

Policy Brief

Are Cross-Border Practices a Threat to Democratic Participation among EU Citizens?

Fulya Apaydin and Juan Díez Medrano

Introduction

New challenges

Regional integration and the transportation and communications revolutions are changing the way individuals relate to place through increasing the opportunity for transnational movements, forming transnational bonds between individuals, and sustaining ties to the home country among those who migrate. Today, it is possible to live in a place physically while having one's mind and consciousness elsewhere.

Greater mobility in the EU

Most significantly, EUCROSS findings demonstrate that EU citizens are engaged in a wider and more complex array of cross-border activities than most people believe (Salamonska et. al. 2013). If this process has a significant impact on a large number of people, it may be consequential for the social cohesion in actual physical locations—i.e. towns, cities or countries—and the quality of democracy. Do these cross-border activities jeopardize democracy by way of weakening incentives to participate in elections? Does the EU, by promoting an open and borderless society, also weakens itself in political terms?

The trade-off

This policy brief addresses these questions by comparing political engagement of Europeans who lead transnational lives with those who do not. In doing so, it shows that individuals who lead more transnational lives participate at least as much in politics as those who are more anchored in their national societies.

Transnational mobility and political participation

Mobility: a threat?

We move beyond previous works by examining the role of transnational skills and experiences in voting behavior with a focus on national and European elections. There is a broad consensus among scholars that the European single market will work more efficiently when labor moves across Europe to those locations where there is a varying demand for different types of skills, together with the mobility of goods, services, and capital. However, critics also point out that mobility can be psychologically costly to individuals. According to this framework, migrants, even when they are EU citizens, arguably threaten the host countries' social cohesion.

How do transnational individuals vote?

We do not want to enter this debate in this policy brief. Our goal is to evaluate the extent to which transnational mobility threatens the quality of democracy by forming a new class of individuals who no longer participate in political life. In this policy brief, we will focus on transnational individuals who continue to live in their country of origin. If this group of individuals participates less in political life than individuals without much transnational experience, we can assume that the

political apathy of transnational individuals will be greater. Preliminary evidence collected as part of the ESF-sponsored project EUMARR reveals that transnational experience and skills do not impinge on people's non-electoral political participation, although men in bi-national couples appear to be slightly less politically engaged than men married to co-nationals (Díez Medrano, 2014).

Mobility and voting in EU elections: the link

This policy brief focuses on voting behavior—the cornerstone of democratic systems. Furthermore, it examines the impact of transnational experiences and skills on political participation in national and European contexts. Two questions guide the study: 1) Does transnational experience reduce participation in national political life? 2) Does transnational experience have any substantial impact on participation in supranational political life at the European level? We first frame the problem theoretically and analytically using Hirschman's well-known formula of Exit, Voice, and Loyalty. Then, we describe the data used in our statistical analysis. Next, we present the estimated statistical models and discuss the results. Finally, we draw policy conclusions from the findings.

Framing the problem: Exit, Voice, and Loyalty

Lesser incentives to vote

There are various reasons to expect that mobile individuals have lesser incentives to vote in national elections. Movement across borders, exposure to news about political issues in different countries, time-constraints of an itinerant life can detract attention from national political debates. Another potential explanation is that transnational individuals come to minimize the importance of national politics in a broader international context and conclude that voting in a national election is not particularly relevant. Also, transnational individuals may withdraw from national politics in contrast to more rooted persons due to considerations that their life opportunities—whether at the professional or personal level—are not strongly tied to the national context. Under these circumstances, transnationals' incentives for voting are lesser than those who lead more sedentary lives.

However, transnational experiences can still induce greater participation in national politics. For instance, if transnational lives are generally perceived as entailing a psychological and material cost—as something that one would have rather avoided—those who perceive their lives as such may attach higher importance to participation in national politics, so that they can create the conditions for rendering transnational mobility unnecessary. Also, transnational experiences may intensify a sense of national belonging and trigger political participation in national elections.

Mobility and potential incentives

It is possible to apply a similar rationale to development of expectations among individuals with transnational experience and skills. While the more transient character of their lives compared to that of individuals with no transnational experience or skills may distract them from participation in political life, transnational individuals may be more sensitive to the impact that the European Union has on their life opportunities. Therefore, they may find it more important to vote in European elections in contrast to their more locally-rooted counterparts.

Transnational skills and life opportunities

These debates further speak to Albert Hirschman's famous formula: "Exit, Voice, and Loyalty" (1970, 1993). According to this framework, Vote in national and European elections is an expression of Voice, but also of Loyalty. This is because people who adhere to a national political order where voting is a basic institution to express their opinion will demonstrate their commitment through voting. In Hirschman's own terms loyalty "keeps exit at bay and activates voice" (Hirschman, 1970; see also Barry, 1974; LaPonce, 1974). Meanwhile, vote in national elections should be negatively correlated with Exit, since it is the alternative to Voice and Loyalty. Hirschman's later work leaves some room for a positive association, however, especially when unhappy citizens opt for both trying to change the way the system works in the country where they live and simultaneously experiment with exit options, such as moving abroad. Whether the Voice-Exit relationship can be positive or negative depending on whether individuals primarily think of Voice and Exit as exclusive alternatives or whether they view them as compatible strategies in search of personal or collective betterment.

Vote as an indicator of voice and loyalty

The Data and Model

The data for this research were collected between June and October 2012, as part of the EUCROSS project. They originate in 6000 phone interviews with a random sample of German, Danish, Romanian, Italian, Spanish, and UK nationals. The survey includes a wide range of questions that measure the physical and virtual mobility, political participation, European identification, solidarity, cultural preferences, income, and occupation of the participants, and also provides information on the demographic background of the respondents. To test the relationships between Vote and measures of Exit and Loyalty, we use logistic regression, controlling for socio-economic and other relevant variables that explain voting behavior.

6000 random interviews in Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the UK

Political participation

The dependent variable in the model, *voice*, is the key measure that assesses national political participation. To measure this, the respondents were asked whether they voted in a) the last general elections in their country of residence and 2) the last European Parliament elections. The answer categories are "Yes"; "No" and "Don't Know".

National loyalty

Drawing cues from Hirschman's discussion (1970), Judith Shklar's earlier work (Shklar, 1993), and later elaborations (Dowding et al. 2000; Delanty, 2003) we define political loyalty as a deeply affective and voluntary attachment to a political entity based on a sense of belonging/identification (Dowding et al. 2000) and

Loyalty as identification, emotional attachment and willingness to show solidarity

characterized by a willingness to show solidarity. Formulated as such, political loyalty does not necessarily entail a strictly rational justification. In fact, this emotional dimension is a key factor that differentiates loyalty from ordinary commitment and obligation (Shklar, 1993). The intensity of these sentiments may be borne out by cultural, historical, and social experiences that are not necessarily political in character. In this sense, political loyalty is a non-contractual relationship that feeds from diverse sources. Together, these sources provide reasons to individuals to express a voluntary commitment to an entity that is recognized as legitimate by its members (Delanty, 2003, p. 125).

In addition to emotional attachments, identification with/belonging to a community is a fundamental component of political loyalty (Dowding et al., 2000; Delanty, 2003) because self-declared membership constitutes a basis to justify current and future political preferences. In this sense, political loyalty may manifest itself in the form of civic nationalism and/or constitutional patriotism based on self-declared identification with a political community (Habermas, 1994). Finally, solidarity is a third component of political loyalty, for it encourages investment in maintaining/reproducing social cohesion, a necessary ingredient of a dependable and goal-attaining community (Dowding et al., 2000).

For Hirschman, national loyalty encourages voting because strong feelings of attachment prompt citizens to voice their discontent and push them to strive for change from within rather than take the exit option. The model uses a national loyalty index based on questions that measure national identification and solidarity.ⁱ

Expectation: greater national loyalty, greater likelihood of voting in national elections

Transnational mobility

European Union (EU) nationals can freely relocate to live and work in a member state other than their own. Trans-European mobility is further promoted by EU-funded schemes. To assess whether social, economic and political opportunities to exit national borders influence voting behavior in national elections, we construct a transnational mobility index through adding the responses to 26 questions that measure physical and virtual mobility experiences as well as transnational skills and ties of the respondents. The index is deliberately constructed as a broad measure that includes not only diverse transnational background and engagements but also respondents' cross-border networks. The range for the index is 0 to 50.ⁱⁱ

An additive index with 26 cross-border mobility indicators

In addition to the variables above, the statistical models control for other factors that have been discussed in the literature in connection with voting behavior. We measure education through a variable with six values that represent the respondents' highest academic degree. The categories are: (1) Primary education or less; (2) Lower secondary education; (3) In-between lower and higher secondary; (4) Higher secondary education; (5) Lower tertiary education and (6) Higher tertiary education. Measuring income is known to be a complicated matter. Since we assumed that many respondents would not provide accurate information when directly asked about their income level, we asked a related question. The

Controlling for education, income, age, gender, marital status, family background, political orientation and citizenship

question reads as follows: “Which of the following descriptions comes closest to how you feel about how well off your household is today?” The set of answers include: (1) We find it very difficult; (2) We find it difficult; (3) We make ends meet; (4) We are living comfortably on the money we have; (5) We are living very comfortably on the money we have. The statistical models also control for gender, marital status, and age. Since the literature suggests a curvilinear positive relationship between age and voting, we include both a measure of the person’s age and an additional variable based on the square of age. To measure a person’s social background, the statistical model below controls for the education level of the mother, the education level of the father and the income status of the household when the respondent was 14 years old.ⁱⁱⁱ Finally, the statistical models include a variable that captures a person’s political orientation and a measure of citizenship. To measure the former, we use the answers to the following question: “In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Which of the following positions best describes your political outlook? The categories are (1) Left; (2) Centre-left; (3) Centre; (4) Centre-right; (5) Right; (6) Left and right do not exist anymore. To measure the latter, we include dummy variables to differentiate between Danish, German, Italian, Romanian, Spanish and UK nationals.

Findings

Greater participation in national elections

We begin our analysis with a simple analysis of the associations between national loyalty and transnational experience/skills and vote in national and European elections. The findings show first that the participants in the study, no matter the country, participate less in European elections than in national ones. On average, participation in the latter across the countries that participate in this study is about twenty percentage points lower than in the former (see Table 1 and Table 2). This is consistent with findings of earlier research on voting in Europe.

Highest participation rate: Denmark

	Germany	Denmark	UK	Italy	Romania
No	14.6	6.9	14.6	12.7	24.9
Yes	85.4	93.1	85.4	87.3	75.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 1. Participation in the last general elections across six cases, figures in %.

Highest participation in EU elections: Italy

	Germany	Denmark	UK	Italy	Romania
No	35.1	27.1	47.9	22.5	37.0
Yes	64.9	72.9	52.1	77.5	63.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 2. Participation in the last European elections across six cases, figures in %.

Tables 3 and 4 also show that while national loyalty is associated with greater participation in national and European elections and that the association is greater with respect to the former than to the latter type of elections, transnational experience and skills bear no relationship with electoral behavior.

		No	Yes
National loyalty	<i>Low</i>	29.4	70.6
	<i>High</i>	14.0	86.0
<hr/>			
Transnational mobility	<i>Low</i>	14.7	85.3
	<i>High</i>	14.1	85.9

Table 3. Participation in national elections based on national loyalty and transnational mobility, figures in %.

Greater national loyalty associated with greater interest in EU elections

		No	Yes
National loyalty	<i>Low</i>	44.7	55.3
	<i>High</i>	32.7	67.3
<hr/>			
Transnational mobility	<i>Low</i>	33.4	66.6
	<i>High</i>	31.6	68.4

Table 4. Participation in European elections based on national loyalty and transnational mobility, figures in %.

Transnational mobility increases the propensity to vote in EU elections

Tables 5 and 6 increase the level of complexity. They examine these same relationships, this time controlling for/holding constant other variables that potentially impact on political participation, as discussed in the previous section. The conclusions are similar: the greater the feelings of loyalty to one's national state, the greater the propensity to vote in both national and European elections. Contrary to the results observed in Table 4, however, transnational experience translated into a slightly higher propensity to vote in European elections. It is thus loyalty to the national state--and other factors--that drives political participation, whereas transnational experience does not deter individuals from national political participation and can even encourage participation in European political life. In general, neither loyalty nor transnational experience/skills have a great impact on the propensity to vote. This is clearly the case in the last two columns of Table 5 and Table 6, which compare a model with loyalty and transnational experience/skills with one where these two variables were removed. The percentage of the variance is largely the same.

**Transnational mobility
has no significant impact
on voting in national
elections**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Constant	0.34	1.02 (*)	0.86 (*)	-3.53 (*)	-3.50 (*)	-1.94 (*)
National loyalty	0.23 (*)	0.23 (*)	0.24 (*)	0.22 (*)	0.18 (*)	
Country dummies						
Germany		-0.66 (*)	-0.64 (*)	-0.60 (*)	-0.62 (*)	-0.71 (*)
Italy		-0.52 (*)	-0.48 (*)	-0.70 (*)	-0.71 (*)	-0.83 (*)
Romania		-1.42 (*)	-1.40 (*)	-1.41 (*)	-1.29 (*)	-1.45 (*)
Spain		-0.61 (*)	-0.59 (*)	-0.76 (*)	-0.72 (*)	-0.91 (*)
UK		-0.67 (*)	-0.65 (*)	-1.05 (*)	-1.03 (*)	-1.18 (*)
Transnational mobility						
Exit			0.01	-0.00	-0.00	
Sociodemographic factors						
Education				0.31 (*)	0.29 (*)	0.29 (*)
Income				-0.20 (*)	-0.21 (*)	-0.22 (*)
Gender				0.07	0.04	0.04
Marital status				0.51 (*)	0.51 (*)	0.51 (*)
Age				0.15 (*)	0.15 (*)	0.14 (*)
Age2				-0.001 (*)	-0.001 (*)	-0.001 (*)
Education of the father				0.02	0.02	0.009
Education of the mother				0.01	0.04	0.007
Household income when 14				-0.08	-0.03	-0.08
Political orientation					0.05	
Prob > Chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pseudo R2	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.15	0.15

Table 5. Logistic regression results with exp(B), dependent variable=national political participation. *Significant at $p \leq 0.05$.

National loyalty and transnational mobility both increase the likelihood of voting in EU elections

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Constant	-0.28	-0.06	-0.45	-4.76	-5.22	-3.55
			(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
National loyalty	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.14	0.14	
	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	
Country dummies						
Germany		-0.28	-0.23	-0.18	-0.20	-0.26
		(*)	(*)			(*)
Italy		0.33	0.42	0.40	0.46	0.27
		(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Romania		-0.43	-0.38	-0.17	0.001	-0.23
		(*)	(*)			
Spain		-0.02	0.06	0.01	-0.01	-0.11
UK		-0.82	-0.77	-1.03	-1.05	-1.10
		(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)
Transnational mobility						
Exit			0.02	0.02	0.02	
			(*)	(*)	(*)	
Sociodemographic factors						
Education				0.21	0.21	0.23
				(*)	(*)	(*)
Income				-0.10	-0.08	-0.12
				(*)	(*)	(*)
Gender				-0.001	0.06	0.01
Marital status				0.32	0.31	0.33
				(*)	(*)	(*)
Age				0.14	0.16	0.14
				(*)	(*)	(*)
Age2				-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
				(*)	(*)	(*)
Education of the father				0.03	0.05	0.03
Education of the mother				-0.08	-0.08	-0.06
				(*)	(*)	(*)
Household income when 14				-0.07	-0.03	-0.07
				(*)		
Political orientation					-0.03	
Prob > Chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pseudo R2	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.13	0.11

Table 6. Logistic regression results, dependent variable=supranational political participation. *Significant at $p \leq 0.05$.

The statistical results generally concur with existing theories of electoral participation. Older, married, and more educated individuals, but with lower incomes relative to their level of education, participate more in both national and European elections than other individuals. We also find that, holding other factors constant, men vote more than women in European elections and that the higher the mother's education, the lower the propensity to vote in European elections.

Virtual vs. Transnational Mobility and Political Participation

Virtual and physical cross-border experiences are different

EU citizens cross borders in at least two ways: physical and/or virtual. In the first case, individuals use some form of transportation to move from one national jurisdiction to another. On the other hand, virtual cross-border practices include all forms of interaction with individuals and cultures beyond one's nation state without any physical mobility. Physical cross-border experiences are more costly and leave important marks on individual perceptions of foreign contexts and cultures. On the other hand, virtual cross-border activities, such as online shopping, communication via internet-based platforms, resource transfers and consumption of non-national cultural products are arguably lower in cost and do not require a substantial resource use thanks to the increasingly affordable telecommunication technologies.

These practices may influence the political behaviour of European citizens in distinct ways. For example, frequent physical cross-border engagement may enhance individual awareness about economic and political circumstances at home and elsewhere and prompt them to take action by casting a vote in the ballot box. On the other hand, lesser frequency of these practices may breed political apathy especially at the supranational level, and push voters to either ignore or show limited interest in electoral participation.

In order to test the diverse impact of physical and virtual mobility practices, we repeated the analysis by exploring their role in voting behaviour. In doing so, we constructed an additive index for physical mobility, based on responses to the questions on experiences that involve actual border crossing.^{iv} Similarly, we constructed a virtual mobility index based on cross-border experiences that do not involve any form of physical moving across the national borders.^v

Physical mobility matters for voter turnout in EU elections

The results reveal that physical and virtual mobility experiences of individuals have no significant relationship with participating in national elections. On the other hand, the relationship between these factors and voting in EU elections appears more complex. While virtual mobility experiences are positively and significantly associated with participating in EU elections, this relationship no longer holds once we introduce the political orientation into the picture. As Model 6 in Table 7 demonstrates below, physical mobility turns to be a significant predictor of voting at the supranational level once the political orientation of the respondent is taken into account.

	(1) (Vote national)	(2) (Vote national)	(3) (Vote national)	(4) (Vote EU)	(5) (Vote EU)	(6) (Vote EU)
Constant	0.85 (*)	-3.54 (*)	-3.55 (*)	-0.37	-4.69 (*)	-5.16 (*)
National loyalty	0.24 (*)	0.22 (*)	0.18 (*)	0.17 (*)	0.14	0.14 (*)
Country dummies (base: Denmark)						
Germany	-0.64 (*)	-0.60 (*)	-0.63 (*)	-0.24 (*)	-0.18	-0.20 (*)
Italy	-0.41 (*)	-0.68 (*)	-0.68 (*)	0.43 (*)	0.40 (*)	0.48 (*)
Romania	-1.26 (*)	-1.37 (*)	-1.20 (*)	-0.34 (*)	-0.16	0.06
Spain	-0.50 (*)	-0.72 (*)	-0.66 (*)	0.08 (*)	0.01	0.02
UK	-0.62 (*)	-1.05 (*)	-1.02 (*)	-0.77 (*)	-1.03 (*)	-1.04 (*)
Transnational mobility						
Physical Mobility	0.05 (*)	0.01	0.02	0.03 (*)	0.02	0.03 (*)
Virtual Mobility	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.02 (*)	0.01
Sociodemographic factors						
Education		0.31 (*)	0.29 (*)		0.22 (*)	0.21 (*)
Income		-0.20 (*)	-0.20 (*)		-0.10 (*)	-0.07
Gender		0.07	0.04		-0.003	0.06
Marital status		0.51 (*)	0.51 (*)		0.32 (*)	0.30 (*)
Age		0.15 (*)	0.15 (*)		0.14 (*)	0.16 (*)
Age2		-0.001 (*)	-0.001 (*)		-0.001 (*)	-0.001
Education of the father		0.01	0.02		0.03	0.05
Education of the mother		0.004	0.03		-0.07 (*)	-0.09 (*)
Household income when 14		-0.08	-0.03		-0.07 (*)	-0.04
Political orientation			0.05			-0.03
Prob > Chi2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pseudo R2	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.03	0.12	0.12

Table 7. The role of physical and virtual mobility in national and supranational political participation. *Significant at $p \leq 0.05$.

CONCLUSIONS

Low participation in national and European elections has become a problem in most Western democracies. The roots of this problem are complex and have been analyzed elsewhere. In this research project, however, we are interested in the general consequences of transnational mobility across the European space on member country citizens' identifications, lifestyles, political attitudes, and political behavior. The literature and the statistical results clearly demonstrate that transnational experience and skills hardly have any impact on political participation. When they do, these factors encourage people to be more politically active at the supranational level. This is good news for the health of European democracies and for those concerned about the quality of democracy at the national level due to the allegedly negative effects that the single space for the movement of citizens across the European Union may generate. Paraphrasing Hirschman, voice and exit are not exclusive alternatives in the European Union. On the policy front, these statistical results suggest that promoting mobility does not impact on the propensity to show up at the polls. If anything, mobility increases participation in European elections.

References

- Barry, Brian. 1974. "Review Article: 'Exit, Voice, and Loyalty.'" *British Journal of Political Science* 4 (01): 79–107. doi:10.1017/S0007123400009376.
- Delanty, Gerard. 2003. "Loyalty and the European Union" In: *Political Loyalty and the Nation-State*. Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics. Routledge, London, pp. 123-136.
- Diez Medrano, Juan. 2014. "Practices before Identifications: Transnational Experience, World Outlook and Behavior in the Context of Globalization" Paper presented at the 21st Conference of Europeanists, 14-16 March, Washington DC.
- Dowding, Keith, Peter John, Thanos Mergoupis, and Mark Van Vugt. 2000. "Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Analytic and Empirical Developments." *European Journal of Political Research* 37 (4): 469–95. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.00522.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1994. "Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe." In *Condition of Citizenship*. New York, USA: Sage Publications.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty; Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hirschman, Albert O. 1993. "Exit, Voice, and the Fate of the German Democratic Republic: An Essay in Conceptual History." *World Politics* 45 (02): 173–202. doi:10.2307/2950657.
- Laponce, Jean. 1974. "Hirschman's Voice and Exit Model as Spatial Archetype." *Social Science Information* 13 (3): 67–81. doi:10.1177/053901847401300304.
- Salamońska, Justyna, Lorenzo Grifone Baglioni, and Ettore Recchi. 2013. *Navigating the European Space: Physical and Virtual Forms of Cross-Border Mobility among EU Citizens*. EUCROSS working paper 5.-
http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=10&Itemid=110
- Shklar, Judith N. "Obligation, loyalty, exile." *Political theory* (1993): 181-197.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The EUCROSS research project examines the relationship between the manifold activities of EU residents (nationals, mobile EU citizens, and third-country nationals) across the borders of nation states and their collective identities. To disentangle empirically the factors and mechanisms that link together the cross-border practices facilitated by European integration, globalisation and/or other dimensions of collective identity, EUCROSS adopts a two-stage, mixed quantitative/qualitative approach.

In the first stage, a quantitative survey (8,500 cases) is carried out among nationals, intra-EU movers (Romanian citizens) and third-country nationals (Turkish citizens) who reside in six European countries (Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom). In the second stage, via 160 in-depth interviews, the meaning given by individuals to cross-border practices, their collective identifications, and the role that the European Union, globalisation, and the nation play in these personal narratives is investigated among a select typology of respondents to the quantitative survey.

EUCROSS CONSORTIUM



(Coordinator) Università degli studi 'Gabriele d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara

<http://www.unich.it>



GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

<http://www.gesis.org>



Aarhus University, Center for Global and Regional Studies (GLOREA)

<http://projects.au.dk/glorea/>



Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals (IBEI)

<http://www.ibeio.org>



University of York

<http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/soci/>



**UNIVERSITATEA
DIN BUCUREȘTI**
— VIRTUTE ET SAPIENTIA —

University of Bucharest, Faculty of Sociology and Social Work

http://www.unibuc.ro/en/fac_fsas_en

Endnotes

ⁱ The observed values for this index ranges between 0 and 7 and includes the following questions : On a scale from one to five, where one means “strongly disagree” and five means “strongly agree”, please tell me how much you agree with the following statements? “I feel [Country of Residence]” (None=0, strongly disagree=1...2...3...4...strongly agree=5) and Imagine that another [country’s relevant administrative district or region] [if necessary add also: in [CoR]] was struck by a natural disaster. Who do you think should make financial contributions to its reconstruction? (None=0, Only the respective region=1, CoR as a whole=2).

ⁱⁱ The observed values for this index ranges between 0 and 50 and includes questions in Endnotes iv and v, plus the following questions that measure transnational networks and skills: The citizenship of which countries do you hold? (continuous variable that ranges between 1-2); Please think about all family members, in-laws and friends you have who live in [CoR]. I would like to know how many are originally from other countries (A lot=2, A few=1, None=0) ; Do you have any family members, in-laws or friends who live outside [CoR]? (Yes=1, No=0) ; In general, irrespective of the level of your knowledge, have you ever learned any other language besides <<your native language and>> [official language of CoR]? ((Yes=1, No=0) ; Which other languages have you learned? (continuous variable that ranges between 0 and 16).

ⁱⁱⁱ These indicators are the following : Education level of the father (Primary education or less=1, Lower secondary education=2, In-between lower and higher secondary=3, Higher secondary education (university)=4, Lower tertiary education=5, Higher tertiary education=6) ; Education level of the mother ((Primary education or less=1, Lower secondary education=2, In-between lower and higher secondary=3, Higher secondary education (university)=4, Lower tertiary education=5, Higher tertiary education=6) ; Which of the following descriptions comes closest to how you feel about how well off your household was when you were 14? (We were living very comfortably on the money we had=5, We were living comfortably on the money we had=4, We made ends meet=3, We found it difficult=2, We found it very difficult=1).

^{iv} Values for this index range between 0 and 12. The index includes the following questions : Have you ever lived in another country for three or more consecutive months before you turned 18? (Yes=1, No=0); Please think about all your journeys abroad before you turned 18 (e.g. with your parents, other relatives, school or alone). How many countries did you visit before you turned 18? (None=0, One=1, Two=2, Three-Five=3, Six-Ten=4, More than ten=5) ; “ Have you lived in another country for three or more consecutive months since you turned 18? (Yes=1, No=0) ; Have you ever (e.g. as student or during your professional career) participated in an international exchange program that has been funded or co-funded by the European Union? (Yes=0, No=1); Please think of trips abroad which included at least one overnight stay. How many of these trips have you had in the past 24 months? (None=0, One=1, Two=2, Three-Five=3, Six-Ten=4, More than ten=5).

^v Values for this index range between 0 and 30. The index includes the following questions: Please think about the last 12 months: How frequently did you talk to family members, in-laws and friends abroad by phone or using your computer? (Everyday=4, At least once a week=3, At least once a month=2, Less often=1, Never=0) ; How frequently did you communicate with them by mail or e-mail? (Everyday=4, At least once a week=3, At least once a month=2, Less often=1, Never=0) ; And how frequently via social networks? (e.g. Facebook, Hi5, Google+ etc) (Everyday=4, At least once a week=3, At least once a month=2, Less often=1, Never=0) ; Please think about all private and business related messages you received by e-mail and, if you use them, via social networking sites during the last 12 months. Approximately which percentage of them came from abroad (excluding spam and junk messages)? (1= "Between 0-25%" 2="Between 26-50%" 3="Between 51-75%" 4 ="Between 76-100%") In the last 12 months, have you in your spare time been active in any organization or group which is oriented towards other countries or cultures? (e.g. voluntary relief organizations, cultural associations, Salsa clubs etc.) (Yes=1, No=0) ; Do you ever send money abroad for reasons other than purchasing goods or services? (Yes=1, No=0) ; How Often ? (At least once a month=3, At least once a year=2, Less than once a year=1, None=0) ; In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?-From partner (Yes=1, No=0), From close relatives (Yes=1, No=0), From other relatives (Yes=1, No=0), From other persons (Yes=1, No=0) ; Thinking about the last 12 months, have you purchased any goods or services from sellers or providers who were located abroad? That is, for example, via websites, mail, phone, etc. (Yes=1, No=0) ; And do you follow sports on an international level or in another country (e.g. watching matches of the German Bundesliga or the Formula-One world championship)? (Yes, at least once a week=3, Yes, at least once a month=2, Yes, but less often=1, No=0) ; How often do you watch TV content which is in another language and has not been dubbed, either directly on TV or via the Internet? (Every day=4, At least once a week=3, At least once a month=2, Less often=1, Never=0) ; In your work, how often did you interact with people (e.g. business partners, clients, colleagues) who are located in another country than [CoR] during the last 12 months? (Every day=4, At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2, Less often=1, Never=0).