of mass education in the construction of national identity will be scrutinized in this section.

The origins of nation state can be traced back to the late Middle Ages and early 17th century. Firstly, in the age of explorations, new technologies used in ship building had enabled European merchants to trade in overseas. Accordingly, flourishing commercial life and growing wealth had altered the economic and social structures of the Medieval Europe. For instance, getting rich with international trade, a new group of individuals called ‘bourgeoisie’ appeared. Later, they supported artists and intellectuals, whose activities towards rediscovering Greek and Roman thought paved the way for Renaissance (Mingst,

2001: 23). Furthermore, being politically excluded from ruling mechanism in dynastic regimes, this group also began to seek to take part in government. The old and static monarchies, on the other hand, could not respond the needs of the demanding internal order and meet the challenges of changing external balance (Sander, 1995). The Treaty of Westphalia was a turning point in the new European order since it adopted the notion of sovereignty. Besides, with the decline in power of the pope and the emperor, the territorial state proved to be the core actor in the international scene. Finally, after the Treaty of Westphalia, the sovereign state having its national army and strongly established secular base arised (Mingst, 2001: 23). The forces behind destruction of the ‘Old Order’, can be summarized as ‘rationalism’ and ‘capitalism’. The former indicates the ideas and trends against the Old; the latter points to new production methods (Navari, 1981: 35–36). As a last word, both ‘the idea of citizen who recognized the state as his home land’ and ‘the idea of state that exists to serve those citizens’ were the cornerstones in the intellectual evolution of the nation state (ibid: 35 ).

As for the nation-building in Europe, it was a phased policy carried out by a number of state apparatus. Since there was no ‘given ethnic core’ for any modern nation state, people were produced ‘as the basis and origin of political power’ (Balibar, 1996: 138). In this long and complex process, national leaders had tried to create ‘a memory of common past, a density of linguistic and cultural ties, and a conception of equality of all members of the group’ (Hroch, 1996: 61) among people having different origins and loyalties. As stated by Smith (1995: 51), the chief instruments of the nation state were ‘compulsory military training in the citizens army, a unified system of public, mass education and growing state control over the press and communication, in a later age, radio and TV.’ Of the three instruments, education was the most effective policy since it provided a sound structure for instilling national ideas in children at a very early age.

For the beginning, history has a significance in nation building process due to three reasons (Cohen, 1999: 26). First, as being the centerpiece of identity, national ideologies benefit from historical events of heroism or victimhood in order that they can create a ‘we’ sense which solely belongs to that group and differs it from ‘others’. Second, it has two functions as ‘strategic’ and ‘unifying’. History tells a meaningful story to its audience, which not only unites them but also gives them clues to justifying their present actions. For this reason, it is generally referred to the national history when national politicians need to vindicate their

ideas or policies. Finally, seeing that a sense of national consciousness is vital for national identity, history substitutes for religion. As regard the sources of collective identities in the Middle Ages, they were neither ethnic origins nor monarchic regimes. Instead, both the universal authority of the Church and the notion of Christian civilization had bound people throughout Europe, notwithstanding the political fragmentations in the Continent. On the other hand, established against the Old Order, the nation state was entirely secularized. As a consequence, the main instrument of creating a national consciousness was not the religion but the national history (ibid: 28-29).

With regard to the history-education relation, Europeans have been given to believe that each nation has its own distinctive past through history education which was formalized from a nationalist perspective regarding content and teaching. In addition, the links with pre-modern past both served to dignify national characters and revitalize their heroism in each generation. In this context, the ethno-history of the nation was reproduced and disseminated through rituals, history textbooks as well as political or cultural myths (Smith, 1997).

Among a number of scholars concentrating on the issues related to the nationalism, Smith is the one who pays a particular attention to the role of history in the nation-building process. Even though he agrees on the idea that 'the nation is a modern phenomenon', he also adds 'modern nations have their roots in pre-modern eras and pre-modern cultures' (Smith, 1996: 124). In his analysis, Smith puts a special emphasis on the ethnic past of the nations, and thus, in this context he makes a distinction between pre-modern ethnic communities as 'the aristocratic lateral and the demotic vertical types' (ibid: 125). In the first place, the bureaucratic state undertakes the task of inducing a sense of belonging in its people. On the other hand, for the latter group, educated intelligentsia deriving great inspiration from the ethnic history of the community becomes the driving force of transformation from the ethnic community to a fully-fledged nation-state. In this process it is essential that the ethnic history be reinterpreted with a view to preventing a conflict between generations (ibid). At this point, Smith places much emphasis on the role of history education by arguing that 'crucial to the success of the national state was the formulation and dissemination of a single canon of national history, literature and the arts. Through the standardization of textbooks and the elaboration of a national literary and artistic heritage, the civic-territorial nationalism of the political community of the national state took root among the mass of the population, turning them into politically conscious and participant citizens' (Smith, 1995: 51).



Smith, furthermore, criticizes the contemporary scholars regarding the issue of nationalism on the grounds that they underestimate the importance of history and the ties of a nation with its ethnic past. For instance, Smith disagrees with the argument of Hobsbawm (Smith, 1993) which is mainly based on the assumption that the nation-state is a 'recent historical innovation' created through 'the standardization of administration,..., in particular, state education' (Hobsbawm, 1983: 264) and by 'the invention of public ceremonies and the mass production of public monuments' (ibid: 271). In this context, Hobsbawm regards the nation-state, national histories and symbols as the products of 'social engineering' (Hobsbawm, cited by Smith, 1993: 12). On the other hand, for Smith, the role of those who construct the modern nations is not the inventions of traditions, but the reconstruction of the customs and institutions of the ethnic community, which provides a social basis for the nation-state (Smith, 1993: 16).

Given the role of history lessons in the national education systems, it can be concluded that both approaches to the history teaching have been effectively used with the aim of awakening a we-feeling among the young people. In the national history textbooks, the pre-modern history of nation-states, national symbols and stories of national heroes are interwoven in a way that the students are inculcated into national awareness thanks to the history, borrowing from Hobsbawm, serving as a social engineering.

In addition to the importance of national history in the nation building process, language is also crucial to the state formation process (Clark & Dear, 1984). Indeed, language is more than a communication instrument since as stated by Gilbert (1998: 133), 'Its expressive potential is held to reflect national character as embodying distinctive values, an aspect of culture which we have unrealistically split off from others and so far ignored'. As an effective instrument for inducing a sense of identity, the language policy of the nation state has commonly strove for creating a genuine cultural area into which the nation state could easily penetrate. In France, a very best example of the implementation of this kind of policy, pupils who did not speak French, but for example Breton, were strictly punished and forced to speak French as a part of linguistic homogenization policy after the Revolution (Hechter, 2000: 63). Apart from these linguistic campaigns, both 'the education of girls' and 'the rise of free schooling' helped spread of French language (ibid: 64).

There had been a constant power struggle among different sources of authorities in the Continent throughout the Middle Ages. Consequently, it was almost impossible to inspire a sense of belonging in any place of Europe. On the other hand, creating a homogenous population was of critical importance for the nation-building. The language policy has gradually become the most accentuated and effective instrument in this process (Fishman, 1996).

Language, thus, has played a key role in the nation-building process due to two main reasons. First, before the spread of national ideas, there had been a huge lack of communication between the elites and new inhabitants of towns and cities coming from rural areas because of growing urbanization since the latter were still illiterate. As a result, it was difficult to organize and govern those people with whom the rulers did not have a common language (ibid: 155-157). Creating a common language, which could be read and written by the majority, was seen as an indispensable precondition for being a nation (Caviedes, 2003). One function of the language except for unifying people was that it had ‘the demarcation and boundary function’ in the expression of the national identity (ibid: 151).

Second, it is a belief that there exist emotional ties between the national language and the people who speak it. At this point, the Primordialists and the Constructivists, the opposite schools of nationalism, evinced different viewpoints regarding this so-called spiritual connection. According to the Primordialists, the characteristics of the people and the nature of that national language were innately coincidental. On the other hand, for the Constructivists, identification with that group was taught through a common language. The common ground for both sides was their insistent on the necessity of developing a unified language (Caviedes, 2003).

In the age of modern nationalism, it was taken for granted that the national language was the natural transmitter of the values and norms of that nation. By this way, the written and oral literature began to be used as a means of expressing and eulogizing both the characteristics and the past of the nation. The national language has become a mystique and sacred instrument serving as sentimental bridge between the past and present of that country. Herder was the forerunner thinker who put the language in the intellectual and emotional center in search of national ‘authenticity’ (Fishman, 1996: 159).

Apart from the belief that the language was both an instrument bringing together people and a sentimental link serving as a bridge between the past and present, there were also economical and political reasons behind the creation of national language (Rokkan, 1999). In the first place, for example, the compulsory education in some Protestant countries and the invention of printing gave rise to the standardization of vernaculars. In addition, the monasteries and church schools played a significant role in alphabetisation of vernaculars (Rokkan, 1999: 173). Furthermore, the developing economy and flourishing trade created new opportunities for those who were skillful at reading and writing. With the commence of industrial revolution literacy gained importance as the workers asked to read the instruction and do their job in accordance with them.

Finally, the feeling of equality among the members of the group can be created to the extent that a sentiment of national identification with that political authority is promoted. In this context, ‘political socialization’ rendered possible reproduction of societies by conveying their definite cultural components to its members. As a sort of general socialization, individuals benefit from ‘political socialization’ mechanism while they form their personal, collective and public identities. Even though it is undeniable that the schools have played a considerable role in transmitting of national values, the political socialization as an integral part of the functions of national education systems has been ignored (Nevola, 2001).

### **3.2.2. Nationalization of Education Systems**

Nationalization of education systems in Europe is a process that had started in the peripheral countries in the seventeenth century and had reached its peak in the second half of the twentieth century. This process, despite the Modernist argument on the contrary, was essentially triggered by the crises of ‘national integrity’ that these countries experienced due to their weakness in military and economic areas (Ramirez & Boli, b, 1987: 192). As a matter of fact, while compulsory education campaign was launched earlier in the countries such as Austria (1774), and Prussia (1716), which were not economically developed, France and Britain, as economic and political leaders of that age, began to nationalize their education systems in the end of the nineteenth century (ibid: 166). There lied two important factors behind the nationalization of education systems in Europe. First, the impact of Reformation both on the individual / God and individual / state relations, second, the effects of destructive

wars on the defeated countries. Besides, the requirements of competitive world economy and the convergence of state / individual dichotomy in terms of ‘citizenship’ myth paved the way for an increase in state intervention in education.

With regard to the impacts of the Reformation and ‘national integrity crises’ on the nationalization of education in Europe, first of all, though the Reformation had no direct effect on the commencement of state-driven schooling, it was crucial to the success of educational development due to two main reasons. The first effect of the Reformation was its ground-breaking stance on individual and God relations. From the Reformist point of view, the individual was responsible for his/her own attitude towards religious life. Therefore, neither the ‘mediating role of the Catholic Church’ nor the ‘ignorance of the peasant’ was acceptable (ibid: 193). Accordingly, the individual gained importance as a social actor. Reformation paved the way for reorganizing the Catholic Church. As the supremacy of the Church was being undermined, the nation state could strengthen.

In addition to the effects of the Reformation, mass schooling was increasingly widened in Prussia, Austria, Denmark and Sweden as a result of economic and military failures these countries experienced. For instance, Prussia, one of the earliest countries in which mass schooling spread, was a politically fragmented state administrated by a powerful bureaucracy. Frederick the Great, who considered this fragmentation as the major reason of military setbacks, aimed to unite German people by means of a national education systems (ibid: 187). With regard the core states, France began to nationalize her education system after it was defeated by Prussia in 1870. A period of recession Britain faced at the end of the nineteenth century triggered the nationalization of mass schooling in this country.

Finally, mythical concept of citizenship reconciling ‘statism’ and ‘individualism’ could be realized by national educational policies. According to this logic, only the state-directed education could provide the best for its citizens who were also indispensable members of the nationalism project (ibid: 176).

As a conclusion, education has always played a crucial role in the construction of national identities as it is seen nation building process took place in Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A sense of national awareness could be created through history

textbooks and language courses which were mainly concentrated on the success and uniqueness of that nation. Besides, school has also had great importance since it has been the ever best place for political identification of the pupils with that nation. As a result, nation state building usually went hand in hand with nationalization of education systems in Europe. The nation was constructed by means of consciously pursued policies by national elites with the help of some instruments such as state education and compulsory military service inculcating a sense of national unity into the young and general population (Hobsbawm, 1997). State education was key to the nationalization process in which ordinary people became national citizens. Schooling provided ‘on a nation-wide scale, a means of establishing common patterns of behaviour and values’ as well as ‘a strong web of intergenerational stability and continuity’. The growing interest in state education during this period reflected in the number of students attending schools in that student numbers doubled in countries such as Germany, Austria, France Norway (Hobsbawm, 1983: 293-294). In addition, a rapid progress was seen in the field of primary education not only teaching literacy but also imposing social and national values upon young children. In those years, primary education systems swiftly developed in Western countries such as Britain and France (Hobsbawm, 1997).

The rapid increase in the number of literate thanks to the invention of printing as well as the spread and standardization of the vernacular languages in the late Middle Ages served as a preliminary stage to the nationalization of education systems. For Anderson, ‘print capitalism’, one of the brilliant examples of entrepreneurial capitalism, has played a pivotal role in the awakening of a national consciousness. With the invention of printing press, a good number of books were printed in vernacular languages and thereby, read by millions of people. As a result, Latin, ‘ the sacred elite language ’ lost its dominance, and vernacular languages began to spread throughout Europe (Smith, 1993: 18). More importantly, these languages contributed to develop a sense of belonging with the help of print capitalism in three ways. First, printed books in several languages created a communication area among the people who read them. Second, with the print capitalism, the vernacular languages became perpetual and standardised. Finally, the print capitalism served as a device selecting vernacular languages that later became the language of powers (Anderson, 1991: 52-61).

With regard to the education-nation building relation, Gellner argued that nations were the products of the modern times as born of nationalism in agrarian societies even could not be

imagined (Spencer&Wollman, 2002). For Gellner, new industrial society needed to be built on a homogeneous culture due to both the complex nature of 'division of labour' and the necessity for providing 'geographical and social mobility' of this new society. As a consequence of transformation from 'agro-literate' community to 'advanced industrial society', the members of this community were asked to be literate (Spencer&Wollman: 34-36, 2002) . At this point, state-led and nationalized education systems played a crucial role in creating this 'high' culture (Gellner, 1983: 18, cited by Spencer&Wollman, 2002: 35). In brief, schooling and nationalization of education system played a tremendously important role in the production of nationals.

### **3.2.3. The European Identity and Education**

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 the extent that 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 (Shore, 2000). 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, even though this historical and functional connection between education and political socialization mechanism seems to be 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), it 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.

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.

Having realised 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 programmes and projects have been launched, yet they were chiefly about 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 its 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: 7).

To summarize the main points; first, 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 nationalist view. In addition to the emphasis on the idea of a shared past, pupils are also to express themselves in national language rather than their mother tongue. Despite the fact that state educational systems try to converge some school subjects such as mathematics and science, literature, history and civic education still remain national in content and teaching (Smith, 1997).

Given this important point, European Union lacks such a crucial instrument in identity-building that it can not compete with national education systems; therefore, it has to rely on

‘a collection of initiatives instead of a structural approach’ (Walkenhorst, 2004: 5) in educational matters which is solely dominated by national systems of the member states.

Second, the schools have been patent instruments of political socialisation among the young people. There are three underlying reasons behind the power of national education systems (ibid: 7): first, pupils are given political education when they are at their ages in which political consciousness is newly being developed. Another reason is compulsory education, which makes all the students participate in education. Last, the state can control the whole society over the children by turning them into politically conscious citizens. Thereby, each pupil who is obliged to learn national curriculum is supposed to assimilate both national values and national interests. Compared to the national governments, since EU does not possess a union-wide education system, European values and a European consciousness can be hardly created and disseminated throughout the Union. Moreover, EU’s influence on the formation of ‘European citizenship’ lags behind that of national states; that is, 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’.

As a conclusion, the construction of European identity, which is essential for the development of the political integration as well as for the legitimacy of the Union policies, has been slowly progressing, notwithstanding innumerable setbacks. In this section, we tried to evaluate the national educational systems remaining persevering fortress of nation-states, which try to halt massive attacks of transnational interests and supranational intentions of European Union. Considering the lack of European authority in educational policy, both a closer cooperation between member states and EU and inculcation of European values by adding a European dimension in educational systems would be a contributory policy for strengthening the psychological dimension of the integration.

#### **3.2.4. Persistence of National Education Systems**

European Union does not have a common education policy. The very reason of this is the reluctance of nation-states to endorse a supranational authority with regard to their education policy. Even though there is a growing sovereignty transfer from nation-state to EU level, the



nation-state is determined to sustain its monopoly on shaping national education systems in terms of structure and content. Nationalist philosophy, which formulated the national identity within the clearly defined borders of national territory (Ham, 2000), stands in the way of further Europeanization. Therefore, European educational policy is exclusively restricted to general matters and vocational training (Walkenhorst, 2004). It is obvious that education should not be solely in the hands of national governments so that political identification of European people with the idea of united Europe supporting a deeper integration can be provided. Moreover, it should be underlined that there is a strong correlation between level of education and 'feeling European'; that is, according to Eurobarometers result 46 (Autumn, 1996), 66 percent of respondents who completed their education after the age of 20 feel 'European' whereas 36 percent of interviewees who completed their education by the age of 16 tend to be more national. In addition, identification with Europe is notably high among 'those whose interests, occupations, and social communities extend beyond provincial and national frontiers' (Green, 2000: 305). Taking into consideration the importance of education in the identity formation, roots of rivalry between nation-states and European institutions over education policy can be traced back to the 70s.

Generally speaking, the member states avoid opening their education systems to extensive Europeanization since it is seen as the heart of identity construction. In particular, there is a considerable effort to protect 'political education', which is regarded as 'high politics' issue by the member states (Walkenhorst, 2004). This is not an abstract resistance but a concrete policy pursued by all the member states, whose result is nationally reserved education systems.

The first attempt at adding a 'European dimension' to the school curriculum and teaching methods, the Janne Report of the European Commission was spurned by the Education Ministers of the member states on the grounds that it would have a deleterious effect on their national education systems (Nevola 2001, Cederman 2001). The following Tindemans Report (1975) restated that: 'EU must be experienced by the citizen in his daily life. It must make itself felt in education, culture, news and communication' (1976: 12). Nevertheless, subsequent commission reports and initiatives at the European level could not challenge the nation-states authority over education sector (Nevola, 2001). Then the turning point came with the Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education on the European dimension of 24 May 1988. It was the first time that close connection between European

identity construction and educational realm was acknowledged by the ministers of education of the member states. In line with the decisions of the Resolution, it was aimed to ‘strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and make clear to them the value of European community and its member states in their historical, cultural, economic and social aspects of the European Community with other countries of Europe and the world’ (Official Journal C 177, 06/07/1988). In this regard, an action plan was formulated at the level of member states. According to this plan, the member states would ‘include the European dimension explicitly in their school curricula in all appropriate disciplines, for example literature, languages, history, geography, social sciences, economics and the arts’ (ibid).

The second major landmark was the inclusion of education as a European policy area in the Treaty on European Union. As to the European dimension in education, the Article 126 of the TEU, however, underlines the supremacy of member states with regard to education policy by stating that: ‘The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging co-operation between the Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content and teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity.’ The subsequent Amsterdam Treaty did not improve the Union’s position vis-a-vis member states considering the same points it reiterated. That is to say, the Article 149 of the Amsterdam Treaty restated that: ‘The Community shall contribute to the development of education by supporting and supplementing action taken by the Member States, while fully respecting their cultural and linguistic diversity regarding content of teaching and the organisation of education systems.’

When the Article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty (the TEU) is examined, it is seen that ‘socio-cultural dimension’, which is essential for identity construction, was neglected. Conversely, ‘socio-functional approach to education’ was preferred to the former, which was also one of the most sensitive issues for member states. According to the socio-functional approach to education, technologic innovations and economic competitiveness are the very determinants of the reconstruction of education systems since they require a high qualified work force. In this regard, those who are well-educated and skilled have great opportunities to find better jobs. Thus, the main responsibility of schools, first and foremost, is to give a sort of education enabling students to cope with competitiveness in work life. As a consequence,

there was no reference to education as an instrument of political socialisation to a European collective identity in the Article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty (Nevola, 2001: 340).

In conclusion, the attempts at strengthening European identity by injecting a European dimension in the national education systems proved to be unsuccessful to a large extent on account of the fact that they have been undermined by the consciously pursued policies of the member states. On the other hand, being restricted by the strict provisions added in several treaties such as the Article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty and the Article 149 of the Amsterdam Treaty, the Community has been trying to create alternative ways in order to awaken a sense of Europeanness and enthusiasm for European political integration among the European people. For example, the Community has started education programmes such as Socrates and Erasmus regarding higher education, which mainly aimed at encouraging mobility and promoting cooperation between schools and universities. Other important activities are the project of rewriting the history textbooks, intercultural education and education for active citizenship, which are conducted by the Council of Europe.

### **3.3. EUROPEANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

#### **3.3.1. Higher Education in the Middle Ages**

As natural products of the intellectual accumulation and social energy of their times, the Medieval universities possess two distinctive features: having a supranational character based on the claim of universalism as well as being a center of attraction both for the worldly authorities and for the Church and the Papacy. Besides, a number of factors contributed to the developments of universities in the Western world, namely: the Carolingian Heritage, the Wandering Scholar and the Cathedral Schools (Wieruszowski, 1966).

Charlemagne, the Frankish Emperor, had played a very significant role in the emergence of universities since the school systems established by him provided a mighty infrastructure for the prospective medieval universities. This was a system based on schools associated with monasteries and with cathedrals. While the 'inner schools' were established for the training of the young priests and for the literacy of the clergy, as a response to the order of Charlemagne, the 'outer schools' were founded for the education of the laymen. Despite the collapse of the Frankish Empire, the Carolingian school tradition survived even though the

roles of inner and outer schools reversed. In this new process, the Monastic Schools concentrated their attention on the service to the Church and to God, so they lagged behind to the development of the content and teaching methods. Furthermore, they intended to isolate the world of the monk from the outside so that they could devote all their times to serving God. As a result, the laymen who wanted to have education, not for being priest but for acquiring professional skills, had begun to prefer the Cathedral Schools offering a more satisfactory teaching staff and curriculum than the Monastic Schools.

With regard to the other important contributions of Charlemagne to the blooming of early medieval universities, first, he and a group of scholars backed by him supported ‘Carolingian minuscule’, a new script which saved the Latin classics from a total loss. Moreover, Charlemagne also proposed to create a curriculum that would preserve all the necessary knowledge for reading and interpreting Holy Scriptures (ibid: 17).

The Cathedral School, which provided education for those who wanted to work for the Church or the government, had developed in the beginning of the twelfth century.<sup>81</sup> As a consequence of the increasing demand for secular education ‘studia generalia’ began to develop. Even though the term ‘studia generalia’ had been firstly used for higher education institutions, it was replaced by ‘university’, for the latter began to express the schools of higher education as a whole (Wieruszowski, 1966: 16). In summary, all the developments seen in the field of higher education in the 12th and 13th centuries had played a crucial role in the emergence of the medieval universities.

Regarding the student life in the Middle Ages, the students of the Medieval universities differed from the present-day students in several aspects. First, as they started their higher education at the age of twelve and fifteen, the students in the Medieval universities were rather young; therefore, they quarreled quite often. Furthermore, there was a constant tension between students and townmen. The reason was that the students were usually coming from different regions, so they needed accommodation. Although the townmen derived financial benefits from these students, clearly there was a little sympathy between ‘town’ and ‘gown’<sup>82</sup>.

---

<sup>81</sup> [http://www.andrews.edu/~penner/colleges/mc\\_intro.html](http://www.andrews.edu/~penner/colleges/mc_intro.html) (retrieved on 31 March 2005)

<sup>82</sup> [http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med\\_univ.html#itm5](http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med_univ.html#itm5) (retrieved on 4 April 2005)

Second, the students usually left their hometown in order that they could get a higher education in one of the prominent medieval universities such as Bologna and Salerno Universities in Italy, or the University of Paris in the Northern Europe<sup>83</sup>. Even though the students generally suffered from lack of financial aid, homesick and accommodation problems, those who traveled for education were warmly welcomed by the Churches and the schools throughout Europe in the Middle Ages (Wieruszowski, 1966: 21). At this very point, the Christian universalistic ethics played a crucial role. According to this, all the European people were believed to be united in their faith in Jesus Christ. The medieval universities had already become a natural part of this Christian universalism because they transformed the general principles of Christian belief into the 'theological dogma' and 'the newly discovered writing of Aristoteles into a 'canon of secular education' (Lenhardt, 2002: 274).

For this reason, as stated by the same author (2002: 274): 'The medieval universities were European and not local institutions, they came into being throughout Europe. They attracted scholars and students from all over the Occident regardless of their nationality and social status, except women'.

In addition to the support of ecclesiastical world, the students were also provided their security of life and property by the worldly authorities seeking to benefit from the reputation of medieval universities as being the centers of higher education and intellectual movements. Both the Church and the monarchs, which were in a never-ending struggle against each other in the search of universal authority, resorted to the medieval universities in order that they could strengthen their legitimacy. The medieval universities were the very places where the same sources such as the Bible and the writing of Aristotle, on which the contesting sides based their arguments, were interpreted and taught (ibid: 275). Thus, those who traveled for getting education throughout Europe were protected by law. For instance, Frederick II, King of Sicily and Germany and Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire<sup>84</sup>, guaranteed security and some privileges to the German students who went to Italy for studying law in 1158 (Toplumsal Tarih, 2005).

As to the organizations of medieval universities, they were established according to two different models: The Bologna University, in which the student corporations were very

---

<sup>83</sup> ibid .

<sup>84</sup> <http://mars.acnet.wnec.edu/~grempe/courses/wc1/lectures/25meduni.html> (retrieved on 5 April 2005) .

influential, was the model for the universities in the Southern Europe. In this model, the students hired the teachers, paid their salaries and even fired them in case of insufficient instruction.<sup>85</sup> The Southern Universities were highly concentrated on higher professional training such as law, medicine or theology.<sup>86</sup> For example, the Bologna University was specialized in Roman law and canon law of the Church; the Salerno University was specialized in medicine.<sup>87</sup> On the other side, the Northern Universities were modeled after the University of Paris, in which the scholars organized the education activities, rather than the students. The Northern Universities had four faculties: arts, theology, law and medicine, and each faculty was headed by a dean.<sup>88</sup> As opposed to the Southern Universities, they were centered in teaching of liberal arts and theology.

### **3.3.2. Changes and Trends in Higher Education**

The content and teaching methods of higher education, whose origins can be found in the Middle Ages, have developed throughout the time. In this process, the rise and fall of nation state and the rapid expansion of globalisation in economic and cultural terms have shaped the organization of higher education programmes. In addition, the higher education has been gaining importance on account of the swift changes seen in the information and communication technologies, which necessitate a highly qualified workforce.

To begin with, the higher education has begun to play a key role in the social and economic development of societies in the twenty-first century due to several reasons. Firstly, as scientific and technological innovations have helped to improve the quality of life, the universities, as the very best places of production and dissemination of such ‘cognitive resources’, have become the center of attention.

Another stimulus that underlies the importance of higher education is the technological competition between developed countries. As a result of this competition, technological progress entails a more adaptable and capable workforce. Furthermore, the more work the machines do, the greater the intellectual training of personnel becomes necessary.

---

<sup>85</sup> [http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med\\_univ.html#itm3](http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med_univ.html#itm3) (retrieved on 4 April 2005) .

<sup>86</sup> <http://mars.acnet.wnec.edu/~grempe/courses/wc1/lectures/25meduni.html> (retrieved on 5 April 2005) .

<sup>87</sup> [http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med\\_univ.html](http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med_univ.html) (retrieved on 4 April 2005) .

<sup>88</sup> *ibid* .

Accordingly, the universities in particular and the higher education institutions in general are gaining importance.

Finally, the organization of higher education is to be strategic in order that it can respond to the challenges of the era of science and technology. Thus, the period of schooling is lengthened everywhere (Blondel, 1998: 253 -254).

The universities played a crucial role in the formation of nation-states during the 19th and 20th centuries. Since the Middle Ages, there had been a constant tension between universalist claims of universities and particularist demands of religious and worldly authorities (Lenhardt, 2002: 275). However, as a result of the political fragmentations in the Medieval Europe, the Medieval universities had retained their autonomy to a certain degree. The dissolution of feudal order as well as the irrevocable decline in the power of the Papacy paved the way for the establishment of absolutist monarchies and the emergence of nation states in Europe. The universities became the core institutions in the heyday of the nation states. There were two important reasons for this. First, the universities educated the national elites who became the leaders of national movements afterwards. Most significantly, the higher education is essential for both personal and social development (Vijlder, 2001: 159). It is taken for granted that white collar workers in the public and private sectors hold a BA in the related subjects. In view of the fierce competition for employment, people want to get a more qualified education in universities. With regard to the social development, the higher education institutions are the key actors that prepare the young people for the responsibility of developing their countries in economic, political and cultural areas. As a consequence, bearing in mind the importance of universities in the creation of well-educated nationals, the national governments paid such a particular attention to the higher education that ‘Nation-states and universities formed a symbiosis’ (ibid: 159).

Today, we are living in the age of globalisation. Among a number of contemporary ideologies such as ‘commodification, entrepreneurialism, globalisation, managerialism and multiculturalism’, the globalisation seems to be the most effective one due to the fact that ‘it has a great influence on the economic policies and cultural life of the nation states’ (Badley, 2003: 480). In general terms, globalization<sup>89</sup> is ‘the process by which the experience of

---

<sup>89</sup> <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=9344667&query=globalization&ct=>  
( Retrieved on 11 April 2005 ).

everyday life, marked by the diffusion of commodities and ideas, can foster a standardization of cultural expressions around the world. An extreme interpretation of this process, often referred to as globalism, sees advanced capitalism, boosted by wireless and internet communications and electronic business transactions’.

In line with this definition, globalisation brings forth new opportunities and new risks. First, the advancement in information and communication technologies and widespread use of internet remove the barriers between countries and people. Furthermore, the liberalisation of trade and the internationalisation of economic activities, i.e., transnational corporations and denationalization of the functional systems such as banking systems, telecommunications and energy, contribute to the free movement of goods and services (Vijlder, 200: 159).

On the other hand, security-related problems including drug-trafficking, illegal migration, and production and dissemination of weapons of mass destruction, which are the results of uncontrolled border movements and insufficient international cooperation, have becoming more serious. Another threat is the likely standardization of world culture modeling American way of life and morals and values of this country (Badley, 2003: 481).

Considering the risks and opportunities coming with the irreversible process of globalisation, it can be claimed that the nation-state is no longer the most determinant and powerful actor in the international arena. As a result of both the perception of global threats and the global competition in the field of economy, the competition between countries intensifies and extends to a number of areas from security issues to environmental problems. In this context, the EU exemplifies the political will of a group of states to complete an economic and monetary union in order to cope with the challenging economic pressures.

Another impact of globalisation on the nation-states is that the nation-states, willy-nilly, retreat from organization and conduction of some domestic policy areas in which they are traditionally powerful. The higher education is the very example of this situation due to two main reasons. First, as it was mentioned before the higher education institutions are the central places in training of young people for working life. In addition, it also plays an important role in dissemination of national values and preservation of cultural unity (Vijlder, 2001).



However, developments in the communication and information technologies necessitate an improvement in the qualification of workforce. Besides, the economic value of knowledge has been increased in the last decades (ibid: 160). Thus, it is no longer possible for the nation states to monopolize the organization and conduction of higher education policies since it is closely related to the changing trends in world economy. In the higher education area, the national states have developed several strategies in that they could meet the needs of challenging global economy while preserving national values, which is an issue of great sensitivity. On the one hand the spoken national language is cautiously protected against English as the academic lingua franca, on the other hand universities are actively supported in the export of higher education services (Viljder, 2001: 161).

As a last word, despite its constructive effects on the improvement of national higher education systems, the increasing impact of globalisation on the higher education is criticized on account of the fact that the traditional goal of universities as searching of the truth is being undermined. As stated by Badley ( 2003: 482 ),

‘The implications for higher education of globalization are serious . We now see greater demands from industry and from governments for higher education to prepare students directly for the workplace. Higher education is thus becoming more and more economy-centred and vocationally oriented. It is turning from liberal education, becoming less of a social or public good and selling itself more as a marketable commodity. Traditional university subjects such as history are seen as less important than market-oriented subjects such as business, economics, science and technology.’

### **3.3.3. Formation of a European Higher Education Area**

The convergence of national policies between the member states in the field of higher education has gained momentum in the 80s and 90s (Trondel,2002: 10). It was not a coincidence that the Union underwent serious economic crises and political changes in those years. The beginning of 90s indicates a new phase in the European integration history. Briefly, the aim of completing the Single Market was accomplished in 1992, and the Maastricht Treaty put the goal of being ‘an ever closer union’ necessitating a deeper political integration and convergence of national policies and implementations in a wide range of areas from security and defence policies to social and cultural policies. However, despite the good will and ambitions of European politicians, the desired outcome has not been achieved yet since the EU is still far from being a political union. The integration was mainly driven

by economic incentives, so the successful completion of the Single Market revitalized the feverish debates on the political futures of the Union. As a matter of fact, they are still going on and has been affecting all the aspects of Europeanization policies.

With regard to the higher education area, it can be argued that economic objectives and priorities have always been a more effective driving force than those of the political aspirations (ibid: 16). Consequently, the very reason behind the Lisbon Strategy as ‘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’ is the challenging economic competition although it also aims to contribute to the creation of the peoples of Europe. Considering this, the Europeanization of higher education policy is twofold: the inter-institutional and the intergovernmental levels (the so-called Bologna Process) (Kwiek, 2004).

Before going further, it should be made clear that creation of a European Higher Education Area is essential for the construction of Europe due to three main reasons (Froment, 2003: 27). First, if Europe is expected to be united politically, the prospective European leaders should be trained in such a way that they can see themselves first as ‘European’. In this regard, the importance of gaining experience in other European countries can not be underestimated.

Second, the global economic competition puts pressure on higher education systems since these institutions are the key players in training of young people for working life. Moreover, in as much as science and technology are constantly progressing, the qualities demanded of a skilled and capable workforce change.

Third, taking into account the importance of national currency for nation states, the introduction of Euro into the Common Market is a sign of new period in the integration process as using a single currency requires a greater social cohesion. In fact, both Money and education are very significant contributors to creating and consolidating a ‘we-ness’. Thus, a strong and stable common currency depends on an integrated Europe to a large extent. For this reason, education as the other key instrument in the creation of a sense of ‘we-feeling’ needs to be paid particular attention.

As regard to the inter-institutional cooperation on the higher education, first Magna Charta Universitatum was signed by the Rectors of European Universities in 1988 (Kwiek, 2004: 760). The fundamental principles of the Charta underscores that the freedom of universities in their task of research and teaching, and the traditional role of universities in production and dissemination of universal knowledge should be promoted.

The second important attempt at shaping the European Higher Education Area came in 2001. The European University Association was established with the Salamanca Convention. More than 300 European higher education institutions and their representatives came together and set the basic principles and priorities regarding the higher education area. The Salamanca Message underlined the following principles<sup>90</sup> :

- The autonomy of universities as a fundamental value must be preserved.
- The European Higher Education must remain a public responsibility in that it must be open to all under-graduate and graduate students with the aim of providing education for personnel development and lifelong learning.
- The creation of European Higher Education Area must go in parallel with the formation of European Research Area.

In addition to these key principles, quality was notably addressed as ‘the basic underlying condition for trust, relevance, mobility, compatibility and attractiveness in the European Higher Education Area’ in the Salamanca Convention (ibid ).

In the second convention of European Higher Education, a number of priorities for the next phase of the Bologna Process were set forth by the representatives of the higher education institutions, so this declaration can be regarded as the formal position of European Universities (Froment, 2003). The Graz Convention mainly confirms the following principles<sup>91</sup>:

- The universities are the key institutions in the cultural, social and economic development of European societies.

---

<sup>90</sup> [http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/salamanca\\_convention.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/salamanca_convention.pdf) (retrieved on 18 April 2005).

<sup>91</sup> [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/02-EUA/0309Graz\\_publication.pdf](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/02-EUA/0309Graz_publication.pdf) (retrieved on 18 April 2005).

- Despite the fact that universities must contribute to the long-term visions of a Europe of knowledge, higher education should remain primarily a public responsibility.
- Research should be an integral part of higher education.
- Academic quality should be improved by building strong institutions.
- It is crucial that the Bologna Process to be promoted.
- Student mobility contributes to the improvement of academic quality.

As regards the intergovernmental cooperation, given the fact that the higher education is an integral part of the education policies playing a vital role in the nation-building process in Europe, a close cooperation at the European level has recently emerged in the field of higher education. Nevertheless, the member states have retained their control on the formation of the national education policies in accordance with the subsidiarity principle. In addition, since the EU has a limited power for affecting the implementation process, the member states have dominated the adaptation and implementation processes of the common educational policies .

Despite all the impediments, with the help of both the efforts of the European Commission and the decisions taken by the European Court of Justice in favor of the Community actions have given momentum to the Europeanization of the higher education area since the 90s. It means that there is a move from an intergovernmental cooperation to a supranational governance (Trondal, 2002). Briefly, the Europeanization of higher education is a very delicate issue in view of the dilemma that on the one hand the member states are reluctant to lose their national sovereignty and on the other, they are determined to meet the challenges of global competition in the fields of economy and technology.

Actually, the EU efforts to pursue a more active policy in the higher education area has become more apparent in the last decades. In that sense, the higher education policy of the EU is primary ‘regulative activities’ (Trondal, 2002: 10). At the same time, through these policies, and by means of enhanced mobility of the teacher and students, it attempts to create a common European identity. However, it was the eagerness to improve the economical and technological competitiveness giving an impetus to the Europeanization of the higher education rather than the willingness to create an overarching European identity. In this regard, the universities as the very places of producing science and technology, are the central institutions in line with the target of responding to the challenges of global

competition. In the words of Coulby (2002:41): ‘Universities are critical institutions in both the production and reproduction of the space of flows. In their research facilities and programmes, they are among the institutions actually creating it. In terms of reproduction, it is universities that generate the skills needed for success in the knowledge economy’. Furthermore, the technological progress makes it necessary to improve the qualifications of workers.

Another significant aspect of the Europeanization of higher education area is the role of national states in convergence of educational policies as well as the present implementations in the field of higher education. Generally speaking, the education policy is key to the nation building process; thus, it is closely related to the national sovereignty of the member states (Trondal, 2002). As stated by Novoa (2002: 132) ‘ Education has been one of the most contested arenas in Europe, not only due to the its symbolic value in national imaginaries but also because of public resistance to a ‘common policy’’. He also continues that ‘The results of the Eurobarometer reveal that a majority of European citizens believe that the formulation of educational policies should remain at the level of each member states’ (ibid).

On the other hand, as stated before, one can not say that the national governments retain the full control over the formation and implementation of the educational policies to due to fact that they are directly affected by the challenging and irreversible globalization in a wide range of areas. Yet, it is still impossible to claim that the Community acts as the primary actor shaping and harmonizing the national education policies (ibid). Rather, it helps national states to improve their capabilities in technological race and economic competition. In view of the growing role of the Commission in the Bologna Process, it can be claimed that the Commission, the most supranational body of the EU, has been gaining importance in the formation of the Community education policies. Especially since the Prague Summit (2001), the Commission has been playing an active role in determining of the targets and goals which would be undertaken by the EU. More importantly, as it has seats in the preparatory group, it can influence the content of the Bologna Process (Balzer&Martens, 2004: 13). In brief, even though the Commission was not included in the beginning, it has become the driving force behind the Bologna Process thanks to the outcomes of its longlasting efforts in the creation of a European educational space (ibid ).

The most significant initiative taken towards the creation of a European Higher Education Area is the so-called Bologna Process started with the signing of the Bologna Declaration on 19 June 1999. Before the Bologna Declaration, the Sorbonne Declaration was signed by the Ministers in charge of higher education of France, Italy, UK and Germany with a view to harmonizing the architecture of the European Higher Education. The Sorbonne Declaration has put emphasis on the following<sup>92</sup>:

- The convergence of the overall framework of degrees and cycles in an open European area for higher education;
- A common degree level system for undergraduates (Bachelor's degree) and graduates (Master's and doctoral degree).
- Enhancement of students and teacher mobility by facilitating measures.

The next year, the Bologna Declaration was signed by 29 European Ministers in charge of higher education with the aim of creating the European Area of higher education by 2010, and fostering the European System of higher education world-wide. In the Bologna Declaration the following decisions were taken<sup>93</sup>:

- Adopting a system of easily readable and comparable degrees,
- Adopting a system based on two main cycles: undergraduate and graduate levels. The first cycle, lasting at least 3 years, was designed to prepare students for the employment market. Those who completed this level successfully could attend the second cycle (Master).
- Establishing a system of credits (such as ECTS).
- Promoting teacher and student mobility by removing obstacles.
- Fostering European cooperation in quality assurance.
- Strengthening European dimension in higher education.

The next step after signing of the Bologna Declaration was the Prague Summit on 19 May 2001. The Ministers in charge of education of 33 European countries came together in Prague to evaluate the ongoing process and to set the targets for the future. In the Prague Declaration, the objectives of the Bologna Declaration were reiterated and the EUA and

---

<sup>92</sup> [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main\\_doc/980525SORBONNE\\_DECLARATION.PDF](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/980525SORBONNE_DECLARATION.PDF) (retrieved on 18 April 2005).

<sup>93</sup> [http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna\\_declaration.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf) (retrieved on 18 April 2005).

National Unions of student in Europe (ESIB) were appreciated for their active involvement in the process. The Prague Summit was also a turning point since under the Swedish Presidency, the Commission was included in the process by acknowledging that its previous efforts in the field of higher education were highly compatible with those of the Bologna Process (Balzer&Martens, 2004: 10). In the Prague Declaration it was given special attention to the concepts of ‘lifelong learning, involvement of students and enhancing the attractiveness and competitiveness of the European Higher Education Area to other parts of the world’.<sup>94</sup>

Two years after the Prague Summit, the ministers in charge of education met in Berlin so as to define the intermediate priorities for the next two years, namely quality assurance, the two-cycle degree system and recognition of degrees and periods of studies.<sup>95</sup>

With regard to the quality assurance, it was underlined that ‘mutually shared criteria and methodologies’ should be developed, and the ministers agreed to establish a national quality assurance systems having ‘a definition of responsibilities of the bodies and institutions, including internal assessment, external review, participation of students and the publication of results’.<sup>96</sup>

As to the two-cycle system, it was stressed that first and second cycle degrees should include adjustable profiles so as to meet widely varying needs of labour market as well as different academic and individual preferences.

Regarding the recognition of degrees and periods of studies, the Ministers drew attention to the fact that the Lisbon Recognition Convention should be approved by all the signatory countries in the Bologna Process. Furthermore, it was added that every graduate student should be provided the Diploma Supplement automatically and free of charge. In the Berlin Declaration, the doctoral level was addressed as the third cycle in the Bologna Process, and the need for creating a synergy between EHEA and ERA was also stressed.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/en/basic/haupt.htm> (retrieved on 18 April 2005).

<sup>95</sup> <http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/BASIC/Pros-descr.HTM> (retrieved on 22 June 2005).

<sup>96</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>97</sup> <http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/BASIC/Pros-descr.HTM> (retrieved on 22 June 2005).

The last meeting regarding the formation of the European Higher Education Area was held in Bergen on 19-20 May 2005. In this summit, the Ministers in charge of higher education evaluated the ongoing process as well as the developments in the degree system, quality assurance and recognition of degrees and study periods.

Firstly, for the degree system, it was noted that there were still obstacles to access between the cycles and also there was a need for a greater dialogue between the participants such as governments, institutions and social partners so as to create opportunities for employment of graduates holding bachelor degree.

With regard to the quality assurance, it was underlined that enhancing cooperation between nationally recognised agencies was crucial to the mutual recognition of accreditation or quality assurance decisions.

As to the recognition of degrees and study periods, it was stated that ‘36 of the 45 participating countries have now ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention’. Furthermore, the Ministers asked all participating countries to deal with ‘recognition problems identified by the ENIC/NARIC networks’.<sup>98</sup>

### **3.4. FINAL REMARKS ON THE EUROPEANIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Since the European integration process has been an economically-driven project, the institutions and policies focused on the cultural and social cohesion have been eclipsed by those centred on the economic objectives and priorities during the construction of European Union (Ferrarotti, 2002). In line with this argument, the European education policy has been disregarded for a long time as well due to two main reasons. First, education has been considered very important in the nation-building process thanks to its irrefutable contribution to the creation of national identities. Second, education was not seen as a policy area directly related to the economic aspirations.

The Lisbon goal of ‘becoming the most competitive and knowledge-based economy in the world’ underlined the significance of education, and the member states seeking to cope with

---

<sup>98</sup> [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main\\_doc/050520\\_Bergen\\_Communique.pdf](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/050520_Bergen_Communique.pdf) (Retrieved on 22 June 2005).



the challenges stemming from economical and technological competition began to enhance their cooperation in higher education area. As a result, the convergence of higher education policies of the member states has been increasing through the successive intergovernmental and institutional conferences and through the Bologna Process. Considering these facts, it can be argued that the role of education in the construction of European identity differs from that of the national identity in three ways: the instruments used in identity formation process, the projects given priority, and the actors involved in this process.

First of all, the national education systems had two important tools in awakening and maintaining of national consciousness: history and language education. They both served to create and recreate the glorious history of the nations, through reinterpreting of past experiences, victories or defeats from a nationalist point of view. In other words, the sense of national belonging was created by means of history textbooks and literature courses designed to rediscover the uniqueness and sacredness of all the features that distinguish one nation from another (Cohen 1999, Smith 1997). As to the national languages, a common language read and written by a majority of people was regarded as an indispensable element of national states. National language was seen as an emotional connection between generations since it transmitted national values and norms. In addition, a common language was a necessary instrument for making people quality workers in the industrial age (Fishman 1996, Rokkan 1999).

On the other hand, it is obvious that these two effective instruments can not be used in the construction of European identity since Europeanization of history and language teaching is not realizable. There are noteworthy attempts like the project of rewriting of history textbooks that aimed for the elimination of expressions narrating hatred and hostility towards other nations as well as for the revision of textbooks to create a new understanding built on peace and reconciliation among the nations. Yasemin Soysal (2002), who made a research on the rewriting of history textbooks, argues that narration of national canons, unique myths and national heroes have been increasingly normalized during the last years.

With regard to the language teaching, the language policy of EU seeks to create a multicultural and multilingual sphere within the Union. In pursuance of this aim, the Community promotes both learning and teaching of different Community languages and teaching of languages that are rarely used or taught by means of Lingua programme. Besides

Lingua, an international exchange programme between higher education institutions, Erasmus also fosters mobility and foreign language learning (Caviedes, 2003).

As regards the priorities, the economic goals have taken precedence over cultural objectives in formation of European educational policy. For this reason, the basic principles, context, mission and philosophy of education have been changing in accordance with the economic interests and considerations of the states. Indeed, the educational domain has been shaped by the risks and opportunities brought by unalterable globalisation. In this context, Europeanization of education systems can be regarded as a part of wider internationalization / globalization process of education systems (Lawn&Lingard, 2002).

Furthermore, the crisis of welfare state results in the loss of state authority and control over the areas such as educational services in which the central authorities had been traditionally influential for a long time. As a result, while the state control over educational policies has been diminishing, private institutions and initiatives regarding the education policy have been gaining power. Beyond all these factors, the factual reason lying behind the weakening of state control over education is, first and foremost, 'economism' as a 'dominant ideology' (Wielemans, 2000: 33). In this context, in the European Council meeting, the key principles of would-be European education policy were firmly outlined as 'recognition of qualifications and diplomas at all levels in order to facilitate mobility within the EU, improving the quality of education at all levels, expanding the concept of education to the broader context of lifelong learning', which inevitably served to the fulfillment of economic objectives. Therefore, it seems that the recent interest in education is directly related to the aim of 'becoming the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world', as stressed in the Lisbon European Council Presidency Conclusions (Fredriksson, 2003: 537). In this respect, universities, the long-lasting educational institutions traced back to the Middle Ages, have been paid particular attention due to their close relations with the world of economy and technology. As a matter of fact, as stated by Wielemans (2000: 31), 'In almost all sectors of higher education, the pressure for the pursuit of useful knowledge is growing and to a great extent research is now sponsored by the external users of knowledge'.

Apart from the external pressures, the higher education area has also been affected by the economic considerations and targets of the member states. As a result, in contrast to the primary and secondary education, which are still nationally sensitive issues, the domain of higher education has already been opened to the further Europeanization. To illustrate, with

the beginning of Bologna Process, Europeanization of higher education area has been increasingly intensified during the last decade.

Finally, a high number of transnational actors including non-governmental organisations, advocacy groups, teacher unions and associations and local representatives under the auspices of the Council of Europe and the UNESCO have been taking an active part in the recreation and redefinition of Europe (Soysal, 2002). In this regard, the European education space is a new evolving policy area, and, transnational actors rather than national institution have profoundly affected this process up to the present. For instance, Shore (2000) points out that European officials described as ‘the agents of European consciousness’ have made a great contribution to the realization of a borderless European area. In addition to the efforts of European officials, national politicians and officials termed as ‘system actors’ by Lawn&Lingard (2002: 292) have shouldered the responsibility of interpreting and translating the discourses of globalisation into their national contexts. The same authors argues that (2002: 305),

‘in some parts of Europe, they acted within or close to an observable new magistracy of influence, in some cases working to ‘modernise’ their governmental policies through close reliance on the EU new ‘centre’ or the powerful transmission and brokering of international agency data, the new currency of policy . They are taking on the task, for education, of using a Europenisation process and project, to produce new meanings about trans-national states and globalisation .’

Taking into consideration the differences considering instruments, priorities and actors in the evolution of European education policy, it can be concluded that unlike the nation-building process, the construction of an overriding European identity has not been regarded as priority from the very beginning. Moreover, the European educational policy can not benefit from the traditional instruments of nation-building as teaching of national history and language in view of the fact that Europe does have neither a common history nor a common language. Therefore, an overarching European identity can not be built upon the national identity model. More importantly, the economic considerations and goals of the member states take precedence over the cultural and social dimensions of the integration process. For this reason, the educational programmes and policies of the Union have been exclusively concentrated on the aim of dealing with the economic and technological challenges brought about the globalisation process. As a result, Europeanization of education policy has been largely limited to the higher education area since the universities are the very places of the production of useful knowledge and technological innovations.

## CONCLUSION

The role of education in the creation of a common European identity has the potential of enhancing also the political integration in Europe. The idea of European political integration is a long-standing political aspiration existing since the early Middle Ages. In order to realize this ambitious goal, monarchs, emperors, and political leaders such as Charlemagne, Napoleon, and Hitler embarked on numerous wars, which resulted in destruction of Europe in economic, social and political terms. However, a political integration under the control of a tyrant had little chance to survive due to the countless political fragmentations, religious wars and the highly delicate balance of power mechanism in Europe. Therefore, the first peaceful attempt to create an integrated Europe coming after WWII has made great strides since the second half of the 20th century.

It is difficult to claim that the European Union is a purely political integration. On the contrary, the European integration process has been limited to economic integration for a long time as the member states, most of which were strong fortress of nation-state, have always hesitated to further the political integration. Moreover, although the goal of political integration has been reiterated several times, the integration process has been dominated and shaped by intergovernmentalist approach focusing on economic objectives and priorities rather than political aspects of the EU evolving as a separate entity. Thus, there has been a constant tension between the intergovernmentalist approach favoring political independence and the federalist approach seeking to strengthen the political union.

In this context, another important dilemma has arisen out of the fact that the need for an overriding European identity has been underrated because of the domination of nation-state and national identity in academic and political discourses. As a result, most of the academic search have been centred on the idea that European identity could not replace the national identities, on the contrary, it should supplement to the national identities. With regard to the political sphere, the goal of creating a common European identity has not been a high priority for national politicians. On the other hand, despite their limited success, the Community institutions have made courageous initiatives to inspire a sense of Europeanness. With the Maastricht Treaty, which is a turning point in the integration process, the lack of European identity has become visible. This new period required a considerable sovereignty transfer from national to EU level, which is a quite sensitive issue both for the national governments

and for the European people. However, in addition to the lack of public support for political integration, the huge gap between European institutions mostly located in Brussels and European people having different origins, such as French, Polish or Italian, bring about extensive criticism that democratic deficit and legitimacy problems have been underestimated so far. Therefore, it is the exact time to build the EU legitimacy on the support and political will of European people. Nevertheless, the fact that European people are far from being categorized as a genuine European community yet put the prospective political integration in jeopardy. The recent outcomes of this major drawback were seen during the referendums held in France and the Netherlands when European constitution was spurned by the majority of people. Evidently, the rejection of the Constitution, which would provide a more democratic and functional institutional mechanism, will hinder the deepening of political integration. The construction of a common European identity, therefore, is of vital importance for attaining the aim of political integration.

As to the education-identity formation relation, education policies, which played a pivotal role in building of nation-states during the heyday of nationalism, has been introduced in the EU agenda recently. That is to say, education has remained a national priority until the Maastricht Treaty, which provided a clear legal basis for making educational policies on the condition that the Community would respect ‘the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organisation of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversities’. Besides, it was particularly emphasized that the supremacy of member states could not be challenged in favor of the supranational policies and there could be no interference seeking to harmonize the national education policies.

An important point that should be underlined is that the member states hold different stances on the educational and training issues. To put it succinctly, the member states, which deal with global economic pressures and technological competition and also face with the need for improving the quality of workforce, have been convinced of the necessity to enhance cooperation areas and to converge their national policies in higher education and vocational training areas, that are regarded as inextricably interlinked with their economical and educational priorities.

Following the introduction of the Maastricht Treaty, the Community, developing several education and vocational training programmes based on different legal bases, brought in the

new generation of programmes under the names of Socrates (general education), Leonardo da Vinci (vocational training) and Youth (non-educational activities). Generally speaking, the second phase of the new generation of programmes, started in 1999, has been more effective than the first stage on account of several reasons. First, the legal basis of these programmes was reinforced by Art 126 and Art 127 as being directly related to the educational activities. Second, the responsibility and role of participants were enhanced, and finally, the application procedure was simplified to encourage interested parts to benefit from these programmes. The second generation of programmes mainly focused on a few number of objectives such as increasing mobility, providing a multicultural and multilingual Europe and promoting the lifelong learning (Ertl, 2003).

As to the impact of the programmes, it can be argued that the Socrates Programme for general education is the most related programme to the aims of constructing a common European identity since the two sub-groups of Socrates programme, namely Comenius (school education) and Erasmus (higher education) place a noteworthy emphasis on both developing and promoting the European dimension. To foster the Europeanization in school education, a number of student and teacher exchange programmes as well as language teaching and learning projects was created within the general framework of Socrates. In this respect, as Comenius and Erasmus programmes attempt to increase student and teacher mobility, Lingua programme aims to promote learning of foreign languages and teaching of the rarely used and taught languages. Besides supporting the multiculturalism and multilingualism in Europe, Lingua also seeks to contribute to the aim of creating a highly qualified working force, who are able to speak different Community languages. This workforce emerges as a need for maintaining the success of the Single Market. Apart from Comenius, Erasmus and Grundtvig programmes that are centred on the different levels of the general education, there are other complementary instruments for increasing the overall effect of Socrates programme. For example, the Minerva action focuses on developing and encouraging the information and communication technologies as well as the open and distance learning. In addition, promotion of dialogue between different educational partners, dissemination of best results and experiences, enhancement of cooperation with the LdV and the Youth programmes have been provided through joint actions, observation and innovation and accompanying measures.

Unlike the general educational space, the member states have been interested in converging their vocational training policies. The very reason of this constant interest is that vocational training has been considered as a crucial instrument for coping with the growing unemployment problem as well as for improving the quality of workforce in an increasingly globalised economic sphere. As a result, the member states embarked with great enthusiasm on enhancing the cooperation areas in vocational training area. Indeed, both Art 127 of TEU and Art 149 of Amsterdam Treaty provided a more flexible legal basis than those for general education for creating a common vocational training policy. Furthermore, as a consequence of this enhanced cooperation on vocational training, a number of instruments such as the European Credit Transfer (ECTS), Europass training and the Certificate Supplement were designed to recognize the vocational skills and qualifications obtained in different member states.

The most significant instrument of EU in formation and conduction of vocational training policy is, undoubtedly, the Leonardo da Vinci programme. In summary, the Leonardo II, covering 2000-2006, aims to develop knowledge and skills in vocational training, to facilitate access to vocational education projects and to promote contribution of vocational training to innovations in this field. A general assessment concerning the LdV programme can be that since the priorities and goals of member states coincide in the area of vocational training, a common vocational education policy is highly likely to be formed by the national governments of member states.

The third chain of the Community programmes regarding educational policy, the Youth programme is mainly interested in non-educational activities. The Youth programme, whose legal basis was also introduced by the Maastricht Treaty, essentially concentrates on promoting the active participation of young people in construction of people's Europe through exchange programmes between the member states as well as with the third countries. This attempt is quite promising on the grounds that it pays a particular attention to the common values and cultural diversity of Europe. The two other objectives of the Youth programme seek to foster the active participation of European youth in shaping the European society, and to increase the cooperation in youth policy area. For a general evaluation of the Youth programme, it can be claimed that it undertakes a pivotal role in construction of a common European society. That is to say, the Youth programme, first and foremost, tries to reach the young people who have limited opportunities to be involved in education and

training programmes. Furthermore, it also attempts to create an actual cooperation area in which young people with extremely different viewpoints considering the idea of a united Europe can come together and work for common objectives. Thus, the involvement of young people in Europeanization process is of crucial importance for the approval of EU as a political entity.

Finally, the higher education is another area that member states agreed on enhancing cooperation. The universities are among the most long-standing and eminent institutions of Europe in view of the fact that there had been a borderless European higher education space in the Middle Ages. In this period, an outstanding higher education area which is based on the Christian ideals and on the idea of universal knowledge had been constructed throughout Europe from the North to the South. Compared to the contemporary European universities, which played a crucial role in nation-state building during the age of nationalism, the Middle Age universities could maintain their freedom as well as their universalistic character to a great extent. Thus, these universities had made a great contribution to the creation of a common European culture. However, this relative freedom of the Medieval universities was undermined by the rising nation-states seeking to benefit from every possible instrument for building a national identity. Today, a revival of interest in convergence of national higher education policies has emerged due to the global economical and technological challenges the member states have to cope with. Accordingly, the Bologna Process carried out by inter-institutional and inter-governmental negotiations and cooperation essentially concentrates on the key priorities such as quality, mobility, recognition of qualifications and European dimension in higher education.

In this regard, it can be concluded that the very reason behind the attempts of Europeanization of higher education is the pressing need for handling the inexorable global economical and technological pressures. On the other hand, the fact that the influence of European Commission has been gradually increasing on the Bologna Process (Balzer&Martens, 2004) is an important and pleasing development in formation of an European education policy, which has been dominantly shaped by the intergovernmentalist approaches from the beginning.

In conclusion, 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. However, education has remained a national priority of the member states due to the fact that nationalized education policies played a very significant role in the nation-building process seen during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century in Europe. As a consequence, the member states have always been reluctant to develop and implement the Community-led education policies seeking to create a supranational European education policy. On the other hand, faced with global pressures in terms of economical and technological competition, the member states have begun to converge their vocational training and higher education policies with an aim of ‘becoming 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 (March 2000). Therefore, the formation of a European educational space has been driven by economic priorities rather than a genuine interest in creating and inspiring a sense of Europeanness in European people. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that without a public support for European political integration, it is absolutely impossible to strengthen the political dimension of the entire integration process that is currently passing through a critical phase due to the rejection of European Constitution in referendums held in France and the Netherlands .

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### PRIMARY SOURCES

The European Union. *Towards a European Constitution.*

Retrieved: 4 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/roadtoconstitution/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/roadtoconstitution/index_en.htm)

The European Union. *Final Act of the Treaty of Nice.*

Retrieved: 4 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/C\\_2001080EN.007001.html](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/treaties/dat/C_2001080EN.007001.html)

The European Union. *A Constitution for Europe.*

Retrieved: 4 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/introduction\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/constitution/introduction_en.htm) Retrieved

The European Union. *Draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe.*

Retrieved: 4 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/constitution/futurum/constitution/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/constitution/futurum/constitution/index_en.htm)

The European Union. *European Parliament Fact Sheets.*

Retrieved: 22 April, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://www.europarl.eu.int/facts/4\\_17\\_0\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.eu.int/facts/4_17_0_en.htm)

The European Union. *Maastricht Treaty Title II.*

Retrieved: 30 April, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://europa.eu.int/en/record/mt/title2.html>

The European Union. *The Amsterdam Treaty: a Comprehensive Guide.*

Retrieved: 5 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/lvb/a09000.htm>

The European Union. *Education, Training and Youth: introduction.*

Retrieved: 16 January, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://europa.eu.int/scapplus/leg/en/cha/c00003.htm>

The European Union Education and Training. *Socrates European Community action programme in the field of education (2000-06).*

Retrieved: 7 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/brochnew_en.pdf)

The European Union Education and Training. *Socrates European Community action programme in the field of education (2000-06), Gateway to Education.*

Retrieved: 16 February, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education\\_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/depl\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/socrates/depl_en.pdf)

The European Union. *Socrates-Legal Basis.*

Retrieved: 18 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/legal\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/legal_en.html)

The European Union Regulation (EC) No 253/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 January 2000 establishing the second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education 'Socrates'.

OJ C L 28\1, 3 February 2000,

Retrieved: 18 February, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/decsoc2\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/decsoc2_en.pdf)

The European Union Education and Training. *More Information about Comenius.*

Retrieved: 28 April, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/comenius/moreabou\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/comenius/moreabou_en.html)

The European Union Education and Training. *What is Socrates/Erasmus ?.*

Retrieved: 18 February, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/what\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/erasmus/what_en.html)

The European Union Education and Training. *What is Grundtvig?*

Retrieved: 7 August, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/grundtvig/overview\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/socrates/grundtvig/overview_en.html).

The European Union Education and Training. *The LdV programme, pillar of lifelong learning.*

Retrieved: 17 February, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/leonardo\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/leonardo_en.html)

The European Union. *The Copenhagen Declaration.*

Retrieved: 18 February, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/copenahagen\\_declaration\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/copenhagen/copenahagen_declaration_en.pdf)

The European Union Education and Training. *Recognition and transparency of qualifications*

Retrieved: 25 March, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/rec\\_qual/rec\\_qual\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/policies/rec_qual/rec_qual_en.html)

The European Union Education and Training. *Leonardo - First phase: 1995-1999*  
Retrieved: 25 March, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/old/leonardo\\_old.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/old/leonardo_old.html)

The European Union Education and Training. *Leonardo da Vinci  
Community Vocational Training Action Programme Second phase: 2000 - 2006*  
Retrieved: 25 March, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/guides/en\\_1.doc](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/guides/en_1.doc)

The European Union Education and Training. *Leonardo Da Vinci  
Community Vocational Training Action Programme Second phase: 2000-2006*  
Retrieved: 19 May, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/part-countr\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/leonardo/new/leonardo2/part-countr_en.html)

The European Union. *European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training-In brief.*  
Retrieved: 25 March, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.cedefop.eu.int/inbrief.asp>

The European Union. *Youth action programme 2000-2006.*  
Retrieved: 17 March 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11603.htm>

The European Union. *Youth Programme-User's Guide.*  
Retrieved: 23 May 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/guide05\\_en.doc](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/guide05_en.doc)

The European Union Regulation. No 1031/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 April 2000 establishing the 'Youth' Community action programme. OJ C L 117\1, 18 May, 2000,  
Retrieved: 28 March, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec\\_1031\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/dec_1031_en.pdf)

The European Union. *Youth Programmes, Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe,*  
Retrieved: 29 April 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/doc/studies/iard/summaries\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/doc/studies/iard/summaries_en.pdf)

The European Union. *2001 White Paper on a new impetus for European Youth,*  
Retrieved: 30 March, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://europa.eu.int/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11055.htm>

The European Union Education and Training. *Interim evaluation report on the results achieved and on the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the implementation of the second phase of the Community action programme in the field of education 'Socrates'*,

Retrieved: 28 April, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intsocrates_en.pdf)

The European Union Education and Training. *Interim report on the implementation of the second phase of the Leonardo da Vinci Programme (2000-2006)*,

Retrieved: 22 June, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intleonardo\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/intleonardo_en.pdf)

The European Union Education and Training. *Interim evaluation of the Youth Programme 2000-2006 (covering the period 2000-2003)*,

Retrieved: 29 June, 2005 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/eval/report\\_interim\\_evaluation\\_youth\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/youth/program/eval/report_interim_evaluation_youth_en.pdf)

The European Union Public Opinion. *Eurobarometer 56.3 "Special Bureaux" (2002) Executive Summary Getting Information on Europe, The Enlargement of The E.U. & Support For European Integration*,

Retrieved on 21 October, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/public\\_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs\\_166\\_summ\\_eu15\\_en.pdf](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_166_summ_eu15_en.pdf)

The European Union Public Opinion. *Standard Eurobarometer 51.0, Public Opinion in the European Union, Fieldwork : March – April 1999, pg:8-9.*

Retrieved on 21 October, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/public\\_opinion/archives/eb/eb51/eb51\\_en.pdf](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb51/eb51_en.pdf)

The European Union Public Opinion. *Standard Eurobarometer 46 (1996) Fieldwork: October-November, pg:42.*

Retrieved on 30 December, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/public\\_opinion/archives/eb/eb46/eb46\\_en.pdf](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb46/eb46_en.pdf)

The European Union. *The Treaty of Rome, Treaty establishing the European Community*,

Retrieved: 28 September, 2004, from the World Wide Web: URL

<http://europa.eu.int/abc/obj/treaties/en/entoc05.htm>

The European Union. *The Treaty on European Union (TEU).*

OJ C 191, 29 July 1992,

Retrieved: 17 October, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/11992M/htm/11992M.html>

The European Union. *Treaty of Amsterdam*.

OJ C 340, 10 November 1997,

Retrieved: 17 October, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

<http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/11997D/htm/11997D.html>

The European Union. Treaty of Nice.

OJ C 80\1, 10 March 2001,

Retrieved: 17 October, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/12001C/pdf/12001C\\_EN.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/en/treaties/dat/12001C/pdf/12001C_EN.pdf)

The European Union. Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education meeting within the Council on the European dimension in education of 24 May 1988

OJ C 177 , 6 July 1988,

Retrieved: 26 November, 2004 from the World Wide Web: URL

[http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:41988X0706\(01\):EN:HTML](http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/lex/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:41988X0706(01):EN:HTML)

## SECONDARY SOURCES

### Books

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised Edition ed. London and New York: Verso.

Balibar, E. (1996). 'The Nation Form: History and Ideology', in Eley, G and Suny, R. (eds), *Becoming National A Reader*, New York: Oxford University Press, 132-149.

Bellier, I & Thomas, W. (2000). *An Anthropology of the EU: Building, Imagining and Experiencing the New Europe*, Oxford: Berg.

Beukel, E. (1993). 'Education', in Andersen, S & Eliassen, K. (eds), *Making Policy in Europe: The Europeification of National Policy-making*, London: Sage Publications, 155-170.

Borchardt, D. (1995). *The Origins and Growth of the EU*. Lux: Office for Official Publications of the European Community.

- Brewin, C. (2000). 'European Identity', in Andrew, J, et al. (eds), *Why Europe? Problems of Culture and Identity : Political and Historical Dimensions*, Basingstoke Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 55-73.
- Brock, C & Tulasiewicz, W. (2000). *Education in a Single Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Cederman, L.E. (2001), 'Political Boundaries and Identity Trade-Offs', in Cederman, L. E (ed), *Constructing Europe's Identity: The External Dimension*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1-32.
- Chrysoschoou, D. (1997). 'Rethinking Democracy in the European Union: The Case for a Transnational Demos', in Stavridis, S; Mossialos, E; Morgan, R; Machin, H. (eds), *New Challenges to the European Union: Policies and Policy-Making*, England: Dartmouth Publishing, 67-85.
- Closa C, (1998). 'European Union citizenship and supranational democracy', in Weale, A & Nentwich, M (eds), *Political Theory and the European Union Legitimacy, constitutional choice and citizenship*, London: Routledge, 172-186.
- Cohen, S. (1999). *Politics Without a Past: The Absence of History in Postcommunist Nationalism*, US: Duke University Press.
- Collins, H. (1993). *European Vocational Education Systems*, London: Kogan Page.
- Clark, G & Dear, M. (1984). *State Apparatus: Structures and Language of Legitimacy*, England: Allen & Unwin Publishers.
- Coulby, D. (2002). 'Education and the European Space of Flows', in Novoa, A and Lawn, M. (eds.), *The Formation of an European Education Space*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 35-47.
- Dedman, M. (1996). *The Origins and Development of the European Union 1945-95 A history of European integration*, London: Routledge.

- Edwards, G. (2000). 'The Problems and Possible Future Development of a European Identity in the European Union', in Anderson, P; Wiessela, G; Williams, C (eds), *New Europe in Transition*, London: Continuum, 66-80.
- Ferrarotti, F. (2002). 'Notes towards the Definition of a European Educational Space', Novoa, A and Lawn, M. (eds.), *The Formation of an European Education Space*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 47-55.
- Field, J. (1998). *European Dimensions Education, Training and the European Union*, London: Jessica Kingley Publishers.
- Fishman, J. (1996). Language and Nationalism, in Woolf, S (Ed), *Nationalism in Europe, 1815 to the Present*, London: Routledge, 155-171.
- Flora, P. (1973). Historical Process of Social Mobilization: Urbanization and Literarcy 1850-1965, in Eisenstadt, S.N& Rokkan, S (eds), *Building States and Nations*, US: Sage Publications, 213-238.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gilbert, P. (1998). *The Philosophy of Nationalism*, Boulder: WestviewPress.
- Green, M. (2000). 'On Being European: The Character and Consequences of European Identity', in Cowles, M & Smith, M (eds), *Risks, Reforms, Resistance or Revival: The State of the EU*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 293-322.
- Header, H. (1998). *Europe in the Nineteenth Century 1830-1880*, New York: Longman.
- Hechter, M. (2000). *Containing Nationalism*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1997). *The Age of Capital 1848-1875*, London: Abacus.



- Hobsbawm, H. (1997). 'The Mass-Producing Traditions : Europe, 1870-1914', in Hobsbawm, H & Ranger, T. (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hroch, M. (1996). 'From National Movement to the Fully-Formed Nation: The Nation-Building Process in Europe', in Eley, G and Suny, R. (eds.), *Becoming National A Reader*, New York: Oxford University Press, 60-79.
- Jones, R. (1996). *The Politics and Economics of the European Union : an introductory text*, Brookfield,US: Edward Elgar Pub.
- Kostakopoulou, T. (1998). 'European Union citizenship as a model of citizenship beyond the nation state', in Weale, A & Nentwich, M (eds), *Political Theory and the European Union Legitimacy, constitutional choice and citizenship*, London: Routledge, 158-171.
- Kühnhardt, Ludger. (2003). *Constituting Europe: Identity, institution and the search for a global role*, Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Lukacs, J. (1965). *Decline and Rise of Europe*, New York: Doubleday and Co.
- Meehan, E. (1997). 'Political pluralism and European citizenship', in Lehning, P & Weale, A (eds), *Citizenship, Democracy, and Justice in the New Europe*, Routledge: London, 69-85.
- McCormick, J. (1999). *Understanding the EU: A Concise Introduction*, Houndmills: Macmillan, 31-56.
- Merkel, W. (1999). 'Legitimacy and Democracy: Endogenous Limits of European Integration', in Anderson, J (ed), *Regional Integration and Democracy: Expanding on the European Experience*, US: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 45-67.
- Mingst, K. (2001). *Essentials of International Relations*, US: W. W. Norton & Company, Second Edition.

- Møller, J. (1995). *The Future European Model: Economic Internationalization and Cultural Decentralization*, US: Praeger Publisher.
- Murphy, A. (1999). 'Rethinking the Concept of European Identity', in G. Herb and D. Kaplan. (eds.), *Nested Identities: Nationalism, Territory, and Scale*, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 53-73.
- Navari, C. (1981). 'The Origins of the Nation-State', in Tivey, L. (ed.), *The Nation-State: the formation of modern politics*, New York: St. Martin's, 13-37.
- Nevola, G. (2001). 'Education and Political Socialisation between National Identity and European Citizenship', in Haller, M. (Ed.), *The Making of the European Union : Contributions of the Social Sciences (European and Transatlantic Studies)*, Germany: Springer, 331-359.
- Pantel, M. (1999). 'Unity-in-Diversity: Cultural Policy and EU Legitimacy', in Thomas Banchoff, T and Smith, M. (eds.), *Legitimacy and the European Union: The Contested Polity*, London: Routledge, 46-63.
- Questiaux, N. (2001). 'Why Europe? From Contradiction to Refoundation', in Andrew, J, et al. (eds.), *Why Europe? Problems of Culture and Identity : Political and Historical Dimensions*, Basingstoke Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 19-34.
- Ramirez, F.O. and Boli, J (a). (1987). 'Global Patterns of Educational Institutionalization', in Thomas, G.M. et al. (eds.), *Institutional Structure : Constituting State, Society and the Individual*, US: Sage Publications, 150-172.
- Ramirez, F.O. and Boli, J (b). (1987). 'On the Unions of States and Schools', in Thomas, G.M. et al. (eds.), *Institutional Structure : Constituting State, Society and the Individual*, US: Sage Publications, 173-197.
- Rokkan, S. (1999). 'Nation-Building and Language', in Flora,P.; Kuhnle, S.; Urwin, D. (eds.), *State Formation, Nation-Building, and Mass Politics in Europe The Theory of Stein Rokkan* , Oxford: Oxford University Press, 170-190.

- Rosamond, B. (2000). *Theories of European Integration*. New York: ST. MARTIN'S PRESS, INC.
- Rothman, S. (1970). *European Society and Politics*, US: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Sander, O. (1999). *Siyasi Tarih: İlkçağlardan 1918'e*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Schlesinger, P. (1994). 'Europeanness' - A new cultural battlefield', in 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, 33-49.
- Schmitt, H.A. (1962). *The Path to European Union From the Marshall Plan to the Common Market*, US: Louisiana State University Press.
- Shore, C. (2000). *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*, London: Routledge.
- Smith, A.D. (1993). 'Nation: Invented, Imagined, Reconstructed?', in Ringrose, M and Lerner, A.J. (eds.), *Reimagining the Nation*, England: Open University Press, 9-23.
- Smith, A.D. (1995). 'The Nations of Europe after the Cold War', in Hayward, J. and Page, E.C. (eds.), *Governing the New Europe*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 44-66.
- Smith, A.D. (1996). 'Nationalism and Historians', in Balakrishnan, G. (ed.), *Mapping the Nation*, London: Verso, 175-197.
- Smith, A.D. (1997). 'National Identity and the Idea of European Unity', in Gowan, P and Anderson, P. (eds.), *The Question of Europe*, London: Verso, 318-341.
- Smith, A.D. (1999). *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Soysal, Y. (2002). 'Locating European Identity in Education', in Novoa, A and Lawn, M. (eds.), *The Formation of an European Education Space*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 55-69.
- Spencer, P and Howard, W. (2002). *Nationalism: Critical Introduction*, London: Sage.
- Stephen, G. (1996). *Politics and Policy in the European Union*-third edition, England: Oxford University Press .
- Thatcher, M. (1994). 'A Family of Nations', in Nelsen, B and Stubb, A.C.G. (eds.), *The European Union: Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 45-61.
- Toulemon, R. (1998). 'For a democratic Europe', in Westlake, M. (ed.), *The European Union beyond Amsterdam : New Concepts of European Integration*, London: Routledge, 116-129.
- Veen, H. (2000). 'Towards a European Identity: Policy of Culture?', in Andrew, J, et al. (eds.), *Why Europe? Problems of Culture and Identity : Political and Historical Dimensions*, Basingstoke Hampshire: MacMillan Press, 41-52.
- Wieruszowski, H. (1966). *The Medieval University: Masters, Students, Learning*, Canada: D.Van Nostrand Company.

## **Journals**

- Avrupa Birliği'nin Bilim, Araştırma ve Eğitim Politikaları ve Türkiye'nin Uyumu (2004). İktisadi Kalkınma Vakfı Yayını, no : 19.
- Badley, Graham. (2003). 'Integrating Culture and Higher Education: a pragmatist approach', *European Educational Research Journal*, 2 (4), 477-495. Retrieved 20 February, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL [http://www.worldwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=2&issue=4&year=2003&article=1\\_Badley\\_EERJ\\_2\\_4\\_web&id=85.99.70.85](http://www.worldwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=2&issue=4&year=2003&article=1_Badley_EERJ_2_4_web&id=85.99.70.85)

- Balzer, C. and Martens, K. (2004). 'International Higher Education and the Bologn Process What part does the European Commission play?', *Proceedings of the epsNet Annual Conference 2004: Charles University, Prague*. Retrieved 27 May, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.epsnet.org/2004/pps/Balzer.pdf>
- Caviedes, A. (2003). 'The Role of Language in Nation-Building within the European Union', *Dialectical Anthropology*, 27 (3-4), 249-268. Retrieved 3 March, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.springerlink.com/media/9CGPXWYRLQL4LCJTXXWW/Contributions/R/5/V/8/R5V82T1546583M11.pdf>
- Cederman, L.E. (2001). 'Nationalism and Bounded Integration: What it Would Take to Construct a European Demos', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 7(2), 139-174.
- Eriksen, E.O. and Fossum, J.E. (2002). 'Europe in Search of its Legitimacy: Assessing strategies of legitimation', *ARENA Working Papers*, 02 (38), 1-29. Retrieved:17 March, 2005 on the World Wide: URL  
[http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp02\\_38.pdf](http://www.arena.uio.no/publications/wp02_38.pdf)
- Ertl, H. (2003). 'European Union Programmes for Educational and Vocational Training: Development and Impact', *SKOPE Research Paper*, 42 (Spring), 1-49. Retrieved 25 Februaray, 2005 on the World Wide: URL  
<http://www.economics.ox.ac.uk/SKOPE/Working%20Papers/SKOPEWP42.pdf>
- Fossum, E. (2001). 'Identity-Politcs in the European Union', *European Integration*, 23 (4), 373-405.
- Fredriksson, U. (2003). 'Changes of Education Policies within the European Union in the Light of Globalisation', *European Educational Reseach Journal*, 2 (4), 522-546. Retrieved 16 June, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.wwwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=2&issue=4&year=2003&article=3 Fredriksson EERJ 2 4 web&id=85.99.65.175>

- Froment, E. (2003). 'The European Higher Education Area: A New Framework for the Development of Higher Education', *Higher Education in Europe*, 28 (1), 27-31.  
Retrieved 25 January, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com/app/home/content.asp?wasp=e5f858283b24476b99133bf29d7f0aa9&referrer=contribution&format=3&page=1&pagecount=6>
- Ham, P. (2000). 'Identity Beyond the State: The Case of the European Union', Retrieved 20 October, 2004 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/vap01/>
- Hingel, A.J. (2001). 'Education policies and European governance-contribution to the interservice groups on European governance', *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*, 5 (1-2), 7-16. Retrieved 3 February, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/areas/group12/contribution\\_education\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/areas/group12/contribution_education_en.pdf)
- Howe, P. (1995). 'A Community of Europeans: The Requisite Underpinnings', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 33 (1), 27-46.
- Kwiek, M. (2004). 'The Emergent European Educational Policies under the Scrutiny: the Bologna Process from a Central European perspective', *European Educational Research Journal*, Retrieved 7 February, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
[http://www.wwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=3&issue=4&year=2004&article=3\\_Kwiek\\_EERJ\\_3\\_4\\_web&id=85.99.65.175](http://www.wwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=3&issue=4&year=2004&article=3_Kwiek_EERJ_3_4_web&id=85.99.65.175)
- Laffan, B. (1996). 'The Politics of Identity and Political Order in Europe', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (1), 81-102.
- Lawn, M. and Lingard, B. (2002). 'Constructing a European Policy Space in Educational Governance: the role of transnational actors', *European Educational Research Journal*, Retrieved 18 February, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.wwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=1&issue=2&year=2002&article=LawnEERJ12&id=85.99.65.175>

- Lenhardt, G. (2002). 'Europe and Higher Education between Universalisation and Materialist Particularism', *European Educational Research Journal*, Retrieved 28 January, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.wwwords.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=eerj&vol=1&issue=2&year=2002&article=Lenhardt EERJ 1 2&id=81.213.130.174>
- Lodge, J. (1995). 'Democratic Legitimacy and the EC: Crossing the Rubicon', *International Journal of Public Administration*, 18 (October), 1595-1637.
- Noh, M. (2004). 'The EU Inter-cultural Education and Training Programmes for Enhancing of European Awareness towards European Citizenship: Centred on ERASMUS, LINGUA, PETRA, COMENIUS', *International Area Review*, Retrieved 15 February, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://segero.hufs.ac.kr/library/iar/14-10.pdf>
- Pair, C. (1998). 'Vocational training yesterday, today and tomorrow', *Education for the twenty-first century: issues and prospects*, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Schnapper, D. (1997). 'The European Debate on Citizenship', *American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 126 (3), 199-221.
- Seton-Watson, H. (1985). 'What is Europe, Where is Europe?', *Encounter*, 377 (July-August), 9-16.
- Trondel, J. (2002). 'The Europeanisation of Research and Higher Educational Policies-Some Reflections', *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 6 (12), 1-18. Retrieved 26 January, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-012a.htm>
- Verger, Jacques. (2004). *Avrupa'da İlk Üniversiteler, Ortaçağ'ın Gezgin Öğrencileri.* (Saadet Özen). *Toplumsal Tarih* 135 (Mart, 2005), 50-54.

Vijlder, F. (2001). 'Globalisation of higher education. What roles for nation states?', *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*, 5 (1-2), 159-162. Retrieved 19 January, 2005 on the World Wide Web. URL  
<http://www.springerlink.com/media/3L93GQWUXPCWTV03EUA0/Contributions/R/8/K/6/R8K6236Q65711831.pdf>

Walkenhorst, H. (2004). 'The Construction of European Identity and the Role of National Educational Systems- A Case Study on Germany', Retrieved 3 January, 2005 on World the Wide Web: URL  
[http://www.essex.ac.uk/government/Essex\\_Papers/Number\\_160.pdf](http://www.essex.ac.uk/government/Essex_Papers/Number_160.pdf)

Wielemans, W. (2000). 'European educational policy on shifting sand?', *European Journal for Education Law and Policy*, 4, 21-34. Retrieved 12 May, 2005 on the World Wide Web: URL  
<http://www.springerlink.com/media/E05D21WUVQ7RUJRHECW0/Contributions/R/7/1/8/R7187207QX518738.pdf>

## Web Sites

EU News, Policy Positions& EU Actors online. *Referenda on EU Constitution - state of play in the member states*, Retrieved: 4 August, 2004. [WWW document]. URL  
<http://www.euractiv.com/Article?tcmuri=tcm:29-130616-16&type=Overview>

University of Essex. The Treaty on European Union (TEU). Retrieved: 17 May, 2005. [WWW document]. URL  
<http://www.essex.ac.uk/info/Maastricht.html>

Penner, D.S. (1992, May 19). *The heritage of university planning, medieval universities, Early Development of Universities*. Retrieved: 31 March, 2005. [WWW document]. URL  
[http://www.andrews.edu/~penner/colleges/mc\\_intro.html](http://www.andrews.edu/~penner/colleges/mc_intro.html)

University of Witwatersrand. *"Discussion Document: Is University Life Any Different Today than it was "Yesterday"?* Retrieved: 4 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL  
[http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med\\_univ.html#itm5](http://www.wits.ac.za/alumni/med_univ.html#itm5)



- University of Pittsburg. Archive of European Integration. *Green Paper on The European Dimension of Education. COM (93) 457, 29 September 1993.* Retrieved: 18 January, 2005. [WWW document]. URL <http://aei.pitt.edu/archive/00000936/>
- Western New England College. *Medieval Universities* . Retrieved: 5 April, 2005. [WWW document] . URL <http://mars.acnet.wnec.edu/~grempel/courses/wc1/lectures/25meduni.html>
- Encyclopedia Britannica Online. *Globalization*. Retrieved: 11 April, 2005. [WWW document] . URL. <http://www.britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=9344667&query=globalization&ct>
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *Message from the Salamanca Convention of European higher education institutions Shaping the European Higher Education Area.* Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL. [http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/salamanca\\_convention.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/salamanca_convention.pdf)
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *Graz Declaration 2003 Forward from Berlin: the Role of Universities.* Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL. [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/02-EUA/0309Graz\\_publication.pdf](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/02-EUA/0309Graz_publication.pdf)
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *Sorbonne Joint Declaration on the architecture of the European higher education system.* Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL. [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main\\_doc/980525SORBONNE\\_DECLARATION.PDF](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/980525SORBONNE_DECLARATION.PDF)
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999, Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education.* Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL. [http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna\\_declaration.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/bologna_declaration.pdf)
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *The Bologna Process – Towards the European Higher Education Area, Berlin Summit on Higher Education* . Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL. <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/en/basic/haupt.htm>
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *Basic Information (January 2004) The Bologna Process – Towards the European Higher Education Area* Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL. <http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/EN/BASIC/Pros-descr.HTM>

Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. *The European Higher Education Area - Achieving the Goals, the Bergen Declaration.*

Retrieved: 18 April, 2005. [WWW document]. URL.

[http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main\\_doc/050520\\_Bergen\\_Communique.pdf](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/050520_Bergen_Communique.pdf)

The History of the European Union- *the difficult ratification of the Maastricht Treaty.*

Retrieved: 3 July, 2005. [WWW document]. URL.

<http://www.historiasiglo20.org/europe/maastricht.htm#Ratificación>