

**What kind of citizenship for whom? The ‘refugee crisis’ and the European Union’s conceptions of citizenship**

## **Abstract**

The EU plays a dominant role in coordinating the responses to the massive inflow of refugee-migrants into Europe; consequently, the conceptions of citizenship and future integration which are embedded in its policies are significant. We explore and analyse the key EU education policy documents that refer to immigrants to identify the forms of citizenship attributed to various types of incomers by the EU. Our analysis demonstrates that the EU's conception of refugee-migrants is more closely affiliated with the notion of 'Global citizens' rather than with that of 'European citizens'. Furthermore, we suggest that the EU distinguishes and navigates between various migratory flows, namely internal-European, desired external-European and undesired external-European (refugee-migrants), each associated with a distinctive conception of citizenship as well as with related policy discourses. In the light of the migratory flows into Europe, the particularistic conceptions of citizenship shaping the EU's educational policy carry considerable implications for the future integration of refugee-migrants in Europe.

## **Introduction**

Humanitarian crises are events in which threats to life, physical safety, health or basic subsistence goes beyond the coping capacity of individuals and the communities in which they reside (Martin, Weerasinghe, & Taylor, 2014). Frequently, this results in migratory flows of people within and between countries, as people seek shelter and elementary living conditions. Large scale cross-border migratory flows require coordinated mechanisms of international protection and support. According to the United Nation's 'International Migration Report 2017' (UN, 2017), the number of international migrants worldwide rose by approximately 70% during the period of 2005-2017, reaching a staggering 258 million people. In parallel, migration flows often touch upon issues such as human rights, humanitarian and development principles, cooperation and burden sharing, among others (Martin, Weerasinghe, & Taylor, 2014). Most migrants are not able or willing to return to their home countries and therefore pursue the status of refugees in a host country. In their quest for fundamental protection and a better life, many refugees seek sanctuary in developed countries (UN, 2017).

The European humanitarian crisis, or as it is commonly termed 'refugee crisis' (a label which clearly identifies the refugees as the source of the problem), intensified in 2015 with a dramatic increase in the number of migrant-refugees seeking asylum in the European Union (EU) following the conflicts in Syria and Iraq (Trauner, 2016). While EU member states respond independently to the inflow of migrant-refugees entering their national borders, the EU has played an active role in formulating a coordinated effort aimed at coping with the pressing needs of migrant-refugees, as well as of EU member states.

EU policy measures towards these migration patterns are woven within a wider context of attitudes towards states' participation in the EU community, particularly in regards to citizenship and social justice. The recent crisis has exacerbated several notable longstanding tensions which include: the challenge of coordinating national and EU-level responses to the crisis (especially with regard to burden-sharing); the struggle for leadership and policy coherence among and within the EU institutions as they seek a common and effective response; and, the tension between interests and values of various stakeholders (Murray & Longo, 2018). These tensions have created a major problem for the EU as it attempts to solidify and strengthen the collective EU identity and foster collaboration whilst facing decreased acceptance and cooperation from member states.

From the perspective of the EU that tension is partly addressed through the notion of EU citizenship, which is held automatically by all nationals of the EU member states on top of their national citizenship since the Treaty of Maastricht. The EU citizenship project has been slowly developed and consolidated primarily through various practical educational measures within member states' education systems, as well as within the EU's flagship educational programme – Erasmus+ aimed to “support education, training, youth, and sport in Europe” (Erasmus + official website). Banai and Kreide (2017) argue that these measures are being challenged by the newcomers to the EU region as the pressures arising from the migration crisis within nation states has created ambivalence towards, and are in conflict with, the principles of inclusion and universality that underpin the EU's conception of citizenship. This study identifies the EU's construction of citizenship/s as it relates to immigrants and analyses these with reference to the main conceptualisations of citizenship they navigate between– namely global and European citizenships.

Both global and European citizenship represent non-national models of the contract between individuals and their society (Marshall, 2009). The contestation between the two conceptions has been extensively debated in the literature (e.g., Jamieson, 2002; Keating, Ortloff, & Philippou, 2009); however, the ways they have been appropriated to deal with the reality of the European migration crisis is significant and largely underexplored, especially in the context of education. In this study, we explore depictions of citizenship shaping the EU's education policy, through an analysis of key education policy documents published by the EU agencies which attempt to deal with immigrants; we codify, compare and evaluate competing depictions of citizenship as portrayed in the documents. We also examine those education policy documents which specify funding priorities and examine the criteria by which funds are allocated . This study therefore sheds light on the shifting nature of the conceptions of citizenship and their operationalisations in EU education policy during the period when migration levels increased rapidly and were a major source of concern within nation states. Below we discuss the various conceptions of citizenship and then outline our approach. Then we discuss the findings and conclude.

## **Citizenship: National, Regional and Global conceptions**

Turner (1993) defines citizenship as ‘as set of social practices which define the nature of social membership’ (p. 4). Most individuals engage as citizens and as active participants in society within their local communities (Osler, 2011). Moreover, most people are educated about citizenship within the confines of their local state education systems (Bromley, 2011). The underlying regulative ideal of citizenship – a promise of moral, legal, political and social equality within the polity has been traditionally dependent on legal membership in the polity and its geographical borders (Banai & Kreide, 2017). Accordingly, Robertson (2016) argues that national education systems purposely acted as facilitators of social encounters between people and between groups at the national level, with the purpose of building a shared culture and ethos, as well as their internal reproduction mechanisms.

Notwithstanding the primacy of nationally based conceptions of citizenship they have been challenged by the introduction and immersion of new non-national conceptions. This is due to dynamic social and historical contexts, such as: the relations between colonial powers and colonised entities (Connell, 2012); globalisation and international educational reforms (Steiner-Khamsi, 2014); and, large scale population movements, including migration crises (Martin, Weerasinghe, & Taylor, 2014). Insofar as the familiar thick construction of national citizenship is destabilised and transformed, novel non-national formations of citizenship have emerged, encompassing regional, transnational and global classifications (McLaughlin, 1992). Delanty (2000) defined post-national models of citizenship as ‘any form of citizenship not exclusively defined by the nation state’ (pp. 64–65); the most prominent examples of such constructs are European and global citizenship.

Robertson (2011) notes that the augmentation of such forms of citizenship suggests the emergence of new polities, along with their novel boundaries, legal structures and rights regimes. Within this new space, which is not entirely national nor international, governments, organisations and individuals maneuver and negotiate the meaning of citizenship (Sassen, 2008). Key conceptual structures are created, epistemological and ontological boundaries are formulated, and the conceptions of citizenship are insulated and demarcated. This process raises questions concerning the sense of belonging, identity, responsibility and loyalty of people (Engel, 2014), underpinned by discourses concerning inclusion, social justice, human rights and

civic engagement. These tensions illustrate that citizenship remains a contested idea, continuously reconstructed through negotiations between competing ideologies.

Nonetheless, the evidence as to how non-national forms of citizenship are incorporated into education policy suggest that they are closely related to and defined by reference to national sovereignty and state authority (Gerrard, 2017). The European humanitarian crisis is situated precisely in the midst of this intersection. Whilst the EU champions universal access to social justice and inclusiveness as the pillars of the social contract between Europeans and these values are incorporated in its education policies; in parallel the nation states often pursue an agenda that offers limited protection for vulnerable populations such as the migrant-refugees originating from crisis-driven countries (Sexsmith & McMichael, 2015). These tensions are inevitably mirrored and impact upon the depictions of and attitudes towards education in the EU community and its member states. Below we elaborate the basic notions of European and Global citizenship in the context of education.

The roots of the idea for European citizenship derive from the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 which promoted European Citizenship and began a mechanism for its reproduction through education; various attempts have since been made to align European education systems with it and thus promote European integration (Olson, 2011). The ‘Production’ of European-minded citizens, engaged with the community and committed to European culture and values now constitutes a main policy objective of the EU (Robertson, 2016). The concept of European Citizenship has been primarily operationalised as a form of ‘Active Citizenship’, which is articulated as an expectation that individuals engage and participate in democracy as a means of achieving social and economic outcomes at the national and supranational levels (Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009). Scholars have explored the multifaceted nature of European citizenship and critiqued it for: creating an exclusive entity under the guise of an open, democratic and inclusive society (Olson, 2011); focusing on an economically oriented conception of citizenship (Ververi, 2017); and for promoting well informed but passive and depoliticised citizens (Robertson, 2016).

Notably, the EU citizenship project, established key universal values shared by the EU community. Among those values are respect for human rights, diversity and pluralism, and an anti-discriminatory approach to the ‘other’ (Keating, 2009). The EU citizenship project has undergone several developmental stages; in its recent phase (post-Maastricht), EU citizenship is seen as dissociated from a geographical territory, a construct depicted as multifaceted, civic

oriented and largely a post-national one (Bîrzéa, 2000; Keating, 2009). With respect to its foundational pillars, EU citizenship is portrayed as based upon universal values such as human rights, equality, democracy, 'fair globalisation' and inclusion (Likic-Brboric, 2011). However as EU citizenship requires prior citizenship of one of the EU countries, it does not encompass people who are not EU nationals.

As the European Commission (1996) specifies, education policies designed to promote citizenship in the EU region should incorporate the following dimensions: (i) the recognition of the dignity and centrality of the human person; (ii) social citizenship, social rights and responsibilities, the struggle against social exclusion; (iii) egalitarian citizenship, that is, the rejection of discrimination and prejudice based on gender and ethnicity; understanding the value of equality; (iv) intercultural citizenship: the value of diversity and openness for a plural world; (v) ecological citizenship (1996, p. 17). Keating (2009) notes that those underlying principles indicate that rights are not exclusively derived from the nation-state, but are generated by broader frameworks such as the EU's. From this perspective, the political identity of EU citizens is based on a combination of civic principles as opposed to national borders (EC, 1996) and a global vision of European society (Bîrzéa, 2000).

European citizenship defines EU citizens as those simultaneously holding national identity and citizenship, as well as membership in the broader European community (Welge, 2014). The current state of affairs stipulates that only nationals of EU member states are granted EU citizenship, not as a replacement for their national one but as a complementary status (Scherz & Welge, 2015). EU citizens thus benefit not only from transferable supranational rights across the EU region, but also from local rights granted by EU member states in which they choose to reside. However, there is no standardised system for naturalisation in the EU, thus member states are sovereign to establish their own naturalisation processes (Scherz & Welge, 2015). Consequently, access to EU citizenship is automatically granted to citizens of EU member states, nevertheless access to EU member-states is a local state matter, making access to EU citizenship for non-EU member-states nationals a matter out of the direct reach of the EU. As refugees are not considered EU citizens until they become a citizen of a member state the question emerges as to what other forms of citizenship (specifically forms of global citizenship) are anticipated for them in official EU policies.

In parallel with the emergence of European citizenship over the past few decades the concept of Global Citizenship (GC), which embodies a wide range of meanings (Authors, 2017a), has become prominent. It is associated with various antecedents including: education for environmental concerns and sustainability; the promotion of multicultural societies and intercultural understanding; an outcome of globalisation and the international economic race; and a vessel for the integration of immigrants in national societies and the promotion of social cohesion. With regard to the latter, GC has been notably affiliated with educational responses to various turbulent social and political processes such as those undergone by post-conflict societies (Davies, 2006; Quaynor, 2015), post-national societies (Ramirez & Meyer, 2012), and refugee education (Dryden-Peterson, 2016). Despite this multidimensionality, education designed to promote GC has become an international educational trend that has been explored in various contexts, much broader than that of the European citizenship concept (Authors, 2017b). Unlike EU citizenship which draws its legitimacy from an established and powerful supranational organisation, GC lacks a binding legal structure and political affinity although it, and its derivatives such as Global skills and competencies, are actively promoted (and measured) by global agencies such as the UNESCO and OECD (Jimenez, Lerch, & Bromley, 2017; Pigozzi, 2006). Currently the OECD is promoting and measuring global competencies on the grounds that these will provide young people the skills to deal with the consequences of globalisation, technological change and movements of people.

Global citizenship and related terms such as cosmopolitanism, global-mindedness, global consciousness, and world citizenship have been in use for centuries (Oxley & Morris, 2013; Unterhalter, 2008), but while previously these concepts were abstract, today they comprise part of attempts made by various stakeholders worldwide to define new forms of citizenship that accompany and sometimes replace previous nation-based forms (Oxley & Morris, 2013). Several reviews addressed the different concepts and typologies which have been associated with global citizenship (Beck & Sznaider, 2006) and global citizenship education (Authors, 2017a). Oxley and Morris (2013) provide a model, which has gained significant popularity for content analysis and policy studies (Authors' 2017a;b), that categorises conceptions of global citizenship as either cosmopolitan or advocacy modes. While cosmopolitan conceptions refer to identification, global consciousness, and understanding of global relations, advocacy-based conceptions focus more on global problem solving. These two categories are divided into sub-categories, each addressing a

particular aspect of global citizenship (such as moral, political, cultural, or environmental, among others). We employ those categories as conceptual lenses in our exploration.

## **Approach**

Our investigation focused on citizenship conceptions as embedded in EU education policy related publications that emerged during the crisis. As education is a primary means for assisting in the reception and integration of refugees in Europe, our aim was to examine which conceptions are reflected within the EU's education policy. To this end, we qualitatively analysed primary documentary sources published by the EU or by the European Council (EC). As Ross and Davies (2018) note, the voluntary nature of the union may create gaps between proclaimed EU policies and their actual implementation, particularly by member states. For that reason, we explored those sources that outline EU principles and policies as well as sources that describing their funding criteria as together these signal both what the EU claims is important and what it is willing to fund.

Data collection was performed systematically (see below) as we gradually narrowed down the number of sources in order to focus on several key documents. Table 1 summarises the list of sources used in this study. These represent a selection of education oriented publications as well as EC official policy documents specifically addressing migrant populations with a focus on education measures. We started by delving into the labyrinth of the EC official website, searching for documents concerning education policies and documents dealing specifically with the 'refugee crisis' within the context of education. In addition we executed focused searches through Google to locate additional documents. Lastly, we searched academic scholarship between 2015 to 2018 using Web of Science, ERIC and EBSCO databases to locate relevant articles that be significant. In addition, we examined Erasmus+ guides published between 2014-2017 in order to identify modifications and changes associated with the humanitarian crisis. The main EU funding scheme for education is Erasmus+ (2014-2020). Erasmus+ is structured upon three 'Key Actions': Key Action 1 (individual mobility for study purposes), Key Action 2 (cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices) and Key Action 3 (policy reform support) (EC, 2016).

The method of systematic analysis of texts was based on the qualitative content analysis (QCA) as per Schreier (2012, 2013). According to this method, we systematically revealed and

described the meanings of data collected through eight stages: (1) deciding on a research question; (2) selecting material; (3) constructing a coding frame; (4) segmentation; (5) trial coding; (6) evaluating and modifying the coding frame; (7) main analysis; and (8) presenting and interpreting the findings (Schreier, 2013). Stages 1-5 were performed separately by each of the researchers, while evaluation and modification at stage 6, as well as the following stages, were performed collaboratively.

The limitation of this study is primarily the possible divergence between the statements of the policy documents analysed and the actual policy enactment as can be seen for example in the actual selection of funded projects. Further studies could trace the possible differences between the two, but this enquiry identifies the possible themes that should be explored in detail later on. Moreover, focusing mainly on documents related to education might not capture the broader discourse towards the humanitarian crisis in EU policy. We address this point by providing some review of the major scholarship on this topic.

We identify the current prevailing conception/s in EU policies and present our analysis through the three prominent themes that emerged from the analysis, these were: integration, inclusion, and multilingualism.

### **Depicting citizenship - Integration, Inclusion and Multilingualism**

Integration constitutes the major theme that emerged across the documents we analysed. The “Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals” communication (2016c) is an official EC document which directly refers to the “migration crisis” and outlines the commission’s policy priorities in support of integration, focusing specifically on the role of education and employment. The rationale for the enactment of policies designed to promote integration is described explicitly as an essential reaction to the growth in human mobility and diversity across Europe and globally. The document avoids direct references to refugees or migrants, instead the terminology used is ‘third-country nationals’, who are defined as “*migrants including refugees who are nationals of non-EU countries and who are in the EU legally.*” (p. 2). This terminology generally refers to people who migrate to the EU who are non-EU citizens and avoids an explicit distinction between people fleeing from war ridden zones and people who migrate to the EU from more peaceful or economically privileged environments; thus the

discourse around their integration is limited to the practical concerns of citizenship (as the right to work or study) and not around the political or moral means.

The Integration of ‘third-country nationals’ is presented throughout the document as carrying positive attributes for European societies. Notably, when referring to the opportunities which arise from successful integration the economic rationale prevails: “...*evidence shows that third-country nationals have a positive fiscal net contribution if they are well integrated in a timely manner, starting with early integration into education and the labour market.*” (EC, 2016c, p. 3). Moreover, the EC also warns that “*failure to release the potential of third-country nationals in the EU would represent a massive waste of resources, both for the individuals concerned themselves and more generally for our economy and society.*” (EC, 2016, p. 4). Migrants in general are therefore presented as beneficial to the EU as they are economically productive if integrated properly. This indicates the motive for allowing incoming migrant flows to the EU and explicitly portrays migrants as an economic resource. As integration is not discussed with reference to national and thus EU citizenship, the policy discourse thus adopts a particular form of global citizenship, which supposes advantages for globally mobile workers who can articulate certain capabilities that are valued in the global labour market.

Nevertheless, the communication also refers to the issue of social cohesion and to the importance of maintaining underlying European values, such as democracy, the rule of law, and the respect for fundamental rights. According to the EC, social integration is to be realised by:

*“This dynamic two-way process on integration means not only expecting third-country nationals to embrace EU fundamental values and learn the host language but also offering them meaningful opportunities to participate in the economy and society of the Member State where they settle.” (EC, 2016a, p. 5)*

This quote reflects the EU’s overall assimilationist goal: to transform migrants into economically productive European-minded citizens (as per Robertson, 2016); a one-way process which avoids the promotion of any inter-cultural exchange between EU and non-EU citizens. In essence, non-EU citizens who migrate to the EU are seen as a homogenous group with the potential to contribute to the European economy if they adopt European values and granted an abstract form of EU citizenship; while EU citizenship can only be attained through the legal means of the host country. The result is that migrants are expected to be integrated and

naturalized as Europeans but this process is decoupled from the process of becoming a European citizen.

Thus different conceptions of citizenship are employed by the EU towards EU nationals (whose integration is unquestioned) and non-EU nationals (who are urged to integrate through EU fundamental values). Therefore, by using the concept of ‘fundamental EU values’ as a point of reference by which integration is measured, the EU effectively excludes other non-EU conceptions of citizenship, regardless of their potential similarity to its own conception. This mirrors the way nationalist conceptions of citizenship, such as “British Fundamental Values” are used as an exclusive concept aimed towards the assimilation of “others” (Elton-Chalcraft, Lander, Revell, Warner, & Whitworth, 2017; Authors, 2018). Overall, in these two key documents, the EU conceptualises incoming migrants as desired human capital, capable of increasing fiscal net contribution.

Subsequently we investigated the EU priorities as demonstrated in its funding of education projects. It’s stated priorities are explained in the document titled ‘Joint Working Group seminar on integration of migrants’ background paper (EC, 2017b) where the EC seeks to align its funding of education projects with their key principles, such as inclusion and intercultural understanding, which constitute the foundational pillars of European citizenship. The Joint Working Group sought to supplement the EU’s action plan by encouraging and facilitating peer learning across countries concerning common challenges in all education sectors (EC, 2017b). The three official EU educational priorities for migrants as stated in the paper are:

*“(a) to integrate newly-arrived migrants into mainstream education structures as early as possible; (b) to prevent underachievement of migrants and to allow them to fulfil their potential; (c) to prevent social exclusion and foster intercultural dialogue through drivers such as sport, culture and youth activities”*  
(EC, 2017b, p. 2).

Notably, these educational priorities reflect a comprehensive and inclusionary approach. However those priorities do not align with other education-oriented sources, such as the “Education as a Tool for the Economic Integration of Migrants” Erasmus+ funded report (published in February 2016) (2016b), which provides a more detailed articulation of the EC’s perception of the integration of migrants. The report discusses the role of education in promoting integration. Questions such as how pre-school attendance, school tracking, the combination of

students and teacher characteristics, and class composition affect the educational outcomes of immigrants are investigated in the report. However, in its introductory section the report distinguishes for the first time between immigrants and refugees:

*“According to the United Nations’ definition, refugees are persons who, because of the well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, are outside the country of their nationality and are unable to return. This group raises specific issues that are different from those posed by immigrants.”* (p. 7).

Following this definition, refugees are subsequently explicitly excluded from further consideration in the report. The implication is that, with regard to the dimensions discussed in the report (e.g. literacy levels, school attendance, educational outcomes), the refugees present different and greater problems compared to the immigrants. Clearly a migrant’s inability to return to his/her own country is not necessarily aligned with his/her ability and motivation to integrate within the host country. The outcome is that for the purpose of integration in the EU refugees are categorised as a separate group, differentiated from other non-EU migrants who are not refugees and subsequently from EU internal migrants. This conceptualisation of EU citizenship and exclusion of refugees is in tension with the report’s basic purpose; to find ways to integrate non EU citizens.

In view of this explicit separation between migrant groups as demonstrated in these EC policy documents, we explored how these distinct conceptions were operationalised in the criteria which were employed to allocate funding. We examined documents describing the EU’s funding priorities, namely the Erasmus+ Programme guides.

A main principle of Erasmus+ is to maintain equity and inclusion among applicants and participants. The introductory part of the Erasmus+ Programme Guide states that Erasmus+ *“aims at promoting equity and inclusion by facilitating the access to learners with disadvantaged backgrounds and fewer opportunities compared to their peers...”* (see for example EC, 2014, p. 13). Although these universal aims of the EU are well articulated and in principle refugees would seem to come from ‘disadvantaged backgrounds’;but they are excluded. The EU had in 2014 classified those eligible applicants according to the following categories: (1) disability; (2) education difficulties; (3) economic obstacles; (4) cultural differences; (5) social obstacles; and - (6) geographical obstacles (EC, 2014, p. 13). While non EU migrants may

experience any or all of these challenges, and this is recognised by the EU in an earlier document which specifically describes both immigrants and refugees as people who are experiencing “*cultural differences: immigrants or refugees or descendants from immigrant or refugee families; people belonging to a national or ethnic minority; people with linguistic adaptation and cultural inclusion difficulties.*” (EC, 2014, p. 13). The compartmentalisation of immigrants and refugees into the category of those with ‘cultural differences’ raises several issues. Indeed, immigrants and refugees may well experience linguistic and other obstacles when arriving in European countries, particularly if they lack previous knowledge of the local European languages. However, linguistic and cultural adaptation is not specific to refugees and immigrants as compared to people exercising mobility across nations due to other motivations. In that sense, the relationship between the status of ‘refugee’ and the issue of linguistic adaptation and cultural integration is problematic.

Simultaneously, the paragraph also refers to another cultural attribute, in this case a demographic one, namely belonging to a national or ethnic minority. Notably, the EU designates a category titled ‘social’ for people who are experiencing discrimination because of ethnicity and religion (EC, 2014, p. 13), and therefore are entitled to extended EU support. Interestingly, immigrants and refugees who may face discrimination on a social or economic basis are excluded from consideration for eligibility under this criterion. These operational distinctions suggest that the EU, through its prime educational programme, has operationalised a restricted view of the status of immigrants and refugees, one which favours background factors (nationality, ethnicity, language) over personal factors and basically is blind to double or multiple marginalities, which are extremely common among many mobile populations. Overall therefore the EU distinguishes between the different motivations of people arriving in Europe and identifies the diverse, fast-growing and under-privileged refugee population as a homogenous group.

A review of Erasmus+ guides published in 2016 and 2017 (EC, 2016c, 2017) after the dramatic increase in the number of refugees entering Europe (Trauner, 2016), was revealing. Firstly, the equity and inclusion clause remained identical to the original 2014 version and needs to be considered in the light of changes made by the EU in language and phrasing since then. More recent guides (EC, 2016, 2017) use the following terms when referring to people in Europe in the context of the refugee crises: ‘asylum seekers, refugees and migrants’. This language

differs from the previous terms ‘immigrants and refugees’ used at the beginning of Erasmus+ implementation in 2014. In contrast to the earlier nomenclature, this terminology does allow a distinction between the various legal statuses of people associated with the humanitarian crises, but is simultaneously used generically and homogeneously across the guides. It is the extended use of this generic terminology that contextualises these findings. The guides refer to refugees in two instances: (1) placing the inclusion of refugees in Erasmus+ projects as part of the award criteria; (2) highlighting the particular needs of refugees as part of their integration into existing educational activities. The latter is demonstrated in regards to the school staff mobility project (key action 1):

*“These activities [mobility activities] are also an opportunity for teachers to gain competences in addressing the needs of pupils with disadvantaged backgrounds. Given the current context concerning young migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, particular attention will be also given to support projects that train teachers in such areas as training refugee children, intercultural classrooms, teaching pupils in their second language, classroom tolerance and diversity.”* (EC, 2017a, p. 62).

Similar statements were found in the 2017 Erasmus+ key action 1 in regards to mobility projects for VET staff (p. 51), school staff (p. 62), young people and youth workers (p. 76) and for adult education staff (p. 278) (EC, 2017a). However, with one exception, no reference to refugees was found with regard to higher education mobility projects. A single reference was identified relevant to the aims of key action 2: *“activities to promote the integration of refugees, asylum seekers and newly arrived migrants and raise awareness about the refugee crisis in Europe;”* (EC, 2017a, p. 124). The generic terminology is used across key actions and continues to treat refugees as a homogenous and marginalised group, signaling that although the language has changed, the conception has not.

This “othering” is further explored through the EC Multilingualism website; according to which the harmonious co-existence of many languages in Europe embodies the EU’s aspiration to be united in diversity (EC, 2017c). Languages are seen as a vessel for building bridges, enabling interaction and understanding between people and cultures, a cornerstone of the EU project. In order to achieve this purpose, the EU wishes that EU citizens become literate in at least two languages in addition to their own mother tongue (EC, 2017c). Interestingly, while the

EU's linguistic philosophy is aimed at strengthening social cohesion between Europeans, when referring to migrants the EU uses a somewhat different logic; linguistic proficiency is presented as a main factor in the integration of immigrants into host countries' national economies as language skills are seen as playing an important role in ensuring employability and competitiveness (EC, 2016b, 2017c). In terms of migrant education, language learning is identified by the EC as the foremost challenge (EC, 2017b) and simultaneously as the main recipient of government spending on education towards integration (EC, 2016b). Whilst the EU publicly and continuously proclaims its agenda of what it means to be a European citizen, when referring to migrants and particularly to refugees, it employs an exclusive discourse, identifying the needs of these incomers for fluency in EU languages, but omitting the value of their own languages. Thus if EU citizenship can't be legally granted through cultural or linguistic compliance, it might be again conceptualised as a form of global citizenship, where individuals who are able to adapt, might possess advantages in the global arena,

## **Discussion and conclusions**

Through the analysis of EU education policy documents we conceptualised the articulations of European and Global citizenships which were used in relation to the recent humanitarian crisis in Europe. We show that in practice, EU policies target the main in-flows of arrivals differently in terms of the conceptions of citizenship that are used to portray each of these populations and in terms of the opportunities and financial support provided to them. Specifically, we have shown that the EU has adopted a conception akin to an economic form of Global Citizenship to portray those refugees coming from outside the EU that contrasts markedly with the principles underlying European citizenship which are employed to portray non-refugee migrants. In comparative terms the EU documents utilize an economic and cultural form of cosmopolitan Global Citizenship to portray non EU migrants, as per Oxley and Morris, while refugees in particular are portrayed as an economic asset or burden, to be assimilated, but omitted from the EU citizenship discourse.

A number of key points arise from the analysis above. First, the concept of European citizenship seems to be used exclusively to refer to mobile populations who are internal within the EU. Funding schemes such as Erasmus + now use the term "Active (European) Citizenship" in its discussions of existing citizens of the member states and their need to become more

entrepreneurial and economically competitive (Authors, 2017c). When specifically addressing migration challenges, these documents identify integration as the main goal, which is portrayed as beneficial (to the member states) economically. Consequently, while different conceptions of citizenship are demonstrated within our analysis, the theme of integration seems to narrow down this discourse and reduce the significance of values and rights into a mere economic ‘box’ (Arce-Trigatti & Anderson, 2018). While integration and the adoption of “European fundamental values” are portrayed as producing economic gains for the accepting countries, it is unclear how the new arrivals will be entitled to European Citizenship upon integration, as such citizenship can be gained only after obtaining national citizenship in one of the EU countries.

It thus can be assumed that the new arrivals and in particular those who are arriving from outside of the EU member states are expected to integrate economically and culturally, in line perhaps with the specific forms of global citizenship adopted, which is in principle not dependent on naturalisation processes. Thus, it seems that EU unintentionally creates an additional form of limbo-status for refugee populations as it promotes integration through adopting an economic conception of GC, while being unable to bestow either national citizenship nor European citizenship on the refugee populations. Our analysis here echoes the discourse on the promotion of British Fundamental Values in the UK and highlights the ambiguity of inclusion under a specific value laden flag (Elton-Chalcraft et al., 2017).

Second, the EU funding priorities mirror the dual meaning that is employed to deal with the humanitarian crisis. While we showed that the official statements strictly followed the language of EU citizenship (equality, human rights, respect of languages and cultures), the actual funding priorities are directed towards rapid assimilation, firmly omitting the possible contribution of arrivals’ cultural and linguistic resources and also disregarding double and multiple marginalisations, which may leave the most vulnerable populations behind.

The EU was established and amalgamated upon the basis of shared universal values. The recent humanitarian crisis presented an opportunity to actively validate those at the union-level, as well as among member states (Murray & Longo, 2018). We have, in the context of the refugee-crisis, demonstrated the existence of different citizenship conceptions within EU policy. Navigation between various citizenship conceptions at the union-level suggests a fundamental shift from the initially declared inclusive approach of the EU, towards an increasingly exclusionary one. Whether the use of different conceptions is an attempt to garner support from

member states who oppose large-scale integration of refugees requires further research. Nevertheless, the use of a cosmopolitan conception of global citizenship has allowed the EU to develop an economic rationale for integration at the same time that it legitimizes the integration of refugees within EU member states.

## Bibliography

- Arce-Trigatti, A., & Anderson, A. (2018). Defining diversity: a critical discourse analysis of public educational texts. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 1–18. Advanced online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1462575>
- Authors 2013; 2017 a,b,c; 2018
- Banai, A., & Kreide, R. (2017). Securitization of migration in Germany: the ambivalences of citizenship and human rights. *Citizenship Studies*, 21(8), 903–917. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2017.1380649>
- Beck, U., & Sznaider, N. (2006). A literature on cosmopolitanism: an overview. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00098.x>
- Bîrzéa, C. (2000). Education for Democratic Citizenship: A Lifelong Learning Perspective. *Council for Cultural Cooperation*, 21, 1-86.
- Bromley, P. (2011). Multiculturalism and human rights in civic education: the case of British Columbia, Canada. *Educational Research*, 53(2), 151–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2011.572363>
- Connell, R. (2012). Just education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 27(5), 681–683. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2012.710022>
- Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review*, 58(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352523>
- Delanty, G., 2000. *Citizenship in a global age: society, culture and politics*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016). Refugee Education. *Educational Researcher*, 45(9), 473–482. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16683398>
- Elton-Chalcraft, S., Lander, V., Revell, L., Warner, D., & Whitworth, L. (2017). To promote, or not to promote fundamental British values? Teachers' standards, diversity and teacher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 43(1), 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3253>
- Engel, L. C. (2014). Global citizenship and national (re) formations: Analysis of citizenship education reform in Spain. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 9(3), 239–254. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197914545927>
- European Commission (2014). *Erasmus+ programme guide*. Luxembourg, LU: EU.
- European Commission (2016a). *Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals*, Luxembourg, LU: EU.
- European Commission (2016b). *Education as a Tool in the Economic Integration of Migrants*. Luxembourg, Luxembourg, LU: EU.
- European Commission (2016c). *Erasmus+ programme guide*. Luxembourg, LU: EU.
- European Commission (2016d). *Reception of newly arrived migrants and assessment of previous schooling*. Luxembourg, LU: EU.

- European Commission (2017a). *Erasmus+ programme guide*. Luxembourg, LU: EU.
- European Commission (2017b). *Joint Working Group seminar on integration of migrants*. Luxembourg, LU: EU.
- European Commission (2017c, April 2). Multilingualism. Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism_en)
- Gerrard, J. (2017). The refugee crisis, non-citizens, border politics and education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(6), 880-891, DOI: 10.1080/01596306.2016.1227959
- Hoskins, B. L., & Mascherini, M. (2009). Measuring Active Citizenship through the Development of a Composite Indicator. *Source: Social Indicators Research*, 90(3), 459–488. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27734804>
- Jamieson, L. (2002). Theorising identity, nationality and citizenship: Implications for European citizenship identity. *Sociología*, 34(6), 507-532.
- Jimenez, J. D., Lerch, J., & Bromley, P. (2017). Education for global citizenship and sustainable development in social science textbooks. *European Journal of Education*, 52(4), 460–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12240>
- Keating, A. (2009). Educating Europe's citizens: moving from national to post-national models of educating for European citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(2), 135-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020902731140>
- Keating, A., Ortloff, D. H., & Philippou, S. (2009). Citizenship education curricula: the changes and challenges presented by global and European integration. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(2), 145-158.
- Likic-Brboric, B. (2011). EU Enlargement, Migration, and Asymmetric Citizenship: Political Economy of Inequality and the Demise of the European Social Model? *Globalizations*, 8(3), 277-294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2011.576844>
- Marshall, H. (2009). Educating the European citizen in the global age: engaging with the post-national and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(2), 247–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270802642002>
- Martin, S., Weerasinghe, S., & Taylor, A. (2014). *Humanitarian crises and migration : causes, consequences and responses*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Mclaughlin, T. H. (1992). Citizenship, Diversity and Education: a philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), 235-250.
- Murray, P., & Longo, M. (2018): Europe's wicked legitimacy crisis: the case of refugees. *Journal of European Integration*, 1-15. Advanced online publication. DOI: 10.1080/07036337.2018.1436543
- Olson, M. (2011). The European “We”: From Citizenship Policy to the Role of Education. *Studies in Philosophy of Education*, 21, 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-011-9272-5>
- Osler, T. A. (2011). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: national identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2010.503245>

- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393>
- Pigozzi, M. J. (2006). A UNESCO view of global citizenship education. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910500352473>
- Quaynor, L. (2015). “I do not have the means to speak:” educating youth for citizenship in post-conflict Liberia. *Journal of Peace Education*, 12(1), 15–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2014.931277>
- Ramirez, F. O., & Meyer, J. W. (2012). Toward Post-National societies and global citizenship. *Multicultural Education Review*, 4(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.11102887>
- Robertson, S. L. (2011). The new spatial politics of (re)bordering and (re)ordering the state-education-citizen relation. *International Review of Education*, 57, 277-297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-011-9216-x>
- Robertson, S. L. (2016). Piketty, capital and education: a solution to, or problem in, rising social inequalities? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(6), 823–835. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2016.1165086>
- Ross, A., & Davies, I. (2018). Europe and Global Citizenship. In I. Davies, L.C., Ho, D, Kiwan, C.L. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant & Y. Waghid. *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Citizenship and Education* (pp. 21-36). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sassen, S. (2008). *Territory, authority, rights: From medieval to global assemblages*. Oxfordshire, UK: Princeton University Press.
- Scherz, A., & Welge, R. (2015). Union Citizenship Revisited: Multilateral Democracy as Normative Standard for European Citizenship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(8), 1254-1275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2014.969202>
- Sexsmith, K., & McMichael, P. (2015). Formulating the SDGs: Reproducing or Reimagining State-, Centered Development? *Globalizations*, 12(4), 581-596. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2015.1038096>
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2014). Cross-national policy borrowing: understanding reception and translation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 34(2), 153-167. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2013.875649>
- Turner, B.S., (Ed.), (1993). *Citizenship and social theory*. London, Newbury Park and New Delhi: Sage.
- Trauner, F. (2016). Asylum policy: the EU’s “crises” and the looming policy regime failure. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(3), 311–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2016.1140756>
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2017). *International Migration Report 2017*. New York, USA: UN.
- Unterhalter, E. (2008). Cosmopolitanism, global social justice and gender equality in education. *Compare*, 38(5), 539–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920802351291>

- Ververi, O. (2017). The Council of Europe's citizenship conception in 'Education for Democratic Citizenship': a critical discourse analysis of two textbooks. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 15(4), 518-530. Print. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2017.1335594>
- Welge, R. (2014). Union citizenship as demoi-cratic institution: increasing the EU's subjective legitimacy through supranational citizenship? *Journal of European Policy*, 22(1), 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2014.881300>

Table 1: List of sources comprising the data base

Title	Issue date	Link to document
Study Group on Education and Training report: accomplishing Europe through education and training	1996	<a href="https://www.sel-gipes.com/uploads/1/2/3/3/12332890/1997_-_accomplishing_europe_through_education_and_training.pdf">https://www.sel-gipes.com/uploads/1/2/3/3/12332890/1997_-_accomplishing_europe_through_education_and_training.pdf</a>
Erasmus+ Programme Guide	2014	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/programme-guide/2014-version_en">https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/programme-guide/2014-version_en</a>
Erasmus+ Programme Guide	2016	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/programme-guide/2016-version_en">https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/programme-guide/2016-version_en</a>
Erasmus+ Programme Guide	2017	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/sites/erasmusplus2/files/2017-erasmus-plus-programme-guide-v2_en.pdf">https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/sites/erasmusplus2/files/2017-erasmus-plus-programme-guide-v2_en.pdf</a>
Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals	2016	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/legal-migration/integration/action-plan-integration-third-country-nationals_en">https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/legal-migration/integration/action-plan-integration-third-country-nationals_en</a>
Education as a Tool for the Economic Integration of Migrants	2016	<a href="https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c9c38a03-e785-11e5-8a50-01aa75ed71a1">https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c9c38a03-e785-11e5-8a50-01aa75ed71a1</a>
Joint Working Group seminar on integration of migrants	2017	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/2017-background-paper-migrant-integration_en.pdf">https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/2017-background-paper-migrant-integration_en.pdf</a>
EC Multilingualism website	2017	<a href="https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism_en">https://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/multilingualism_en</a>