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Abstract
Since the Erasmus Mobility Programme was established, a primary goal has been to develop participants a European citizenship identity. However, few studies have empirically examined whether this identity develops during the Erasmus experience (Sigalas, 2010) and no studies have yet addressed the more fundamental questions of Erasmus participants’ primary citizenship identity – National, European, Global, or to something else – and how they understand this identity. Based on the analysis of interviews and surveys from students in 29 European countries and 160 different institutions, this study reveals that close to the same number of Erasmus students report primary citizenship identification to Europe as they do to their own country, and more than half hold a transnational citizenship identity. This paper also presents a typology of qualitatively distinct Erasmus student understandings of citizenship identity, revealing wide variation in conceptions. The paper concludes with a discussion of one particular category that suggests the emergence of the idea of an “Erasmus Citizen.”

Introduction
Unprecedented and indeed “revolutionary” changes are shaping the current reality of higher education around the world (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley, 2009, p. i) and comprehending the meaning and implication of these shifts is a deeply challenging task that requires dedicated research and reflection in the future (Altbach and Teichler, 2001). A major part of these changes has been the substantial increase in study abroad and mobility worldwide, particularly in the United States and Europe, and their importance in the political agendas of many countries (European Parliament, 2010; Open Doors, 2010; Rivza and Teichler, 2007; Wuttig, 2009). Within the current context of expansive higher education change, the activity of study abroad and mobility lies at the very heart of globalization trends and internationalization efforts of governments and educational institutions and is touted as one of the “success stories of higher education in the last millennium” (Altbach and Teichler, 2001, p. 10).

In his 2009 discussion, “Global Citizenship and Study Abroad: A European Comparative Perspective,” Hans deWit stated that, “Europeans have felt themselves to be global citizens to a greater degree than their American equivalents. Only in recent years has there been a drive to create a European citizenship (291).” This assertion touches upon two assumptions that have been important drivers in the increase of study abroad in recent decades in both contexts. On the U.S. side, that study abroad will develop students into global citizens (Lutterman-Aguilar and Gingerich, 2002; Streitwieser & Light, 2010; Streitwieser & Light, under review; Woolfe, 2009; Zemach-Bersin, 2009), and on the European side the idea that Erasmus experience will develop in participants a sense of European citizenship identity (EU Commission 2008; Sigalas, 2009, 2010; Teichler and Maiworm, 1997). Both terms—global citizenship and European identity—are ubiquitous, highly contested and their use in attracting students to study
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1 The first author wishes to acknowledge the support of a Fulbright Senior Research Fellowship in 2010-2011 and the generosity of Professor Juergen Schriewer and his colleagues at the Centre for Comparative Education and the Abteilung Internationales (ORBIS) at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin.
abroad and mobility on both continents is questionable. As DeWit’s statement suggests, exactly how these particular notions of citizenship are being used to attract students to study abroad and mobility needs to be more deeply investigated.

The notion of citizenship has long been a historically contested, highly complex, often changing and diversely understood social construction (Carter, 2001; Davies, 2006; Everson & Preuss, 1995; Roman, 2003). At best, it is defined through a confluence of each individual’s political and social context and the resulting personal and idiosyncratic worldview to which they ascribe. The most common theme has been the simple idea that citizenship means individuals are part of a political community. In Europe, since the 1957 signing of Articles 8-8e of the Rome Treaty on the European Economic Community, all who were nationals of a Member State were also considered to be citizens of the Union. This citizenship later became formally and legally established with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in February of 1992. Even so, any analysis has to keep in mind that the continent is extremely diverse in terms of national, regional, linguistic, educational, political and socio-economic differences (DeWit, 2006).

Study abroad and mobility programs seek to develop a range of intercultural competencies (Hammer et al, 2003; Deardorff, 2006; 2009), including an awareness of the concept of citizenship identity (Dolby, 2004; Stearns, 2009; Woolf, 2009; Zemach-Bersin, 2009). In Europe, the notion of citizenship is embodied foremost in the Bologna Process’ flagship mobility program, ‘Erasmus’ (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students). While concepts of European citizenship have been explored widely in the scholarly literature (Carter, 2001; Davies, 2006; Habermas 1993), mobility students’ conceptions have been less researched (DeWit, 2009; Streitwieser & Wang, 2007; Streitwieser and Light, under review). Knowledge of student’s ideas of citizenship is still largely anecdotal and based upon assumptions that are not often strongly supported by empirical evidence.

Student Conceptions of International Experience (SCIE) Study
The study on Erasmus students arose from a parallel study at Northwestern University: Student Conceptions of International Experience (SCIE)² (Streitwieser and Light, under review).

The first author of this paper secured a grant to engage in similar research with a sample of students in Europe engaging in mobility in Erasmus. Students in the Erasmus Mobility Programme were selected primarily because of the program’s scope and relevance in Europe and because of the relative similarity in student characteristics in terms of age and educational context to those we studied in the U.S. (Byram & Dervin, 2008). In Europe, popular reference to the ‘Erasmus Generation’ has become increasingly common. This study concerns itself with whether this so-called Erasmus Generation is characterized by a distinctive sense of European identity. There is little empirical research to show whether European citizenship identity does develop during the Erasmus experience (Sigalas, 2009; 2010). And, no study has addressed the more fundamental question of how Erasmus participants attribute their primary citizenship identity—National, European, Global, or to something else—and how they understand citizenship identity. If the development of a European identity is important for Erasmus policy makers, then a necessary starting point is to first understand how participants conceive such citizenship. As Everson and Preuss advocated over 15 years ago, “Any study of the emergent notion of Union Citizenship should simply accept that the ‘peoples of Europe’ possess a great variety of understandings of the concept of citizenship. Future research should consequently seek honestly to identify such

² The authors wish to acknowledge the funding for SCIE from Northwestern’s Buffett Center for International and Comparative Studies and the Searle Center for Teaching Excellence.
conceptions, and should only then assess their likely impact upon the emerging notion of Union citizenship (1995, 48; italics added)."

Two principle research questions have guided this study. 1) What are Erasmus students’ primary identifications of citizenship; and 2) What are the differences in their conceptions, or understandings, of citizenship and how do they map onto the four primary identifications of citizenship noted above.

The Erasmus Programme: Establishing a Sense of European Citizenship Identity

The Erasmus program enables Europeans to spend 3-12 months studying in another European country. Currently, there are 31 participating countries. Between 1997 and 2008 over 1.5 million students, close to two thirds of all mobile students in the European Union, and two thousand tertiary institutions were engaged in Erasmus exchange opportunities (Kritz, 2006). Erasmus has been described as “the single most successful component of EU policy” (Altbach and Teichler, 2001, p. 10) and “a social and cultural phenomenon” in its own right (British Council, 2009).

When Erasmus was first established in 1987, one of its primary goals was that participants be distinguished by a practical working knowledge of European-wide ways of doing business, working, behaving and thinking. The idea was to assist students in developing competencies and tangible links that would imbue them with the feeling of being part of Europe and, over time, strengthen the Union and make it a more attractive place to study and work (deWit, 2009; Everson and Preuss, 1995; Wuttig, 2009). In addition, the program wanted to diversify the student population, make the educational system more open and competitive, and develop the personal contacts and knowledge gains that students could bring home and utilize professionally (DeWit, 2009; Kritz, 2006; Green Paper, 2009). In contrast to American study abroad goals related to national security, foreign policy, and combating an image of Americans as parochial (Stearns, 2009), European mobility also included the goal of fostering a European citizenship identity (DeWit, 2009; Green paper, 2009). As Sigalas (2010) has stated, “it is clear that international student mobility and direct contact were meant to create a European identity” (p. 242).

Methods

Sample

To address the question of Erasmus student citizenship identity, 45 semester and yearlong Erasmus students were interviewed and 244 students completed open-ended surveys. The sample represented two populations: Europeans from throughout Europe studying at either the Humboldt Universitaet or the Freie Universitaet in Berlin for a semester or a full year and coming from 29 countries and 141 different higher education institutions, and Germans from those same two institutions studying in 18 different European countries for the same period of time.

Methodology

3 Interviewed students came from Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey.

4 Surveyed students came from Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, *Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, *Kazakhstan, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, *Russia, *Scotland, *Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey. Note that countries marked with an asterix do not have Erasmus ‘National Agencies.’

5 Please contact the author for a list of the individual institutions since they are too many to include here.
The study was guided by the Theory of Variation (Marton & Booth, 1997) and the research method, Phenomenography. Phenomenography is “the empirical study of the limited number of qualitatively different ways in which we experience, conceptualize, understand, perceive, [or] apprehend various phenomena (Marton 1994, p. 4424).” The strength of phenomenography is that by deeply understanding how learners think about and approach a particular educational experience, policy makers and educators gain empirically derived, in-depth insight into how their inputs (teaching, programming) lead to better outputs (learning, meaningful experiences). There are four critical assumptions in Variation Theory. These are that 1) People understand and approach learning differently; 2) these different understandings/"conceptions" can be empirically documented; 3) there is a hierarchy of complexity of understanding; and 4) knowing this we can teach, prepare and train better, move people from less to more complex conceptions over time (Marton & Booth, 1997; Micari, Light, Calkins and Streitwieser, 2007).

Data Collection
German students were interviewed and surveyed online (using SurveyMonkey) upon returning from abroad. They filled out the surveys at the end of the first semester abroad. Non German students were interviewed and surveyed in the first months of their Erasmus experience. The interviews followed a semi-structured protocol developed as part of SCIE (above) but modified with questions about European citizenship for the Erasmus student study. All discussions were digitally audio-recorded and lasted between 30 and 90 minutes. The citizenship questions were posed near the end of both of the interview and the survey (see below).

**Interview question**
“In light of your mobility experience, how do you identify yourself most comfortably: as a national citizen, European citizen, global citizen or otherwise?

How would you explain and define your understanding?”

**Survey question**
29. First and foremost I identify myself as, and feel most comfortably like, a:

–Citizen of my country (example: I am French, English, Slovenian, Turkish, etc)
–European Citizen
–Global Citizen (Weltbuerger, Erdenbuerger)
–Other (your own definition)

30. Please explain your choice to the above question.

Data Analysis
The interviews were transcribed. The interviewer (first author) also took notes during the discussion. Details from notes and transcription were transferred into an Excel sheet for analysis, as were the responses to the survey. The first researcher read through the qualitative data in four separate iterations: 1) to write an initial description of the primary citizenship identification as framed by the four choices (national, European, global and ‘other’); 2) to identify initial variations within each choice of citizenship; 3) to summarize the descriptions of each conception type; and 4) to constructed a table of the general conceptual variations identified on the broad notion of citizenship, beyond the four initial citizenship types offered (Akerlind 2005).
Each pass through the data involved pulling out and summarizing variations in understanding that were emerging from the analysis and succinctly trying to describe them to include all possible meanings into the individual category. The conceptions were then supported with selected student excerpts drawn from the raw survey and interview data. Steps three and four were discussed at length with the second researcher in order to member check (Patton, 2002). In those discussions of the data, both researchers reviewed one another’s coding for variation within the sample by carefully examining each individual respondent’s excerpts and asking whether the categories that seem to be related consistently fit together or were in fact different distinct categories or subcategories. In the same way, the researchers checked one another’s analysis to verify whether the selected quotes supported each category of conception.

Findings

Primary Citizenship Identification.

The close-ended survey responses indicated that the majority of the Erasmus students' primary identification of citizenship was distributed nearly evenly between their national citizenship and the idea of European citizenship: 36% indicated a national citizenship identity first and 38% indicated a European citizenship identity first (see Figure I below). The remaining students split between 14% choosing a global citizenship identity first and 13% selecting ‘Other’ as their preference, thereby essentially rejecting the first three categories that were offered.
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Figure 1: Erasmus Students and Primary Citizenship Identification

In some cases, the reasons given for selecting the “other” category concerned the very concept of citizenship as being defined in terms of geographical locations and borders. A number of students rejected this assumption by stating, in the words of one, “I don’t want to identify myself with any term of
citizenship, since I believe the citizenship is a theoretical term which defines a person by setting cultural, territorial and political limits” (a Polish student). Most of these students, however, accepted the geographical assumption but chose “other” because it was not specific to their identity – instead preferring their identity be tied to a city, to a European region, or to multiple identities, for example French and European (see table 1 below).

Table 1 also describes the variety of reasons why students chose their primary citizenship identity. Many of the reasons are similar across the different types of citizenship, such as a perceived idea of value associated with the type of citizenship, but some are particular to the type. Students indicated global citizenship for example, because in encompassing the whole world, it suggested an idea of citizenship without borders or frontiers and values of universal equality. On the other end of the spectrum, identification with one’s nation state was often chosen for reasons that included the identity would be expected of them (i.e., they are French because they have a French accent), it is inevitable and/or sticking with their passport identity is just most simple. European identity, on the other hand, was chosen because for some it was regarded as a new or modern identity which represented the future they as young people (and presumably as Erasmus students) identified with.

Table 1:
Primary Citizenship Identity: Reasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. National Citizenship</th>
<th>2. European Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Inevitable identification</td>
<td>1. Modern European value identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection unrealistic; family, friends, cultural nationality &amp; language defines you; like it or not.</td>
<td>Typical Euro values, &amp; behavior, even manners, are also mine Erasmus; it’s where my friends are (home is where the heart is); we are a new, young! Generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Simplest Identification</td>
<td>2. Future Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU too different, too complicated; can be myself; background complicated so I just defer to my passport.</td>
<td>EU Pride! EU Belongingness; We have to make EU succeed; it’s where my future lies; Europhile; trust in the EU; All the EU benefits; administrative advantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expected Identification</td>
<td>3. Travel Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National ID is expected of me; how others define me I go along.</td>
<td>I’m all over Europe; Tied to multiple EU countries; regional identification; Widely traveled, speak many languages, can participate everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accentuated Identification</td>
<td>4. Negative Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight my own nation and national identity; Emphasizes similarities with my nationality; focuses my attention on national events (good and bad).</td>
<td>Shame of or discomfort w/ my own country; prefer ‘loneliness’ of EU anonymity to national identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Emotional Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesickness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Global Citizenship</th>
<th>4. ‘Other’ Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heritage Identification</td>
<td>1. Specificity Identification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizen profile from parents; I’m a hybrid of many cultures.</td>
<td>City (urban) identity; Regional identity (culturally &amp; linguistically similar countries e.g. Northern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Borderless identification**
   Citizenship within borders is wrong definition; Rejection of borders, not being limited by borders.

3. **Global value identification**
   Global posture toward others, world; It’s about human values & attitudes which we all share; EU and World think alike/human.

4. **Travel Identification**
   Travel, exposure; travelled around the world; I'm comfortable w/ all; I can make it anywhere.

5. **Liberation identification**
   Europe is too small for me; My future is beyond Europe; EU excludes, Gone too far not to be Global Citizen now.

European); Individual ID first: me on my own.

2. **Multiple Identification**
   I represent several types; Depends where I am; my mood; community/context I'm in.

3. **No Identification**
   Definition is the problem; Rejection of any citizenship ID or label; I'm just a human being; my ID is problematic, Irrelevant; humanity matters.

---

**Conceptions of Citizenship**

Student responses on the interviews and to the open ended survey item asking them to describe their experience and understanding of the citizenship they identified as primary to themselves revealed four basic types of student conceptions of citizenship. These are illustrated in Table 2, below. Each of the four types of conceptions are qualitatively distinct from one another, and differentiated by a key ‘aspect of variation’ which describes that main difference.
Table 2:
A General Typology of Erasmus Students’ Conceptions of Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Default</th>
<th>Idealized</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views citizenship as:</td>
<td>matter of fact; based on simple criteria, a default reaction, uncritical</td>
<td>idealized, typically negatively defined by other non-ideal citizenships</td>
<td>positive commitment to the ideal of a geographic and cultural entity</td>
<td>problematic, challenging and unsettled concept to be critiqued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of Variation</td>
<td>Uncritical acceptance</td>
<td>Negative comparison</td>
<td>Positive engagement</td>
<td>Systemic critique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Default Conception
A student who holds a Default Conception of citizenship understands it in an uncritical and matter-of-fact way. Their understanding of the notion is based on simple, unquestioned criteria related to their background which are often derived in a default, unreflective manner. The following student excerpts illustrate these characteristics. These students describe their choices in terms of simple benchmarks they feel they share with others in the citizenship group. These criteria simply function to make them who they are via “language”, “upbringing”, and “values”. They are national if they have lived most of their life in one country, but if they have multiple nationalities in their background, they may identify at European or even at a global level.

- I generally do not think about it. (Belgian - National citizenship identification)
- I find it very difficult to answer otherwise, as language and cultural upbringing follows you through thick and thin. (Danish - National)
- European citizen because European people have a common history, relative common events through the past, and share some values. (French - European)
- My mother is turkish My father is french Í was born in ger many Í live in turkey Í lived also in argentina So.. is there any other choice than feeling global? (Turkish - Global)

Idealized Conception
A student with an Idealized Conception of citizenship understands citizenship as something meaningful, which he or she regards as more ideal in contrast to negative comparisons to less than ideal forms of citizenship. Such negatively constructed conceptions may be to problems they associate with their own country (financial woes, internal strife, or unflattering “stereotypes”) or to concerns they may ascribe to broader, more abstract forms of citizenship (the EU as a “bureaucratic monster” or to the idea of borders as “toxic”).

- There is no real European identity since Europe only exists at Brussels and Strasbourg. It is far away and I perceive it as a bureaucratic monster. (French – National citizenship identification)

---

Student excerpts are identified by student nationality and the primary citizenship type with which they identify. They are not corrected for grammar or spelling.
During my time here in Edinburgh I have still come across lots of stereotypes regarding German people, that - in my opinion - can still be traced back to Nazi Germany. Therefore I sometimes hesitated to tell people where I am from and almost wished to be able to tell them something different. This is why, I would rather like to call myself a "European Citizen". (German – European)

Frontiers are toxic and somehow artificial, made up. they do not exist in my head. they lead to a lot of trouble, and it is possible to see differences without refering to countries or cultures like this test does. i srONGLy reject th is view. (German - Global)

Commitment Conception
A student with a Commitment Conception of citizenship understands citizenship as being required to make a positive commitment to the ideal of a geographic and cultural entity. Their more positively constructed conception of citizenship is contrasted with the previous, more negative conception of citizenship in so far as it requires going beyond simply the rejection of a comparison to actually fully engaging in the citizenship. This may mean overcoming problems, “dualistic thinking” in one own country; exploring new “languages and cultures”; developing “pride” and new “friends,” or integrating “various identities.”

The belgian politics make a belgian identity almost problematic. in this way I tend to stress my 'belgianness' in order to break with the dualistic thinking (vlaams- waals) that rules nowaday in my country. (Belgian – National citizenship identification)

I am learning the languages and cultures and am a europhile. I like french film and german, I know foreign politics better than english, I want the Euro in England, I am European. (English – European)

We (young people, student, open minded people) are able to go on with Europa. We can follow the dream that we can believe in Europa. Now i'm european citizen, i'm speaking three languages. The most of my friends are european. now, i can say that i understand differents european cultures. And finally, i'm proud of europa we have to go on with it. (French - European)

Originally from Bulgaria, I am a student in England and Erasmus-student in Germany, while my parents live in Germany now and my friends live all around the world, especially in various European countries….I support the opinion that one can have various identities in the same time, and can feel e.g. first and foremost European when outside Europe, and first and foremost of his own nationality when within Europe (Bulgarian – European)

Problem Conception
A student who holds a Problem Conception of citizenship understands citizenship as a problematic, challenging and unsettled concept. Their conception of citizenship is based on a critical construction of the notion. These students are not comfortable settling with one of the definitions on offer and instead systemically critique the concept of labels and boundaries altogether or have proposed their own understanding. This may reveal itself in a rejection of “frontiers", non-egalitarian entities, theoretical definitions, and limiting “mindsets”.

I am a Global Citizen, and an European one, but there are many things that make me different from others... I dont believe in frontiers, in the European Government, but I believe in cultures and identities. (Spanish - National)

I have always been really open minded, but an experience like a study period aborad made me aware of many things, such as the fact that people cannot be judjed according to their country or their culture, and that it is possible to get in touch with everyone, if we try. Enjoing the Erasmus
experience I have learnt not to ask “where are you from?” but “what do you do?” or “what do you like?”, and the same are doing the people I got in touch with. (Italian - Global)

• I don’t want to identify myself with any term of citizenship, since I believe the citizenship is a theoretical term which defines a person by setting cultural, territorial and political limits. (Polish - Other)

• …I am very aware of how my personality and values are formed through the German, maybe even European society and mindset, but I sometimes find that very limiting….I have never consciously felt a sort of national identity and it is a charming idea calling oneself a global citizen, but on the other hand I think calling oneself a global citizen neglects the differences that do exist between the people in the world in terms of privileges. I do seek for a world where theses differences grow smaller, but as it is now I think it would be naive and ignorant to call myself that …never having experienced hunger, war, threat or other living conditions that hinder me from meeting basic needs. I cannot relate to any of the categories named above. (German - Other)

Discussion
These data indicate that over half (52%) of the Erasmus students in this sample are not primarily bound to citizenship connected to their own nations of birth - 38% identify primarily as European citizens and 14% as Global Citizens. To some substantive degree, they have transcended their national consciousness.

Even more interesting, perhaps, are the ways in which students understand citizenship, which vary from rather unreflective acceptance of key characteristics to much more critical interaction with the concept of citizenship itself. These types of conception, moreover, cut across the range of primary citizenship identifications. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the types of conceptions revealed in this study map unevenly across the categories of primary citizenship identification. Preliminary analysis of the data in this study indicate that students with Type I and Type II understandings of citizenship appear to identify more readily with national citizenships, while those with Type III and Type IV conceptions appear to identify more often with categories of European or Global citizenship.

The latter, more complex, understandings of citizenship may perhaps explain at a deeper level why many students were able to transcend their own national consciousness to identify with broader and more abstract notions and locations of citizenship. Indeed, the Erasmus students exhibiting commitment and even problem conceptions towards the idea of European citizenship may not only be described as part of the “Erasmus generation” but, even more appropriately, as “Erasmus citizens.”

Conclusion: The Erasmus Citizen
The emergence of this idea of the “Erasmus citizen” may be described in relationship to earlier descriptions by Everson & Preuss of an “associative relationship of citizenship”. Such an idea of citizenship they write:

…reveals an institutional ideal which appears only attainable if the values embodied in the concept of citizenship are, as it were, transferred into a sphere where these values are perhaps not endemic. The ‘academic citizen’ may be such a case…[but] further research is likely to
discover quite different cases for the associative dimension of citizenship." (Everson & Preuss, 1995, 56)

We feel that this research has begun to uncover some of these other cases. Indeed, we are suggesting that the Erasmus experience and being part of the Erasmus generation lets one go beyond being a good national or even a good European citizen. At certain levels of understanding it engages students in committing to an on-going, unsettled and changing idea of citizenship which transfers them into another sphere of thought, value and action.
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