EDUCATION AND PUBLIC POLICY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

CROSSING BOUNDARIES

EDITED BY
SARAH K. ST. JOHN
& MARK MURPHY

Education and Public Policy in the European Union

Sarah K. St. John • Mark Murphy
Editors

Education and Public Policy in the European Union

Crossing Boundaries

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Sarah K. St. John
School of Education
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, UK

Mark Murphy
School of Education
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, UK

European University Institute
Florence, Italy

Contents

v

LIST OF FIGURES

**Where Migration Meets Education: Case Study of Policies Referring
to the Mobility of the Highly Skilled**

Introduction

Sarah K. St. John and Mark Murphy

The Europeanisation of education, in particular addressing and analysing the key European Union (EU) initiatives implemented during the 1980s such as ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students), has been documented fairly substantially (see Jacobone 2015; Cairns 2017; Sigalas 2010; Wielemans 1991; Absalom 1993). The increasing role of higher education institutions as actors received attention from the mid-1980s, including their role on the international arena, and the internationalisation of education became a key theme during the 1990s (Teichler 2005). Although externally to the framework of the European Community, though still at European level, the Bologna Process and the creation of a European Higher Education Area is well-trodden scholarly ground (see Garben 2011; Lazetic 2010; Corbett 2005; Huismann and Van der Wende 2004; Piro 2016). In the

S. K. St. John (✉)
School of Education, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

European University Institute, Florence, Italy
e-mail: sarah.stjohn@eui.eu

M. Murphy
School of Education, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK
e-mail: mark.murphy.2@glasgow.ac.uk

light of growing effects of globalisation, education has not escaped analysis from the perspective of how EU policies can impact education in a globalised world (see Field 1998; Ball 2012) and on the use of the Open Method of Communication in recent policymaking (see Souto-Ortero et al. 2008; De Ruiter 2010). This is therefore not another book about the Europeanisation of education. Instead it rather flips the subject on its head and addresses the *educationalisation* of European policy.

Policies are all too often placed in their individual silos, which can sometimes work against the deeper understanding of the wider policymaking picture and its reach across public policy domains. This project crosses boundaries to explore education's relationship with other areas of public policy as well as its far-reaching role in the construction of a united Europe. The distinctiveness of this study is its interdisciplinarity, to demonstrate education's significance and breadth across the broad landscape of European integration by presenting a collection of case studies that represent policy areas that have experienced the infiltration of education.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CROSSING INTERDISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES

The term 'interdisciplinarity' refers to 'a broad spectrum of research activities based on cooperation between various disciplines' (Gornitzka 2003). It is not a foreign concept in the worlds of academia and EU institutions, but it is a concept that has in the past been relatively under-exploited. The modern world is changing, intensifying the need for research that crosses disciplinary boundaries. The complexity of the developing challenges facing contemporary societies cannot afford to wait for monodisciplinary views to converge or until there is conclusive evidence to arrive at a scholarly consensus, so if academia is to participate in the problem-solving process for contemporary society, it needs to address the dissonance of scientific knowledge (Huutoniemi 2016). Compartmentalisation within academia has long been the norm, creating academic safe-havens, and infrastructure has developed around such cultures. A 1972 report by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) entitled *Interdisciplinarity: Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities* suggested that interfering in the disciplines would be interfering in the entire social structure of a university. However, at the same time, it noted that an interdisciplinary approach was becoming more important to bring about creative change in universities. This did not mean completely abandoning disciplinary divisions, but fostering more dynamism in interdisciplinary collaboration and in combatting the prob-

lems facing society (McCulloch 2012). Too much compartmentalisation does not lend itself well to research that seeks to transcend academic boundaries, and it is becoming increasingly important to take more creative approaches to explain and analyse societal scenarios that do not always slot smoothly into disciplinary boxes. The intensity of interdisciplinary funding programmes, institutes and other science policy incentives for interdisciplinary studies demonstrates a response to this demand (Huutoniemi 2016).

While monodisciplinary study can achieve depth in resolving an isolated part of a problem, researching multifaceted policy fields and their characteristics requires a broader perspective as more sophisticated findings can often be found at the juncture between disciplinary boundaries, where diverse expertise are pulled together to unpack the complexities. Education is one such case.

A Brief Account of European Union Education Policy

Education as a Community policy field has experienced a slow and cloudy development. Direct reference to education was omitted in the Treaty of Rome of 1957, setting up the European Community. The fundamental aim of the European Community, outlined in the Treaty of Rome, was to be an economic entity creating a common market (article 2) in which its activities included the 'abolition, as between member states, of obstacles to the freedom of movement for persons, services and capital' (article 3c).

Educational matters did not fall within the responsibilities of the Community (Shaw 1992). The received view dictates that before the 1970s the Community was involved in neither university affairs nor education in more general terms (Corbett 2005; Field 1998; Frazier 1995; Shaw 1992; Neave 1984). With a lack of provision specifically for education within the Treaty, the general assumption accepted is that the first activity relating to education within the framework of the European Community is that of vocational training and the education of migrant workers' children.

The free movement of people put pressure on national infrastructure, which led to Community intervention in the form of two action programmes: The Social Action Programme in 1974 and the Education Action Programme in 1976. The action programmes set the path for the development of major programmes during the decade that followed. From 1985, the Community produced draft decisions to the Council for the programmes COMETT (Community programme for Education and Training in Technology) and ERASMUS, followed by PETRA (Community action programme for the vocational training of young people and their preparation

for adult working life) and LINGUA (Community action programme to promote foreign language competence in the European Community). In 1992, education and higher education featured in the Maastricht Treaty, and between 1993 and 1999, with paths towards a knowledge-based society, the notion of Lifelong Learning emerged. This featured in the Lisbon European Council of 2000. The Commission made known its focus on economic development and social cohesion through a knowledge-based society and economy (Pépin 2006), and by the mid-2000s, education was at the heart of the EU's economic and social strategy for 2010–2020.

However, even with the utmost importance placed upon it in view of economic objectives, the responsibility of the European Commission in the field of education remains that of supporting the member states in the development of coherent education policies and supporting policy dialogue among member states. The European Commission can advise and benchmark, and introduce initiatives to promote education and training across the member states, but it does not hold the authority to impose legally binding resolutions or a harmonised education and higher education policy.

Setting a Theoretical Backdrop: European Integration and Policy Development

European integration is a curious concept. On the one hand, some policy sectors show a clear degree of political integration beyond the nation-state, while other sectors show little or no integration and continue to sit on the back bench. Certain areas such as foreign and security policy, social welfare, economic governance, culture and education have remained within member-state remit, and the question of why member states give up control in certain areas, but not in others, has been at the centre of integration theories (Rosamond 2000).

During the period of early European integration, several schools of thought emerged seeking to explain the construction of Europe and the integration of state competence. Valuing the role of supranational political institutions in the rational decision-making structure at the European level, federalists believed that the upward delegation of power with a mutual constitutional agreement was the most efficient system to safeguard peace. Functionalists suggest that nation-states are not capable of coping with the economic and social needs of the citizens, and therefore,

supranational institutions are necessary to exercise the function that rational individuals attribute to them (Saurugger 2014).

From functionalism came neofunctionalism, born out of the study of a group of American political scientist scholars, including the most renowned Ernst B. (Haas 1958), who applied functionalist thinking to the formation of the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Economic Community. They sought to provide an explanation for the convergence of economic activities across borders as a driver of wider economic integration, and how this would then trigger political integration, facilitated by supranational institutions.

Neofunctionalists emphasise the difficulties encountered by public authorities when coping with economic and social issues. However, in order to advance the integration process, neofunctionalists insist on the need for deliberate and entrepreneurial action by European authorities already established rather than relying on the spontaneous emergence of new functional agencies. The basic argument of neofunctionalism can be explained as: two or more countries agree to collaborate for integration in a given economic sector, which can be called sector a. To increase effectiveness, they agree to delegate the operations to a supranational bureaucracy. While the integration of sector a achieves some of the supposed benefits, the full advantage will not be reached until associated economic sectors are also drawn in. A functional linkage is created, which puts pressure on associated sectors b and c until they become part of the equation (Rosamond 2000). This concept, known as spillover, is at the centre of Haas's theory. Spillover is defined as 'a situation in which a given action, related to a specific goal, creates a situation in which the original goal can be assured only by taking further actions, which in turn create a further condition and need for further action and so forth' (Lindberg 1963), and that spillover assumes that member-state economies were relatively interdependent before the integration process began (Mutimer 1989).

Neofunctionalism makes three key assumptions. First, the relevant actors in the regional integration process are economically rational beings, and their attitudes are based on interests. When they transfer their loyalty to the supranational level, they choose their options rationally. Second, once decisions are made, they have unintentional consequences which lead to spillover into new areas of policy (Saurugger 2014). Once launched, the process is difficult to predict. Although member states can decide the terms of the initial agreement and try to control subsequent events, they cannot exclusively determine the direction, extent and pace of change

(Schmitter 2005). Third, the supranational institutions do not act as secretariats to the member states' preferences, but instead become actors in their own right and influence the interests and beliefs of public and private actors in the integration process (Schmitter 2005).

Neofunctionalism faced criticism from scholars wanting to defend the implied death of the nation-state and the presence of national interests during the integration process: the intergovernmentalists. Intergovernmentalists suggest that the creation of supranational institutions is only possible if the states are in agreement and that the advancement of the integration process depends on the states.

Intergovernmentalism highlights the importance of state sovereignty, placing it at the centre of the European integration process and focussing on the significance of the 'national' in contrast to the 'supranational'. According to intergovernmentalists, European integration takes place thanks to cooperation between sovereign states, behaving as rational actors, and whose interactions are managed by the principles of authority and hierarchy. The independence of each state is not reduced as a result, but instead strengthened by helping states to adjust to the constraints imposed by the international environment (Saurugger 2014). For intergovernmentalists, states are the primary actors in decision-making and the advancement of the European integration process. Intergovernmentalism maintains that the most effective means of understanding the dynamics of European integration is through the interaction of national governmental preferences. Throughout European integration, national leaders have not only played a significant role in furthering European integration, but they have done so for very precise self-interested national motives. European integration was able to advance thanks to national decisions and it allowed for states to better provide economic prosperity and social welfare for their citizens, by proposing that the very motivation of the national leaders to construct Europe was to salvage the nation-state from the point of view of chronic inadequacy in the face of detrimental experiences during the Second World War (Milward 1992).

The main assumptions of conventional intergovernmentalism are that states are the central actors in European integration and 'their behaviour is based on rational cost-benefit analysis with four perspectives: analysing the attitudes of governmental elites; European integration as savior of state sovereignty; neorealist accounts; and two-level games' (Saurugger 2014). Intergovernmentalists draw on the realist paradigm of international relations, which depicts states acting according to established preferences and behaving rationally.

While integration theories seek to identify the powers at play—the supranational or the state in the case of the opposing theories of neofunctionalism and intergovernmentalism—in how the European Community acquires competencies, they do not fully answer the question on how and why some policy areas develop more quickly than others. Mark Pollack concerned himself with this question, coining the 'competence creep' concept (1994, 2000). Pollack identifies that policymaking in the 1950s was overwhelmingly at the national level with a secondary EU presence in the core common market areas. However, by the late 1960s and early 1970s, the EU began to expand into a number of issue-areas, and by 1992 it had a shared competence in nearly every issue-area, except police and public order. Murphy (2003) highlights other similar descriptions of the EU's growing competence in education as training, including the 'creeping extension' by Field (1998), 'covert activity' by Ryba (in 1992) and semi-clandestine 'perversion' by Nóvoa (in 2000).

Pollack's main questions address how and why the European Community moved into new areas that were not included in the Treaty of Rome, including research and technology, environment, education and cultural and audiovisual policies; why policymaking in some areas began earlier and proceeded more rapidly than in others; and how the patchwork of regulations and spending programmes comprising EC policy in each of these areas can be explained. He creates the foundations to his argument by adopting Theodore Lowi's classification of policy types: regulatory, redistributive and distributive, which he adapts for use in the EC context. He argues that each of these policy types corresponds to a distinct process of task expansion because each is dealt with in a distinct political arena, encompassing different actors and managed by different decision rules, and generates a distinctive bargaining style among the national interests represented in the Council of Ministers and the European Council. Each policy area differs in its substantive content, how quickly it developed and in its mix of distributive, regulatory and redistributive policies.

Education is a primarily distributive policy, which involves the allocation of Community financial resources to the member states, through a rough approximation according to the member state's contribution to the EC budget (Pollack 1994). A growth spurt in the development of education policy can be noted at the same time as there was notable expenditure on education during the mid-1980s, when programmes like COMETT, ERASMUS and LINGUA were adopted. However, education also features some regulatory policies in the form of the mutual recogni-

tion of degrees and the provision for migrant workers' children. Described as the result of functional or economic spillover, regulatory policies at community level are defined as policies in which member states agree to adopt common Community regulations on the activities of public and private actors within their national jurisdictions. Redistributive policies are seen as tactical or bargaining linkages to major intergovernmental bargains and generally decided at the highest level of European Community governance, the European Council. They are considered to be the least complex as they are defined in terms of the redistribution of resources from some member states to others.

SPILLOVER THEORY AND THE COMMUNITY'S CHALLENGE WITH EDUCATION

Education constitutes one area of public policy, which is intrinsically linked to the rest. Changes and developments in education cannot be understood if the broader context of public policy is not considered because reforms in the former will likely impact upon the latter. At the same time, the development of public policy in other areas creates spillover into educational matters, even when it is not always desired. The few regulatory policies identified by Pollack can be seen as unintended consequences of other policies that fell on the shoulders of education. Education was omitted from the Treaty of Rome in the setting up of the European Community and left to the prerogatives of the nation-states (Murphy 2003). Nevertheless, the provisions for a common vocational training policy and the free movement of people left a side door open for activity in education following the principles of the spillover theory. The provision for a common vocational training programme required the training of teachers, and the free movement of persons, as dealt with in articles 48–58 of the European Economic Community Treaty, posed pressures on education policy from two perspectives: first, in the recognition of diplomas, formal qualifications and training and, second, in the integration of migrants and their families. The latter case required the teaching of foreign languages, provisions and specialist training for teaching the children of migrants. Furthermore, creating a Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) led to developing vocational training of agricultural workers to establish best practices in the field.

As European integration continues to progress, member states are confronted with a variety of problems relating to education, which cannot

always be managed at the national level. The introduction of the free movement of people brings about increased pressure on the provision of greater, more varied vocational, educational and working opportunities, and the organisational and financial implications of this become a common interest at a higher level than the nation-state. Policies in other sectors such as industry and social affairs have spilled over into education, where educational opportunities and infrastructures have necessarily had to come into play. Even in contemporary policymaking, education has grown in importance on the European agenda as a result of policies that seek to strengthen the European economy. It can be said that from the beginning of European integration, education has proved to emerge as the nuts and bolts of numerous areas of European Community policy according to a developmental path that neofunctionalism had predicted. However, according to neofunctionalist theory, nation-states would not be able to determine the direction, extent and pace of change once a certain degree of loyalty had already been transferred to the supranational level. The fact that the European Community continues to have limited regulatory power in matters relating to education dictates that at this point neofunctionalism ceases to hold water and that states are able to exert influence within the policy-development process, in line with intergovernmentalist thought.

It is the multifaceted nature of education that makes it a slippery fish for European Community policymakers. Education seeps into and pops up in numerous areas of public policy, but it is impossible for the Community to pin it down as a fully fledged area of its competence. While it has the ability to bolster economic objectives, education also possesses a fundamental cultural component that weaves into the fabric of a nation with close attachment to nation-building. When it comes to dealing with education, the EU has to negotiate statism.

NATIONS, NATIONALITY AND NATION-BUILDING

The concept of nation-state is a debated area that has been addressed by Karl Marx, Max Weber and Emile Durkheim but, according to Chernilo, with no clear concept of what it is (Chernilo 2006, 2008). Indeed, it is a complex notion that goes beyond the structural make-up to encompass the people within the state and the bonds between them, and the 'nation' and the 'state' should not be confused as the same entity. While states are composed of institutions, a nation is described as 'a shared belief that its

members belong together, and a shared wish to continue their life in common', and 'in asserting national identity, one assumes that beliefs and commitments are mirrored by those whom one takes to share that identity' (Miller 2000). It is also described as 'not simply the product of macro-structural forces; it is simultaneously the practical accomplishment of ordinary people engaging in routine activities' (Fox and Miller Idriss 2008) and 'a human population sharing historical territory, common myths and memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members' (Smith 1991). Anderson defines nationalism as 'an expression of certain straightforward ideas which provide a framework for political life' (Anderson 2000). Ultimately, a nation is a community of people, which is determined by a common nationality and national identity, that distinguishes one state from another.

Beneath the surface of the nation, there is nationality. In its direct sense, nationality can be described as belonging to the country from which you possess a passport, implying that nationality is assigned at birth and it is a condition imposed on the individual. However, despite being imposed on individuals, it is considered to be a means to maintaining solidarity among states that are large and anonymous where the individuals are unable to foster solidarity through face-to-face interaction (Miller 2000). This notion indicates that nationality is much more profoundly embedded in individuals than simply the passport they hold. Scratching deeper below the surface of a nation, and beyond nationality, national identity can be found.

National identity is closely linked to personal identity; the first element used to describe one's personal identity is often nationality. One's country of origin forms a marked part of who they are, but it is necessary to determine what it means for personal identity to constitute that nationality beyond the passport they carry, and hence how one's national identity shapes their personal identity. People of the same national identity believe they share similar traits that distinguish them from people from other nations. These can be of a cultural nature, consisting of shared values, tastes and sensibilities, which go beyond the simple sharing of institutions (Miller 2000). Another thread to add to Miller's list is the use of a common language (Laffan 1996), though it is also possible to feel a sense of belonging to a nation in which more than one official language is spoken, such as in Belgium and Switzerland. While the nation relies on nationality to maintain its solidarity, individuals are equally reliant on national identity to provide them with a purpose that goes beyond what they are able to

generate themselves. Whether they choose to recognise their national identity or not, there is a mutual need between the individual and the state: individuals need national identity to function as social beings, and the nation—even the state—needs individuals to identify with the nation-state through its symbols and institutions (McCrone and Bechhofer 2015).

The consequences when this mutual need breaks down can be seen in recent events in Catalonia—without forgetting other similar referenda such as that of Scotland in 2014, as well as consultative referenda in northern Italy in the autumn of 2017 for increased regional autonomy—where sub-state nationalisms have proven stronger than state nationalisms and individuals identify with a regional identity more than national identity. If individuals are unable to identify with their nationality, they seek replacements for national identities, which challenges the legitimacy of existing states.

To avoid such cases requires effective nation-building, but nation-building is a delicate process that is not as simple as instilling a common national identity on individuals. It is not possible to simply 'adopt a national ideology' (Miller 2000) or to change national identity. National identities are embedded in a nation's past and individuals carry an obligation to bring them forward into the present and future. New nationals inherit the past in which fellow nationals fought and spilt blood in defence of the nation, making nationality an ethical community because it stretches across generations and it is non-renouncing for the present generation. This temporal element constitutes a type of national community that cannot be shared by other forms of association (Miller 2000).

Nation-building can be considered in the first instance as the establishment of a new state as a political entity, but it is also described as 'the process whereby the inhabitants of a state's territory come to be loyal citizens of that state' (Bloom 1990). Moreover, nation-building is the fostering of national identities, which, apart from characterising a nation's traits, myths and shared values, unite individuals to achieve the solidarity mentioned earlier. It is suggested that nation-building is successful when the nation-state has not only achieved solidarity among its people, but when it can also claim its people's loyalty, especially in cases of competition with external actors such as in international conflict or where symbols of national identity are threatened. In this context, national sentiment is an important source of power for a state when it comes to acting within the foreign policy arena (Bloom 1990).

In order for nation-building to be successful, it is necessary that the individual feels connected to the nation-state and that they also feel the benefits of such connection. Bloom (1990) suggests that when individuals connect with the nation-state through symbols of the state, identity and psychological security are enhanced. Once an identification of the nation-state has been fostered by the people, then the same identification is passed on to new generations by family and social groupings. Nation-building is therefore not a requirement for developing countries seeking to establish nations for the first time, but it is an ongoing process for developed states to ensure the solidarity and loyalty of the nation to confront national challenges when they arise. Thanks to effective nation-building, citizens not only stand together in times of terrorist attacks or national disasters, but two great wars have shown that citizens will go as far as fighting and even dying for their country. When nation-building fails, citizens look elsewhere for identifications and loyalties and the nation-state effectively risks falling apart.

EDUCATION AND NATION-BUILDING

If nation-building is fundamental for the survival of the nation-state, what then are the building blocks? Education provides a proposal for a mechanism in the nation-building process. Varying forms of education, whether within the framework of the formal education system or not, repeatedly prove to be important for the development and transmission of nationhood (Lowe 1999). Similarly, Neave (2001) suggests that education is embedded in the nation-state, so much so that it is considered to have been a founding factor in its establishment, adopting education as an instrument for transferring national history to their societies and for promoting national language and culture. The link between education and national-identity formation presents itself as a fairly understudied area, yet strong links to nation-building can be drawn from areas of educational research such as the teaching of history, the teaching of language and culture and in more recent curriculum, the inclusion of teaching on citizenship. However, nation-building through the education system does not only regard teaching subjects that specifically relate to elements of national identity, like national history and language, but it is also the mentality and the approach with which education is delivered to its citizens that contributes to the values and morals they develop. In this sense, educational settings can be considered as the closest context to the family setting

regarding the trans-generational diffusion of elements forming national identities.

At this stage, it is possible to weave into this discussion the impact of globalisation on national identity to raise a point that despite an increasingly globalised world, national identities are maintained. Globalisation, which as Bartolini (2006) seeks to explain should not be confused with Europeanisation, is 'limiting 'states' capacity to determine the cultural make-up of its citizens'. Citizens across the globe are reading the same news, watching the same television programmes and the same films, following the same fashion trends and purchasing the same commodities, but the fact remains that national identities are still evident. Therefore, if factors external to education are becoming more globalised, while education systems are maintaining their national focus, this fact that education systems have so far resisted globalisation can be used to suggest that education is an important driver in the development and maintenance of national identity. In this regard, it is true that Ball (2012) advocates, within the question of private education as a means to problems of state education, that state education is diminishing in its welfare form. However, the point is that education in the strict sense of the state system has maintained its national domination.

If education forms a fundamental means to nation-building and the development and transmission of national identities, it can be understood why nation-states are adamant to keep a tight grip on their education systems. For the nation-state there is too much at stake to allow any interference in the functioning of education systems and the content of curricula. As Walkenhorst (2008) suggests, education is too closely interwoven into the national fabric of a state in terms of identity, culture, heritage and solidarity. From the point of view of supranational involvement in education, education has always been and remains an area of national sensitivity (Garben 2011). Taking into account the considerations detailed above, nation-states will be hostile towards any meddling in a policy that has the potential to weaken its nation-building and to dilute its national identity. This is because, as suggested earlier, unsuccessful nation-building reduces national solidarity, placing the nation-state in a precarious position. It risks breaking the mutual need that exists between the citizen and the state, causing citizens to lose their sense of belonging and potentially look towards other forms of self-determination, and causing states to lose the loyalty that constitutes their strengths in times of challenge and conflict, even from the point of view of manpower.

Aims and Overview of the Book

It has been highlighted that education is multidimensional. It possesses a strong cultural attachment at the heart of the nation-state, while at the European level its role has evolved through economic missions. Education is therefore difficult to standardise in the context of explaining policy development in the EU. Integration theorists have proposed that policy develops on the one hand as an automatic process involving spillover, while others on the other hand sustain that the influence of the state remains strong in policy development. However, in the case of education, a curious situation emerges in which state control and spillover appear to coexist. Education is not a fully fledged area of EU competence and member states flex their muscles over its control, yet it can be seen seeping into numerous areas of public policy.

The purpose of this book is to explore, via a set of case studies, forms of inter-sectorial working, illuminating in particular the fundamental question: how education policy is adapted to meet the needs of related, but in some cases, quite distant, policy domains. In doing so, it aims to expose the breadth of education's presence and dynamism in public policy at the European level, despite its image as an area of low competence in the EU.

This project is not only aimed at educationalists, but it also aims to open up the field of education policy to a wider audience in European policy-making. The book aims to appeal to practitioners looking beyond the confines of their policy area to understand how education might impact and assist in their work, as well as academics seeking to make more sense of the intricacies of competency expansion and overlap within the EU.

Structure of the Book

While the next chapter on the origins and evolution of EU education policy remains within the confines of education policy, it aims to widen the understanding of education's breadth across European integration by laying the first piece of the puzzle, identifying the origins and evolution of education policy at the European level. The chapter challenges the received view that the European Community withheld interest in education until the 1970s when it carried out recognised activities relating to education. Though it is true that no formal awareness of matters relating to education was apparent in the European institutions until this time, saying that education was never considered within the ideology of a united Europe and