



The Construction of Transnational Identities in the Narratives of a European Civic Organisation

Copyright © 2016
Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines
<http://cadaadjournal.com/>
Vol 8 (1): 84 – 107

FRANCO ZAPPETTINI

Royal Holloway, University of London

franco.zappettini@rhul.ac.uk

Abstract

Drawing on a study conducted with an association of citizens operating in the European public sphere and applying the Discourse Historical Approach, this paper investigates how the organisation's members construct their transnational citizenship and how they negotiate it vis-à-vis European, national, and local identities. The analysis reveals that informants often claim their transnational identities as membership of an expanded community of relevance, through the transportability of their civic engagement and through meta-narratives of spatiality and progress whereby cosmopolitan scenarios are often reterritorialised within the European space. These arguments are frequently realised through the metaphorical scenario of 'spatial dynamics' which makes sense of identities as emergent from unbounded social interaction, and through the indexicality of transnational narratives as specific discourses of socio-historical transformation of nationhood.

Key words: transnationalism, European identity, active citizenship, European public sphere, cosmopolitanism, Discourse Historical Approach

1. Introduction

Over the last few decades, there has been a surge of interdisciplinary interest in the investigation of social transformations relating to a complex set of phenomena conveniently captured by the term transnationalism. Scholars have stressed how intensified flows across borders, the deterritorialisation of cultural practices, the reconfiguration of social orders and a new politics of space have increasingly blurred boundaries of groupness and imaginaries of communities affecting, in particular, the reproduction of social and political identities constructed around nationhood (cf. Smith and Guarnizo 1998; Sassen 2002).

Some discourses of transnationalism have filtered down into and interplayed with political narratives of Europe as a post-national community of citizens. Whilst, in some cases, some of these narratives have penetrated the public opinion simply accommodating Europeanness with local and national identities in a 'non-zero sum' proposition, discourses of transnationalism have also contributed to the (slow) emergence of an 'active' European civil society where political issues are increasingly being debated in a transnational public sphere. This paper focuses on the articulation of discourses of transnational

citizenship and European identity drawing on a study conducted with members of a non-governmental organisation called European Alternatives (EA). The aim of this paper is to provide insights on the evolution of European and national identities in the light of transnational narratives brought about by civic actors, thus contributing to existing work on the discursive construction of European and transnational identities in the public sphere (Krzyżanowski 2010; Triandafyllidou et al. 2009; Ruzza 2004). In particular this paper attempts to address the question: how do ‘active’ citizens discursively enact their European identities as members of a transnational community?

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: section 2 provides a theoretical background to (trans)national narratives in the European context; section 3 introduces the data and the analytical framework used in this paper; section 4 presents the analysis and conclusions are drawn in section 5.

2. (Counter) Narrating the Nation: Transnational Narratives in the European Context

Over the last few centuries ‘national’ referents have provided individuals with a major source of group identification and belonging. For Anderson (2006), specific historic conditions and the political agendas of newly born nation-states accelerated, sustained, and crystallised the cultural reproduction of national communities and the organisation of political life (for instance the attribution of citizenship) developing ‘nationhood’ into naturalised referents for one’s group identity, a process he famously termed the membership of an ‘imagined’ community. Hall (1997) highlights how the imagined component of ‘we-ness’ in national identities is constantly (re)produced, negotiated, and instantiated in tangible symbols, practices, and discourses that rely on narratives of collective belonging and otherness, and on the perceived spatial and social homogeneity of the in-group and its differentiation from out-groups. The work of Billig (1995) and Wodak et al. (1999) further corroborate this view highlighting how national categorisation is effectively achieved in every-day discourses through rhetoric and linguistic devices functionally aimed at indexing, naturalising and entrenching representations of ‘us’ and ‘them’.

In recent years, a significant body of interdisciplinary literature has recognised transnationalism as an important macro phenomenon emerging in relation to the de-territorialisation of cultural, social and economic practices, which are moving away from nationally rooted apparatuses, or which supersede the remit of national institutions (Portes et al. 1999; Levitt and Glick Schiller 2004; Vertovec 2009). The term transnationalism has been used not only in social anthropology to account for new forms of social interaction resulting from intensified cross-border mobility (whether related to diaspora or triggered by economic factors) but also in political theory with regard to practices of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to highlight the fact that at least one of the actors involved is a non-state entity (Risse-Kappen 1995). Social movement studies have also extensively discussed transnationalism, for example in relation to cross-border political mobilisation (Tarrow 2005). Transnationalism has thus conceptually emerged as a range of complex social phenomena which interface discursively with powerful narratives of cultural ‘inbetweenness’, territorial ‘unboundedness’, and post-national politics. For

example cultural studies scholars such as Bhabha (1994) and Appadurai (1996) suggest that in the wake of intensified cross-border flows, national narratives are displaced across different cultural networks, resulting in a dilution of established meanings of community. In Bhabha's view, transnational practices can generate 'third spaces' where individuals can find cultural positionality in reference to a boundless time and space between national territories. This 'in-betweenness' does not reproduce dominant discourses but rather allows for 'hybridity' which, in some cases, could be interpreted as a 'counter-narrative of the nation' (Bhabha 1994: 300).

This view is reinforced by Beck (1996) who, in relation to global risks and political activism, argues there is 'a new dialectic of global and local questions which do not fit into national politics' (226) and which can only be 'properly posed, debated and resolved' (ibid) in a transnational framework. Certain issues - such as environmental risk, migratory flows, and organised crime which obviously do not stop at borders - can affect the wider community and, therefore, can be more effectively debated in a trans-border arena where civil activism can be organised around different interests and solidarities to transcend national borders and to recreate the reference framework for social and political membership at different and wider levels. Furthermore, for Beck (2008) transnational activities and global practices of interconnectedness can be seen as empirical factors in the process of a reflexive cosmopolitanisation of society. In this sense Beck, and other sociologists, see the potential in modern society for the realisation of humans as 'citizens of the world' living in the Aristotelian cosmopolis where culture-centric attitudes and feelings of loyalty to particular groups are transcended. For these individuals, notions of group and solidarity are much less territorially bound and may result in different understanding of civic communities beyond national ties. More than in the formation of 'global' identities, this understanding of cosmopolitanism can be found, for example, in reflexive attempts to no longer construct national identities in relation to the 'other' (Delanty 2000). In this vein Beck (2008) suggests that in a cosmopolitan framework identities 'become plural and relate in a plural way' (92) to different national, ethnic, and cultural elements and they can be a 'creative achievement' of individuality and integration in the global society.

Transnational narratives have interplayed in many different ways with discourses of Europe and the transnationalisation of the European field. As suggested by Delanty and Rumford (2005), global and local/European processes may or may not overlap - synergically coexist and/or antithetically compete - thus intensifying convergence as well as divergence of social, economic and cultural patterns of transnationalisation. The European instantiation of global phenomena has thus been compounded, possibly accelerated but, in some cases, also reversed by the EU's integration process. This interplay has resulted in a highly stratified society in which different transnational elements have filtered down the individual consciousness as ideological components of belonging as well as 'banal' forms of consumption of discourses of Europeanness (Hanquinet and Savage 2013).

One can thus distinguish at least two sets of phenomena at play in the transnationalisation of Europe. The first set of phenomena can primarily be seen as a consequence of the operationalisation of the EU project which has

enabled free movement of goods, capital, services, and people across Member States. This has resulted in converging and intensified patterns of economic and social intra-state activities as well as the definitions of new 'spaces' (e.g. Schengen area, Euro area) where borders are no longer in place, have shifted or overlapped, and where the 'desirable' trans-state mobility of EU citizens may have contributed to the formation of some transnational social and civic ties. For Eder (2006) this idea of Europe has relied on the 'narrative plausibility' (257) of an identitarian transnational space whose internal boundaries are deconstructed and external boundaries reproduced (see also Balibar 2009 for whom Europe is a 'borderland' in which the transnationalisation of the internal space has been counter posed by the strengthening of physical and ideological external borders).

The second set of phenomena relates to worldwide patterns of social and cultural mobility and the redefinition of political agency and solidarity enacted at a European level. In this sense, European identities can represent reflexive forms of social self-understanding and understanding of societal change (Delanty and Rumford 2005) which may encompass forms of cosmopolitan awareness recognizing Europe in its relation with the world (Biebuyck and Rumford 2011). Forms of identification with Europe and as Europeans can therefore index narratives of transformation of nationhood and can be instantiated in forms of grassroots social agency and 'active citizenship' oriented towards cosmopolitan imaginaries.

One of the changes brought about by the interaction of the two sets of dynamics discussed above has arguably been the slow emergence of a European civil society in the public sphere¹, a feature which Habermas (1998) regards as essential of deliberative democracies and as a communicative arena where transnational/European identities can gradually emerge and 'thicken' from bottom-up. Whilst for some time the role of a European civil society relied on the procedural inputs of Brussels-based, professionally organized groups into highly institutionalized policy making processes, for the last two decades, the consolidation of a European civil society has increasingly been regarded as vital for the EU since the 'permissive consensus' granted by citizens to the EU institutions has been waning (Hooghe and Marks 2009). It was especially in the wake of the failed European Constitution in 2004/5 that fostering the emergence of bottom-up civic initiatives - in addition to the more traditional Brussels-based NGOs - became a prominent item in the EU's discourses². Spurred by this institutional interest, several civil society organisations of 'active citizens' have thus emerged which are organised in both local initiatives and transnational networks and which focus on different interests and activities trying to exercise some influence on political deliberations affecting European citizens.

This paper focuses on a study conducted with members of one such organisation called European Alternatives (EA) (Zappettini 2015). EA characterizes itself as a transnational association of citizens and its main aim is the promotion of citizens' democratic participation in the debate on European issues with a view to exert influence on European policy-making and to 'build a Europe of justice, democracy, and solidarity'³ from the bottom-up. EA's activities are themed around specific topics such as migration, civil rights and social justice, typically organised as: on and offline campaigns; workshops;

debates; publications and public forums. EA also promotes various activities under the Active citizenship programme, for example the ‘Trans Europa Festival’, a yearly festival of culture, arts and politics, taking place simultaneously in several cities across Europe.

3. Data and Analytic Framework

The data consists of over 10 hours of recorded material and was collected over three years (2011-2013) via four moderated focus groups and nine individual interviews undertaken in 10 different EA branches across Europe (see Table 1 for details)⁴. This was further corroborated by ethnographic work in the EA’s London group. All participants represent a self-selecting sample of members who responded to an initial call sent via each branch’s gatekeepers. Socio-demographic details of participants are summarised in the Appendix. Group and individual discussions were initiated with open questions addressing three different macro topics: transnationalism, Europe, and identities. Questions were loosely introduced to allow the emergence of personal and collective narratives as well as ‘secondary’ topics (Krzyżanowski 2010) (for full methodological details see Zappettini 2015).

The analytical framework employed is largely based on the Discourse Historical Approach (Wodak 2009). The DHA builds on the key principle that discourses represent ‘texts in context’ as they are socially produced and consumed in relation to specific socio-historical conditions. In the DHA, contextualisation is typically operated on distinct but interrelated micro, meso, and macro levels which are:

- a) the immediate, language or text internal co-text; b) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses; c) the extra-linguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific ‘context of situation’; and d) the broader socio-political and historical contexts, within which the discursive practices are embedded (Wodak 2009: 67).

Moreover, in the DHA, the historical dimension refers to both the inclusion of ‘as much available information as possible on the historical background [...] in which discursive ‘events’ are embedded’ (Wodak et al. 1999: 8-9) and to the study of changes occurring to discourses diachronically. Unlike some other CDA approaches⁵, the analysis in the DHA is strongly oriented towards linguistic structures and it draws on argumentation theory, pragmatics, and other sociolinguistic theories. This study has followed the DHA usual analytical operationalization consisting of: a) a thematic analysis identifying the key analytical categories or discourse topics and b) an in-depth or argumentation-oriented analysis consisting of an investigation of discursive strategies, *topoi* and their means and forms of realisation. Data was thus initially mapped out to demarcate the main propositions and the discursive strategies deployed by the speakers, i.e. the ‘more or less intentional plan[s] of practices ... adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic goal’ (Wodak 2009: 94). The analysis of strategies was guided by *topoi*, i.e. standardised argumentation schemes deployed to validate claims and to justify conclusions. In classical rhetoric, *topoi* (Latin *loci*, or ‘common places’) operate as warrants or implicit premises to the validity of an argument and they can be made explicit

as conditional or causal logics such as 'if x, then y' or 'y, because x' (see Reisigl 2014)⁶. For example, the statement 'the last Prime Minister made a mess of our economy, we cannot afford to let him run the country again' relies on the topos of analogy/likelihood that assumes that a person is likely to do more of the same in a similar situation. In accordance with Krzyzanowski (2010), as well as universal topos (in the Aristotelian sense) the analysis was also concerned with identifying context-dependent and genre-dependent topoi⁷. The unpacking of the specific discourse-pragmatic aspect of *topoi* was achieved by interpretive work and via multi-level contextualisation (e.g. reference to socially or historically shared cognitive frames invoked indexically by participants and/or in relation to the NGO activities). Finally, at the micro linguistic level, the analysis identified those linguistic elements which linked utterances with *topoi* and functionally supported strategies, including figurative language and rhetorical tropes (such as metaphors, synecdoche, and metonymies), deictic features, and other para-verbal features.

FOCUS GROUPS

CODE	DATE	Number of Participants	LOCATION	LANGUAGE	DURATION
LO1-2	6/4/11	2	London - UK (Pilot)	English	36'
BO1-6	21/4/11	6	Bologna - Italy	Italian	70'
CL1-6	14/9/11	6	Cluj-Napoca - Romania	Romanian	84'
CA1-3	22/4/12	3	Cardiff - UK	English	65'

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

CODE	DATE	(1)	MEMBER's AFFILIATION	LANGUAGE	DURATION
RO1	20/4/10	F	Rome - Italy (pilot)	English	36'
AM1	9/02/13	S	Amsterdam - NL	English	80'
BE1	16/2/13	S	Berlin - Germany	English	52'
BE2	8/2/13	S	Berlin - Germany	Italian	41'
LO3	18/1/13	F	London - UK	English	45'
PR1	24/1/13	S	Prague - Czech Republic	English	65'
PR2	27/1/13	S	Prague - Czech Republic	English	42'
SO1	21/1/13	S	Sofia - Bulgaria	English	61'
VA1	24/1/13	S	Valencia - Spain	English	56'

(1) F = Interview conducted face to face; S = Interview conducted over Skype

Table 1. Details of focus groups and interviews

4. Results

4.1 Thematic Analysis

The thematic analysis identified a number of topics discussed by members in relation to the three macro questions (transnationalism, Europe, identity) which have been summarised in Table 2. Macro propositions relating to transnationalism constructed the latter as both a *de facto* system of cross-border social practices (e.g. mobility) and as a cosmopolitanism ideology in opposition to nationalism. Transnationalism was also frequently discussed as a socio-political frame for the organisation of communities and civic participation beyond borders. Through the second set of topics, members discussed Europe as a social and political transnational project of peace and an open space of intercultural and political debate emphasizing the bottom-up construction and, at times, its divergence from the institutional project. Europe was also discussed through narratives of conflict and diversity as a distinctive society and, at the same time, highly interconnected with the wider world society. Finally in relation to identity, some members engaged in meta-discussions of (European) identity and critically problematized its meaning whilst most members constructed their Europeanness in relation to historical, cultural, and civic discourses as further discussed below.

Topics related to TRANSNATIONALISM	Topics related to EUROPE	Topics related to IDENTITY
Alternative to (inter)national systems of governance	Space of experimentation with participatory democracy and active citizenship	Identities are relational, contextual, multiple, and open
Ideology opposed to nationalism Historical changes of society	Opportunity to implement a better and more just society	Identity labels are problematic, unimportant, dangerous
Ability to interact across borders	Emphasizing bottom-up construction vs. institutional vision	Identity content and processes influenced by history and family ties
Practices of mobility	Coexistence of values and cultures	Belonging emerges from interactional experiences
Cultural diffusion and diversity	Collective memories of conflict and heritage	Belonging emerges from civic participation and engagement with democracy
World citizenship	Interconnectedness with wider world society	Institutional validation and formal membership

Table 2. Summary of topics discussed in relation to macro questions

4.2 In-depth Analysis

4.2.1 Strategies, topoi, and linguistic realisations

Informants appeared generally oriented towards three macro-discursive strategies: a) the dismantling of nationhood, b) the construction and

transformation of the meaning of communities of relevance, and c) the negotiation of the meaning of identities. These, in turn, were articulated via a number of micro strategies, supported by a variety of topoi, and achieved through different linguistic means as summarised in Table 3. It must be stressed that different topoi were sometimes used by members to achieve different strategies. For example the *topos of connectedness* was used by several members to achieve representations of a linked community whilst representations of the open and unbounded nature of modern societies represented a warrant for problematizing and delegitimizing nationhood and national structures. Consequently, at a macro-level, members were often able to dismantle existing spaces whilst reconstructing new ones and to position themselves in such new spaces redefining their relationality *vis-à-vis* (new) 'others'. The next section will discuss a representative selection of these findings. For a full discussion of all strategies see Zappettini (2015).

Macro strategies of dismantling nationhood		
Micro strategies of	Topoi	Linguistic Realisations
Deconstruction, problematisation, delegitimation of national structures	<p>Topos of historical revisionism and artificiality (national narratives are not plausible anymore because they were artificially constructed by nation states)</p> <p>Topos of 'natural' disintegration (national structures are incongruent because nation states are naturally disappearing)</p> <p>Topos of world citizenship (nationality should be irrelevant because we are all world citizens)</p> <p>Topos of (transnational) flows and obstacles (National borders are bad because they obstruct the transnational flow of people and culture)</p> <p>Topos of global risk/action (action must be taken transnationally because issues are global and national structures are inadequate)</p>	<p>Statements of rejection</p> <p>Metaphor of mapping; biological metaphors (life, evolution, decay); metaphor of container</p> <p>Metonymy of border for state hegemony</p> <p>Tropes of 'box' and 'obstacles'</p> <p>Spatial representations of inside/outside;</p> <p>Agentivisation and antagonisation of states and 'global' actors</p>
Macro strategies of construction and transformation of communities		
Micro strategies of	Topoi	Linguistic Realisations
deterritorialisation, 'scaling up' solidarity	Topos of network (one's sense of community membership reflects a variety of personal, cultural, and organisational connections)	<p>Hypernymic/hyponymic implicatures</p> <p>Multilevel representations</p> <p>Spatial and temporal representations of 'connection' and 'expansion'</p>

<p>transportability of civic engagement</p> <p>decoupling linguistic and civic identities</p>	<p>Topos of imagination (if one can imagine being part of a regional or national community, then one should be able to imagine him/herself as a European or world citizen)</p> <p>Topos of Utopia (anyone should feel European because we have a moral obligation to achieve an ideal just society regardless of one's physical location)</p> <p>Topos of (transnational) active citizenship (everyone should engage in European politics because civic participation must not be constrained by physical place or nationality)</p> <p>Topos of solidarity (if the principle of (fiscal) solidarity applies at regional and national level, then it should be applied at a European level)</p> <p>Topos of linguistic identity (language diversity should not impede a sense of Europeanness because languages refer to distinct civic and cultural components of identity)</p>	<p>Metaphorisation of the term 'European space'</p> <p>Metaphor: Europe as a 'lab'</p> <p>Tropes of schaal and 'new frontier'</p> <p>Metonymy of 'voice' for citizens</p> <p>Historical 'we'</p> <p>Neologisms ('globish', 'Euro-English')</p> <p>Metaphor of the universality of English</p>
Macro strategies of negotiating the meanings of identities		
Micro strategies of	Topoi	Linguistic Realisations
<p>Problematizing or relativising the meaning of (European) identity</p> <p>Representing processes of identification: (inter)connectedness and 'in-betweenness'</p> <p>legitimisation</p> <p>by-passing national identification</p>	<p>Topos of non-categorisation (straightforward categorisation should be avoided because labels are problematic and dangerous)</p> <p>Topos of non-fixity (defining one's identity is problematic because identities are not fixed)</p> <p>Topos of interactional experience and relationality (identities are multiple because they develop out of different experiences and they only make sense in relation to one another)</p> <p>Topos of 'negative' history (one cannot be proud of his/her own heritage if past</p>	<p>Dismissive interjections; hedging; periphrasis; vagueness; deferral; reversing questions</p> <p>Metaphor of the EU as an organic body; Metaphor of 'lessons from history'; Metaphor of slavery for emancipation from Communism</p> <p>Spatial adverbs to indicate cultural proximity/affinity</p> <p>Trope of 'common ground' and 'heritage'; tropes of ties, links, nodes, and connections</p> <p>Temporal deictics</p>

	<p>'national' actions caused bad consequences)</p> <p>Topos of 'positive' EU membership and topos of democracy/equality (one feels European because EU membership defines equals rights for all citizens)</p> <p>Topos of 'negative' EU membership (if Europeanness is simply defined by official status then it is less relevant for individuals and communities)</p>	
--	--	--

Table 3. Summary of strategies, topoi, and means of linguistic realisations

4.2.2 The dismantling of nationhood

Members employed arguments which problematize and delegitimise social, cultural and political meanings associated with nationhood. These were predicated on two main argumentative schemes: one based on a critical revisionism of nation-states as cultural hegemonic projects (highlighting the artificiality of national elements such as borders) and the other exposing the current inadequacy/unresponsiveness of national structures (such as governments) vis-à-vis global flows. These strategies emerged explicitly when members were asked to elaborate on their understanding of transnationalism and in some cases through the prompt 'what's wrong with nation (states)?' on the back of general negative stances on nationhood. For example PR1's strategies of dismantling nationhood were primarily predicated on the *topos of honesty* and the *topos of artificiality of nations* which she invoked to characterise nations as negative agents that constrain individuals to forcibly fit into the category of 'nationals' and, through that warrant, to question and reject her allegiance with the national community as 'banal' self-categorisation:

Extract 1

PR1: I don't know what nations are for ... I think the problem with nations [...] is that they force you [...] to identify with the same criteria ... and also to act as the person who identifies with this criteria ... your homeland, you know [...] I think national identities are really dishonest. If I say I am French, in a way I am lying because...well, [...] I am French because I grew up etcetera, etcetera, but I... it means that I identify and that I embrace the French nation and I...I am sorry, but I don't [laughter] [...] It's not honest, I cannot do it.

PR1 constructed her argument around the 'moral dilemma' of defining herself as French. She initially delegitimised nations as artificial and negative agents and, premised on the *topos of honesty*, she rejected her investment in the narratives of the French nation as this would make her an impostor. PR1 perceived the reproduction of Frenchness as a forceful expectation to claim herself as something untrue and she constructed the predicative adjective *French* as a convenient label more than a meaningful identitarian signifier.

The dismantling of nationhood was also achieved via *strategies of delegitimation* aimed at representing the inadequacy of national structures and predicated on the *topos of global risk/action* (i.e. ‘there is the need for globally concerted action vis-à-vis global problems’). Members invoked this topos to contextualize the ineffectiveness of national initiatives against a global background of contingencies (generically nominalised as ‘corporations’, ‘climate change’, ‘criminals’) and to discredit nation-states as either ineffective actors or indeed wilful non-actors:

Extract 2

LO3: I think the argument clearly isn't that nation-states are getting less powerful but I do think there's a lack of ... there's a, a reduced legitimacy of nation-states - given the fact that you have transnational corporations, you have global climate change, you have all these issues that are being avoided by nation-states because they can say, they can kind of claim powerlessness and claim that it's not in their interest to do something

Strategies of dismantling nationhood were also achieved via the *topos of flow* and *topes of container* which members deployed to represent nation-states as units contained by artificial boundaries and whose salience members often challenged when positioning themselves ‘outside the box’ (see McEntee-Atalianis and Zappettini 2014 for a detailed account of these realisations). For example RO1 drew on the *topos of flow* to achieve strategies of delegitimation of national structures aimed at showing the inadequacy of states *vis-à-vis* global dynamics:

Extract 3

RO1: Yeah, transnational is just a move beyond the idea that nations are the sort of units of everything in which life happens and that, at best there are relationships between nations, but [it is] the idea that life moves across nations [...] so this transnational life is not about [...] going abroad, travelling to another country, and discovering something new, but it's seeing the normalisation of life in its every stage love, work, leisure happening across borders with obviously the complication that the world is not ready for that. The world is still very much based on national institutions [...] so it's very much the example of transnational life being there but nation-states putting obstacles towards this transnational life flowing...

By contrasting the ‘natural’ flow of transnational life on the one hand with the institutional organisation of the world as defined by artificial national structures on the other, the speaker’s goal was to show the inadequacy of the latter and, ultimately, to delegitimise them. RO1 realised this representation through the metaphor of LIFE IS MOVEMENT in which citizens interacting through increased cross-border mobility are metonymically referred to as life itself (‘life moves across nations’). Against this backdrop of positive representations of vital and natural movement of society, the speaker was able to characterise nation-states as negative agents which regulate the free motion of life by drawing on the metaphorical concept of NATIONS/STATES ARE CONTAINERS (realised via the expression ‘units in which life happens’) and through the trope of ‘obstacles’.

Similarly, BE2 drew on the *topos of flow* of historical events to dismantle nationhood primarily in reference to the 'inevitable' process of state disintegration:

Extract 4

I think boundaries are a [...] a well-established construct, that, from a physical and political construct, has also become a cultural construct, so I think it is now difficult to go beyond this idea, and to take down the nation-state, and I think that it is not even necessary [...] it will happen, it will be a natural process, I mean the disintegration of the nation-state is happening anyway, and it will happen because it is almost a biological process. I believe that the nation-state is becoming more and more obsolete but exactly for a natural process, fundamentally, occurring more in a network of cities than in a cluster of nation-states

BE2 problematised nation-states as artificially bounded units relying on a critical interpretation of nation as a historical and socio-political construct which has been reproduced culturally. The speaker's main strategy was to characterize the dismantling of nation-states as a natural process occurring within an 'ecology' of society. To construct his argument, BE2 relied on the *topos of flow* through which he represented the world as naturally interconnected. Furthermore he deployed the metaphor of THE WORLD IS A LIVING ENTITY to represent social phenomena in terms of natural processes. Depicting the world as a living body with its own biology, therefore, for BE2 social structures are liable to decay with the passing of time just like any living entity, this imagery evoked clearly by the verb 'disintegrate'. At the same time, through his discourse BE2 depicted the degradation occurring to social structures as if they were part of a biological process of evolution whereby changes have functional purposes (cf. the use of the word 'obsolete'⁸). Through this frame the speaker was thus able to contextualise the 'natural' demise of nation-states due to their functional inadequacy along an evolutionary line of progress and transformation (signalled by the progressive/future verbal forms 'is happening/ will happen').

4.2.3 The reconfiguration of communities, spaces, and social orders

Members realised a number of arguments aimed at representing their social locations within re-imagined social, political, and cultural spaces invoking, *inter alia*, *topoi of interconnectedness*, *imagination*, and *solidarity*. As well as to represent certain referents of belonging - such as their family ties or their experiences with other (European) cultures - the *topos of interconnectedness* was deployed to conceptualise societal transformations and the very idea of a European community linked beyond borders and embedded in a 'glocal' system of relations. Moreover, the *topos of interconnectedness* helped members represent their engagement from an organisational perspective, not only for example to highlight the simultaneity of communication inside EA, but above all to realise discourses of mutual engagement in a project of participative democracy and active citizenship. Through the *topos of interconnectedness* and through the metaphor of NETWORK members achieved representations of the European community in an on-going process of transformation and capable of expanding, propagating, and reaching out to other members. In these representations it was also clearly noticeable how members had an important

investment in their role as active agents in creating connections and enlarging the network:

Extract 5

PR2: the network is working in terms of reaching out to individual people and kind of informing and connecting [...] this is what I like about the network, that it really is working on a very local level and then kind of expanding from there.

Strategies of de/re-territorialization of Europe as an imagined community and strategies of representing the transportability of one's political engagement were also supported by the *topos of active citizenship* (i.e. 'any individual should contribute to the democratic life of a community regardless of their cultural background or any formal membership'). For example PR2 invoked this *topos* to represent herself and other members as active agents in the process of 'doing' Europe:

Extract 6

PR2: the idea of transnationalism for me really means (..) that people independent of geographical borders are still coming together saying that we have a common idea, a common voice and we have a common purpose [...] this idea that ... you're not locked by where you are geographically and where you're kind of home is. It's especially an issue for me because, even though I am not European by birth, I can still contribute in some way and it doesn't matter if I'm living in Prague or I'm living in Berlin or I'm living in the UK, I can still contribute to this idea of a greater overarching community.

PR2's construction of community was initially realised through an argument of convergence of transnational interests through the metaphor of journey and entailments of movement ('people are coming together'). In addition, the member constructed a widely inclusive 'we'-community through a strategy of unification that attributed different commonalities to the group. Against this background, the member was also able to claim an active role in the construction of the European community, despite the disclaimer that she is not European by birth. Such an argument was supported by the *topos of active citizenship* through which the speaker represented civic participation decoupled from cultural or geographical containments – such a deconstruction realised via the metaphorical entailments of 'home' for culture and 'locked' for physical places (see Zappettini and Comănaru 2014 for similar strategies of decoupling civic identities in relation to languages).

Other members represented their engagement as active citizens through the metaphorical scenario of 'experiment'. Through this scenario several members constructed Europe as a laboratory with the right set of conditions for developing a better society through forms of civil engagement separate from nationality. For example BE2 characterised such a process as a bottom-up, one-directional motion ('step') initiated locally and propagated further out by geographical proximity in an almost inevitable cosmopolitan progression:

Extract 7

BE2: I see the European space as an interesting space of experimentation [...] it has the the cultural and political conditions ... for implementing this idea of transnationality for the time being only in Europe ... although for me it will have to develop by necessity beyond the European space [...] many see precisely in this

idea of Europe, in this feeling of belonging to Europe just a first step in being able to experiment with the idea of transnational citizenship beyond that of national citizenship

The *topos of imagination* represented an argumentative scheme that members frequently deployed to talk about an ideal European community, especially through metaphorical representations of society as moving, expanding and progressing in space/time. For example, AM1 constructed a dynamic relation of movement between multiple communities/identities through the geographical metaphor of ‘mapping’. In particular AM1 used the trope of scale (Dutch *schaal*) to represent her ‘mental map’ of Europe as an expanded (g)locality:

Extract 8

AM1: There is this concept [...] that you up the scale that you go from, from one (...) community to a bigger community (...) in Dutch it's *schaal* (...) scale enlarging [...] it's the idea that if you can increase that scale in your head from a region to a nation, then you should also be able to (...) see it in a bigger scale, and I think that (...) it is really the borders that you have in your head [laughs] I would say that (...) after your nation-state the next logical step is Europe because that's the continent you are on or something and after that it's the world but I dunno if it's the final step [laughs] perhaps we could go to a different planet! [laughs] Europe is kind of (...) the new frontier

AM1's strategy was aimed at depicting the European society as one stage in the dynamic process of expanding the imagination of community (realised through expressions such as ‘you go from...to’ and ‘the next step’). Drawing on *topos of ‘imagined communities’* the speaker argued the possibility and desirability of expanding one's perception of community by shifting the imagination of borders (linguistically realised through ‘upping the scale’). Furthermore, the representation of communities historically moving towards larger configurations was enhanced by the use of the term ‘new frontier’. Such a term not only suggests the physical edge of boundaries but is distinctly related to notions of exploration/pioneering and visionary social reforms. AM1's strategy seemed therefore to achieve a redefinition of space and community by constructing Europe as a proxy for the ongoing narrative of human wealth and social justice. In this respect, AM1 invoked again the *topos of ‘scaled up’ imagination of community* as a warrant in an argument about the desirability of (economic) solidarity in the European society by analogy with the Dutch system:

Extract 9

AM1: for example in the Netherlands there is one part [...] that is really poor and everybody pays the taxes and the money gets redistributed, and nobody really thinks about it because we're all Dutch and there is this solidarity [...] and then the European argument is of course, well, ... it's the scale thing again, like how it works in a nation-state, it can also work like that in Europe: the countries that have a bit more money they re-distribute that to parts that are poorer

Representations of Europe as an imagined space also emerged conspicuously in the interview conducted with BE1. One of the most prominent aspects of her discourse was an explicit metaphorisation of Europe through the *topoi of Utopia* and *of global citizenship enacted locally*:

Extract 10

BE1: to me [Europe] is more really kind of imagination of the wish of how we can live together. It doesn't work in reality at the moment but it's an idea we have to go to [...] this ideal of having a shared place to live in makes me European and [...] no, it's not about place [...] it's a kind of utopia we should go to. In the Utopia everybody who wants to be European can be European [...] this utopia could be everywhere [...] I mean it could be somewhere in Africa it's just a shared ideal [...] but of course there's a process in Europe and you have this idea of Europe of this peaceful place after the second World War [but] I mean if I were living in New York I would engage in the same things I'm doing here I'm quite sure because it's a human idea [...] and if there are African people in Berlin, Africa is part of Europe

BE1 achieved different strategies of deterritorialisation of Europe through the *topos of Utopia*. Whilst at the level of literal meaning BE1 often characterised Europe as an ideal society rather than a physical place - by frequently downplaying and dismissing the geographical dimension - at a metaphorical level she often relied on representing Europe as a 'place' and her commitment to a better European society as the journey towards it. These two levels of meaning were articulated in an argument that can be summarised as: there is a moral obligation for individuals as citizens to achieve a better society and because IDEA(L)S ARE PLACES and PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS, progress towards the goal is made by moving towards the desired place. In BE1's spatial conceptualisation of Europe therefore the path to a 'bigger-and-better-than-the-EU' society constituted a powerful referent for her orientation to Europeanness so that the process of 'getting there' appeared just as salient for her identity as the destination itself.

4.2.4 Negotiating the meaning of (European) identities

When asked directly about their European identity, members used the prompt to realise a number of different strategies. Some members distanced themselves from a simplified use of 'being/feeling' European. Strategies of problematisation and avoidance were for example signalled by the frequent use of hedging ('I don't know', 'I don't think') or para-verbal features suggesting uncertainty, periphrasis in response to the prompt, deferring an answer, or reversing the question (see Zappettini 2015).

BE2 indicated a general difficulty to embrace stable or unreserved definitions of identities deploying the *topos of non-fixity* (i.e. Europe is an evolving idea/moving object) and realising his argument through the trope of container to reject identities as static and essentialised.

Extract 11

BE2: I think that the concept of European identity is very problematic because [...] the idea of identity gives me this message of something static and immobile, of something well defined, doesn't it? Something closed and fixed in time, and I do not think this is a concept applicable to the idea of Europe that inevitably must be something in movement I do not think it is possible to create an identitarian container for Europe I think it is a wrong approach, well a little bit forced anyway [...] I do not think European identity is the right idea for Europe

Similarly to BE2 most members discussed identity as an open (i.e. non-predetermined) and fluid process. A significant number of arguments on

European identity were also aimed at representing specific contents and processes of 'being European', i.e. what makes one European and how identities emerge, for example, out of transnational experiences (such as living abroad and mobility). Most of these arguments were achieved via *topoi of (inter)connectedness*, and of *interactional experience* and realised through spatial metaphors such as MAPPING and NETWORK which have been discussed in McEntee and Zappettini 2014. Similarly, some members constructed their Europeaness by highlighting their heritage ties through the *topos of family history* (Zappettini 2015).

Significantly, in all these discourses, members constructed Europeaness primarily through the articulation of its relationality with other elements and other identities. For example, LO3 referred to her transnational upbringing and socialisation as the main reason for her European identification drawing on the metaphorical representations of movement of one's heritage (cf. the expression 'linked with the history that doesn't necessarily come from the UK') whilst constructing her European identity vis-a-vis her British 'alterity':

Extract 12

LO3: Yeah, I feel European. The fact that I have so many relatives who live ... in different parts of Europe, that it's just how I was brought up (...) to feel European and sort of linked with the history that doesn't necessarily come from the UK, and yeah ...I'm sure it's an aspect of not wanting to just feel British [laughs] so a slight kind of feeling of wanting to be other than being British I'm sure that's part of it, yeah

From a different stance, RO1 achieved representations of his Europeaness through strategies of assimilation and dissimilation invoking the *topos of interactional experience* and the *topos of history* to construct similarities among the 'Europeans' and by contrasting them with the 'Canadians':

Extract 13

RO1: I think European identity is very much about [...] the way we think, the way that history plays a bigger role on how we would think, how we behave, what mistakes we've made [...]I feel very much European... and ironically ... the European identity developed when I moved to Canada, and when you're like in a third country outside of Europe, it's a lot easier to see what you have in common with fellow Europeans that were also in Canada

Constructions of Europeaness were also conspicuously achieved through its negotiation with local, national, and other identities. Some members represented identities as multilevel affiliations and derived their Europeaness from hypernymic implicatures of being national or through hyponymic implicatures of being world citizens. Notably, however, whilst most members tended to accommodate multiple identities, such linear hierarchical logic of 'local to global' was not always reproduced by some respondents who in fact dismissed, bypassed, and rejected their national affiliation. For example BE1 engaged in a strategy of delegitimisation of the German identity through the *topos of history*:

Extract 14

BE1: I don't really identify as being German, no, not at all ... but this is also because of the German history; they really don't have many good things to talk

about. I identify with the village I come from and then I identify as a Berliner now because I'm living in the city and I identify more as being European than being German ...I think I just have a problem with the German in a way, due to history, which is quite strange because now, in the crisis it happens quite often that if you are German, people say 'come on, but you're in Germany, and you've got money, and you can find a good job, so come on' but really, I can't be proud of it because I see the crisis from outside more than inside

BE1 overtly realised her rejection of the national identification through the propositions 'they don't have many things to talk about' and 'I can't be proud of it'. Through the moral evaluation of a past which, in her view, marred the attractiveness of 'being German', the speaker clearly dissociated and excluded herself from the German community through the use of the pronoun *they*. Moreover the uneasiness of being German was also made discursively relevant by the speaker through the context of the current economic crisis. In this case, although she could potentially identify with a positively connoted German referent, PR1 indicated again her rejection of Germanness. The speaker realised such a strategy through her metaphorical external positioning (inferable from the expression 'I see the crisis from the outside') through which she empathised, from a non-German stance, with other Europeans who have been affected by the crisis. It would therefore appear that in the process of identification with an expanded community - from village to Europe- the speaker bypasses the nation.

Moreover, a few members referred to a more complicated and conflictual interplay between multiple identities highlighting their 'in-betweenness'. For example, in her account PR2 negotiated simultaneous positionings as both a national American and a European:

Extract 15

PR2: I don't necessarily feel strongly American ... at the same time I also feel that I don't quite feel European either, I feel like it's somewhere, I feel like I'm very lucky to have like both perspectives and to have experience both and kind of take a lot out of that [...] I don't think it's also this idea that you give up your national identity to become European...I think that people have many identities, the idea is to really make sure that European is one of them

PR2's overall strategic orientation was towards the representation of identities as multiple and mutually compatible experiences that are neither exclusively 'transportable' nor necessarily 'activated' by a specific location. PR2's initial argument on the interplay between American and European referents of her identity was constructed through a spatial dimension which allowed her to position herself 'somewhere' in-between 'both perspectives'. The *topos of in-betweenness* appears positively invoked by the speaker who considered herself 'lucky' to be able to experience that situation.

The salience of identity as membership or formal categorisation was generally downplayed by members. For example SO1, a Bulgarian national, relativised the significance of Europeanness through an argument suggesting that the rationales for the EU membership of Bulgaria were primarily economic (*topos of commodified membership*). As such he regarded European identity (that is the formal entitlement to claim Europeanness derived from the status of Bulgarian citizenship) as a by-product of market logics and as an 'add-on'

identity. Discerning between distinct social and economic purposes of the EU integration gave SO1 the warrant for constructing his multiple identities:

Extract 16

SO1: I do identify as European at one level, on another level I do identify as a Balkan, you know, as somebody from the Balkans, and that's important for me, perhaps because I don't feel the Eastern leg of the European Union is very much integrated in what it is supposed to be integrated, so yeah, I do feel European with that note in mind.

On the one hand he dismissed the simple ascription as European deriving from Bulgaria's membership of the EU. On the other hand he called himself European in reference to Europe as an ideal social project. However, he highlighted the discrepancy between ideal and factual dimensions ('it is not what it is supposed to be') an argument that he linguistically realised through the metaphor of the EU as an organic (i.e. properly functioning) body whose 'Eastern leg' is not 'much integrated'. This premise enabled him to take a position as 'someone from the Balkans' an identity that, in this context, appears to supplement a 'weak' European identity deriving from economic rationales and bridges the gap between ideal and factual European communities:

Finally, in contrast to most views, members of the Cluj focus group discussed the official attribution of European citizenship as a significant referent for their identification as Europeans. In general, the Cluj members placed much emphasis on topics of mobility as the expression of a newly acquired status of freedom following Romania's accession to the EU in 2007 as illustrated by the extract below:

Extract 17

CL3: The right we have now [...] we can travel more freely now, and somehow we were given more rights to do what we want [...] we took some distance from something that bound us, we are not bound anymore, it isn't hard to dream of something anymore, like it used to be, now (..) it's more ok than before.

CL6: since 2007 you can really feel better that you are European, not just that you can travel more ... and get in contact with other cultures, but you come into contact with the legislation and all the bureaucratic fields...

CL2: Yes I often feel equal to others in France, Italy from anywhere and then it gives you a little more confidence ... confidence in yourself as a person, not as a Romanian, as a European so to speak

The three members legitimised their Europeanness through the *topos of European citizenship* as a consequence of Romania's accession to the EU in 2007. For CL3, EU membership indexes Romania's emancipation from the Communist regime and the severe travel restrictions formerly experienced by Romanian citizens, a passage signalled by the juxtaposed deictics *before* and *now*. Europe seemed to represent a new salient referent for renegotiating his civic affiliation away from national institutions and closer to the EU which could arguably be interpreted as a 'freeing agent' via the passive construction 'we were given rights'.

The temporal dimension deployed by CL3 was taken up further by CL6 ('since 2007') to represent her Europeanness enhanced by Romania's membership of the EU. In this case she constructed the experience of dealing with the EU institutions as a positive example of her EU citizen status and as a validation of

her Europeanness through the implicit inference that EU legislation applies equally to all EU citizens. The warrant that all citizens are equal before the law also enabled CL2 to affirm his Europeanness vis-à-vis other European citizens and, at the same time, to bypass the formal membership as a Romanian.

5. Conclusions

The analysis revealed three different macro strategic orientations adopted by members' in relation to discourses of transnationalism, Europe, and identity: the challenging and dismantling of nationhood; the construction of new 'imagined' communities, spaces and social orders; and the negotiation of meanings of (European) identities.

The analysis also revealed a complex and dynamic picture of how European citizenship was enacted by members through transnational narratives. Whilst some members constructed their Europeanness through accounts of historical, family, and cultural connections with European referents, most interviewees recognised themselves as Europeans through discourses of civic participation and engagement with transnational democracy. They thus conceived of their Europeanness as membership of an expanded 'community of relevance' through the transportability of their civic engagement and through meta-narratives of spatiality and progress whereby ideal scenarios of cosmopolitan citizenship and global democracy were often reterritorialised within the European space.

Without necessarily being claimed as an identity per se, transnationalism seemed to provide members with a lens for understanding their activities in a larger remit of global interaction and social transformation. Against this backdrop, members generally treated Europe as a relational spatial concept rather than an essential, global, or unified identity referent, constructing their European locations vis-vis a network of spaces, identities, and relationalities. At the same time, the data analysis has shown that a large proportion of members took a generally cautious, if not sceptical stance on embracing clear-cut, static, and formal definitions of (European) identity. In this sense, the salience of feeling European for the majority of members did not just seem to lie in the external validation of a status (e.g. citizenship) as much as in their agency to imagine and actively enact such citizenship. In this case, whilst European identity was sometimes constructed as 'brought along' by individuals in some cultural and historical forms, it was often represented as 'brought about' by civic participation and by the reimagination of communities of relevance.

The analysis has highlighted a diversity of linguistic realisations through which members achieved their strategic goals. In particular, it was shown how spatial representations were conspicuously driving discourses of transnationalism, citizenship, and identities. Members often made sense of social interaction through the metaphorical scenario of 'spatial dynamics' (flow, network, movement) to demarcate their social, cultural, and historical locations and to 'suture' personal and collective narratives of belonging. Whilst narratives of nationhood were often dismantled, the negotiation (or rejection) of

membership within a national imagined community defined the construction of transnational and European identities.

Overall the study has suggested that, in the discourses of members, transnational and European narratives were often interwoven to produce multiple and dynamic identities projected towards a cosmopolitan ideal of Europeanness. Of course, the high mobility, the age range, and the political commitment of the informants represented key variables that limit any generalisation of this insight. However, whilst the 'unbounded' reality of the informants might not necessarily represent the experience of ordinary (non)EU citizens, EA members have shown the potential to promote new discourses of (European) identity and to play a key role in the definition of the European space beyond 'Fortress Europe'. This study strongly suggests that transnationalism must be treated as a salient element interplaying (and often conflicting) with national belonging in the discourses of European civil society actors. This study has also highlighted the mutually constitutive nature of processes of mobility, political agency, and the transformation of nationhood.

From the stance of the data analysed, this paper thus contributes the view that European citizenship can index narratives of Europe and transnationalism as specific discourses of socio-historical transformation of nationhood and it calls for a critical appreciation of *places* and *spaces* as both cognitive and ideological contexts that must be treated as multiple, processual and unbounded elements of discourse rather fixed geographical or cultural categories. Finally, this paper encourages the exploration of European identities (treated as social and discursive constructs) at bottom-up and grassroots levels as these standpoints have only been cursorily appreciated by the CDA literature.

Notes

- ¹ For Habermas the public sphere represents a site for citizens' participation in the democratic dialogue and the formation of public opinion which is made up of different actors including the civil society organized in movements of citizens.
- ² See for example the European Commission's 'PLAN D' http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/decisionmaking_process/a30000_en.htm). Accessed 14/12/2015
- ³ <http://www.euroalter.com/who-we-are/our-organisation> Accessed 8/2/2015
- ⁴ Local branches are typically made up of members of different nationalities.
- ⁵ It is not possible to discuss all the different critical approaches to discourse analysis in this paper. For a literature review of the major trends see Zappettini, 2015 and Krzyzanowski, 2010.
- ⁶ I treat all warrants in argumentation schemes as topoi including those which infringe or violate rationality rules and which Wodak et al. (2009) refer to as fallacies.
- ⁷ This use of topoi in DHA has been criticized by Zagar (2010) for its departure from classical argumentation theory, however it has widely been used in pragmatics (cf. Kienpointner and Kindt 1997).
- ⁸ The Oxford dictionary's definition of 'obsolete' (meaning 2 Biology) is 'no longer functional for the organism'.

I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

References

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity At Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Balibar, E. (2009). Europe as borderland. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27: 190-215.
- Beck, U. (1996). The cosmopolitanism manifesto. In G.W. Brown and D. Held D (eds.), *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity. pp. 213-228.
- Beck, U. (2008). The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity. *The British Journal of Sociology* 51: 79-105.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Biebuyck, W. and C. Rumford (2011) Many Europes: Rethinking multiplicity. *European Journal of Social Theory* 15: 3-20.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Delanty, G. (2000). *Citizenship in a Global Age: Society, Culture, Politics*. Buckingham, England; Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Delanty, G and C. Rumford (2005). *Rethinking Europe: Social Theory And The Implications Of Europeanization*. Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge.
- Eder, K. (2006). Europe's borders: The narrative construction of the boundaries of Europe. *European Journal of Social Theory* 9: 255-271.
- Habermas, J. (1998). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London; Thousand Oaks: Sage in association with the Open University.
- Hanquinet, L. and M. Savage (2013). The Europeanisation of everyday life: Cross-border practices and transnational identifications among EU and third-country citizens. *Eucross Working Papers Series* 6.
- Hooghe, L. and G. Marks (2009). A postfunctionalist theory of European integration: From permissive consensus to constraining dissensus. *British Journal of Political Science* 39: 1-23.
- Krzyżanowski, M. (2010). *The Discursive Construction of European Identities: A Multi-level Approach to Discourse and Identity in the Transforming European Union*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang
- Levitt, P. and N. Glick Schiller (2004). Conceptualizing simultaneity: A transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration Review* 38: 1002-1039.
- McEntee-Atalianis, L. and F. Zappettini (2014). Networked identities. *Critical Discourse Studies* 11(4): 397-415.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E. and P. Landolt (1999). Tansnational communities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22.
- Reisigl, M. (2014). Argumentation analysis and the discourse-historical approach: A methodological framework. In C. Hart and P. Cap (eds.), *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Bloomsbury. pp. 67-96.
- Risse-Kappen, T. (1995). *Bringing transnational relations back in: non-state actors, domestic structures, and international institutions*. Cambridge; New York, Cambridge University Press.

- Ruzza, C. (2004). *Europe and Civil Society: Movement Coalitions and European Governance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Sassen, S. (2002). Towards post-national and denationalized citizenship. In E.F. Isin and B.S Turner (eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London; Thousand Oaks: SAGE. pp. 277-291.
- Smith, M.P. and L. Guarnizo (1998). *Transnationalism From Below*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Tarrow, S.G. (2005). *The New Transnational Activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Triandafyllidou, A., Wodak, R. and M. Krzyżanowski (2009). *The European Public Sphere and the Media: Europe in Crisis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. Oxford; New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd edn.). London: Sage. pp. 63-94.
- Wodak, R., de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., et al. (1999). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Zappettini, F. (2015). *The Discursive Construction of Europeanness: a Transnational Perspective*. Birkbeck: University of London.
- Zappettini, F. and R. Comănaru (2014). Bottom-up perspectives on multilingual ideologies in the EU: The case of a transnational NGO. *Journal of Contemporary European Research* 10: 402-422.

Appendix

Appendix 1. Summarising socio-demographic data collected through questionnaires at focus groups

Focus Group	Cardiff - UK			Cluj - Romania						Bologna - Italy						London (pilot)- UK	
Date	22/04/2012			14/09/2011						21/04/2011						06/04/2011	
Duration (mins)	65			84						70						36	
Participant Code	CA1	CA2	CA3	CL1	CL2	CL3	CL4	CL5	CL6	BO1	BO2	BO3	BO4	BO5	BO6	LO1	LO2
Age Group																	
18-24	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							X	
25-34										X	X	X	X	X	X		X
35+																	
Male/Female	F	F	F	F	M	M	F	M	F	F	F	M	F	F	M	M	M
Occupation	Student	Student	Student	Student	Unemployed	Employee	Student	NGO Coordin.	Youth Worker/Student	Journalist	Researcher	Student	Student	Employee	Employee	Researcher	Employee
Nationality	Turkish	Romanian	British	Romanian	Hungarian	Romanian	Romanian	Romanian	Romanian	Romanian	Italian	Italian	German/Russian	Italian	Italian/French	Italian	British
Current Country Of Residence	UK	Wales	Wales	Romania	Romania	Romania	Romania	Romania	Romania	Romania	Italy	Italy	Germany	Italy	Italy	UK	UK
Lived Abroad	Cyprus 4yrs; UK 2yrs	Sweden 6mths	France 9mths	Belgium 7mths; Greece 3mths	Germany 3mths; Netherlands 1mth	Italy 8mths	France 4mths; Austria 3wks			France 9mths; Tanzania 3mths	Spain 1yr; Belgium 9mths; UK 6mths	Germany 1mth	Russia 13yrs; Spain 2yrs; Italy 1yr; Slovakia 1mth	France 6mths	UK 4mths; Ireland 4mths; France 9mths	Ireland 1mth; Spain 5mths; France 4mths; USA 5mths; Lebanon 1yr	France 1yr; Spain 5mths; Lebanon 1yr
First Language	Turkish	Romanian	English	Romanian	Hungarian	Romanian	Romanian	Romanian	Romanian	Italian	Italian	Italian	Russian	Italian	Italian	Italian	English
Other Languages; Self Reported Proficiency	ENG 5 FR 3	ENG 5 SW 4 FR 1	FR 5	FR 5 ENG 4 GER 2.5	GER 5 ROM 5 ENG 4	ENG 3 IT 3	ENG 5 FR 5 IT 4 GER 2 SP 2	FR 5 ENG 5 IT 4 SP 1	ROM 5 ENG 4 FR 2 SP 1	ENG 4 FR 3 IT 4	ENG 5 FR 3 SP 4	ENG 5 GER 1 FR 1	GER 5 SP 4 IT 4	ENG 4 FR 4.5 SP 3	FR 5 ENG 3 FR 3	ENG 3 FR 3	GER 5 FR 4

LEGEND: ENG-English; FR - French; GER - German; GR - Greek; HUN - Hungarian; IT - Italian; POR - Portuguese; ROM - Romanian; RU - Russian; SP - Spanish; SW - Swedish.

Appendix 2: Summary of socio-demographic data collected through questionnaires at individual interviews

Interview	Rome - Italy	Berlin - Germany	Berlin - Germany	London - UK	Prague - Czech Republic	Prague - Czech Republic	Sofia - Bulgaria	Valencia - Spain	Amsterdam - Netherlands
Date	20/04/2010	16/02/2013	08/02/2013	18/01/2013	24/01/2013	27/01/2013	21/01/2013	24/01/2013	09/02/2013
Duration	36	52	41	45	65	42	61	56	80
Participant Code	RO1	BE1	BE2	LO3	PR1	PR2	SO1	VA1	AM1
Age Group									
18-24									
25-34	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
35+			X						
Male/Female	F	F	M	F	F	F	M	F	F
Occupation	NGO Worker	Unemployed	Cultural Manager	Student	Human Rights officer	Admin/education sector	PhD Student	Journalist	Temp clerk
Nationality	Italian	German	Italian	British	French	American	Bulgarian	Spanish	Dutch
Country Of Residence	Italy/UK	Germany	Germany	UK	Czech Republic	Czech Republic	Slovenia	Spain	Netherlands
Lived Abroad	Canada 2yrs; UK 8yrs; Spain 1yr	Italy 9mths	Spain 6mths; Austria 3yrs; Germany 7yrs		Germany 3yrs; UK 1yr; Romania 8mths; Czech Republic 2yrs	Czech Republic 5yrs	Croatia 3mths; Malta 6mths; Macedonia 3yrs	Netherlands 2yrs; Hungary 1mth; Russia 1mth; Finland 1mth	Sweden 1yr; Australia 2mths
First Language	Italian	German	Italian	English	French	English	Bulgarian	Spanish	Dutch
Other Languages; Self Reported Proficiency	ENG 5	ENG 4	ENG 4	GER 2	ENG 5	SP 3	ENG 5	ENG 3	ENG 5
	SP 5	IT 3	GER 3	FR 1	GER 5	CZ 3	MAC 5	IT 1	GER 4
	POR 2	FR 2	SP 2	SP 1	ROM 3		SB-CR 4	CAT 5	FR 2
		SP 1			IT 3		RU 3		SP 1
		TUR 1			CZ 2				

LEGEND: CAT - Catalan; CZ - Czech; ENG - English; FR - French; GER - German; GR - Greek; HUN - Hungarian; IT - Italian; MAC - Macedonian POR - Portuguese; ROM - Romanian; RU - Russian; SB-CR - Serbo-Croatian; SP - Spanish; SW - Swedish; TUR - Turkish.