AMERICAN NATIONAL IDENTITY, POLICY PARADIGMS, AND HIGHER EDUCATION

A History of the Relationship between Higher Education and the United States, 1862–2015

ALLISON L. PALMADESSA

American National Identity, Policy Paradigms, and Higher Education

Allison L. Palmadessa

American National Identity, Policy Paradigms, and Higher Education

A History of the Relationship between Higher Education and the United States, 1862–2015

palgrave
macmillan

Allison L. Palmadessa
History, Greensboro College
Greensboro, NC, USA

ISBN 978-1-137-59934-6 ISBN 978-1-137-59935-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-59935-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017938316

Cover illustration: Cover design by Fatima Jamadar

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Nature America Inc.
The registered company address is: 1 New York Plaza, New York, NY 10004, U.S.A.

For my family—
Matthew, Audrey, Sabrina, and Natalie

Preface

The relationship between the United States government and higher education is an ever-evolving negotiation of influence for sustaining a national cultural identity embedded in a historical narrative of overcoming challenge and rising to domination. This relationship was established with the earliest colonial universities as colonial leaders founded or were bred by these institutions, and the university has remained an integral part of forming leaders, workers, contributors, and all classifications of citizens throughout the nation's history. At this important juncture in American history in 2017, when the US is riddled with domestic and international challenges of great social, cultural, political, and economic implications, it is of utmost importance to consider the relationship between the government and the institution of higher education as it morphs and adapts to challenges on the horizon.

Higher education is an important social institution that prepares students to be contributing members of society and produces knowledge for capital and for the public benefit. As the institution grew in importance to the nation-state, its relevance to national identity, government authority, and legislative agendas became more evident. Since 1862, the federal government has called upon higher education to support its national goals. Not only has the government called for support, but it has also implemented legislative actions that create a tangible relationship between the social and political institutions. The impact and various forms of legislative actions are as varied as the history of the institution

itself, and it is of utmost importance to consider this relationship in the current historical milieu. The nation is at an interesting social, cultural, and political juncture in 2017; there are legislative propositions stalled in Congress related to higher education, and the new president is diametrically opposed to his predecessor's social agenda. Hence, the next four years will be an interesting period in higher education history.

This historical relationship and the means by which the federal government employs higher education to support the national agenda is likely to shift and be altered in the near term, in this unsettling period in the US history. There are many challenges at home and abroad that invoke the knowledge and utility of higher education, and the government is willing to regulate the institution to fulfill those needs. This work is a historical account of this relationship: the relationship between national identity as perceived and promoted by presidents and solidified through their agendas, federal legislation that directly impacts higher education, and the role higher education is expected or called to fill in times of crisis and upheaval, either at home or abroad.

The context of this work is 1862 to 2015; the Morrill Acts to the proposals lying in wait in Congress from the Obama administration. This is an expansive work, but obviously cannot cover every detail of higher education or presidential history. It is focused on presidential discourse related to national identity and higher education, and the legislation passed by Congress in this over 150-year history. To study this broad period and unwieldy relationship, I wed social science, linguistic, and historical methodologies to approach and dissect this complicated study. My intention is to provide a contextual history of how this great institution has influenced, and been influenced by, national identity and powerful presidential agendas. The implication of this work is not only historical understanding, but also for policymakers to be aware of the reach of legislation that sometimes appears to be for social justice, but arguably may work in opposition to the goals purported. With this perspective in mind, this work seeks to provide an understanding of a complex relationship that is currently in flux and stands to serve varied agendas and goals, depending on impending legislation and a new presidential administration.

Greensboro, USA Allison L. Palmadessa

Acknowledgements

This book is the culmination of an idea I began working on as a graduate student. I would be remiss not to acknowledge the support and guidance of my dissertation committee that waded through a partial version of this work—Dr. David Ayers, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Dr. Richard Crane, Benedictine College; Dr. Wayne Journell, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro; and Dr. Craig Peck, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. An extra special thanks to Dr. David Ayers for tolerating all of my related works and publications, working with me, and teaching me this complex methodology. I would also like to thank the editorial team at Palgrave-MacMillan for their guidance, advice, and support through this project.

Most importantly, I thank my family for their unending support. My husband Matthew, our three daughters, Audrey, Sabrina, and Natalie, who have all endured my hours behind a desk missing important family time. Matt, I could not have completed this work if not for your support and understanding of the importance, frustrations, and significance of this achievement. Audrey and Sabrina, thank you for being such good helpers through this very long writing process. And little Natalie (who was born in the middle of this project), thank you for being an angel through the final stages of writing and revision.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The American Revolution marked a radical turn away from the religious and authoritative regimes of Europe toward Enlightenment ideals of liberalism and human progress based on modern systems of knowledge (Anderson 2006). Perhaps there is no better symbol of America's early commitment to these ideals than the early American colleges and universities. As the United States (US) matured, it developed a dense network of research universities unmatched in any other nation. Indeed, the US and its colleges and universities are archetypical modern formations, and each has co-evolved with the other: The nation-state has resourced and legitimated the university, while the university has perpetuated a national cultural identity. Readings (1996), in fact, associates the university with "the destiny of the nation-state by virtue of its role as producer, protector, and inculcator of an idea of national culture" (p. 3). Thus, higher education and the formation of American national culture are inextricably linked.

The primary goal of this work is to examine the identity of the nation-state as construed by presidential administrations, how that identity is imposed upon higher education and drives its purpose to reproduce that identity, and how policy paradigms in higher education demonstrate the relationship between American cultural national identity and the purpose of the institution of higher education from 1862 to 2015. At the beginning of this period, universities became a focus of national attention as the Morrill Act of 1862 was passed to encourage growth in not just the number of public universities in the US, but also increase agricultural

A.L. Palmadessa, *American National Identity, Policy Paradigms, and Higher Education*, DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-59935-3_1

and mechanical production and promote greater technological output that would inevitably increase the nation's power and presence in the marketplace. Followed by The Morrill Act of 1890 and moving into the turn of the twentieth century, higher education grew and prospered, giving the nation-state an immense foundation of research and technology that would be vital to success during the world wars and the economic challenges that defined the first half of the twentieth century.

After the challenges and tragedies of the first 50 years of the twentieth century, the federal government began to focus on the great potential of the university to support its new-found position as world leader. The Truman administration explicitly recognized higher education as vital to the interests of the US in the Truman Commission report (*Higher Education for American Democracy*) which lauded higher education as a true mechanism of power as a means to promote a democratic agenda and support the needs of the marketplace. From the late 1940s to the 1960s, public investment in higher education continued as the institution of higher education was recognized as a distinct and influential social force in the growing post-War US, and policymakers across party lines maintained a consensus regarding public investment in higher education (St. John and Parsons 2004). This resulted in one of the greatest acts of federal legislation in higher education, the Higher Education Act of 1965. In the 1970s, however, the world experienced a period of cultural, political, and technological globalization positioning the US as a leading superpower, and the emergence of global capitalism. Within this milieu, the salience of the nation-state as a hegemonic scale of political organization has been questioned. As Readings (1996) puts it, "the nation-state is no longer the major site at which capital reproduces itself" (p. 13).

The 1980s and 1990s ushered in an era of increased focus on global capitalism and the role of technology in maintaining economic advantage in the marketplace. Thus, the federal government turned to higher education for support in research and development, encouraging lawmakers to support the economic potential of the institution. Again, in the first two decades of the twenty-first century and in the face of great global unrest and a myriad of challenges, the federal government turned its focus to the economic potential and power of the university. As a result, the administrations focused on supporting legislation that encouraged higher education to focus on outputs—of human capital and knowledge capital. Thus, the policy consensus regarding higher education dissipated

into a contest between those who viewed higher education as a public good on one hand and those who viewed it as a private good to be bought and sold through capitalist markets on the other. This dramatic policy change is explained in the present analysis as a shift in policy paradigms (Hall 1993).

Federal attention to higher education as a mechanism of administrations' means to reach national goals is clearly an issue that deserves attention in the second decade of the twenty-first century. As evidenced in this work, administrations and policymakers wield their power over social institutions through policy formation, argued here as a political act with discursive implications that sometimes result in policy paradigm shifts to meet economic goals arguably robbing the public of the benefits higher education stands to provide the populace. As President Obama's American Graduation Initiative has become a legislative proposal in the America's College Promise Act and his second term is coming to a close, a policy paradigm may emerge that has the potential to alter the future purpose of higher education. In a world riddled with fear and economic challenges, the great institution can be influenced to serve the public through the sharing of knowledge, or it can be coerced to function as a servant to the national economy. Future policy regarding higher education will have a powerful impact on one of the US's greatest social institutions, an impact that can either assist the institution in serving the public good, or it can serve private interests, situating the institution as an economic agent of the nation (Palmadessa 2017).

Changing relations between the nation-state and higher education have led to an ongoing debate regarding the future of higher education. According to Readings (1996), "the contemporary University [*sic*] is busily transforming itself from an ideological arm of the state into a bureaucratically organized and relatively autonomous consumer-oriented corporation" (p. 12). One the other hand, higher education can be viewed as an arm of the neoliberal state (Jessop 2004, 2008a; Jessop et al. 2008). While many scholars have debated the relationships between higher education and the global political economy, few have addressed the role of higher education in consolidating national identity within this milieu. Thus, in this work, I explore the role of higher education in consolidating American national identity and how higher education's task of shaping American national identity has changed from 1862 to 2015.

In this work, I found that there were multiple identities dominating presidential discourse from 1862 to 2015; however, there were three

micro-strategies within the discursive practices that resulted in consistent identity formation. Through analysis of presidential discourse, I found that the dominant identity of the US from 1862 to 2015 was consistently related to the nation's superior status, predominantly in the market economy. Each president defined success of the nation based upon the economic status of the US. One change through time is the focus on not just the domestic economy as either successful or being greater than other nation-states' economies, but that the US dominated the global marketplace. The US maintained this status by the success of the people, success built upon the workforce being educated and the products sold in the marketplace being developed by educated people.

This national dominance in the marketplace was dependent upon the people to perpetuate. Presidents spoke of economic growth and status as not just a goal or superior status relegated to the nation, but it was a status enjoyed by the people as the nation's economic status ensured their freedom as without a stable economy, the nation would suffer and possibly become likened to failing nations and the people would then lose stability and freedom. By equating the economy to people's freedom, presidents were able to convince the public to accept economic superiority as an identity for the nation as this was the only way to maintain dominance and leadership, a role argued as relegated to the US based on history.

For people to meet the demand set forth by presidents to construct or maintain the dominant identity, people have to work, and the more educated people are, and the more products created, the more prosperous the nation and its members will be. Therefore, the presidents place a heavy burden on institutions of higher education to provide the knowledge people need to become effective and profitable workers, for national and individual benefit. This burden of purpose to support the national economy directly and indirectly defined the purpose of education—to produce workers and goods for the market so that the nation could lead and the people could maintain freedom.

To encourage higher education to meet the expectations of the presidential administrations to support the dominant national identity, legislation is passed and policy initiatives are formed to enforce the goals of presidential administrations. The extent of the influence of policies is measured through the lens of Hall's (1993) policy paradigms. Hall's (1993) approach to understanding policy formation and paradigm shifts that occur as a result involves three stages of policy creation that lead to the ideological shift; analyzing policy through this lens requires the

researcher to analyze the discourse around the process to establishing a need for policy (settings), the ideological and discursive mechanisms that facilitate the creation of policy (instruments), and the actual policy paradigm shift that occurs when policy is written and ratified, creating a shift in power between the policymakers (in this case federal) and the institution the policy directly effects in either function or purpose (in this case higher education). When the third order change of paradigm shift occurs, the social institution (higher education) effected recreates the dominant discursive identity that is supported, promoted, and discursively constructed by the policymaker(s) (presidential administration).

To identify policy paradigm shifts in this work, I take into account the public presidential texts, commission reports, and federal legislation. By analyzing the presidential discourse, first order changes (settings) are identified when presidents state their agenda for the nation and education in formal addresses, such as inaugural addresses, state of the union addresses, and special messages to Congress. Second order changes (instruments) are found in commission reports, proclamations, executive orders, and informal public addresses that repeat the same rhetoric found in the previously stated documents; these reports, proclamations, and executive orders are only second order changes as they do not carry the weight of policy but dictate directly what the administration expects in the formation of policy, informing policymakers of how to write the policy to reflect the goals of the administration. Third order changes are found in the federal legislation that directly impacts the function of higher education. Thus, the paradigm shift is identified in both policy and presidential discourses regarding the enactment of such policy and the expectations the administrations have for higher education to meet the goals of the legislative policy. From 1862 to 2015 I found that five policy paradigm shifts occurred in higher education policy: the first resulting from the two Morrill Acts under Lincoln and Harrison; the second under Truman resulting from the GI Bill and the Truman Commission; the third under Johnson stemming from the Higher Education Act of 1965; the fourth resulting from President Clinton's initiatives related to the Goals (2000) agenda and subsequent legislation; and the fifth is arguably underway during the Obama administration.

This work contributes to the literature regarding the broader history of higher education in the US but it specifically offers a historical account of the relationship between higher education's purpose and the identity of the nation-state, and the role of policy in reinforcing both

the purpose of the institution and consolidating the nation's identity. Considering the historical limits of the study, 1862 to 2015, the work contributes to both theory and practice as it addresses a large fundamental question relating the institution to the nation while tracing contributing factors such as presidential administrations and legislation that solidifies this relationship. Furthermore, findings may enrich our understanding of the broader purposes and functions of higher education not only historically but within a context of cultural, political, technological, and economic globalization. This line of work is of paramount importance, because, as Readings (1996) argues, as long as we fail to understand the institution of higher education within this context, higher education remains adrift in its mission and purpose. Considering the present challenges higher education in the United States is confronted by, understanding the past to inform the present and future of this great beacon of American idealism and power is vital to the future of the institution and the identity of the nation it serves.

Constructing Conceptions of National Identity

This approach rests upon a set of ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions associated with critical realism. Ontologically, the institution of higher education is theorized as a network of social practices constituted at least in part by discourses. Here, practices are "habitualised ways, tied to particular times and places, in which people apply resources (material or symbolic) to act together in the world" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, p. 21). Harvey (1996) suggests that any given practice is a particular amalgamation of six dialectically related elements, which he refers to as moments. These moments include discourses, power, social relations, material practices, institutions/rituals, and beliefs/values/desires. These moments are dialectically related in the sense, for example, that discourses are in part power, part social relations, part material practices, part institutions/rituals, and part beliefs/values/desires. Neither of these moments can be reduced solely to discourses, however. Each moment is discursive but is also something more than discourses. Policymaking, for example, is substantially a discursive practice, though it takes place under material conditions and involves specific institutions and rituals, power, social relations, and beliefs and values. In sum, this study is ontologically grounded in a moderate form of social constructionism typical of critical realism.

Epistemologically, the author agrees with Jessop, who "rejects any universalistic, positivist account of reality, denies the facticity of the subject-object duality, allows for co-constitution of subjects and objects, and eschews reductionist approaches to … analysis" (Jessop 2004, p. 161). As such, the present analysis "escapes both the sociological imperialism of pure social constructionism and the voluntarist vacuity of certain lines of discourse analysis, which seem to imply that agents can will anything into existence in and through an appropriately articulated discourse" (Jessop 2004, p. 161). At the same time, this researcher recognizes both the constitutive nature of discourses as well as the extra-discursive moments of social practices.

The framework that guides my research is adopted from the work of Wodak et al. (2009) study of the discursive construction of national identity in Austria. Wodak et al. frame their understanding of national identity in the context of Anderson's (2006) theory of imagined communities. In what follows, I describe Anderson's work. I begin with a historical account of the emergence of the nation-state. The discussion then turns to various theorizations of identity which may be relevant to work on national identity. Next, I discuss in detail the methodological framework created by Wodak et al. (2009) and a detailed account of how I employ this framework for my study. Following the section on national identity is an overview of Hall's (1993) concept of policy paradigms.

The Emerging Nation-State

Anderson's (2006) theory of the state as an imagined community is a central assumption to the framework presented (Wodak et al. 2009), and is paramount to the discursive construction of national identity as conceptualized in my research agenda regarding American national identity and the subsequent reproduction through higher education. According to Anderson (2006), the imagined community, in thought and boundary, first rose out of a combination of the fall of dynasties and the lessened importance of religious communities at the end of the eighteenth century. This was evident first in print media, novels, and newspapers, as authors assumed readers understood context based on the community in which they lived, not personal interaction between readers. The author was able to do this through creating social space and use of familiarity to reference and make connections with the reader based on calendric time and landscape of text. In modern times, this activity is repeated by

author and reader every day when individuals read the newspaper. It is a mass action by many who will never meet to discuss the news, but when they observe others reading the paper, the imagined community is ultimately reinforced to the individual (Anderson 2006).

While place, space, and time coupled with mass action do create a reference point for the imagined community, it is a much more complex process. Anderson (2006) defines three historical moments in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century that allowed for the nation to be imagined at all. First, Latin was the sacred language that only the educated had access to and therefore the truth; once this language was no longer the dominant language in print, the vernacular was used in its place, and thus a greater audience was allowed to consume knowledge. Second, with the fall of religious authority holding the truth and choosing those who ruled, the natural hierarchy of humans was debunked. Third, time distinctions between past and present, creating a linear method of thinking, became a great factor in creating means of remembrance and future thought.

These historical moments were not created by accident; Anderson attributes capitalism, as early as 1500, to be the key influence as to both how and why the nation as a community emerged as the dominant focus of individuals and agents of the state. Capitalism encouraged the market of books, a market that easily crossed borders. Texts had to be printed in the vernacular to cross borders, and as texts became more widely read, they became contributors to the national consciousness. Print language facilitated national consciousness as it unified a means of communication and exchange; language provided a means of creating an image for a nation—which is subjective—while print allowed permanent representation and surpassed time and created "languages-of-power" (Anderson 2006, p. 44). This is of utmost importance to Anderson's (2006) theory of the nation-state as an imagined community as he states: "the convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language created the possibility of a new form of imagined community, which in its basic morphology set the stage for the modern nation" (p. 46).

This was most important in Colonial America as newspapers were printed by printer journalists who worked closely with the postmaster to ensure distribution to members of the community. This became a key as communication between communities and intellectual life in the colonies was facilitated by newspapers, particularly during the American

Revolution. The American Revolution was truly revolutionary as it was the first break from the old regimes of Europe. Fueled by the theoretical forces of the Enlightenment, liberalism, and economics, the Patriots created an imagined community that completely divorced the religious and authoritative construction of the human hereditary order of monarchical regimes (Anderson 2006).

As Anderson (2006) articulates, how a nation is constructed and legitimated over time and space is an important element in the imagining of the community. For the United States, this begins with the nation's story of origin (Wodak et al. 2009), the American Revolution. The American Revolution was cataloged and preserved in print. Modernity was juxtaposed against ancient history, and progress was defined in the construction of the American imagined community. Out of the American Revolution emerged imagined realities of "nation-states, republican institutions, common citizenships, popular sovereignty, national flags and anthems, etc., and the liquidation of their conceptual opposites … Furthermore, the validity and generalizability of the blue-print were undoubtedly confirmed by the *plurality* of the independent states" (Anderson 2006, p. 81).

In addition, this blueprint was transferable; the United States did not, nor could it, have a patent on the creation of a nation. Rather, the Revolution, its methods, means, and representations were pirated by even unexpected European entities. This meant that not only was a modern nation successfully created, but it created a model and set of standards for the modern nation. Other nations justified their attempts to replicate the American model by referencing history and the progression of their community to meet the assumed criteria to pursue a revolution against the old regime (Anderson 2006).

If nations are imagined communities, and their boundaries, and autonomy are mental constructs, they are not tangible; yet the image is still real to those who identify as members of the community and define or differentiate themselves in terms of a shared narrative and system of meaning, creating what it means to be a member of that community. What it means to be a member of a distinct nation, or *homo nationalis*, to represent the norms and values, the characteristics synonymous and assumed in connection with the state (Wodak et al. 2009), is formerly theorized by multiple scholars, discussed here to establish the definition of national identity as it is operationalized in my research regarding the US from 1862 to 2015.

Theorizing Identity

In addition to theorizing the concept of nations as an imagined identity, Anderson (2006) also contributes importantly to the research regarding how identities were imagined through nationalism, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the US, it is typically assumed that the dominant identity of the nation-state stems from the concept of and the resultant actions related to either Manifest Destiny or the Civil War and its aftermath. As already noted, Anderson (2006) disagrees and posits that it actually began with the importance and influence of print culture during the American Revolution. Nonetheless, the dominant imagining of fraternity as a bond amidst violence across racial, class, and regional lines in the United States "show clearly as anything else that nationalism" in the nineteenth century "represented a new form of consciousness … that arose when it was no longer possible to experience the nation as new, at the wave-top moment of rupture" (Anderson 2006, p. 203). After nations were formed, in both North America and Europe, and differences were forgotten by means of control and manipulation, national consciousness was then spread and consolidated. "As a rule, the road to this national identification was and is paved with monumental narratives which do sufficient justice to the narrative ordering principles of concordance and stringency, through which they also integrate narratively heterogeneous elements and historical incongruences" (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 18). Nation-states as sovereign entities with the ability to exercise power solidified through two world wars in the twentieth century. The creation of the League of Nations legitimized the nation-state as the norm, and after the Second World War, the state as the modern conception of political and social distinction was unquestioned. As a result, at this historic juncture, nations could "now be imagined without linguistic communality" (Anderson 2006, p. 135).

This accomplishment of imagined community beyond the link of language permeated all aspects of social and discursive life in the post-War world. The complex historical experiences of Americans and Europeans became modularized in the twentieth century; nation-ness became inseparable from political consciousness and is reproduced by means of "nationalist ideology through the mass media, the educational system, administrative regulations, and so forth" (Anderson 2006, pp. 113–114). The social changes and changes in consciousness contributed to the imagining of the nation, and were represented in all semiotic

mediums, not simply reinforced by linguistic commonality as the first historical moment of change suggests (Anderson 2006).

Gee's Framework for Understanding Identity

Gee (2000) offers researchers a lens to interpret how individual identities and an individual's "performance in society" (p. 99) are important to the understanding of "the workings of historical, institutional, and sociocultural forces … in the formation and workings of 'modern' societies …" (p. 100) and the implications of neoliberalism "for identity and changes in identity" (p. 100). With the goal of understanding identity in context of place and time, Gee (2000) identifies four ways to view identity: the nature identity, in which individuals are a part of nature and their natural state is their natural identity; the institution identity is an identity not sought by the individual, rather it is imposed upon the individual by the authority of an institution reinforced by laws, rules, regulations, and traditions of the institution; the discourse identity defines individual traits through discursive interaction with other social actors, with power legitimated through the recognition of traits by social actors, emerging from competing discourses; and affinity identity, which is created through a set of experiences and practices that often span large scales.

Most salient to research regarding the discursive construction of national identity are the institution identity, discourse identity, and affinity identity described by Gee (2000). As Jessop (2008b) argues, since nation-states are so difficult to define, they are instead often defined by the social institutions that comprise the state. As a result, the institution identity offered by Gee (2000) contributes a means to understanding the impact the social institution of higher education has on individuals in a given society; how that institution in its authority as a service to the public expected to reinforce national norms influences how individuals make meaning of their role or position in society. If higher education is in fact expected to either create or perpetuate a national identity in the US, this perspective of identity is relevant to understanding how the members of the community accept and live that imposed identity.

The discourse identity, recognizable in discourse among individuals, perpetuates the accepted identity through individuals' interactions that are acceptable within the confines of the imposed identity in their given society and historical moment, and recreates a narrative through which the individuals can reciprocate a set of traits and normative values that

are privileged in the national identity. This is an identity that is created and reproduced by social actors; people are not by nature representative of a discursive identity (Gee 2000). This is of particular importance in the present research as the narratives selected by presidents are a key indicator of the version of democratic idealism that is espoused in each presidency under consideration.

The final view of identity labeled by Gee (2000) is the affinity identity. The affinity identity is created through a set of experiences. Practices have the power to create experiences that shape the identity; since distinctive social practices hold the authority, affinity groups may span large scales. Affinity groups therefore do not have to be physical groups, rather "allegiance to, access to, and participation in specific practices" (Gee 2000, p. 105) constitutes the identity. The practices are created by multiple people and discourses, and are intentionally created in a neoliberal society. Businesses and other entities modeled in corporate structures socially engineer affinity groups to insure that people "gain certain experiences, that they experience themselves and other in certain ways, and that they behave and value in certain ways" (Gee 2000, p. 106). These experiences build allegiance through bonding and commonality in experiences and practices (Gee 2000). In the case of national identity, creating an affinity group that has the potential to span across scales, involves the authority of social institutions, and invokes the need for common narratives that describe and privilege an ideal democratic state, offers an explanation not only for how a national identity can be perceived from outsiders, but how individuals come to willingly subscribe to and perpetuate that identity without question.

Sameness and Selfhood

Ricœur (1992) contributes to the discussion regarding individuals and their relationship to national identity by establishing two components of identity, sameness, and selfhood, in an attempt to address the issues of complexity of defining national identity and identifying its processes, particularly when considering the involvement of social actors in the ever-changing, intrinsic community, to which they ascribe (Wodak et al. 2009). In Ricœur's (1992) theory, there are three components of sameness: (a) numerical identity, based on the idea that two things are one in the same; (b) qualitative identity, which argues that extreme resemblance to the point of interchangeability is present and qualifiable; and (c)

uninterrupted continuity, which deals with temporal change, following from start to end to defy dissemblance of structure in social institutions under consideration. Dialectically related to sameness is the theory of selfhood, which focuses solely on the individual. Since the theory of selfhood focuses solely on the individual person, not the interaction between or among individuals, it is not relevant to this study, nor the framework presented by Wodak et al. (2009), to which I ascribe, as they argue "an imagined community such as a nation cannot have such an 'identity of the self'" (p. 13). However, in the tradition of Ricœur (1992), the authors do argue that narrative identity mediates between the collective and the individual.

Narrative identity creates temporal permanence as the composition of the narrative "aims to synthesize heterogeneous elements by combining heterogeneous factors in linked plots and events" (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 14), thus functioning "to integrate with permanence in time what seems to be its contrary in the domain of sameness identity, namely diversity, variability, discontinuity, and instability" (Ricœur 1992, p. 140). Narrative identity thus reconciles constancy and transformation because part is real and part is created. Therefore, people can reinterpret the past and renegotiate the direction for the future, creating an open form of identity that allows people to prescribe meaning to practices (Wodak et al. 2009).

Interpreting the Imagined Community

Hall (1996), in agreement with Anderson (2006) that identity is a product of discourses and nations are imagined communities, and key in Wodaket al.'s (2009) framework, posits that nations are political formations and "systems of cultural representations" (p. 612) that allow people to interpret the imagined community. Furthermore, Hall (1996) contends that national culture is in itself a discourse, a means by which actions and meanings in the concept of individuals within a community are organized. The dominant method used to construe this culture is through the stories that are told that connect the past and present that in turn imagine how the culture is constructed. The narratives are constructed yet controlled by cultural power as a means to unify across differences, giving social actors agency to reproduce the narratives in various institutional contexts.

Hall (1996) establishes five discursive strategies, or fundamental cultural aspects, of national identity to understand national narrative as

it is constructed. First, the narrative of the nation is present in media, literature, and everyday conversation, among other discursive practices, aiming to create connections to various narratives, memories, symbols, and behaviors that represent shared interests of the community. This narration has the influential power to tie everyday existence, even the mundane, to the destiny of the entire nation. Second, the narrative presents a timeless image of character that persists because it is constituted by or through discourses. Third, invented traditions are employed in the narrative to make sense of past failures, turning them into means of unification. Fourth, the story of the origin of the nation is included, although cultural origins can be difficult to place temporally. Last, the narrative of the origin requires that fictitious people are created to identify the culture of origin from which the present culture developed. The ultimate goal of the narrative construction of cultural national identity according to Hall (1996) is to discursively mask actual differences between people to construct a national community to which people can ascribe. Hall (1996) states, and Wodak et al. (2009) agrees, that the five strategies is not an exhaustive list, and needs to be elaborated upon as "national identity cannot be completely subsumed under the category of narrative identity" (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 25). Thus, to complement narrative identity (Hall 1996) and complete the framework posed in the work by Wodak et al. (2009), the authors turn to Kolakowski (1995).

Elements of National Identity

Kolakowski's (1995) work contributes to the literature on the construction of national identity by defining five elements of national identity. The first element lies within the national spirit that is evoked particularly in a time of crisis. This is an element that is not always historically embedded; people think about how the national identity applies to them and embody this spirit when they deem it necessary. Second, historical memory is a key element in the construction of national identity. Kolakowski is careful to point out that it does not matter if this memory is historically accurate or not; what matters is how far back the memory can reach and link the stories of the past to the present state. The third element in Kolakowski's theory is contested by Wodak et al. (2009) due to their allegiance to Anderson's (2006) theory of imagined communities, but is relevant in other works and theories of creating a national identity. This element points to the anticipation of the future;

Kolakowski (1995) attributes agency to the nation-state, considering the potential death of a nation as a means of identification; institutions do not have agency in the context of an imaginary and therefore cannot die (Wodak et al. 2009). Continuing in contrast to the work of Anderson (2006), Kolakowski (1995) poses the fourth element of national identity as the national body. In this case, it is an actual entity; in the imagined community, it is considered a metaphor for the nation-state (Anderson 2006; Wodak et al. 2009). The last element, and consistent with Hall's (1996) work, is the identification of a named beginning; this beginning can be an event or a set of founding people (Kolakowski 1995). As a result of identified discrepancies and theoretical issues in the works presented, Wodak et al. (2009) developed a unique framework influenced by these works.

Discourse and National Identity

The works of Hall (1996) and Kolakowski (1995) are complementary, but not perfectly aligned. As a result, Wodak et al. (2009) recognize that the two theories have equally useful contributing features, but cannot be simply married as inconsistencies that result in issues of temporality and narration emerge. Thus, they address the role of narrative, time, and discourse in the construction of their framework to ascertain how Austria's national identity is discursively construed. The authors argue:

> … the discursive construction of national identity revolves around the three temporal axes of the past, the present and the future. In this context, origin, continuity/tradition, transformation, (essentialist) timelessness and anticipation are important ordering criteria. Spatial, territorial, and local dimensions (expanse, borders, nature, landscape, physical artifacts, and intervention in 'natural space') are likewise significant in this discursive construction of national identity. (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 26)

Therefore, "the relational, dynamic concept of identity is tied up in a complex dialectical relationship between sameness and difference, and that narrative identity attempts to mediate in this relationship" (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 27). In addition to sameness and difference, uniqueness at the national level allows for social actors in positions of power to conceal the ideologically forced homogenization of identity and covering of difference under the umbrella of national identity as applicable to all who

meet the sameness criteria, situating uniqueness not as a personal attribute that many seek, but rather a means to bring individuals into the community.

After situating narrative identity and time in the context that Wodak et al. (2009) agree is amenable to their research agenda, they address how national identity is discursively constructed. To complete the framework, and solidify the joining of theories and transition to this important point, the authors turn to Martin's (1995) work on collective narrative. Martin (1995) determines that the collective narrative of the past influences human action and interaction, what traits are emphasized, and the meaning and logic behind that emphasis. The result of the identity narrative is therefore to bring "forth a new interpretation of the world in order to modify it" (Martin 1995, p. 13). Wodak et al. (2009) rely on Martin (1995) to finalize their conceptual framework and argue that Martin's (1995) position is most relevant in the realm of political discourse and therefore ignores the "faith-related identifying bond" (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 28) that is paramount to the national character, or homo Austriacus (generalized as homo nationalis), that "is a mere stereotypical phantasmagoria which has no real counterpart outside the minds of those who believe in it" (Wodak et al. 2009, p. 29). This character that creates such a bond among members of the imagined community creates a sense of belonging and contributes to the understanding of why people are willing to defend their nation-state, right or wrong.

Lastly, before unveiling the main theses of the framework of the discursive construction of national identity, Wodak et al. (2009) include Bourdieu's (1993) contribution to the construction of national identity, which operationalizes identity as a social practice. Bourdieu (1993) states, "Through classificational systems … inscribed in law, through bureaucratic procedures, educational structures and social rituals …, the state molds mental structures and imposes common principles of vision and division … And it thereby contributes to the construction of what is commonly designated as national identity …" (p. 7).

The framework Wodak et al. (2009) pose as a theoretical and methodological approach to understanding the discursive construction of national identity that can be adapted to various states, given attention to the appropriate historical and cultural features of the nation under study, brings forth five theses as recommendations for analysis. First, the authors contend that national identity is discursively constructed in social practices. Second, social practices are determined by social institutions