Journal of Social Science Education
Volume 12, Number 4

ISSN 1618-5293

Helga Zichner

How to grow English Lawn in Moldova? Reflecting on the Reasons to Establish and those to Participate in the Erasmus Mundus Programme of the European Union

Keywords
European Neighbourhood policy, Eastern Partnership, Erasmus Mundus, Moldova, education, citizenship

In the framework of its Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), the EU opens up certain facets of its education policy for members of the educational systems of the direct neighbour countries. Bearing the important role of education for processes of nation building and the related formation of citizens in mind, I analyse the meanings of this extension because the reordering of the relations with the new neighbours after the last enlargement of the EU is one of the main aims of the ENP. In the paper I would like to address this issue from two perspectives: Firstly, I want to take a look at the rhetoric employed in EU documents on internal and external education policy. Drawing on the concept of citizenship and its double role for differentiating between insiders and outsiders of a community and realting individuals to a politcal community, the question arises what kind of integration the EU intends for formal non-EU citizens by offering them certain opportunities of participation. The thesis is that the attitude towards participants from non-member states remains without a clear "finalité", reflecting thus one of the overall problems of the ENP. Secondly, I want to look at the level of individual participants in the programme Erasmus Mundus and the meanings their stays abroad have for them. I will show in how far their experiences abroad impact on their daily practices as citizens of their countries[1].

1 Introduction

What I will address in this article are some of the perspectives that are underlying the EU's efforts to (re)build relations with countries outside its external borders, the so called third countries. The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and the Eastern Partnership (EaP) are the core instruments invented by the EU in order to re-frame its relations with countries that are not offered an EU-membership for the time being and education policy is one chapter covered by these political programmes. ENP and EaP are meant to bring these countries in line with European standards in many policy fields and to prevent "new dividing lines" (Commission 2004) between members and non-members of the EU. As this applies also to the domain of education policy my basic question is: how can we interpret the efforts of the European Union to partly open up its education policy to third countries and to the citizens of these countries? How far does the EU take the idea of preventing new dividing lines, if we bear in mind that education policy is still perceived as one of the main instruments nation states have at their disposal in order to make "their" citizens (see e.g. Turner 1994, 159). Education systems are used as a means to make people not only think in terms of a collective entity but to make them "competent members" of this entity according to its values and rules (on competence see Turner 1994, 159; Isin & Wood 1999, 4). Yet, the definition of a group implies the definition of boundaries and with it the definition of outsiders at the same time. Like identity, we can define citizenship as a group marker, the latter having rather legal implications, the former having cultural and social implications (Isin & Wood 1999, 20). The two concepts overlap in that they both relate to or are even based on a sense of belonging (ensemble of belonging, Isin & Wood 1999, 21; see Isin 2008, 37 and Wiener 1993, 211), which in the case of citizenship is complemented by a legal belonging or membership. They overlap also in that both concepts deal with the relation between individuals and some bigger social entity: the individual and the state, the individual and a group. They overlap thirdly, in that both are said to have aspects of status and practice alike (Turner 1994, 159; Isin & Wood 1999, 4; Isin & Nielsen 2008).

As we will see throughout this article education policy on EU level was approached in a similar way as on the national level: it is being perceived as a potential instrument to promote the idea of an (again) collective identity, yet one not limited by national states' borders but drafted as one that could be integrative to the existing diversity within the space of EU member states.

In order to get into the subject I will in the first part of the paper roughly introduce to the difficult discussions around the development of a common education policy which were difficult precisely because of its implications with the idea of constructing a "European" identity and a "European" citizen(ship). Yet, while the efforts to invent some collective identity on EU scale may be seen as the logical consequence of the progressing integration in other policy fields – with Erasmus being recognized widely as an important milestone in that sense (among others Medrano 2011, 33) – it is not so easy to understand why the EU tries to extend its education policy and with it certain dimensions of the identification offers or patterns towards its formal "outside". While there exists some research on ERASMUS, research dealing with the expansion of the exchange scheme into ERASMUS Mundus by which Higher Education Institutions (HEI) of the EU become much more accessible (and vice versa) to non-EU citizens is very scarce.

What interests me in the second part of the paper is to find out more about the motivation behind the

Helga Zichner, Diploma in Cultural Sciences, is researcher at the Institute for Regional Geography, Schongauer Str. 9, 04328 Leipzig, Germany.
email: *h_zichner@ifl-leipzig.de*

ISSN 1618-5293

establishment or the extension of the exchange scheme as one concrete example of how ENP and EaP are put into practice. In order to do so, I will look at how the notions of identity and citizenship are used in EU documents related to the establishment of Erasmus in a first step. I assume that on the political-rhetorical level these notions stand rather for some idealistic imagination or desiderata concerning inhabitants of the union and the development of a society at EU scale presented in a way as the precondition for a prosperous economy. Political rhetoric however has to be distinguished from how these notions are defined and used in scientific debates. With the help of more recent concepts of citizenship I will try to reframe this talk about citizenship, what will enable us to identify certain parallels between the ways EU-citizens are referred to and the ways non-EU citizens are referred to, meaning that at this point I will turn to documents related to the establishment of Erasmus Mundus. Here, I will draw especially on works that focus on the distinctions and overlappings between citizenship and identity (Isin & Wood, 1999) and others that focus on the question of "substance" of EU-citizenship in general (Vink 2004; Wiener 1993)

In the third part of the paper, I will deal with the concrete experiences individuals have had participating in the exchange scheme Erasmus Mundus because these ultimately reveal something about the concrete effects these political approaches unfold on the local level[2]. Thus the idea is to look at how (large scale) EU politics translate into concrete (small scale) practices of individuals, by talking with former participants about their experiences in the exchange programme. Evidently, the EU seeks to influence education policy in these countries on a larger scale than that of the individual, but the question is what kind of local effects we can identify in these countries. In how far do the participants perceive themselves as actors of the intended change? In order to interpret the concrete experiences of individuals (participants in Erasmus Mundus), I will draw on the idea of "acts of citizenship" developed in Isin and Nielsen (2008). Their differentiation between active and activist citizens relates to different patterns of claiming rights or practices as already being citizens (active citizens) who tend to follow established "scripts" (Isin 2008, 38) which remind of the sets of duties common in many citizenship concepts. Active citizens are contrasted to activist citizens as the more creative ones, those who rather interrupt established orders and patterns of doing things, inventing new ways of putting forward claims and thus inventing new forms of citizenship. I will analyse how societal context matters for individuals to realize bits of self-conception gained or altered in another context, coming to some preliminary conclusions about the gap between intentions and practices on the level of individuals that ultimately tell us something about the impact different societal contexts have on the permeability of the (dividing) lines between EU states and their direct neighbours.

2 Europeanizing education policy

> "After more than fifty years of institutional construction and legal development, the visionaries of Europe await the sociological proof of a new highly Europeanized population." (Favell 2008, X)

Traditionally, education policy is seen as one of the core chapters of national politics because it is assumed to be one of the main instruments of citizen formation or to be a means of reproducing national culture. These ideas are bound up with the introduction of a clear distinction between the members and non-members of nation-states and the definition of a certain state-territory. So, not only the nation-state as such but also the concept of the citizen as the legitimate inhabitant of a certain nation state acquired an exclusionary character, among others through compulsory education (Soysal 1994, 17; Hobsbawm 1990, 93) aiming basically at making people aware of belonging to an imagined community (Anderson 1996), or at "attach[ing] all to nation and flag" (Hobsbawm 1990, 91).

Yet, as mentioned above, by defining a "we", you are defining an "other", too. Choosing criteria for eligible citizens means that at the same time you define the "outsiders" or "aliens" (Shaw 2007, 20), and this applies to national education systems as well. So on the one hand, we can consider especially primary schools as part of an "increasingly powerful machinery [of states] to communicate with their [the nation states', HZ] inhabitants" (Hobsbawm 1990, 91), trying to make them believe in a specific exclusionary vision of the community they are part of. On the other hand, a certain international dimension was present in education from the beginning, too, precisely because national education systems were established as a means to distinguish oneself from others (Lawn & Grek 2012, 19; Anderson 1996, 75 ff., 88ff.).

The implicit dimension of "internationalization" in academic institutions (Jöns 2010, 97) or, referring to our regional focus, "a sense of wider Europe", is however mostly absent in the narratives of historians of education, who "have tended to produce constructed silos of the national" (Lawn & Grek 2012, 19).

Bearing this in mind and turning to the second half of the 20th century and the then still young European Community, it becomes easy to understand that first attempts from within the relatively young Community structures pointing into the direction of opening up these "silos" (Lawn & Grek 2012, 19), failed. For a long time, education in the sense of primary and secondary education (in contrast to vocational training)[3] represented "a sensitive issue" (Lawn & Grek 2012, 35) if not even a "taboo" (Corbett 2003, 315; Pépin 2006, 22 and also Jařab 2008, 89) which "should not be part of Community competence" (Corbett 2003, 318). In other words, forms of Europeanization in the sense of institution-building at the European level or any Europe-induced policy changes (Börzel & Risse 2000,

3) in this political domain were not a subject at all, or if it was, it was a peripheral one on the agenda.

The idea of framing education as a domain of Community politics and as something of supranational importance grew only over time. First initiatives from the late 1960s until the mid 1980s are classified rather vaguely as "cooperative" in character (see Corbett 2003, 319 ff. on the "Deal on Cooperation"; Lawn & Grek 2012, 39 f. on "Governing by Cooperation")[4]. The circumscription of what exactly should be the aim of cooperation was again a matter of debate. After in one of the first documents this aim had been defined as "a European model of culture correlating with European integration" (Pépin 2006, 64, cit. Resolution 1971), the expression "European model" had to be removed, reflecting once again "sensitivities in the field of education" (Pépin 2006, 64; Corbett 2003, 322-323 on fights about other wordings).

The institutionalization of education matters progressed and in 1981, education together with vocational training were attached to the same Directorate General, namely that of employment, social affairs and education. Finally, the matter gained more importance on the agenda of European politics (Pépin 2006, 92-93) and was included into the treaty of Amsterdam in 1992. But even after its "enshrinement" (Pépin 2006, 143) into the treaty framework, practically "softer" forms of cooperation continued to characterize the efforts in the field of education. The role of the European level for education matters was perceived as a complementary one, aiming at encouraging nevertheless collaboration.

Despite all this scepticism, the Erasmus programme was established in 1987 after "[e]ighteen months of bitter negotiations" (Pépin 2006, 117; see also Corbett 2003, 324ff.) on the budget and its legal basis. It's establishment is not only an example of intensified collaboration in the field of education but has to be seen in the light of other processes that were going on at the same time within the Community, processes related to efforts of making people aware of being part of a European Community. From the very onset it was clear that Erasmus (without Mundus!) as a subchapter of the common education and vocational training policies serves two aims: the first aim is economic in character, stressing the necessity to create a labour force fitting the economic needs of a "Europe" that was or is to change more and more into a "Europe of knowledge" (Commission 1997). The second aim is rather cultural and consists in getting "Europe" closer to its citizens or in creating "a People's Europe and a sense of European citizenship" (Lawn & Grek 2012, 37). My focus will be on this latter aspect, the creation of the idea of a European citizenship as it has been pushed especially from the mid 1970s onward (Lawn & Grek 2012, 37).

Precisely this "sense of citizenship" seems to have played a role when in 1985 two reports were issued by a commission with the title "ad hoc Committee on a People's Europe" (Adonnino 1985), being part of the "awareness raising" process just mentioned. The starting point for this initiative - according to a member of the Committee (quoted by Shore 1992, 783) - may be traced back to the low turnout of the 1979 European elections, European officials worrying ten years later again about the low interest of the public in European elections (Pépin 2006, 100). So part of the background to initiate Erasmus was a "lack of public awareness" among the citizens in the member states evident in that they were not voting (as a part of following their script), posing ultimately a problem for the political legitimacy or representing a "democratic deficit" (both quotations Shore 1993, 785; similarly Lawn & Grek 2012, 44) of the Community. The answer consisted in inventing a whole strategy, an awareness-raising campaign with the help of a professional public relations company which bore the title "A People's Europe" (see Shore 1993, 788ff.). And it is exactly the consolidation of the concept of "A people's Europe" to which also Erasmus should contribute (Council Decision on Erasmus 1987, art. 2, v), it was about the "civic rationale of student mobility in the light of creating European citizens" (Papatsiba 2006, 99).

Apart from the development of symbols - known from nation building processes - like flag and anthem, passport, driving licence and number plate, and the introduction of a "Euro-Lottery", it was stated with reference to the role of institutions of higher education: "University cooperation and mobility in higher education are obviously of paramount importance" (Adonnino 1985, 24). The overall aim was to "make Europe come alive for the Europeans" (Adonnino 1985, 22; see also Wiener 1993, 205). The parallel between the significance of education of citizens in a single nation state with what was tried to initiate on a supra-national scale is obvious (Lawn & Grek 2012, 41 and 43), however, we need to take a closer look at the citizenship discourse on the level of political documents. In the next section, we will put this into perspective with concepts on identity and citizenship from scientific literature, assuming that this will be helpful later in order to unveil argumentative overlappings in documents relating the establishment of Erasmus Mundus in which a different vocabulary is employed.

2 If Erasmus shall contribute to the creation of European citizens, what shall Erasmus Mundus do?

> "In May 2004 the European Union acquired not just ten new member states but also several new neighbours." (Smith 2005, 757)

Erasmus became successful extremely quickly: by the end of the academic year 2008/09, two million students had participated, the aim being to reach 3 million participants in 2013[5]. It is "one of the most successful attempts to touch directly a large public" (Corbett 2003, 325). And if the assumption put forward by King and Ruiz-Gelices (2003, 230) is true that especially young people can be "won" easily as advocates for Community matters, it should be interesting to reflect on the meaning of Erasmus Mundus, too.

ISSN 1618-5293

We start our analysis by returning shortly to the "A People's Europe" communication (Commission 1988) because it reflects the consensus on thinking about identity issues and the role of education on the European level of that time:

> "European identity is the result of centuries of shared history and common cultural and fundamental values. But awareness of it can be strengthened by symbolic action…"

and on the European dimension of education:

> "the Ministers adopted a resolution designed to strengthen in young people a sense of European identity and to prepare them to take part in the economic, social and cultural development of the Community" (both quotes Commission 1988, 5 and 15).

Here we find a view on identity as "common heritage" (Wiener 1993, 205), as something that results almost automatically from shared history, where it is of course questionable, what the meaning of shared shall be. It is assumed that this identity already exists, without being adopted sufficiently, so identity appears as something at least latently pre-existing. Exactly at this point, the role of education is brought into the game, namely, to help especially young people to embrace the (pre-existing) identity. All this is intended however not for the sake of the discovery of such an identity only, but because it is regarded as necessary for the general wellbeing or positive development of the Community[6]. It is an appeal to a sense of responsibility for the wellbeing of the context in which the young people are living. What the quotations call for, reminds us of the "competent members" in a community (Turner 1994, 159), but in the framework of the concept of citizenship this competence is often coupled with the legal membership and the social and legal dimension:

"But those who do not possess the civil, political and social rights to exercise such citizenship would be denied to become such a competent and full-fledged member of the polity in the first place. Thus the sociological and politico-legal definitions of citizenship are not mutually exclusive but constitutive." (Isin & Wood 1999, 4)

Obviously, Isin and Wood's perspective is that of a citizenship "from below" (Turner 1994, 158), people struggling for gaining certain rights, which is in contrast with how it is promoted on EU/EC level: the EC of that time began to promote a cultural and social dimension of citizenship from above (passive citizenship, Turner 1994, 159), with the legal/juridical dimension in terms of a European Citizenship remaining "under construction" until its establishment in the 1992 Maastricht treaty. In the light of concepts of citizenship resting upon the existence of formal citizenship, exactly this element is missing. "[…] arguments for active citizenship or deep citizenship […] presuppose that the status of citizenship already exists." (Isin & Wood 1999, 19)

I would agree therefore that within Community logics at this stage, the aim was perhaps more about inventing "a unifying myth" (Lawn & Grek 2012, 44) and that efforts were directed much more to the creation of a "feeling of belonging and identity" (Wiener 1993, 204, 207, 211) than the creation or definition of the legal ties of belonging, presupposing that a sense of belonging in terms of identity is also part of the concept of citizenship. The more practical aim of these efforts, however, were not lost out of site: it seems that the strategy was to arouse people's interest and get them engaged in Community affairs. According to the Communication from the Commission "Towards a Europe of knowledge", especially the educational area should contribute to the idea of unity: "[it] must encourage a broader-based understanding of citizenship founded on active solidarity and on mutual understanding of the cultural diversities that constitute Europe's originality and richness" (Commission 1997, 3). An inclusive perspective is emphasised where before exclusive thinking dominated, symbolized ultimately in the lifting of the internal border regime when establishing the Schengen-area (at the cost of restricting the borders with the new neighbours). In difference to the first quotations, now in 1997 we have the European Citizenship (Amsterdam Treaty in 1992), even if it is a status "granted to people who did not really ask for it" (Vink 2004, 26). Still, however, the Commission seems to stick to the cultural/identiy issues (diversity, originality, richness) aspect and to the social dimension (solidarity and mutual understanding). So the efforts are still directed towards raising an awareness of community of belonging together, obviously being assumed to be a precondition for reaching the main aims that prove to be primarily economic in character, as we will see immediately.

Turning finally to the decision on establishing the Erasmus programme, we find several (disillusioning) allusions to its economic aims: the programme shall contribute to generate a "pool of graduates with direct experience of intra-Community cooperation", it is meant to be the "basis upon which intensified cooperation in the economic and social sectors can develop at community level" (Council Decision on Erasmus, art. 2, v). So the whole idea can be reformulated as promoting people who would identify themselves and consequently feel responsible for the further development of Community matters, including their role as members of the future work force on European level. In short: it is about creating "agents of the European integration" (Findlay et al. 2005, 192) or "Eurostars", described as "the very emblem of the new, de-nationalized Europe that the European Union has enabled" (Favell 2008; Favell & Recchi 2011, 72).

Summing up this sketchy analysis, we can say that in the quoted documents what is alluded to as citizenship resembles more with what Isin and Nielsen call the dimension of "depth" of citizenship (2008, 37), which is but one fragment in their concept, concerning the question of a feeling of

belonging or emotive commitment as Turner puts it (1994, 157). The dimensions of "extent" and "content" (voting, legal status) remain untouched in EU documents, provoking criticism for lack of the political dimension of the understanding (Abelson 2005, 9-10), being qualified even as "political kitsch" (Vink 2004, 24). Clearly, efforts directed at the creation of a "feeling of belonging" anteceded the establishement of the "legal ties of belonging "(Wiener 1993, 211 italics in the original)

The question that arises when we are moving on to the establishment of Erasmus Mundus, is how we can consider the opportunities this programme offers to non-EU citizens in terms of the degree of integration of the participants (the ENP shall be about avoiding new dividing lines, as mentioned already). Wiener hints to the general problem the European Citizenship concept implied once the Berlin Wall came down:

> "After Maastricht a new debate unfolded over the gap between politically included and excluded residents – that is, between citizens who had legal ties with the Union and so-called third-country citizens, or individuals who did not have legal ties with the Union but who might have developed a feeling of belonging" (1993, 213).

Is it possible to frame the participation in Erasmus Mundus with what Shaw describes as examples, where "practical benefits of membership of a polity are in some circumstances extended also to those who lack formal citizenship" (2007, 19-20)? Similarly, Soysal is hinting to cases of non-citizen immigrants benefitting in a way from citizens' rights while participating in education systems (Soysal 2012, 385).

If citizenship is one marker of the border between inside and outside (see Shaw 2007, 20; Wiener 2013) then what can the decision to expand the programme to non-EU citizens tell us about the efforts of the EU to (re)build relationships with (citizens of) neighbouring countries who represent exactly those formal outsiders?

The decision to establish Erasmus Mundus was taken in December 2003 (Decision on Erasmus Mundus 2003), the same year in which the European Security Strategy (ESS 2003) was adopted as a consequence to the perceived risks and dangers in the aftermath of 9/11 and the forthcoming "big bang" enlargement (Schimmelfennig 2009, 17) of the EU in 2004. About half a year later the Strategy Paper on the "European Neighbourhood Policy" was published (Commission 2004): altogether this makes clear that the idea to open Erasmus Mundus for third countries has to be seen in the context of the EU's efforts to re-order the relations with countries that were to become the "new neighbours" after the eastward enlargement of 2004. The main motivation lay with securing the EU by securing the neighbourhood, so in that sense the premises were quite different from those of Erasmus that was meant as an instrument to foster inner cohesion: "The best protection for our security is a world of well-governed democratic states" (ESS, 10). The EU's efforts to handle its "outside" are framed by different concepts, e.g. extraterritorial engagement, external governance or as Europeanization beyond Europe (see e.g. Schimmelfennig & Sedelmeier 2004; Lavenex 2008; Sasse 2008; Korosteleva 2012). Despite theoretical differences, all of them analyse how the EU searches to influence in some way or other the domestic policies of states that for the time being, however, are not to be offered a membership perspective.

Even if education policy does not figure among the top priorities of the ENP, there are several references to it, mostly in connection with people to people contacts, presented not so much as an objective in itself but as being important to achieve overarching goals of the ENP: "An effective means to achieve the ENP's main objectives is to connect the peoples of the Union and its neighbours [...]. Thus [...] the ENP will promote cultural, educational and more general societal links between the Union and its neighbourhood." (Commission 2004, 19). So far, Erasmus Mundus is not mentioned explicitly, in other documents we find however that the chapter "contacts between people" translates into the Erasmus Mundus programme in the first place (Commission 2012). Above that, the significance attached to the programme is evident in the fact that the allocated budget for Erasmus Mundus has been doubled in 2012 (Commission 2012, 4).

The overlapping with what is tried with Erasmus lies, I argue, on a level that has to do with the aim of making people identify with a certain idea. In a way, the EU had to think once again or to continue its reflections on what Europe "as a region in world politics" is, similar to the situation in 1989, up to where European basically meant "Western European" (both quotes Wiener 1993, 210). Transposed to yet another scale, the aim of Erasmus Mundus is to help decrease distances between countries in the sense of building closer relations between them:

> "The external dimension [of education and training, HZ] famously encapsulated in the Tempus programme and recently extended through Erasmus Mundus, addresses an equally important and distinct set of needs. Cooperation in education and training is a very powerful instrument at the service of strengthening relations with third countries and for *fostering mutual understanding between EU countries and those beyond our borders*." (Commission 2004a, 8-9, my italics).

Given the fact that practically this kind of exchange and approximation can be organized ultimately only on the level of individuals, we encounter again also the idea of individuals (participants) becoming something of ambassadors for the EU: "The aim of this programme is [...] to have an impact on the visibility and perception of the European Union around the world, as well as building *a capital of goodwill among those who have participated* in the programme." (Decision on Erasmus Mundus

2003, 2, my italics). This idea takes a more concrete shape if we look at the obligations formulated for individual participants or scholars: "Contribute [...] to the promotion and dissemination of the Erasmus Mundus programme in general [...] in their HEI and country of origin" (Commission 2012a, 29). On the level of institutions the task consists even in developing a durable strategy in order to disseminate European and social values (Commission 2012a, 55).

To sum up: On the one hand, there is a difference between the intentions of the two programmes: while the above mentioned emblematic Eurostars emerging ideally from former Erasmus students are standing for the inner-European integration, the bearers of goodwill emerging from those who participate in Erasmus Mundus are to promote the good conditions of the EU HEI and to attest its attractivity. On the other hand, there are at least two commonalities, one being that the achievement of different goals seems to rest on the same precondition, namely that the target group accepts and adopts what is being said to be European values and to identify with these ideals. A second commonality between the two programmes is that ultimately both refer to the optimisation of the workforce available in the EU, because Erasmus aims at training people familiar with the "European way of things" while Erasmus Mundus tries to attract the best students from third countries (Decision on Erasmus Mundus 2008, (3)).

Yet, the question to be answered in this section is what kind of membership does Erasmus Mundus offer the participants from non-EU coutries? Even if they benefit for a certain period of time from their inclusion into the European Area of higher education, we can ask with Shaw whether that "does make [...] such persons, in some practical if not formal sense, 'citizens'" (2007, 19-20).

Given the fact that the participants lack not only the legal status, but that they are in the EU also for comparatively short periods of time (in contrast to a part of the immigrant population from non-EU countries referred to above) and due to the fact, that they benefit only from education systems, to see them as another kind of "partial citizens" (Heater 1999, 131) seems not appropriate.

Despite that we find an appeal to the ideal of equality between EU citizens and other "country nationals", like in the following quotation: "The Commission shall ensure that no group of EU citizens or third country nationals is excluded or disadvantaged" (Commission 2012a, 5). This appeal however should rather be interpreted as a part of the EU's strategy to tackle (all kind of) "global challenges", among others securing the neighbourhood.

Erasmus Mundus altogether has to be considered as a part of the external dimension of the EU education policy in which "soft power" (Nye 2004) is employed in order to initiate domestic reform (Sasse 2008, 295). Programmes facilitating people-to-people contacts are an instrument of "cultural diplomacy", increasing the attractiveness to partner countries (Commission 2004a, 12), are part of this soft power approach. Participants are being exposed to the environment of an EU country which results ideally in a process Schimmelfennig calls "transnational socialization" (2009, 8) meaning that individual actors promote "European" values after they have gained some personal experiences: "[...] in the 'transnational socialization' mode of governance, the EU may try to persuade these societal actors of its values, norms, or policy ideas." As Schimmelfennig continues, he makes clear that the transfer of ideas is not finished when somebody returns with a head full of inspiration, but that then these ideas need to be brought home somehow: "Societal actors will then work to disseminate these ideas further domestically." Indeed, the decisions on Erasmus Mundus (2003 and 2008) both make reference to "the social dimension of higher education" (2003 Art 1 [14], 2008 Art. 1 [11]), mobility allowing for the discovery, experience and understanding of "new cultural and social environments" (2008 Art. 1 [11]). If we interpret Erasmus Mundus as a means to contribute to transnational socialization and if we further accept affiliation to some cultural identity or commit-ment to a set of values (defined as being part of the identity the belonging should be directed to) as one dimension of belonging which can be considered a part of citizenship, then we can reformulate the intention behind the extension of the EU's education policy to "third states" like this: it is a trial to encourage non-EU citizens to follow its ideals of citizenship and all the associated values (democracy, human rights etc.). Participants as potential bearers of the "capital of goodwill" are invited to learn some of the meanings of European citizenship, or more frankly they are offered to stick to the emotional dimension of one of the fragments of European citizenship: the feeling of belonging (again Wiener 1993, 211) in the cultural sense, with limited opportunities to participate in the educational system of the EU. They are "offered" to associate with the cultural ties, far beyond legal ties (Wiener 1993, 211), but significant from the EU's perspective of soft power ambitions.

According to the programme scheme, participants are to return home after their stays and this takes us to the last aspect of this section: the moment of returning home means leaving the new environment and going back to the societal, institutional context of origin.

So in terms of citizenship, as a concept which defines a relation between individuals and society or state (Wiener 1993, 199), closely tied to the notion of membership (Bellamy et al. 2006, 2-3), the situation of former Erasmus Mundus partici-pants may turn out to be a bit more complicated due to the fact that they eventually have become part of two different societal contexts. I argue that the question of what they can really make of their eventually new insights from an eventually different culture etc. once back home, depends not only on themselves but also on the societal and political context of their home countries in which, however, they are full citizens. The understanding of how citizens like

students and professors should behave and involve in their home societies and on the political stage, may differ, that is, the "scripts" (Isin 2008, 38) being available for citizens, the idea of the "good citizen" are context-dependent.

In the last section of the paper, we will see in how far the situation of former participants can be described as "dislocated" or more precisely "bifurcated": on the one hand he or she shall, roughly spoken, accept a certain set of values in consequence of encountering another environment, top down way. On the other hand, he or she shall make a bottom up effort to take these values home and promote them at the interface with institutions in his country of origin. As empirical evidence will show, there are differences at play depending on which side of the interface we look, making it suitable also to differentiate further the concept of the citizen.

3 Being there and coming home – matching and mismatching of citizenship concepts and societal context

> "Being there we have enlarged our horizon and coming back it is like we want to change something, to make something better for Moldova." (Student from Moldova, 955-957)

When talking to former participants in Erasmus Mundus, from all participating universities in Moldova, you hardly hear any critical comments about the programme. All the people I talked to appreciated their stays abroad very much. The only aspect some of them remembered as not very satisfying and not very smooth, were the border crossing or entry procedures. After all the above discussion of the emotional aspect of belong-ing, difficulties like the punctuality of visa issuing, the cumbersomeness and accessability of embassies in general or erroneous controls at airports when arriving or travelling back home relate exactly to the lack of legal ties, the legal status of membership as a mechanism of access or the denial of access to a community and its defined territory.

In order to address their experiences once participants have escaped the border controls, I will come back to the distinction between active and activist citizens introduced in the very beginning. The distinction will prove useful in order to analyse the experiences of some participants in Erasmus Mundus that result from a double or bifurcated interface they are confronted with.

Recalling the underlying intentions leading to the establishment of the programme (attract the best students from outside the EU, turning them into bearers of a "capital of goodwill"), we could call these tasks as a rudimentary "script" for the "good participants" in the exchange scheme of Erasmus Mundus. Those who act accordingly, may be called active citizens (Isin & Nielsen) or perhaps "competent members" (Turner 1994; Isin & Wood 1999) in the very limited understanding I have elaborated above. Active in this sense means to behave in a way that is intended by others presupposing however the active embracement of proposed behavioural patterns, standing insofar in contrast to passivity. Empirical evidence suggests that in some respects the "plan" to employ participants as ambassadors works out quite well while in others it doesn't. Many professors and coordinators of Erasmus Mundus in Moldova mentioned that the interest of students in Erasmus Mundus is too weak. They described their students as amorphous, immobile, sleepy or as not used to enter into a situation of competition. From their point view, students were not "active" enough since they were too hesitant to apply. This is not to say that places offered remain vacant, but that they would welcome if more students applied so that really the "best" students would profit from the exchange programme. Talking to students and staff members directly revealed a different perspective: looking at the initial access to the programme or to the conditions of application in the home country, we find typically that while staff members describe the process of application as very smooth, students are confronted with impediments on the level of the programme administration at their home universities. For students, very much depends on the information policy of the universities and furthermore on the competencies of the specific personnel in charge of handling their applications:

> "When I applied in 2008 my only problem was that nobody could explain to me how to fill out the documents, where I need to go to have them signed. The coordinator of my university did not help me at all." (Vlad, student from Moldova, 194-197)
>
> "My wife applied this year and in Mr. Sandu's [programme director, HZ] office she stayed about an hour listening how much he is fed up with Erasmus Mundus, how much he has to do and so forth. That he does not want to sign anything, that she should go away, a whole hour (…) So that you can write a first recommendation: organize the administration of the programme outside the university, attach it to the office of EU or the delegation, it should be an office of its own, independent of the university, because it harms a lot." (Nicu, student from Moldova, 634-43)

First of all, we have to see that students who apply for an Erasmus Mundus scholarship are ready to engage in a programme not known to them. In contrast to other forms of migration (labour migration especially), educational migration is not that widespread yet and arose also the mistrust of parents who could not believe in the monetary size of the scholarship. Since we talked to participants who were among the first ones from Moldova to leave with Erasmus Mundus, they should be considered pioneers. In that sense, it presupposed a certain degree of courage even, ignoring scepticism of the own family: they can be said to have diverged from conventional paths.

Bearing in mind that Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine participate in the exchange programme only since 2007, the difficulties encountered by Vlad may be

ISSN 1618-5293

explained by a lack of experience on both sides. Students as well as administrators at that time were inexperienced in a way (the total number of scholarship for all the three Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine was 231 in the 2008 call[7]). Several staff members mentioned that before Erasmus Mundus the occasions to visit Western countries were extremely limited.

In contrast to that, Nicu's experience four years later points to a complex of problems that lies beyond the level of personal experience or motivation as it might appear on first sight. Since other students confirmed his experiences in relation to other staff implied in the programme administration, I think that they point to problems that have to do on the one hand with the highly hierarchical relation between students and superiors from teaching and administration staff and that have to do on the other hand with the problem that in Moldova university personnel in general is overburdened and underpaid. Interpreting the experiences against this background with the help of Isin's distinction between active and activist citizens, I would like to stress the following: the will to overcome administrative impediments or individual resistance and traditional attitudes, to try to get access to something unusual so far, can be compared to putting forward a claim (e.g. a claim for support in coming to terms with the procedure). It means to make others used to new claims (resulting from obligations the university assumed by concluding a contract with other EU universities), in a situation where access to these opportunities cannot be taken for granted yet, the appendant procedures not being well established in the beginning. A student engaging in getting a new type of scholarship, in need for a certain degree of cooperation from his home university stands in contrast to the general portrait professors had sketched about their students. Obviously, those who get active in that sense, break the usual patterns of students' behaviour in this specific context, they aspire to something new and in that sense appear as activist citizens.

After leaving the country with the scholarship, everything seems to evolve as the imaginary "script" foresees. Some quotations from the group discussion read like advertisements for the programme. An extreme, yet not unique, example is Bodgan who describes how his value system changed in the course of his scholarship (the dissemination of "European" values is one of the aforementioned aims):

> "My stay abroad had a very positive impact on me in the sense that I have learnt there to learn much better than I did before. Aaa, until I left there, I was (…) well coming back I had become much less discriminating."
>
> Moderator: "Against whom?"
>
> "against everybody, I did not like jews, gypsies, I was a nationalist, there I lived among strangers, and I saw that they are human too and and that, in addition I got friends who are advocates in Russia, professors in Belarus, people from the Polish opposition and so forth. When I leave now to another country, I know whom to contact, who can help me for instance. I have friends in Ukraine and Spain alike. I have friends almost in the whole of Europe. That is the main idea for me." (Bogdan, student form Moldova, 924-930)

Many participants in the discussions, students and staff members alike mentioned that their experiences abroad altered their perceptions about themselves, their country of origin and about their "university life". Almost everybody saw the scholarship as helpful in order to compensate certain deficits of Moldova's system of higher education, primarily in some very practical respects: the availability of specific literature, the possibility to learn a foreign language, to be able to see the country you want to study and to establish relations for further collaboration, book exchanges, acquaintance with other teaching methods etc. All this is contained in the metaphor of the enlarged horizon. In addition, especially staff members mention that sometimes they felt like contributing to enlarge the horizons for others, too:

> "My doctoral thesis is about the bank sector in Moldova, some interior mechanism of the bank. Yet, I wanted to see what it is like in their banking system, how does this mechanism work there (…). That was what I wanted to see, the tangents. (…) Finally, I did a presentation how these things work in our country, how it looks like, what happens, and what is the current situation. Well, and as my other colleagues said, perhaps we don't know much about them, but they know even less about us. Somehow, we are still in a black hole. ((Laughing))" (Staff member from Moldova 120-127)

If one keeps in mind that in the respective call for applications from 2008 only 52 scholarships have been reserved for applicants from EU countries, being able to apply in Belarus, Ukraine and Moldova, the imbalance is clear. The idea to promote knowledge about each other, suggesting a reciprocal interest, is difficult to accomplish and the numerical design of the exchange "rates" suggests that the emphasis lies rather on advertising the EU HEI than on learning about the "new neighbours". In that sense, making non-EU citizens familiar with part of scripts for EU-citizens is much more a priority than achieving a degree of "mutual understanding" as suggested on the rhetorical level.

Finally, many discussants said that after their stay abroad, they wish to change something in Moldova and in some cases they directly copy "good practices" they perceived as such during their scholarship:

> "I want to say that recently (…) at our university there was a professor from France. So this professor adventured to chose us in Erasmus for one month ((laughing)). All was on a very high level, but I coordinated everything. And she asked me how she arrives in our town? And I said,

> Mr. Dean, I know how we should receive her. We must go to the airport, receive her there and accompany her to our town, so that she doesn't get lost on the way, because this is not France, this is not Germany ((laughing)). (…) Simply, I wanted her to have positive impressions, and I think. Simply, I knew that we should offer her this, I was pleased by the way the welcoming was organized in my host country. (…) And I insisted that it should be pleasant, that she has positive impressions." (Doctoral Student from Moldova, 778-791)

All these are (small) examples on the level of individuals where the intended effects of Erasmus Mundus come true. Participants use the chance to go abroad and the opportunities offered, almost as in a handbook, adopting or adapting parts of their value systems according to EU models, rethinking their relations to other people in their home country. Clearly, most of them accept the ways the visited HEI functioned as preferable, calling them normatively "the reality" or as one of the staff members put it: "Thank God, there are some people who see how it is *normal*" (Staff member, 1112-13, my italics). But as we will see in the remaining chapter, limitations may occur when you try to apply certain forms of knowledge gained during Erasmus Mundus stays abroad. Individually, all of the participants have enlarged their personal horizon, but what about sharing these experiences with others, namely, to disseminate what you have acquired in another context within your home context, where you are a full citizen? Above that, the wish to act as equal partners within newly created cross border collaboration networks is not at all easy to realize. At these points, the script often doesn't work as intended and the main questions are how do the discussants interpret these interruptions and what conclusions do they draw? Addressing the context at home with new ideas proves to be quite a challenge because it implies another concept of citizen which maybe in contrast to established patterns of citizenship in the countries of origin. Staying with the distinction between "active citizens" who "participate in scenes that are already created" (Isin 2008, 38) and activist citizens engaged in creating the scene, I will point to three examples, which show on the one hand how difficult it is to be creative in a way that really produces an "effect" and that show on the other hand that behavioural patterns or other ideals accepted as good citizenship are not necessarily accepted in other national contexts.

According to Isin, the creativity at play in actions of activist citizens goes hand in hand with questioning, altering or rupturing actual patterns of behaviour (habitus) which is not always welcomed by others. What the following examples will show is that one certain behavioural pattern can be framed either as participation in a scene, as the creation of a new scene or as something in between, depending on the (national) context.

In our group discussions one of our questions was what chances participants in Erasmus Mundus have or see in order to apply knowledge, practices or experiences in general after they had come back to their home institution. Unfortunately, during the students' discussion, we did not really touch upon this point, so all material is drawn from the discussion with teaching staff members. In their case, there was quite some agreement in several points, which I want to illustrate in the following, some of which reminding slightly of difficulties met by students in the application phase.

First of all, all participating staff members agreed that basically there is no problem to use the concrete scientific knowledge gained abroad in their classes, so transfer of knowledge in this sense goes unproblematic. If however you are changing teaching practices, things start looking differently. One professor had indeed changed her praxis of testing students. In her exams she accepts individual presentations instead of the traditionally written exam because she thinks that it is essential for her students in their professional life to know how to do a presentation. In fact, written exams are still the only officially accepted form to test students, so that she really breaks a convention:

> "I want to say that, okay, I have been to different universities both in Europe and in the US. Basically, I have implemented some teaching methods and methods of evaluation some time ago already, but some of them I apply in...like that... and I think when will somebody come and penalize me because I...
> "Yes, that's it"
> "I realize, I do the exam not in the form we are to do but in form of a presentation. […] While here [at our university, HZ], it is obligatory that all get the same identical exam. […] without paying attention which is the specific of the class, which is the finality of the class, even if everybody is talking about finalities. But you cannot evaluate them all in an absolutely identical way." (Staff members Moldova, 905-923)

Obviously inspired by several stays abroad, she has changed the way to test her students, so that her practice should be in accordance with the practice in the other contexts she had visited. Interestingly however, her change of practice back home remains effective only on the individual level: she is not trying to establish it on a higher scale, she is not calling for the discussion of the appropriate kind of exams in her discipline at her university. In that sense, she is not putting forward a claim, but simply rupturing her individual practice, seemingly not having suffered any sanctions so far but expecting them should her divergence be discovered one day. It is difficult then to appreciate whether her behaviour corresponds with what activist citizens do according to Isin and Nielsen, because the effect of this divergence or change in practice upon the relation between individuals and society remains a more or less latent, until it will be discovered one day.

As however this staff member has touched upon the subject of "finalities", the discussion takes an

interesting turn. Finalities is one important term throughout the Bologna process and so a whole passage evolves around the question in how far the Bologna process (to which Moldova had adhered within half a year) is used today as a means to legitimately further bureaucratise the HEI sector in Moldova without "really" implementing anything. The fact that some staff members have visited HEI in EU-countries has several implications: they see the differences between here and there, some speak of "our Bologna" and "their Bologna", alluding to the – from their point of view - purely formal implementation of the necessary reforms:

> "Like in this famous joke, when somebody asked the English: how come that you have these beautiful lawns? And its like: very simple – you just need to trim it every morning, for 400 years ((laughing)). That's it, well, if you do not have these traditions, let's say, that are passed from one generation to another, and you apply mechanically certain things you have seen here and here and there, it is very difficult." (Staff member from Moldova, 776-779)

> "Yes, so, there is this tendency to: we try to formalize as much as possible, everything we have.
> "And we tick that we
> "And we tick that we have done it
> "According to the Bologna process
> "Accordingly, exactly.
> "Don't you forget that we are registered ((laughing))
> "Anonymously." (Three staff members from Moldova, 963-976)

Aside from these critical observations, several participants describe how not only the Bologna process but also they as staff members are perceived in a rather hostile way:

> "The Bologna programme in the Republic of Moldova is, it doesn't look normal to them, it makes them angry. We believe that if you sincerely, let's say, yes, what also my colleagues said here somewhere, the modality to register at the faculty, the allocation of financial resources, the status of the university...and then if you go and say, well look how they do it elsewhere, you create yourself a lot of enemies ((laughing)) from above.
> "Who say to you: okay, you had a look, now shut up! ((laughing))
> "You had look, you walked around – now take a rest." (Four staff members Moldova, 709-723)

The last speaker creates a "we" and a "them" group: the stay abroad in EU countries (or the US, see above) represents a commonality, creates similar visions about what would be good as well as similar criticism vis à vis the prevailing system in their home country. So again, personally they have been convinced, they are even ready to correspond to their role as ambassadors and promote some aspects as worth a trial in their own context. So far, the aim of capturing some kind of "emotive commitment" (Turner 1994, see above) among the participants is achieved. This engagement is not very welcomed however and provokes even animosities with colleagues who have not travelled to the EU. The positive impressions cannot easily be made fruitful at home, the critical perception of their colleagues seems even to introduce or fortifying a divide of perceptions between how things work at home and how they work abroad: "...they have seen only Moscow, the same system, eventually Iaşi [Romania, HZ] and so on, but they do not know the system, for sure they think that what they do here is the centre of the universe, but...it's not" (Staff member, 824-827).

To sum it up, their stays abroad mean to a certain degree also a potential tension with colleagues from within the university administration as well as with colleagues from the teaching staff. While the EU intends to avoid new dividing lines between EU and non-EU countries on a large scale, on the level of Moldovan universities the fact that a part of the staff identifies with certain aspects of how HE can be organized opens a new dividing line among staff members. Commenting on the chances they see for changing the current situation in education in Moldova, their statements are pretty pessimistic. They see a need for comprehensive systematic changes, declaring them however as totally out of their reach, even if at the same time, some say that if not they themselves, nobody will produce these changes.

In conclusion one can say that despite insights in other contexts, despite identification with other ways of organizing HE, despite agreement on common critique and despite an HE environment in Moldova that at least officially is being reformed according to EU standards, it is difficult to effectively put forward new claims with reference to alter established patterns of doing things in HEI in Moldova and to become an activist citizen in this sense. To make the interface between individual staff members and a university work according to the model of activist citizenship presupposes a general societal context that is prepared and open to such kind of interventions including the self-perception of citizens as the ones, who are able to initiate change. Individuals coming up with new ideas or suggestions are perceived rather as enemies and perhaps even as alienated. From the point of view of EU external education policy as a means to create positive identification with its models and values, this represents however a success: the intended awareness raising, the building of a capital of goodwill is achieved. For the affected participants this goes hand in hand however with a feeling of alienation and power-lessness when back in the context of origin. Many of them have the feeling that they have the potential to change something but they feel blockaded, so that one could call them blockaded or potential activist citizens.

What then about the possibilities of intensifying contacts made during the stay abroad, in order to not loose the connection at all? Do they feel as

ISSN 1618-5293

emancipated members in the European space of higher education after their scholarship has ended, able to continue to knit their network, the incipient links between the EU and its new neighbours? The answer is negative. Nor are they able to accept invitations coming from the networks established during their stays abroad, neither do they feel able to invite colleagues from the EU to Moldova because there is no money with which to finance the most basic things for international guests like travel expenses, accommodation, food. Without any "carrot", they are convinced, nobody will come:

> "Cooperation exists but the main problem is finances, because, I think I have six or seven invitations already for conferences. But financially
> "You cannot accept them
> "And to invite them here, again from the financial point of view...the university does not have any accommodation, absolutely nothing, but only because of our beautiful eyes nobody no, you do not want to come here. Nobody comes. On their account." (Two staff members Moldova, 1469-1474)

To continue to act as "active citizens" according to the ideals formulated in European education policy, to foster the desired mutual relations proves to be difficult in an academic environment that the participants describe as by and large unchanged since the end of Soviet times. Above that, and as banal as it may appear, departing from the traditional paths in Moldovan educational and academic practices and following further the paths they got to know during their stays abroad depends like all fruitful academic travel on a financial backup which is not offered by either side.

4 Conclusions

The idea of European citizenship gained shape in the beginning by debating the need for establishing a European identity, it was about creating a sense of cultural belonging among citizens of the member states hoping that consequently they would be more interested in the political affairs of the Community and in contributing to the economic well-being. While EU-citizenship was established later also as a legal status, we can observe that in the EU's policies towards its "outside", towards the neighbouring countries, elements of the early citizenship approach pop up again without adding some kind of legal status. Among others in the framework of Erasmus Mundus, the EU tries to promote a sense of belonging by fostering the "mutual understanding" among EU and non-EU citizens, seeing participants in the exchange scheme as potential bearers of goodwill who will disseminate "European values" in their countries once they have returned and as potential workforce for the EU. As this approach is thought as a potential contribution to the goal of preventing new dividing lines between the EU and its neighbours and as the sense of belonging in terms of culture can be seen with many authors as one dimension of citizenship, the question arouses what exactly shall be the integrative effect of this policy on the level of individuals. Given the fact, that the level of emotive commitment represents but only one part of the dimension of belonging (the other being legal status), that the stays abroad are short and that on the level of whatever status nothing changes for the participants, I decided not to apply the notion of citizen. The remaining question then is what happens in the case that participants indeed develop the intended cultural ties, get convinced of another system, of the ways organizing things differently in education according to some model encountered in the EU? Empirical evidence suggests that in most cases it is difficult to invest or valorize the capital accumulated abroad beyond the individual level. Suggestions to change certain practices are rejected by colleagues, while others change their practices (of teaching) "clandestinely" without telling colleagues, anxious to be "discovered" and sanctioned one day. Furthermore, contacts established during the stay abroad are difficult to maintain and risk to get lost again or to remain isolated if there are no follow-up options neither on the part of the EU nor on the part of Moldova. Coming back home means in many respects to go back to the point of departure. So in the case that the cultural ties of belonging are not substantiated by personal contacts, these will be difficult to keep up and develop.

When belonging (like in citizenship e.g.) says something about the relation between an individual and a bigger community, the intention of Erasmus Mundus can be said to be twofold: firstly, it tries to establish a relation between non-EU citizens and an however existing EU identity/culture/value-system on one side. Secondly, the citizenship fragment of emotive commitment/the feeling of belonging which in the case of many participants indeed emerges or is strenghtened during the stay abroad shall be transferred in a disseminating manner into the non-EU context, it shall be put into relation to this context. While the first step is done quite smoothly, experiences of coming back home remind of returning into a "dead end street", into a context depicted as unchanged since the end of Soviet times. The participants see virtually no chance to contribute to change this situation or to put forward their claims for changes desirable from their point of view. The fact, that the group discussion in which the cited material was generated was the first occasion on which they exchanged their experiences in a bigger circle is telling therefore. The built up capital of goodwill risks to remain isolated instead of connective and with little effect beyond the very limited personal level.

ISSN 1618-5293

References

Abelson, Michael. 2005. A Europe of knowledge and the civic mission of universities. In: Tor Halvorsen & Atle Nyhagen (Eds.): The Bologna process and the shaping of the future knowledge societies: conference report from the third conference on knowledge and politics. University of Bergen, 18-20 May 2005, 64-69.

Adonnino, Pietro. 1985. A people's Europe. Reports from the ad hoc Committee. Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 7/85, Luxembourg.

Anderson, Benedict. 1996. Die Erfindung der Nation. Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts [Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism]. Frankfurt/Main, Campus.

Bellamy, Richard; Castiglione, Dario; Shaw, Jo (Eds.). 2006. Making European citizens. Civic inclusion in a transnational context. Hampshire, New York, Palgrave.

Bellamy, Richard; Castiglione, Dario; Shaw, Jo. 2006. Introduction: from national to transnational citizenship. In: Bellamy / Castiglione / Shaw (Eds.), 1-28.

Börzel, Tanja A.; Risse, Thomas. 2000. When Europe hits home: europeanization and domestic change. In: European Integration online papers (EioP) Vol. 4, No. 15 (http://eiop.or.at/eipo/texte/2000-015a.htm) last accessed 27.01.2013.

Commission. 1988. „A people's Europe“ (Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament), COM (88) 331 final, 07.07.1988.

Commission. 1997. Communication from the Commission „Towards a Europe of knowledge“. COM (97) 563 final, 12.11.1997.

Commission. 2004. Communication from the Commission: European Neighbourhood Strategy Paper. Com(2004) 373 final, 12.5.2004 [ENP].

Commission. 2004a. Communication from the Commission: The new generation of Community education and training programmes after 2006. COM(2004) 156 final.

Commission. 2012. Joint staff working document. Eastern partnership roadmap 2012-13: the multilateral dimension. SWD(2012) 108 final, 15.5.2012.

Commission. 2012a. Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013. Programme Guide for the attention and information of future applicants and beneficiaries. Version 12/2012.

Corbett, Anne. 2003. Ideas, institutions and policy entreprenneurs: towards a new history of higher education in the European Community. In: European Journal of Education, Vol. 38, No. 3, 315-330.

Council decision on Erasmus. 1987. Council Decision of 15 June 1987 adopting the European Community action scheme for the mobility of university students (Erasmus). 87/327/EEC. In: Official Journal L 166, 25/06/1987 P. 0020-0024.

Decision on Erasmus Mundus. 2003. Decision No 2317/2003/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 5 December 2003 establishing a programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries (Erasmus Mundus) (2004-2008).

Decision on Erasmus Mundus. 2008. Decision No 2298/2008/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 16 December 2008 establishing the Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013 action programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education and the promotion of intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries.

ESS. 2003. A secure Europe in a better world. European security strategy, Brussels, 12 December 2003.

Favell, Adrian. 2008. Eurostars and Eurocities. Free movement and mobility in an integrating Europe. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell.

Favell, Adrian; Recchi, Ettore. 2011. Social mobility and spatial mobility. In: Adrian Favell & Virginie Guiraudon (eds.): Sociology of the European Union. Hampshire: Palgrave macmillan, 50-75.

Findlay, Allan M.; Stam, Alexandra; Dundee; King, Russell; Ruiz-Gelices, Enric. 2005. International student opportunitites: searching for the meaning of student migration. In: Geographica Helvetica, Vol. 60, No. 3, 192-200.

Frediani, Carlo. 1992. La politique de la CEE en matière d'éducation et de culture [The politics in culture and education since the EEC]. Presses d'Europe.

Heater, Derek. 1999. What is citizenship? Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoskins, Bryony; Kerr, David. 2012. Final study summary and policy recommendations. Participatory citizenship in the European Union. Report 4, European Commission, Europe for cititzens programme, submitted 10th May 2012.

Hobsbawm, E.J. 1990. Nations and nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Canto.

Isin, Engin F.; Nielsen, Greg M. (eds.). 2008. Acts of citizenship. London, New York: Zed Books.

ISSN 1618-5293

Isin, Engin F. 2008. Theorizing acts of citizenship. In: Isin; Nielsen. 2008. 15-43.

Isin, Engin F.; Wood, Patricia K. 1999. Citizenship and identity. London: Sage.

Jařab, Josef. 2008. Reforming systems and institutions of higher learning. Towards the creation of a European and global higher education area. In: Education, citizenship and social justice, Vol. 3, 85-96.

Jöns, Heike. 2010. Academic travel from Cambrige University and the formation of centers of knowledge, 1885-1954. In: Peter Meusberger, David N. Livingstone, Heike Jöns (eds.): Geographies of science. [Knowlegde and space, Volume 3, Klaus Tschira Smposia], Heidelberg, London: Springer, 95-117.

King, Russell; Ruiz-Gelices, Enric. 2003. International student migration and the European 'year abroad': effects on European identity and subsequent migration behaviour. In: International Journal of Population Geography, 9, 229-252.

Korosteleva, Elena. 2012. The European Union and its Eastern neighbours. Towards a more ambitious partnership? New York: Routledge.

Lavenex, Sandra. 2008. A governance perspectve on the European neighbourhood policy: integration beyond conditionality? In: Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 15, No. 6, 938-955.

Lawn, Martin; Grek, Sotiria. 2012. Europeanizing education: governing a new policy space. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Medrano, Juan Díez. 2011. Social class and identity. In: Adrian Favell & Virginie Guiraudon (eds.): Sociology of the European Union. Hampshire: Palgrave macmillan, 28-49.

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. 2004. Soft power. The means to success in world politics. New York: Public Affairs.

Papatsiba, Vassiliki. 2006. Making higher education more European through student mobility? Revisiting EU initiatives in the context of the Bologna process. In: Comparative Education, Vol. 42, No. 1, 93-111.

Pépin, Luce. 2006. The history of European cooperation in education and training. Europe in the making – an example. Luxembourg, European Communities.

Resolution of the ministers for education meeting within the council of 16 November 1971 on cooperation in the field of education. Not published.

Sasse, Saskia. 2008. The European neighbourhood policy: conditionality reveisted for the Eastern partners. In: Europe-Asia Studies, Vol. 60, No. 2, 295-316.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2009. Europeanization beyond Europe. In: Living Reviews in European Governance, Vol. 4, No. 3, 5-28.

Schimmelfennig, Frank; Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2004) Governance by conditionality: EU rule transfer to the candidate countries of central and Eastern Europe. In: Journal of European Public Policy, Vol. 11, No. 4, 661-679.

Shaw, Jo. 2007. The transformation of citizenship in the European Union. Electoral rights and the restructuration of political space. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Shore, Cris (1993) Inventing the 'people's Europe': critical approaches to European community 'cultural policy'. In: Man, New Series Vol. 28, No 4 (December), 779-800.

Smith, Karen A. (2005) The outsiders: the European neighbourhood policy. In: International Affairs, 81, 4, 757-773.

Soysal, Yasemin N. 1994. Limits of citizenship. Migrants and postnational membership in Europe. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Soysal, Yasemin N. 2012. Post-national citizenship. Rights and obligations of individuality. In: Edwin Amenta, Kate Nash, Allan Scott (Eds.): The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to political sociology. Malden, Oxfod: Wiley-Blackwell, 383-393.

Turner, Bryan S. 1994. Postmodern culture/modern citizens. In: Steenbergen, Bart van (Ed.): The condition of citizenship. London: Sage, 153-168.

Vink, Maarten (2004) The unbearable lightness of European citizenship. In: Citizenship, social and economics education, Vol. 6, No. 1, 24-33.

Wiener, Antje. 1993. From special to specialized rights: the politics of citizenship and identity in the European Union. In: Michael Hanagan, Charles Tilly (Eds.): Extending citizenship, reconfiguring states. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 195-227.

Wiener, Antje. 2013. Towards global citizenship practice? In: Xavier Guillaume and Jef Huysmans (Eds.): Citizenship and security. London: Routledge, 75-94.

Endnotes

1 My thanks go to Pawel Karolewski and Timofey Agarin and an anonymous reviewer for their thorough and constructive comments on the first drafts of the paper.

2 I adopt here the perspective as it has been developed in the research project "Within a ring a secure third countries. Regional and local effects of the extraterritorial engagement of the European Union in Belarus, Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova", coordinated by Bettina Bruns at the Leibniz Institutue for Regional Geography, see [http://www.ifl-leipzig.de/en/research/project/detail/im_ring_sicherer_nachbarstaaten.html]. The empirical data I will refer to in this article have been generated in the framework of this project. We talked to students and staff who have all participated in Erasmus Mundus in 2008 and 2009. All the quotations are taken from the two discussions in Moldova, organized in March 2012, which were moderated by people from the local context. Interestingly, to organize group discussions in the field of education turned out to be more difficult in Belarus while in Ukraine it was totally impossible. All names and locations have been changed or are omitted.

3 We will see that on EUropean level, education in this sense and "vocational training" were treated differently from the beginning. Even if in most of the literature, education and vocational training are treated together, they are clearly distinguished as two different aspects, education identified much more or even exclusively as the task of single states, whereas vocational training due to its more obvious economic relevance being identified quite early as a matter of the community.

4 The phase of cooperation lasted roughly from the late 1960s until the mid 1980s.

5 [http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus/doc/stat/1011/report.pdf] p.14.

6 Consisting at that time in the European Coal and Steal Community, the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community.

7 [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/results_ compendia/selected_projects_action_2_en.php]