**Europeanisation of Everyday Life: An Exploratory Case Study of High School Students in Early International Education**

The practices of mobility and transnationality, made possible via the rights of European citizenship, are central examples of how the EU politically has broadened the scope of ordinary citizens’ social practices beyond the nation-state in Europe. However, these practices may or may *not* promote European integration or serve the legitimacy of the EU. The linkage between Europeanised practices and conscious identification with the EU is not at all straightforward, and these kinds of transnational practices are often mixed with other kinds of international and global connections and identifications. The project “The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications Among EU and Third-Country Citizens”, calls for a new understanding of what it means to be European; namely that political consciousness through support and knowledge of the EU, is not what constitutes the shared European space, but rather action or interactions, choices and use of new opportunities.

In this present work, I focus on the concept of mobility in the Danish context combining both different forms of physical movement *and* locally rooted experiences. Hence, locality is understood as the frame for everyday values, norms and cultural history that shapes people’s perceptions of intra-EU mobility and transnational social experiences. These questions are to be investigated with a case study of the experiences and intentions of mobility of high school students at an early stage of international education in Aarhus. The informants for this project are both local *and* also potentially mobile in their primary self-perception and are therefore affected by a certain location as well as mobility. This work builds on the assumption that the native no longer remain stationary, neither physical nor mentally; location and mobility need not be binary-oppositions. Therefore, mobilities and transnational social experiences should not be treated as processes of dislocation, but rather as new forms of relocation of people’s identification and nuanced forms of belongings.

On the basis of explorative fieldwork, I will investigate why young students have chosen an international educational profile. Moreover, I will map their social profile and motivations in order to understand their background, self-perception and ideas regarding the question of locality versus the international/global setting of their education. Using qualitative methods, especially focus group interviews, I aim to foreground the narration of these experiences and perceptions, and as a result, go beyond ordinary questionnaires and surveys about European identity which tend to focus on political knowledge of the EU, and nationality versus European identity in simplified ways. The paper aims to broaden our knowledge of how the EU, globalisation and internationalisation are discursively constructed as either similar or separate processes in our everyday life through the discussion of ordinary, indeed banal forms of nationalism and transnationalism.

This paper starts out by introducing an account of the theoretical framework surrounding this paper, diving into aspects of mobility and transnationality; following a state of the art research of various approaches to education, the nation-state and the EU relevant for grasping this combined field of research initiated by our overall research project. Next, I will approach the analytical frame to understand local/global belongings in the EU. Then follows a short description of the specific Danish locality and a discussion of how this case could be operationalised based on inspiration from previous studies using qualitative methods – how we get to the core of our research trough specific methods. A concluding discussion sums up why this methodological approach is important for improving sociological investigations of the European citizens on the grounds of a practice-based research orientation. Essentially, this paper tries to expand ways of collecting data of everyday character in a European context and further, expanding our common understanding of what constitutes the European field of investigation.

***Studying Mobilities and Transnational Social Experiences in Theory***

Theories on migration (one variation of mobility) and transnationalism have until now found their force in researching immigrants from e.g. Asia or the Middle East. In some of these cases their cultural and religious practices stand in obvious contrast to most “European practices” and have therefore been popular objects for research of how transnational practices sustain affiliations in a sending country (Levitt 1998, Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002). On the contrary little attention has been devoted to intra-EU mobility (Recchi 2008; 1), where practices of mobility and transnational social experiences are not necessarily taken out of its national locality through foreign residency.

Practices and behaviour of intra-EU mobility and transnational social experiences, is something even those who see themselves as the most Euro-sceptical enjoy together with other fellow Europeans. Pro-mobility constitutive policies like the Euro, Health care insurance card covering medical treatment abroad, European citizenship introduced in 1993, the Erasmus-Socrates programs and harmonisation of educational systems, have directly or indirectly been constructing rights and incentives to move inside the EU (Recchi 2008; 205-206) and it is therefore possible to talk about a process from internationalisation to internalisation (Ibid; 213). In their book ‘Pioneers of European Integration – Citizenship and Mobility in EU’, Recchi and Favell (2009) sets out to explore how Europe is being built by those individuals who live outside the places that they historically belong to. Covering different types of migrations within the EU – both those who move and those who encounter the movers – Recchi and Favell investigates how social mobility can be linked to global and regional economically processes and also how mover’s values and identifications with EU differs from those who stay (Recchi and Favell 2009; 3-4).

John Urry has been highly influential in extendingthe idea of what constitutes as mobile and mobility. Mobility entails a number of practices that does not necessarily mean cross-border practices, but also highly mundane and belong to the salience of everyday reality. The range of what is mobile today, is almost unlimited: “Moreover, not only people are mobile, so too are many ‘objects’, ‘images’, ‘informations’ and ‘wastes’. Mobility is thus to be understood in horizontal rather than a vertical sense, and it applies to a variety of actants and not just to humans.” (Urry 2010; 348)*.* What constitute new societal borders in new temporal and spatial patterns, are these new criss-crossing mobilities.

Thus, mobilities are more than just physical travel and long term migration. Recchi and Favell (2009) do not adequately consider those who stay, and how banal practices and experiences of mobility are also constructing the European space. Satellite telephones, internet, international media and international consumption are brought into our everyday life practices and constitute as crucial variations of mobilities that also exceed borders. Cheap airlines tickets from Ryan Air are also an example of how intra-EU travel has been made more affordable to a broader range of people and how the European space is not only confined to the elite. As a result, mobility and opportunities are more accessible, and experiences and perceptions of these mobilities are not necessarily separated from national location. Parents sending children abroad or engaging in international networks at home, create an interrelation between location and the European space that decompose the idea of national borders. These forms of mobilities and interactions, Mau and Verwiebe define ‘horizontal Europeanization’: “(…) Contacts, interactions and social relationships between different European countries, as well as various forms of pan-European mobility” (2010; 303).The range of being European today therefore spans from being a classic tourist to buying property abroad. Certain aspects of these processes of bottom-up Europeanisation, rests on a deduction from the political process of integration because, as Mau and Verwiebe note, we do not know whether or not horizontal Europeanisation serves to promote European Integration.

If we further understand transnationalism “(…) as being the extent to which individuals are involved in cross-border interaction and mobility” (Mau, Mewes and Zimmermann 2008; 2), transnational social experiences are not necessarily detaching people from their “home” locality, but rather work as horizontal Europeanization that make them more aware of an international interconnectedness in everyday lives. Physical migration has again been particular important for theories of transnationalism, but in line with Mau, Mewes and Zimmermann it is important to concentrates these types of projects on an entire populations who are all potentially mobile and all part of this European transnational social field (Ibid; 3); though without implying that everybody has equal social opportunities to these practices and experiences. Mapping the practices of these mobilities and unravelling the narratives of how citizens interpret and perceive these opportunities through indirect or direct actions, are therefore important as a constructing factor of the European space and the legitimacy of the EU.

***International Education in Everyday Europe***

On the basis of Favell’s (2001 and 2007) research on mobile Europeans, Favell and Guiraudon (2009 and 2011) remark that any data-driven empirical project should extend the concept of Europeanisation parallel to the notion of globalisation, thus framing it as a macro-regional scale process revolving around a political project, the European Union. Understanding Europeanisation in these terms, gives us various opportunities to deepen the knowledge of how a so-called European transformation affects and constructs citizen’s everyday life. Delanty (1998) suggests focusing on *transformation*, which evokes less ‘the end of the social’ and more the emerging ‘network’ society based on knowledge. The problem however, is not to argue the case of a bottom-up approach to Europeanization in sociology, but rather, how to operationalise this from the outset of banal forms of nationality and transnationality without inciting specific attitudes towards Europe or the EU.

On a broader scale, education as an institution, undergo a significant change due to transnational and global tendencies. Katharyne Mitchell opens up the discussion questioning the potential we have to “educate students *for democracy* in a *non-nationalist* framework” (Mitchell 2001; 71)? According to Mitchell, what is at stake is a change from educating individuals to gain a multicultural self, to now educating a range of strategic cosmopolitans (Mitchell 2003; 387). We can no longer defend the previous fact that citizens are being educated to be members of one specific community, where Mitchell argues that multiculturalism have until today been the prime accelerator for individuals to be able to work through difference in constructing and unifying the nation; essentially, Mitchell calls this the shifting spaces of citizenship. In education, as one of the main institutions in practices of governmentality, the new strategically cosmopolitan citizen is of growing relevance to understand how communities and belongings are being formed today within this global framework (Ibid; 389). Thus, what happens when state-based discipline of a population is not based on territory, but moved to a larger supranational scale?

Thus, let us (re)turn to Europe and local international education: With an exploratory fieldwork, this paper suggests as one of numerous possible cases, to look at early international profiling through high school education as an example of broadening our understanding of everyday Europeanisation. It is assumed that informants relevant for this specific fieldwork are either highly international due to their social background or they intend to achieve an international profile to improve their future capabilities on the global stage. Since, it is not clear whether early socialisation or later cross-border life experiences are the key to European identifications, this case seems to serve as an interesting outset to investigate such multiple processes. Essential is that the high-school students have a locally rooted everyday life in Denmark, but also creating what could be framed a ‘Europeanised profile’; though, the question is to what extent they recognise or perceive this “specific European touch” as significant? The linkage between Europeanised practices (from a political view) and identification with the EU, is not a linear or straightforward mechanism, and is being confounded by globalisation or other international identifications. Previous research has analysed the effects of European mobility and student mobility, and has often been connecting this type of mobility with the political goal of European integration where students are seen as agents of Europeanisation (Recchi and Nebe 2003). One could fear a bias in such research where the goal of deepening European Integration would be reaffirmed and legitimized only by looking at student mobility in itself and not student’s actual personal motivation and local attachment; exactly this bias, is what this present paper seeks to escape by turning to a practices-oriented methodology foregrounding perceptions and personal narratives.

Is international education likely to foster some form of identification with Europe? How do students perceive their local setting in opposition to an international setting? And, how are international education part of student’s everyday narrative and future plans? Approaching such questions facilitates an understanding of the importance education bears, in dealing with the process of Europeanisation, as an institution of both international and national character. Studying this from a qualitative outset, the case of everyday international education is, most crucial to this fieldwork, accompanied by a personal choice part of an intended plan of the future based on perceptions of how we want to live and how we wish to experience the world we live in. Education, for these young students is therefore also part of the mobility-movement where specific choices can be interpreted as part of life strategies and expressions of individuality and multi-faceted experiences (Papatsiba 2005; 32).

Students, who choose education based on a specific international life strategy, have often been researched as student migration (King and Ruiz-Gelices 2003), and also as part of the newer research on high-skilled migration (Smith and Favell 2008). A popular case has been that of the Erasmus-student experience as a case of intra-European mobility (Papatsiba 2005, Wilson 2011). As indicated earlier, mobility in this paper should not be confused with only physical movement across borders, as is the case with migration, but instead, a more nuanced understanding of mobility, like that of Urry, is being ascribed to the students in order to encapsulate the everyday and local context of being mobile, or at least intentions of being mobile. Consequently, it can be argued that education belongs to both a local and global setting and can be interpreted from both an institutional top-level, but indeed, also in an everyday context as narratives of banal national and transnational experiences; banal, only in the sense as they almost go unnoticed as a reproduction of nationalism and transnationalism (Billig).

In a study of education from a European perspective, Soysal approaches Europeanisation of identity with a mission to “locate where it happens” (Soysal 2010; 270). This entails studying Europe from the margins and accompanies one of the main goal of this paper, namely to reveal a wider set of actors and practices that could be considered European. A vital point, important for this paper, is Soysal’s comment on the unnecessary dichotomisation of the different levels to be analysed. National and transnational levels are often taken to be autonomous levels and are not conducive for a prober investigation of what is at stake. This point is seconded by Giarnizo and Smith (1998), who rightly point out that transnationalism does not create an imaginary ‘third space’, and transnational practices are not free, but constrained by contextuality. To locate Europe, is therefore also to locate how these two levels of analysis are constitutive of each other; in Soysal’s words: “this also means paying attention to how local and national are re-articulated within the transnational.” (Soysal 2010; 273).

European member states vary considerably in the extent to which they put the European Union on their agenda via educational institutions (Haus 2009). To varying degrees, member states have adjusted history textbooks (Schissler and Soysal 2005), national narratives and civic education (Hinderliter Ortloff 2005; 35) to European integration and globalisation. These national differences are likely to influence the degree to which citizens identify with Europe. In line with Mitchell (2003), national citizenship is, in theory at least and throughout history, portrayed as the official statement and symbol of a citizen’s loyalty and national attachment towards a country. In order to teach citizens about their nation-state to which they are supposedly loyal, education has been subordinated to state control in a process of nation building and creation of the obedient citizen – “No nation-state can afford not to dedicate resources to the general education of its citizens and to authorize the provisions of teaching material.” (Schissler and Soysal 2005; 1). No less, the teaching of a nation’s history in schools has been convoyed by authenticity and legitimacy as well created boundaries; in short, the textbooks have been the national narrative. From this point of view, the force of education has almost no limit in the creation of the devoted and committed citizen. But what happens when part of the national narrative is replaced by outside forces like the EU that also seek a somewhat public narrative or most favourable – a new type of citizenry depending on legitimacy, recognition and identification to transcend the national border.

So, what narrative is now being told by the citizens? Schissler and Soysal (2005; 4) remark what is essential to this transformation: “In Western Europe, the unfolding of the European Union as a transnational political entity has equally put pressure on the national narratives of collectives and reified the globalisation of the same ideals”. Dominant discourses around the world, like those of human rights, democratisation and post-Second World War’s decolonisation, have challenged the national prerogative and the validity of the national narrative as the sole story of boundary-making and belonging. The textbook, as Schissler and Soysal underscore, is not just a transfer of knowledge, but also a specific notion of time, space and agency that a society aims at installing in its students (Ibid; 7): “Our cognitive maps of understanding and engaging with world surely correlate with the schemas the textbooks provide for the pupils who read them (…)” (Ibid: 8). As a result, the EU depends on member state countries to meet requirements of internalizing values that are shared across EU countries (Hinderliter Ortloff 2005; 36).

Asking the question, whether the goal of a curricular is primarily knowledge-based or normative-based (that is to be European), Hinterliter Ortloff investigates exactly the case of Denmark and the changes of civic education curricula in high schools. Though not approaching the students themselves in her study, Hinterliter Ortloff frame civic curricular as a discourse that: “(…) can be analyzed in terms of its capacity to reveal significance, values, ideologies, and strategies” (Ibid; 38). Framing a curricular on these terms, it is possible to interpret expressions of cultural constructs such as citizenship, and it can further show how cultural images and artefacts are put into practice. Her data shows that a clear implicit distance is detected between European and Danish identity, and civic education is therefore conceptually found to be national. The international role of Denmark is forefronted, but the focus on the EU is kept to that of economic corporation and international politics. A balance between knowledge-based and normative teaching of European matters, is not existing, and Denmark’s European geographical location and responsibilities is only normative to the extent that it is an extension of the national Danish identity (Ibid; 43).

What holds Europe together in textbooks, according to Soysal (2010), is a set of civic ideals and universalistic system of beliefs. However, Europe is not like the nation-state, legitimised through deeply rooted histories and ancient cultures, and what construct a European identity, is exactly these ideals and universal values which could just as easily be determined as modern and is accessible to any nation-state in the world (Ibid; 274). Even the idea of cosmopolitanism is relevant in this case, as a set of values that define new highly international actors on the global stage who “use” these values as identity-markers, thus, not constraint to a location, but as individual values. Soysal’s (2010) approach to the search for Europe is, however, on different analytical terms than Hinterliter Ortloff. Soysal finds in her analysis of school books, examples of what she calls a normalization of national canons. This is a process where the myth of nationhood loses its extraordinary accountancies; for instance with the example of the crusades of the Vikings which is today taught “as occasions for cultural exchange and learning between European and other civilizations” in English textbooks (Ibid; 275). The same tendency applies to German school books, where the role of Bismarck has changed from being portrayed as “politically artistic hero of his time, without any remark on his militaristic tendencies” (Ibid; 276), to be described in more reflecting and general terms where students should adopt a more critical approach to the historical hero in Europe. Also, in the German textbook, Soysal finds a poor representation of the nation as a result of its historical role in Europe, whereas the French textbook welcomes the nation as equalized with Europe and described in same universalistic terms as often seen with Europe. Consequently, Europe becomes French, according to Soysal’s analysis (Ibid; 278). Soysal’s point is exactly, that not despite, but because of Europe’s failure of constructing an identity, it is not necessarily challenging to national identities which the textbook testify to, and could still provoke a reinterpretation of the nation. Therefore, while Soysal identify a number of different representations of Europe in national textbooks, it should not be regarded illegitimate as a construct of Europe, since Europe cannot afford particularism, but should rather be enjoyed as a multiple *and* mutual discourse of Europe across borders – with or without institutionalised contact with the EU (Ibid; 281). Following this view of Europe, public claim for difference (rather than ethnic narratives) across the European field also affirms the universal values proclaimed by the EU and furthers a reification of both a European and a global discourse (Ibid; 279).

Though with a more optimistic tone of voice, Soysal concludes on a similar observation as that of Diez Medrano (2003), namely that understandings and identifications of Europe, remain determined largely by national-level ‘framings’ of European integration that differ widely across the continent. However, Diez Medrano also concludes on the different measures of Europeanisation that he constructs, that Europeanising practices are taking hold in the mundane everyday lives of Europeans – in terms of intermarriage, business networks, consumer practices, and so on. This further forefront one of the core points of Soysal’s work and also this present paper, namely that Europeanisation must first and foremost be understood as everyday *participation* in the European field which then embraces a larger scale of citizens to be considered as Europeans in terms of their actions – this is where Europe happens. Rumford also expresses a vital point on this matter (2008; 93), exactly that EU scholars often have certain expectation of a European society to be initiated or governed by the EU, which has the risk of neglecting those who do not work directly to constitute a pan-EU sphere (EU and Europe should in this sense, be regarded as separate). Acknowledging a universal set of values as constitutive of the European field and EU, would therefore be more inclusive than building Europe, or EU, on the grounds of what we know from the nation-state and expecting a similar society and public sphere to grow from that. The task that lies ahead is then, to entangle Europeanisation from globalization and internationalisation.

***Analytical frame: Conceptualising the analysis of the local/global melting pot***

*“Each border is held to be essential to the wellbeing of some people while being indifferent to the lives of others”* (Rumford 2008; 67).

Borders in the EU are a confusing dialectic between inside and outside and the fact that the EU’s outer border is also the border of a certain nation-state, further contributes to the confusion. Borders in this project will be treated to the extent that they are explicitly experienced or imagined. In order to study Europeanisation from a sociological outset we must methodologically go beyond the political borders without neglecting the perception of them. Contrary to methodological cosmopolitanism, methodological nationalism implies societies in plural – plural in the sense that each society is given by the nation-states: “It imposes a territorial understanding of society based upon state-constructed and state-controlled borders” (Beck 2006; 27). The borders of a nation-state will therefore only be treated as what encapsulate the *locality* of a national population and not what confines society. Locality frames everyday values, norms and the cultural history that shapes their perceptions of intra-EU mobility and transnational social experiences. This idea of locality serves the purpose of conceiving a European society based on new measurements and also to embrace the diversity that is undeniable spanning this politically united field.

The informants for this fieldwork are both local and also potentially mobile in their primary self-perception, which demands a frame in which this can be studied – a potentially multi-sited ethnography; though this is not multi-sited ethnography in a physical way. Transnational subjects are produced through location as well as mobility. The research will be operationalised in a specific national locality, though the findings should be able to grasp and show everyday life in a more European, globalised or international sense – the native no longer remain stationary, neither physical nor mentally – and location and mobility are therefore not binary-oppositions. Mobilities and transnational social experiences should therefore not be treated as a process of dislocation, but rather a relocation of people’s identification and belongings. Consequently we have to broaden our knowledge of location by constructing a notion of a field – a field that encompasses perceptions of belonging to the specific national locality, but also a belonging that extract to other formations beyond their locality (Kaplan 2002).

Thus, without denying the existence and continued importance of the nation-state this project will treat the institutional EU and its geographical borders as one *European transnational social field*, which is basically a reconstructive variation of Levitt and Schiller’s idea of the transnational social field approach*.* With this construction it will also be possible to go beyond methodological nationalism, which has thought of the nation-state as the single container of social processes and now due to processes like globalisation and Europeanisation, there is a need for a shift in paradigms – namely from *methodological nationalism* to *methodological cosmopolitanism* (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002).

Some people might be embedded in the European transnational social field without identifying with it – this refers to being. Belonging to this field means that you consciously connect and identify with a particular group through concrete actions; in this case identification will relate to the feeling of European/EU membership or the feeling of being European. Transnational social fields are spaces for exchange, organisation and transformation of ideas, practices and social networks. In everyday lives people live within a locality but will still be participating within the transnational social field; thus the boundaries of the transnational social field transcend those of the nation-state and thereby indicate that activities, behaviour and practices of everyday life is influenced by various simultaneous flows or movements of institutions, religions, organisations, migration or virtual travel within the field. People also combine ways of being and belonging in different contexts. Hypothetically, people can have their primary social contact within their locality and without necessarily engaging directly in cross-border practices, but not identify at all to this locality (Levitt and Shiller 2004; 1010-1011). This also indicates that even the willingness to travel or movein the EU could be significant to this person’s idea of himself, hence a point of identification.

***The Local Case of Denmark***

The fieldwork will take local outset in Denmark and its citizens, and more specifically Denmark’s second largest city, Aarhus. Theoretically and methodologically this research could take place in any European country, but it must be explicit how Denmark is a unique case for an investigation of Europe’s position in Danish citizen’s perception and social transformation. Denmark is an interesting case as it is often used as an example of how EU membership threatens the internal structure and the homogeneity of the nation. Uffe Østergaard exemplifies the complex Danish *folksiness* that has worked as an unseen social bond of cohesion since 1864 (Østergaard 1998; 366) and often people refer to a specific *danish-ness*. Østergaard’s thesis is that the Europe many Danish people are in opposition to, is its diversity within its citizenry compared to the homogeneity that Danish people have been used to as a precondition for democracy (ibid; 368).

John L. Campell narrow this “Danish way” down to one simple phrase: “The peculiarity of Danes” *–* to untangle Danish values and what it means to be Danish, will help explain Danish political behaviour in foreign policy and the certain reluctance to participate in the construction of Europe (2006: 95-96). In a struggle of core values, Denmark would probably not hesitate to fight for its own treasure, but the Danish image of being a relatively EU-sceptic country is probably close connected to the Danish *no* to the Maastricht Treaty. Denmark both has a deserved reputation as a co-operative member, but on the other hand Denmark obtained four opt-outs from the Maastrict Treaty following the treaty's initial rejection in a 1992 referendum and has therefore proved to be politically somewhat awkward, as Jenkins notes (Jenkins 2000; 159).[[1]](#footnote-1)

Though there are political reasons to see Denmark as an EU-sceptical country, Denmark is according to the KOF Index of Globalization 2011 rated as the sixth most globalised country worldwide measuredeconomically, socially and also politically indicators[[2]](#footnote-2). Based on a large survey of Danish values from 1981-2008, Peter Gundelach says that, though Danish people today are more proud to be Danish than earlier, they are increasingly more tolerant to foreigners. Danish people have due to more world-wide travel and increased internationalisation, gained a greater sense of themselves as Danish, Gundelach says (Weekendavisen 2011, pp. 2). Denmark is surely on the international and global map as a population who are highly mobile and participatory, but it also makes Denmark a peculiar case as these tendencies seems to have strengthened the internal national cohesion. However, this further implies that practices of mobilities can actually lead to a change of values and Denmark might appear to be a surprisingly Europeanised country in terms of lifestyle and behaviour.

***Operationalising Banal and Local Forms of Transnationality in Everyday International Education***

This following section will go through previous studies working with similar methods. It will propose specific research questions that can guide the methods and further discuss specific ideas for methods usable for the unravelling of above problematique.

As earlier implied, this fieldwork takes it outset in a bottom-up approach of student’s early international education. Of this follows, that we accept the mentioned statements of the citizen being influenced to some degree by sets of educational material and not least the state and other institutions relevant in the educational field. Student’s are to a certain extent subject to top-down intension – either from the state or the EU – with their education. Choices are made available to them and they (maybe) free to choose from the educational supply. However, what this paper seeks to forefront is not so much what students are subject to, but rather how they subsequently perceive their everyday, Europe and their locality based on these choices. This is a vital distinction since the answer is subtle and of banal character, not necessarily easy to detect. How do students act on the possibilities given to them and what are their motivations for choosing the present international road – is it strategy, a response to global and international discourses, or is it a response to their up-bringing? How may we map and perceive their choices in the European/International/global field? Also, understanding their social background is important as it will provide an idea of what could have been the guiding factor of their choices. If early socialisation has been the key factor for their international profile, other things are at stake. Is the international education then seen as inevitable for the student? If so, this could have an effect on how their perceive European or international discourses as these might seem more logic than to others. It would give us an idea of how students respond to global discourses and what they “hear” – what student respond to is not necessarily what was intended. Europeanisation must therefore also be understood in terms of, exactly, intensions and response to these intentions, which might not go hand in hand. This operationalisation of everyday Europeanisation focuses on untangling the response to the European/EU discourse from globalisation and internationalisation. However, the assumption is also that within this methodological framework we can argue that these students, though they might not recognise the EU or the fact that they respond to it, actually can be considered as European because of their participation and practices within the European transnational social field, even though we do not see them crossing any borders.

It must be stressed that this group of informants are somewhat over-representative for an actual investigation of everyday Europeanisation of the general Danish population, however not less interesting. It could also be argued that this is an investigation of the elite who have already been established as those who profit the most from the EU. These students are assumed to already respond in some degree to the overall European, global and international discourse in line with the one that Mitchell identify; namely, that students are now suppose to respond to a new global economic regime where a strategic cosmopolitan is more able to manage oneself in such a competitive environments. But is this assumption consistent with the reality? What is interesting is exactly such a case as an explorative and initial fieldwork. It will work as a tone setting preparation for what to expect from other groups in society who is representative for the general population, and it will furthermore give us an opportunity to understand what is at stake when Europeanisation or globalisation actually set their tone. If these students do not reflect on these matters, how can we then expect the rest of the Danish population to do so? A comparison between international students and “regular” students would be the next and interesting step to take, as this would give us the opportunity to understand how high school students perceive their everyday life differently. Comparing life strategies and motivations would give us an exciting insight to what the heart of European and global tendencies actually is.

So how do we do this? Previous studies are relevant to take a look at in order to adjust the expectations and the actual use of specific methods. Research that lies close to the present paper, often search for European identity in its operationalisation. Additionally, Mau and Verwiebe comment that a European society will never fully be understood when treated as an analogue to national society and therefore calls for new methods of operationalisation (Mau and Verwiebe 2010; 355). Quantitative survey methods trying to explore European Identity and identifications often risk highlighting identity in much too abstract terms and risk to infer attitudes that respondents have barely formed. The argument withhold in this paper is that Euro-barometer-style surveys are therefore not sufficient to encapsulate the many nuances of the individuals perception on these matters (Favell et. al. 2011; 15). Instead, research made by Duchesne and others (Duchesne 2010, Meinhof 2004), have been much more prone to study identity “in use” by using qualitative interviews and especially focus group interviews. Focus group interviews, as Duchesne (2010) points out, is particular useful for studying topics that are considered sensitive and a group discussion can therefore show to help participants to get ideas and express their own point of views. Meinhof (2004) explains a very well-organized methodology in order to capture identity-discourse, guided by the research question: “Does Europe and/or the European Union enter people’s experiential everyday life narratives of past and present.” (Meinhof 2004; 222). Besides a carefully selection of informants and in-depth interviews, Meinhof also used pictures instead of questions as initial triggers which proved to be an good method for combining ethnographic interviews with discourse analytical procedures. Another interesting method is that of White (2010) in a study how political problems that are meaningful to people. With in-cap talks to taxi-drivers, White intends to show with this method, the ways Europe and the EU are spontaneously invoked as reference point when citizens make sense of their everyday circumstances.

Without holding their results against this intended fieldwork, it is worth mentioning that Europe/the EU and attitudes towards European Integration were in general not found to have any particular significance to the informants. In Ulrike Meinhof’s study of Europe viewed from below based on everyday narratives, she concludes that people construct their identities in relation to a wide range of cultural, political and experiential factors, but her study shows, Europe was not referred to unless it was provoked by the interviewer. Even national labels such as German or Polish had flexible connotations (Meinhof 2004; 243). Duchesne approaches the discussion of Europe with the concept of conflictualisation; how people differ in opinion about specific questions regarding the EU/Europe and how this furthers a discussion (or conflict). In Duchesnes research, she finds that the reality of the European political system is weak because perception of it is very blurred. Moreover, she concludes that Europeanisation is mostly invisible with the strength of global processes. However, this is mostly due to the fact that a persistence of national frames hinders the EU to shine (Duchesne 2010).

***Conclusion: Expanding the Notion of Finding Europeans***

Though flows of ideas and international political organization might happen more frequently due to globalisation, policies and the power to rule over a population is still constrained to certain institutional arrangements with national variation, and this is where the EU distinguishes itself from globalisation as a region. Policy-making is an institution of modern governmentality and is one of the most important instruments to produce and reproduce collective meanings. Characteristics like order, authority and expertise are inherent in the understanding of a policy and according to Jenkins, the outcomes of policy-making on “street-level” is therefore just as important as it is ‘higher up’ in the *“organizational food chain”* (Jenkins 2005). The status of the EU as a political unity and *“The most formalized and complex set of decision-making rules of any political system in the world”* (Hix 2005; 3) is therefore not irrelevant in the search for everyday Europeanisation, as the indirect influence of European policies and rules, are manifested in a large set of opportunities for families and individuals in their everyday lives. Though Europeanization can surely happen outside the EU (for instance in Turkey), and since borders of the EU are still dynamic, what is interesting in a normative sense, is the effects of the opportunities that citizens enjoy due to their membership of the EU, how these could create the link between micro- and macro-components and if they legitimize the EU as a political community of inclusion and exclusion?

Europeanization is a process of change found in the reverberation of a policy in a nation state; thus, how policies have been incorporated in the logic of discourses, identities, political structures and public policies (Radaelli 2000; 7). Europeanization from a micro perceptive then calls for the empirical focus of *how* European ideas have been translated into and within social processes in national societies (Flockhart 2010; 791). Have the normative constructive power of policies lingered into a collective production of meaning on an everyday level? To answer this questions, this fieldwork and our broader project, sets out to map what practices within this European field, are most likely to foster specific European identification. Legitimacy can only be a reality if people actually recognize the European field – both in positive and negative terms. It is therefore important to distinguish between the intention and outcome of Europeanisation as the outcome of the EU policies could as well be interpret as mere internationalization or perceived as global possibilities by the EU citizens. Thus, Europeanisation in this project should be understood as a societal transformation on a micro-level and not as polity-building based on the top-down intentions (Trenz 2011; 199, Rumford 2005). What is most essential to this project is therefore not what actual ideas or norms have been transferred, but how the idea of free movement and other mobilities made possible by EU policies, have been used, interpret and translated into meaningful everyday structures and choices – the degree to which people have been Europeanised, globalised or internationalised in their everyday life. Moreover, it is not necessarily found in a political imagination through support and knowledge about the EU itself, but rather in the actions and practices within the European field: *“The fundamental unit of society is not an opinion or a belief; it is an action (or interaction)”* (Favell 2005; 1114).

If we are to succeed with this quest, we must first and foremost develop an operationalisation and methodology that suits the task. Our cases and methods must build on the idea that *a European* is more than those who cross borders on a monthly basis or work outside national borders. Europeans are also those who stay at home and only travel three weeks a year to a campsite in Tuscany. Europeans *could* be those who chose an international education as a life strategy. Essentially, we must expand our notion of what it means to be European; we simply need to find them with creative, sociological methods. Based on previous studies we can conclude that Europe is not a topic of conversation on an everyday basis; unless forced by direct questions or obvious hints. Citizens do not think of Europe as often as the EU would like them to, but maybe this should not be the sole valid goal of legitimacy.
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