

Elena NEGREA*

The making of European identity: the EC President's 2011 address to the European Parliament

Abstract: This study draws on a constructivist approach to identity as built through discourse. It seeks to examine the production of European identity by discourse. Its aim is to analyze the European (collective) identity as a discursively constructed concept that emerges in linguistic interaction. To this end, this analysis explores the categories used in linguistic interaction to define and understand the sense of belonging to a European identity.

To show how European identity is made by discourse, the EC President's address to the European Parliament delivered on September 2011 is analyzed. The method used is membership categorization devices analysis, a useful analytical tool stemming from Harvey Sacks's original work on conversation.

Keywords: European identity; identity construction; discourse; membership categorization.

1. Introduction

The search for a 'European identity', a common political, social and cultural identity shared by all (or at least by the majority of) the EU member states, is one of the major challenges that the Union is facing today. The enlargement towards Central and Eastern Europe, the dilemma concerning Turkey's accession and the increasingly difficult to overcome 'Eurocrisis' have substantially contributed to the rise of 'European identity' as a question of topical importance for scholarship and inquiry in the field. Concerns over people's understanding of European identity are not new; different territorial and spatial transformations in Europe, triggered by successive enlargement waves, have called into question the unbreakable domination of state-centred identities (Passi, 2001) over the common identity derived from the EU membership. However, geography (drawing external boundaries) is not the only important element of identity construction. The need to build a European identity is significantly stimulated by the EU's legitimacy deficit (Sassatelli, 2002). With European integration becoming increasingly deeper and wider, questions regarding the legitimacy of the European project have arisen, which urged the EU to take immediate action. Furthermore, the EU's continuous search for instruments of legitimization becomes more pressing when distressful events happen, such as the economic and financial crisis that has lately hit the EU and especially the Eurozone states. In fact, the early '70s and the economic problems that threatened Europe at that time urged the European leaders to look for a way to deepen the European integration. The idea of a European identity that defines Europe with respect to the 'other' was then proposed. The "Declaration on European identity", issued at the Copenhagen European

* Assistant Professor, College of Communication and Public Relations, National School of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania, elena.negrea@comunicare.ro.

Summit in 1973, defined the European identity in terms of internal unity, common heritage, dynamism of the European integration and the cooperation of the (then) nine member states with the rest of the world. It was the first official acknowledgement of the importance of building and consolidating a sense of belonging to the EU as a counterpart to the alert institutional development required by the integration process.

Since the Copenhagen Declaration, the EU's legitimacy has been intensively questioned at different levels, of which popular contestation is the most frightful for EU leaders and officials. The concept of European identity seems to have been insufficiently exploited (if not inexplicably neglected) since its official apparition in 1973. The idea of a common European identity to be shared by European citizens who would use it to interpret the European integration process (Inthorn, 2006) has lost significant (possible irrecoverable) ground to national-driven perceptions of the EU. However, at moments of trouble and uncertainty, some European leaders return discursively to the symbolism of the integration process and play the card of common European identity and solidarity. It is the case of the President of the European Commission, José Barroso, who intensely recalled the importance of building and preserving a common identity in his address to the European Parliament in September 2011. This speech is the object of this study.

2. How to define European identity?

There seems to be no immediate and complete answer to this question. Nevertheless, whichever view one adopts with regards to the definition of a European identity, it should not try to explain European identity by contrast with national identity. This contrastive approach to European identity would not be productive, as the EU seeks to create and consolidate a sense of 'Europeanness' without bringing any prejudice to the national identities of any of its member states¹. The concern for the preservation of both identities leads to a "segmentary-type model of belongings" (Delgado-Moreira, 1997), which, if applied, would make the integration process more difficult. The Union's goal is to foster 'European consciousness', identity and culture *similar* to those inherent to the member states. Such effort would contribute to the elimination of any perceived threats to national identity that might be experienced by the citizens. As McLaren (2006) remarked, "there are likely to be two different realms in which citizens differ in their feelings about national versus European identity. One lies in their strength of national identity in the first place. The other lies in whether they believe the EU to be posing a threat to such identity (p. 7)". Despite the fact that empirical studies have shown that the fear of loss of national identity has a limited impact on the level of support for the EU (McLaren, 2004), such fear may be exploited rhetorically to justify the escalation of nationalism.

Having in mind these precautions, how can we define the European identity? In what respect does European identity differ from nation-state identity? Marcussen *et al.* (1999) conceive nation state identity as a collection of elements forming the "social identity that individuals deal with in a *specific context*" (p. 616) – the state and the political and social order it establishes. The same authors argued that the idea of 'European identity' *need not* be conceptualized significantly differently than the idea of 'nation-centred identity'; in fact, both concepts need to resonate in terms of symbolism and values associated with them. Thus, the conflict between an existing (national) identity and a (new) European one is reduced, and the

public no longer perceives the latter as a threat if “ideas about Europe and European identity appear in various ‘national colours’” (Marcussen *et al.*, 1999, p. 617).

Nonetheless, these “new ideas about Europe” triggered by the integration process re-shape people’s understanding of what it means to belong to a political, economic and cultural super-group such as the EU. The question of belonging to Europe and having a European identity is particularly important in the context of the European enlargement – who are the in-groups and the out-groups of Europe? We can see that territoriality and geography become essential to the future of the European project. Furthermore, the study of European identity significantly relies on the analysis of what unites Europeans in terms of geography, culture, heritage, or politics. This classical ‘top-down’, ‘objective’ (Bruter, 2003, p. 6) approach, preferred by the political scientists and historians, has been completed by research that examines the concept of European identity from a personal, individual perspective. What do people mean when they say that they ‘feel’ European? In a study based on focus groups run in three different EU countries, Bruter (2003) used the alternative ‘bottom-up’, ‘behaviorist’ perspective to examine the notions of European identity and Europeanness as understood by citizens. The study showed that people’s self-assessment of their European identity consisted of a double ‘civic’ and ‘cultural’ dimension. On the one hand, ‘civic’ identifiers such as borderlessness, free movement of people and goods, prosperity, policy-making were mentioned by the participants as identifying them as Europeans; on the other hand, European identity was perceived in terms of ‘cultural’ aspects such as peace and harmony, disappearance of historical divisions, cooperation between similar cultures. These findings, however questionable the method of gathering the data may be, help us better understand the complexity of defining European identity by assessing people’s perceptions of what being European means and the implications of the individual understanding of Europeanness for the future of the European project. People’s perceptions of European identity seem to be essential to their manifest attitudes toward the European integration. Despite the lack of a consistent definition, European identity “appears to underpin political processes” (Inthorn, 2006, p. 75), and determine, to a certain extent, the political, economic and social development of the Union. The real challenge for the EU is to accommodate the European integration with the consolidation of a European identity. A lack of European identity slows the integration, but, at the same time, deepening and widening the process contributes to the diffusion of the feeling of belonging to a European identity. This is not an easy task and, certainly, the “unresolved political nature” (Schlesinger, 2007) of the EU does not help either. Moreover, the status ambiguity of the EU impacts on the functioning of the European communication space, affecting inescapably the people’s perception of a common identity. As a result, European citizens show reluctance in engaging themselves fully in a European public sphere; their interest in the EU’s policies and actions, the level of their political mobilization decrease gradually. Consequently, legitimacy of the EU’s actions is shaken. Needless to say, the constitutional deadlock of June 2005 is probably the most evoked example in the literature regarding the EU’s legitimacy deficit.

Another way of explaining the concept of European identity is prompted by the shift of focus in the literature on identity from the micro-social, individual-based inquiries to the macro-social, group-based, ‘collective’ approaches to the issue (Cerulo, 1997). Underscoring the interplay of individual and collective identity², Jenkins (1996/2008) observes the presence, in both cases, of the two dimensions of identity – self-identification and categorization by others. The nebulousity surrounding the collectivity, by contrast with the embodiment and visibility of individuals, may have been the reason why ‘collective identity’ is less obvious and

harder to conceptualize. This difficulty in grasping the collective identity may have caused the arguably worse mistake made by Margaret Thatcher in “declaring that there is no such thing as ‘society’” (Jenkins, 1996/2008, p. 156).

The ‘European *collective* identity’ is to be considered as a “construct of public communication” (Trenz, 2005, p. 9). Europeans, as a social group, define themselves on the basis of a set of ideas related to Europe and the EU, which they construct and share in discourse. Through interaction and communication, this group forms “a *social imaginary* that gives cultural form to integration making Europe real and giving it shape” (Calhoun, 2003, p. 244). Building European identity entails the existence of a discursive community, of a public sphere, where reflexivity of public discourse on Europe is advertised. This amounts to saying that “social communication produces collective cohesion and identity – and invites us to share in a common fate” (Schlesinger, 2007, p. 417). In the same line, Trenz (2005) emphasizes the idea that the European collective identity is a

“projection that is developed in public discourse. [...] The imagination of the unity of Europe is thus developed in public discourse about *collectively* binding decision-making through the institutional apparatus of the EU and its corollary of rules and procedures. Such an imagination of European unity does not take place in an arbitrary form but is bound to specific historically grown semantics of the social representation of Europe” (p. 9).

Therefore, for Europe to be ‘real’ for citizens who bind to it and to its values, both symbols and myths and public discourse and participation are required. The European public sphere is not only an essential setting for the promotion of European integration; it is also the place where European collectivity is created and a sense of belonging to this collective identity is developed.

The analysis presented in this paper draws on the discourse analytical perspective on identity as an ongoing process accomplished through social interaction, particularly language and communication (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005). It aims at analyzing European (collective) identity as a discursively constructed concept that emerges in linguistic interaction. The analysis seeks to examine the linguistic mechanisms whereby the European identity is produced through discourse, and the categories used in linguistic interaction to define and categorize the sense of belonging to a European identity. Given the specificity of the EU (neither a political nor a purely economic union) and starting from the premise that European identity develops primarily at the level of ‘interactional and institutional orders’ (Jenkins, 2000), identity construction in institutionalized discourse will be investigated.

3. European identity construction in Barroso’s address to the European Parliament

3.1. A few words on methodology

Social psychologists have produced a voluminous body of literature on discourse and identity. Their growing interest in the topic has been fueled by the ‘postmodern’, ‘discursive’ constructivist trend across social sciences. Following social constructivism representatives, identity is no longer analyzed as *reflected* in discourse; on the contrary, it is to be understood as *made by* discourse. What we are witnessing in the inquiry on identity construction is a “re-

location of identity from the 'private' realms of cognition and experience to the 'public' realms of discourse and other semiotic systems of meaning-making" (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006, p. 4). With this theoretical shift comes one of the most intriguing challenges that the researchers have been confronted with, namely how to identify identity construction in various types of discourses (ordinary vs. institutional, spoken vs. written, text vs. image, etc.). Five discourse analytical methods (or sets of methods) have widely spread across the disciplinary spectrum of discourse and identity – critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; Weiss & Wodak, 2003), discursive psychology (Edwards, 2005), narrative analysis (Riessman, 2005), conversational analysis and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967; Sacks, 1992/1995; Schegloff, 1988; Schegloff *et. al.*, 2002). While sharing the idea that language plays a central role in identity construction, these approaches vary in the extent to which identity is theorized. The analysis presented in this paper draws on the ethnomethodological notion of 'doing' different kinds of identity (Garfinkel, 1967, West & Zimmerman, 1987) and the conversation analytical notion of identity as built through linguistic interaction (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006). To explore the construction of European identity in discourse, membership categorization devices analysis (MCDs) will be used. This is a method that originates in Harvey Sacks's seminal work on conversation as 'talk-in-interaction'. In spite of the criticism it has received (Schegloff, 2007) and despite the separate paths that this method and conversational analysis have taken (with the former focusing on categories used by members in conversation, and the latter concentrating on sequence organization and turn-taking), the MCDs analysis has proved to be a valuable empirical tool for examining identity construction in discourse. As Sacks noted (1992/1995), MCDs provides an explanation for the way in which speakers categorize themselves and others in ordinary talk. It is worth mentioning that MCDs has been successfully applied to examining interactions within institutional settings (Schegloff, 1992, Van De Mierop, 2008). An example of institutional discourse will be further analyzed in this paper.

Let me briefly introduce the method and the way in which it can be used. MCDs is an early product of Sacks's work on conversation. As mentioned in the lecture delivered in 1966, where he provided the classical example to which many applications of MCDs can be traced back³, Sacks sought to build an apparatus that generates recognizable descriptions without reference to what was being described. To this purpose, the MCDs was constructed with the aim of producing such recognizable descriptions. The MCDs analysis shows how category terms are employed for 'doing descriptions', that is for making explicit "how speakers come to use the words they do, and how that informs the hearing that the talk gets from recipients" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 463). Thus, the MCDs functions as an apparatus – a set of resources and practices – that provides an understanding of everyday talk by means of describing the collection of categories used to refer to persons and their rules of application. Not any set of categories is a collection, but only those categories that "go together" (Sacks, 1992/1995, p. 238). As for rules of application, he describes two: the economy rule and the consistency rule. The former implies that a single term of the category is sufficient to adequately refer to a person, while the latter holds that if several persons are referred to by category terms, then one can use the collection employed to categorize the first person to subsequently categorize the other persons (Sacks, 1992/1995; Schegloff, 2007). To these key components of the MCDs, other important constituents are added, such as duplicative organization, mishearing, misidentification, non-translatable categories, category-bound activities, to name but a few. From this list, my analysis will dwell more on the notion of category-bound activities; these are types of activities or actions that people vernacularly relate to members of a given cate-

gory. To illustrate this, I go back to Sacks's own example: the action of crying is bound to the membership category "baby" (p. 241). The reason for which this facet of the MCDs will be further developed in this paper lies in the fact that, according to Sacks, naming an activity that binds with a category means that "an identification is being offered of at least the speaker" (p. 301). This highlights the importance of naming activities and actions to the relevance of the category to which those actions and activities are bound.

3.2. The context of interaction

The goal of this study is to analyze European identity as a product of a discourse in particular institutional setting, namely the EC President's address to the European Parliament delivered in September 2011, in Strasbourg. The original bilingual speech (French and English) is available at http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/president/pdf/speech_original.pdf. The context in which this interaction is produced is essential for the display and, furthermore, for the analysis of European identity. The address was given in a distressful context determined by the crisis that the EU confronts, especially the 'Eurocrisis'. Also, the timing is of great importance as the address was delivered approximately two months before the European summit in Brussels, in which the future of the EU would be discussed. As a representative of the institutional dimension of the EU, President Barroso tried to reinforce the EU's capacity to overcome the crisis by discursively challenging the roots of European identity. The intervention of the EC President may have been thought of as a preamble for the December 2011 summit, since many of its points were revisited during the discussions held in Brussels (e.g. the case of Greece and the Eurocrisis, the lack of an economic and fiscal union, the Treaty changes). However, if the efficacy of the address is to be determined, one may observe that the primary audience's (MEPs and EU officials) involvement in the decision-making concerning the future of the EU is modest. Despite the evocation of a common destiny of the EU member states, the measures to be taken in order to further avoid the danger of the crisis that the EU struggles with have been assessed on an individual basis.

3.3. Being European is being a team member

The text of the EC President's address to the European Parliament contains many references to historical and institutional underpinnings of the EU, alongside the technicalities associated with its functioning. Nevertheless, given the context of the interaction, the text also encapsulates the speaker's intention to express the need for a renewal of Europe. President Barroso reaffirms a sense of "Europeanness" by constantly invoking "(our) Member States".

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 10: Barroso | Les causes de la crise sont connues:
(The roots of the crisis are well-known.) |
| 11 : | l'Europe n'a pas répondu aux défis de la compétitivité.
(Europe has not yet met the challenges of competitiveness.) |
| 12 : | Certains de nos Etats-membres ont vécu au-dessus de leurs moyens.
(Some of our Member States have lived beyond their means.) |
| 13 : | Dans les marchés financiers, il y a eu des comportements irresponsables et inadmissibles.
(Some behaviors in the financial markets have been irresponsible and inadmissible.) |
| 14 : | Nous avons laissé se creuser des déséquilibres entre nos États membres, particulièrement dans la zone euro.
(We have allowed imbalances between our Member States to grow, particularly in the euro area.) |

At this point, membership categorization devices come into play and, interestingly, they activate two sets of collections. “Member” may be a category of both “family” and “team” collections. This excerpt contains an ambiguous description regarding the collection of categories to which “Member States” belong. Naming category-bound actions – “living beyond their means” (line 12) – or behaviors – “irresponsible and inadmissible behaviors” (line 13) does seem to help identifying the collection to which the speaker refers to. While it appears that “living beyond their means” is more likely to happen to the members of a family, irresponsible and inadmissible behaviors may apply to both members of a family and to members of a team alike. However, it would be rather odd to define the relationships between members of a family as being “imbalanced”. On the other hand, this would be a perfectly reasonable way to assess teamwork, where some team members may train or work harder than others or they can be more talented, which would lead to “imbalances” between them, affecting, thus, team performance. This seems to be the case with the EU, as shown in the text:

- 102: Barroso The pace of our joint endeavour cannot be dictated by the slowest.
 103: And today we have a Union where it is the slowest member that dictates the speed of all the other Member States.
 104: This is not credible also from the markets' point of view, this is why we need to solve this problem of decision-making.
 105: A Member State has of course the right not to accept decisions. That is a question, as they say, of national sovereignty.
 106: But a Member State does not have the right to block the moves of others, the others also have their national sovereignty and if they want to go further, they should go further.

The description of the EU becomes recognizable due to the work of MCDs that activate the category “member” from the collection “team”. Invoking the slowness of some members is ‘doing’ a (recognizable) description of the EU. This interpretation concurs with other elements that fit the “team” collection of categories. Lines 105 - 106 above indicate that the “team” Europe is defective. It lacks a coherent and acknowledged leadership that could define goals and set directions to attain them. At the beginning of the intervention, the speaker mentions the “crisis of confidence” that the EU is facing and the lack of proper leadership. By referring to Europe as a “team”, President Barroso can further elaborate on the features of the membership. Thus, alongside “members”, other categories of the collection “team” are recognizable in the text; a team has “leaders”, it usually plays “games” and seeks “victory”. Barroso alludes to the “economic gains” to be achieved if Europe succeeds in increasing its competitiveness and growth. Deeper “coordination” and “integration” are required for Europe to become a competitive player.

3.4. Being European is playing by the rules

Another category-bound activity named in the text is that of “playing by the rules”. These rules are established by unanimous agreement and are known to all members of the team. They are stipulated in EU Treaties and regulations. Playing by the rules entails every team member’s commitment to the values of fairness. So far, the fairness seems to have been neglected by some of the team members and this situation has been pointed out by the “referee”. This role is fulfilled by the Commission – “the guarantor of fairness”. Warnings have been used and sanctions will be applied if some members do not comply with the rules.

The presence of many active verbs such as “do”, “need”, “build” “implement” and the repeated use of modals (“can”, “must”) are indicators of the necessity and imperativeness of

becoming a better “team”. Just like in a game where opposing teams must be constantly alert, to make the most of the opportunities presented and to exploit others’ weaknesses, the EU must find the ways to win/ to be successful as a team. This means that no member should be left behind, and that everybody should play by the rules.

- 43: Barroso Greece is and will remain a member of the euro area.
 44: Greece must implement its commitments in full and on time.
 45: In turn, the other euro area members have pledged to support Greece and each other. As stated at the euro area Summit on 21 July: “We are determined to continue to provide support to countries under programmes until they have regained market access, provided they successfully implement those programmes.”

This fragment brings forth other category-bound characteristics of “team members”. Being part of a team means showing solidarity and responsibility for your team mates. It also favors the development of a sense of inclusiveness. The use of pronouns, especially of the first person plural form “we” implies membership to a category (Benwell & Stokoe, 2006), it evokes the sense of belonging to an ‘in-group’ of ‘Europeans’ (De Cillia *et. al.*, 1999). The many occurrences of the inclusive “we” convey the sense of solidarity and create “a sense of co-incumbency within the same category” (Szakacs, 2010, p. 49) of team members who are likely to act according to a common interest:

- 55: Barroso The task of building a Union of stability and responsibility is not only about Greece.
 56: The economic outlook that we face is very difficult. We are confronted with the negative effects of an ongoing global re-assessment of risks.
 57: It is therefore our responsibility to rebuild confidence and trust in the euro and our Union as a whole.

The EC President employs repeatedly the pronoun “we” (its nominative and possessive forms) throughout his intervention, and he does it both inclusively (“We can do it.”, “We can also do more.”, “We must focus our action where it makes a real impact.”, “our Member States”, “our Union”) and exclusively (“Let’s remember that we have already tabled 29 pieces of legislation.”). The inclusive use of “we” conveys a sense of belonging to a team, a sense of “Europeanness”⁴, while using the pronoun exclusively, the speaker points to the institutional dimension of the EU, in this case, the Commission.

All of these membership categorization devices and their work in a text-in-interaction such as the examined address allow us to explore the way in which common-sense assumptions about the EU and the European identity are ‘done’ in discourse through categorization processes. The work of MCDs is relevant to the construction of the “EU” as a team that currently goes through difficult times caused by some team members’ indiscipline, by lack of powerful leadership, and by tough game rules dictated by global markets. To some extent, the text shows, European identity may be defined by means of the categories that people use to refer to the EU.

4. Concluding remarks

This MCDs analysis of President Barroso’s address to the European Parliament shows how “European identity” is interactionally constructed in a situated occurrence of text-in-interaction. In this case, membership categorization procedures are used to produce a constitutive understanding of “European identity” as linked to a set of teamwork values and obligations.

The sense of belonging to Europe and sharing a common European identity is produced in relation to the characteristics of the “team” collection of categories. The membership to the EU resembles membership to a team, which has “members”, “leaders”, “games” to play and “victories” to win. Team members train themselves to better perform in “games” and to achieve victory. European identity is built in discourse by reference to common knowledge organized around the category “team member”. The category-bound characteristics of “team”, such as fairness, responsibility or solidarity, referred to in discourse point to the way in which European identity is to be understood. Being European means being a team member and playing by the rules. However, sometimes some team members don't succeed in complying with teamwork and team obligations. In such difficult times, team values and identity should be reinforced, greater goals should be reaffirmed in order to keep the team powerful. This MCDs offer this recognizable description to account for the definition of the European identity, which is in fact invoked by the discourse.

Finally, this study sought to support the growing interest in exploring issues regarding identity construction with the tools provided by the conversational analysis and the ethnomethodological tradition, more generally. Thus, the paper aimed at showing how membership categorization analysis can be fruitfully used to examine linguistic interactions produced in an institutional setting. In addition to its implications for discourse analysis, the use of membership categorization analysis to inquire into European identity construction sheds some light on the mechanisms through which an abstract construct such as the EU is explained and made accessible to people.

Notes

¹ The Maastricht Treaty stipulates that the Union shall respect the national identities of its Member States (Article F).

² It is worth mentioning that the notion of ‘collective identity’ is far from being a clear-cut object of study in social psychology. Furthermore, Berger and Luckmann (1966/1991) consider “inadvisable to speak of ‘collective identity’” (p. 233), because this notion is misleading as it denies the ‘subjective’ nature of identity, which emerges from the “dialectic between the individual and society” (p. 195). Trying to avoid any confusion that the notion of ‘collective identity’ may produce, some scholars preoccupied to accommodate the concept with the literature on European identity have suggested that ‘collective identity’ should be replaced with the notion of ‘multiple identities’ (Marcussen *et al.*, 1999). People hold multiple identities which they activate depending on the context. These authors believe that, to some extent, ‘multiple identities’ may be a more appropriate notion to the type of governance that the EU is (p. 631).

³ I refer to the notorious quote from a child story that Sacks used to explain how the MCDs method works: “The baby cried. The mommy picked it up” (Sacks, 1992/1995, p. 244). The categories revealed by this example are “baby” and “mommy”, and they are organized into a collection called “family”. The collection is a set of categories (“mommy”, “baby”, “daddy”, etc.) that ‘go together’. The categories inferred with the MCDs are “inference-rich” – a large part of the commonsense knowledge that people have about the society is organized around some categories (Sacks, 1992/1995, p. 40). Arguably, Sacks builds his explanation on

the assumption of a convergence of interpretation and recognition of such categories and the rules applying to them by both the researcher and his audience.

⁴ For an account of the use of pronouns to define the concept of “European identity” and to show the way in which it is constituted in discourse see Cramer’s (2010).

Rezumat: Această lucrare își propune să examineze modul în care identitatea europeană se construiește prin discurs. Analiza prezentată aici se înscrie într-o perspectivă constructivistă asupra identității ca un construct social. Pentru a investiga identitatea europeană, sunt analizate categoriile utilizate în interacțiunea lingvistică cu scopul de a defini și înțelege apartenența la o identitate comună europeană. Interacțiunea aleasă ca exemplu de studiat este discursul președintelui Comisiei Europene, José Barroso, în Parlamentul European din septembrie 2011. Analiza apartenenței la anumite categorii, inspirată din studiile lui Harvey Sacks asupra conversației, este metoda de lucru prin care construirea identității europene este studiată.

Cuvinte-cheie: identitate europeană; construirea identității; discurs.

References

1. Benwell, B., Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
2. Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T. (1966/1991). *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Penguin Books.
3. Bruter, M. (2003). On what citizen mean by feeling ‘European’: perceptions of news, symbols and borderless-ness. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*. 30 (1), 21-39.
4. Bucholtz, M., Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*. 7 (4-5), 585-614.
5. Calhoun, C. (2003). The Democratic Integration of Europe. Interests, Identity and the Public Sphere. In M. Berezin & M. Schain (Eds) *Europe without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship, and Identity in a Transnational Age*. (pp. 243-274 The Johns Hopkins University Press.
6. Cerulo, K. A. (1997). Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 23, 385-409.
7. Cramer, J. (2010). ‘Do we really want to be like them?’: Indexing Europeanness through pronominal use. *Discourse Society*. 21(6), 619-637.
8. De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse & Society*. 10(2), 149-173.
9. Delgado-Moreira, J. (1997). *Cultural Citizenship and the Creation of European Identity*. Retrieved from <http://www.sociology.org/content/vol002.003/delgado.html> (October 2011).
10. Edwards, D. (2005). Discursive Psychology. In K.L. Fitch & R.E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 257-273). Erlbaum.
11. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
12. Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
13. Inthorn, S. (2006). What Does It Mean to Be an EU Citizen? How News Media Construct Civic and Cultural Concepts of Europe. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*. 3(3), 71-90.
14. Jenkins, R. (1996/2008). *Social identity*. Third edition. Routledge.
15. Jenkins, R. (2000). Categorization: Identity, Social Process and Epistemology. *Current Sociology*. 48(3), 7-25.
16. Marcussen, M., Risse, T., Engelmann-Martin, D., Knopf, H. J., Roscher, K. (1999). Constructing Europe? The evolution of French, British and German nation state identities. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 6(4), 614-633.

17. McLaren, L.M. (2006). *Identity, Interests and Attitudes to European Integration*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.
18. McLaren, L.M. (2004). Opposition to European integration and fear of loss of national identity: Debunking a basic assumption regarding hostility to the integration project. *European Journal of Political Research*. 43, 895-911.
19. Passi, A. (2001). Europe as a social process and discourse. Considerations of place, boundaries and identity. *European Urban and Regional Studies*. 8(1), 7-28.
20. Riessman, C. K. (2005) Narrative Analysis. In N. Kelly, C. Horrocks, K. Milnes, B. Roberts & D. Robinson (eds) *Narrative, Memory & Everyday Life*. (pp. 1-7) University of Huddersfield.
21. Sacks, H. (1992/ 1995). *Lectures on Conversation*. 2 vols. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
22. Sassatelli, M. (2002). Imagined Europe. The Shaping of a European Cultural Identity through EU Cultural Policy. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 5(4), 435-451.
23. Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39, 462-482.
24. Schegloff, E. A., Koshik, I., Jacoby, S., Olsher, D. (2002). Conversation analysis and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 22, 3-31.
25. Schegloff, E. A. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In. P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.). *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. (pp. 101-134). Cambridge University Press.
26. Schegloff, E. A. (1988). Description in the social sciences I: Talk-in-interaction. *IPrA Papers in Pragmatics* 2. 1/2, 1-24.
27. Schlesinger, P. (2007). A Cosmopolitan Temptation. *European Journal of Communication*. 22(4), 413-426.
28. Szakacs, S. (2010). The making of 'Soft Villain' in a *Time Magazine* Headline, *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*. 12, 3 (20), 47-59.
29. Trenz, H.-J. (2005). The European public sphere: contradictory findings in a diverse research field. *European Political Science*. 4, 407-420.
30. Van De Mierop, D. (2008). Co-constructing identities in speeches: how the construction of an 'other' identity is defining for the 'self' identity and vice versa. *Pragmatics*. 18 (3), 491-509.
31. Weiss, G., Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis. in G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.). *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. (pp. 1-32). Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
32. West, C., Zimmerman, D.H. (1987) 'Doing Gender', *Gender and Society*. 1(2), 125-151.