



European
University
Institute

ROBERT
SCHUMAN
CENTRE FOR
ADVANCED
STUDIES

WORKING PAPERS

RSCAS 2016/50
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Migration Policy Centre

Europe between mobility and sedentarism: Patterns of cross-border practices and their consequences for European identification

Justyna Salamońska and Ettore Recchi

European University Institute
Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies
Migration Policy Centre

**Europe between mobility and sedentarism:
Patterns of cross-border practices and their consequences for
European identification**

Justyna Salamońska and Ettore Recchi

This text may be downloaded only for personal research purposes. Additional reproduction for other purposes, whether in hard copies or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s), editor(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), editor(s), the title, the working paper, or other series, the year and the publisher.

ISSN 1028-3625

© Justyna Salamońska and Ettore Recchi (s)/editor(s), 2016

Printed in Italy, October 2016

European University Institute

Badia Fiesolana

I – 50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI)

Italy

www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Publications/

www.eui.eu

cadmus.eui.eu

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies

The Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies (RSCAS), created in 1992 and directed by Professor Brigid Laffan, aims to develop inter-disciplinary and comparative research on the major issues facing the process of European integration, European societies and Europe's place in 21st century global politics.

The Centre is home to a large post-doctoral programme and hosts major research programmes, projects and data sets, in addition to a range of working groups and *ad hoc* initiatives. The research agenda is organised around a set of core themes and is continuously evolving, reflecting the changing agenda of European integration, the expanding membership of the European Union, developments in Europe's neighbourhood and the wider world.

Details of the research of the Centre can be found on:

<http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Research/>

Research publications take the form of Working Papers, Policy Papers, and e-books. Most of these are also available on the RSCAS website:

<http://www.eui.eu/RSCAS/Publications/>

The EUI and the RSCAS are not responsible for the opinions expressed by the author(s).

Migration Policy Centre (MPC)

The Migration Policy Centre (MPC) at the European University Institute, Florence, conducts advanced research on global migration to serve migration governance needs at European level, from developing, implementing and monitoring migration-related policies to assessing their impact on the wider economy and society.

The MPC carries out field as well as archival research, both of which are scientifically robust and policy-relevant, not only at European level, but also globally, targeting policy-makers as well as politicians. This research provides tools for addressing migration challenges, by: 1) producing policy-oriented research on aspects of migration, asylum and mobility in Europe and in countries located along migration routes to Europe, that are regarded as priorities; 2) bridging research with action by providing policy-makers and other stakeholders with results required by evidence-based policymaking, as well as necessary methodologies that address migration governance needs; 3) pooling scholars, experts, policy makers, and influential thinkers in order to identify problems, research their causes and consequences, and devise policy solutions. Our research includes a core programme and several projects, most of them co-financed by the European Union.

The MPC working paper series, published since April 2013, aims at disseminating high-quality research pertaining to migration and related issues. All EUI members, as well as other external scholars and practitioners, are welcome to submit their work to the series. For further queries, please contact the Migration Policy Centre Secretariat at mpc@eui.eu

More information can be found on: <http://www.migrationpolicycentre.eu/>

Disclaimer: The EUI, RSCAS and MPC are not responsible for the opinion expressed by the author(s). Furthermore, the views expressed in this publication cannot in any circumstances be regarded as the official position of the European Union".

Abstract

In this working paper we explore to what extent mobilities shape the everyday lives of Europeans. We map out the patterns of physical and virtual mobilities, including intra-European migrations, international travel, but also individual networks across borders and online transactions. In particular, we outline how free movement within the EU, one of the basic rights of EU citizens, is part and parcel of a broader 'mobility mix' of transnational practices. By applying LCA (latent class analysis) to a random sample of 6000 resident nationals in six EU member states (Germany, the UK, Italy, Spain, Denmark and Romania: the EUCROSS survey of 2012) we build a typology of European cross-border practices, drawing a diversified picture of mobilities between two extreme positions of transnationalism and immobility. We describe in detail the typical configurations of social transnationalism in the light of their structuration on the basis of macro and micro categorical differences. Finally, we ask about the consequences of these mobilities for European integration. We do so by linking different mobility patterns identified with LCA analysis to identifications with Europe.

Keywords

Cross-border practices, European identity, European integration, mobility, social transnationalism

Globalisation and individualisation entail the expansion and diversification of forms of physical mobility, alongside virtual mobility, i.e. mobility that does not involve a movement of people from one place to another. Technological advances have facilitated the development and intensification of these new and diverse forms of movements. Social theory has taken into account such changes with a ‘mobility turn’ (Urry 2000 and 2007). Empirical research has paid renewed and multi-disciplinary attention to different forms of Europe-wide international mobility, which have been examined in its different forms: migrations (e.g. Recchi and Favell 2009; Krings et al. 2013; Wiesböck *et al.* 2016); tourism (e.g. Urry 1990); shopping online (Perea y Monsuwé *et al.* 2004); abroad home ownership (e.g. Aspden 2005; Wickham 2007); and virtual mobilities (e.g. Mau 2010; Larsen *et al.* 2006). In this working paper we are interested in the scale and intersection of these mobilities in Europe. We examine ‘cross-border’ practices, or ‘behaviours that are performed by any possible individual agent in any aspect of everyday life’ (Favell *et al.* 2011: 19). This definition suggests a systematic bottom-up approach to the study of individual mobilities, against a rich strand of literature using ‘transnationalism’ in an eminently case-oriented if not metaphorical sense. Our interest in a palette of cross-border practices encompasses, too, the consequences of these experiences for European integration. In particular, we ask if cross-border practices affect identification with Europe.

The cross-border movements described above are normally studied one by one. Instead, this paper will seek to examine them in an integrated way. Its focus will be on Europe and European citizens’ cross-border practices. Therefore, the paper starts with an overview of mobility practices with special reference to Europe. In the following section we describe the dataset and methodology. Drawing on the EUCROSS project, we use survey data on nationals in Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the UK in order to map the patterns and experiences of mobility in everyday life. Our analysis links these movements in space (be it physical or virtual) to social categories and explores the way they combine, either overlapping or substituting one another (see also Urry 2000). This goal is pursued by using latent class analysis. Our exploratory study finds five typical combinations of cross-border practices and their determinants. This empirical classification accounts for most typical patterns of international mobility practices in Europe and shows their association with subjective attachment to Europe.

Types of cross-border practices

To what extent do Europeans live their lives beyond nation state borders? How is transnationalism experienced in everyday activities? In a working taxonomy of movements proposed by Urry (2000), the *physical movements* of people and objects are taken as the most basic form of mobility. Urry’s classification includes other important ways in which people move: *virtually*, in particular via interactive Internet-based applications; and *imaginatively*, via passively consumed media, mainly television and radio (but now also the Internet). While this classification provides a first reference for the examination of mobilities, Urry’s work, and that of many of his followers, is mostly metaphor-driven, which fails to provide an overarching picture of the spread of different mobility experiences in the population. In fact, our attempt to map cross-border practices in Europe is intended to furnish empirical evidence for the scale and patterns of European mobilities. Building on an earlier classification (Recchi 2014), we aim to describe the breadth and patterns of cross-border practices. In the first place we make a distinction between physical and virtual mobilities. Further distinctions are then made between the dimensions of different cross-border practices. Physical mobilities can be seen on a *continuum* from ‘short’ to ‘long’ permanence mobilities. For virtual mobilities, their ‘personal’ or ‘impersonal’ aspect serves as the basis of differentiation (see Table 1). Using this classification we aim to examine in more detail physical and virtual mobility practices, and their possible intersections, on the basis of the available empirical literature.

Table 1 Classification of cross-border individual practices

Physical border crossing?	Dimensions	Indicator
Yes → Physical mobility	High permanence	Long-term stay abroad (> 3 years) Medium-term stay abroad (3 months – 3 years) Short stay abroad (3 weeks-3 months) Holidaying, short trips abroad
	Low permanence	
No → Virtual mobility	Personal	Having a foreign spouse or family member Having family/relatives in a different country Planning relocation in a foreign country Having foreign friends/neighbours Having friends abroad Sending children abroad Having foreign business partners, clients, colleagues Adhering to international associations Interacting with foreigners through social networks Making foreign investments (house, bank account)
	Impersonal	Buying foreign products online

Source: Recchi (2014)

Mapping these cross-border practices is a new way of looking at European societies and their hybridisation via individual social practices. Sociology has been long interested in social mobility, researching occupational, income and status shifts over generations and individual life courses. Implications of class, gender and ethnicity were examined in these analyses, but our study brings the socio-spatial dimension of mobility to the fore, something which has often been overlooked. Finally, we share Urry’s interest in looking beyond mobilities *per se*, and studying their consequences (Elliott and Urry 2010). In this vein, the paper focuses on crossing nation state borders as a way of mapping EU citizenship practices in their day-to-day reality.

Physical border-crossings

Mapping the landscape of European mobilities starts here with an analysis of international movements, of both longer and shorter duration. Firstly, international migration is traditionally the most researched form of long-term physical mobility across borders. For a long time, migration has been framed as a move from a place of origin to a destination of (more or less) permanent character. Migration statistics reflect this approach, as they define migrants as persons who are resident in a country other than their country of origin for at least one year (following a UN-established convention). Yet this definition is limited. Many international moves do not last one year or more. Also, migration horizons are increasingly broader and go beyond the origin and destination dichotomy, entailing step-wise subsequent resettlements from one country to another. This flexibility is a particular feature of intra-European mobility, as one in six Europeans now report having resided in another EU country for at least three months (Salamońska *et al.* 2013). Recently published studies on intra-European migration in the EU15 focus on the diverse motivations of people moving for better quality of life, for studies, for family, or simply because they fall in love with somebody residing in another country (e.g. Benson 2010; King 2002; King and Ruiz-Gelices 2003; Hadler 2006; Recchi and Favell 2009 for a

comparative picture of Western intra-European migrants). In the aftermath of the EU enlargements of 2004 and 2007, population flows from East to West in Europe grew substantially. Although these new migrations are still largely regarded as labour migrations (European Commission 2008), recent publications point, also, to non-economic factors involved, including life-style issues, social networks, quality of life, and life-course related rationales (e.g. Cook *et al.* 2011; Eade *et al.* 2007; Grabowska 2003; Koryś 2003; Wickham *et al.* 2009; Recchi and Triandafyllidou 2010; Krings *et al.* 2013).

Equally, the EU free movement regime facilitates the short-term mobility of a more tourist-like character. In the simplest sense, the Schengen area passport-free facility and the single currency Eurozone make travel projects particularly smooth. Relative ease of traveling and also historically decreasing costs of travel mean that tourism leads to new social encounters and interactions (Hall 2005). Szerszynski and Urry (2006) notice how, in the Western world, travel has become a 'way of life': a claim corroborated by the unprecedented numbers of people on the move. Tourists may travel for diverse reasons, as the World Tourism Organization defines them as people 'traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes' (UN and WTO 1994). Tourist trips are possibly the most common form of short-term physical movements, but short trips for work trigger mobility as well. Hall (2005) and Koslowski (2011) document the blurring boundaries between tourism, recreation, leisure and work as global mobility numbers pick up. Another important aspect of short-term mobility is related to personal relations, when people travel to meet significant others in specific places or they travel with them in search of 'intimate proximities' (Larsen *et al.* 2006).

Virtual cross-border practices

Virtual mobility generates a particular type of experience, which can be described as mediated, artificial or imaginative. Virtual relationships and communications are subject to limitations imposed by the media that make them possible (phone, computer), but these same limitations may also elicit an aspiration for corporeal mobility. Woolgar (2002) points out that, as with physical mobility, focusing on the macro-level does not inform us about the day-to-day utilisation and experience of new technologies. This is why there is a need to understand technology in context, taking into account the social environment in which it is used. Furthermore, the virtual is interrelated with the real, but this interrelation can be either replace or reinforce. Often virtual contacts trigger real actions. And finally, perceptions of technology and related attitudes are not always the same in different social categories.

Studies of transnational social networks were initially the domain of migration studies, which explored how mobile people kept in touch with significant others back home (Portes *et al.* 1999). These illustrated 'travelling-in-dwelling' practices of communication by email or phone as they were becoming cheaper and more easily accessible (very much like travel), especially when compared with previous generations (e.g. Clarke 2005). However, migrants' practices are an extreme illustration of information and communication technologies' use linked to physical mobility. More generally, Eurostat data (2012) shows that connecting to the Internet has become a daily practice for the vast majority of European citizens. The bulk of Europeans use the Internet to send and receive emails, over a third shares their profiles and their ideas on general social media (like Facebook or Twitter). On the basis of a survey carried out in the mid 2000s, Mau's work (2010) on social transnationalism demonstrates how almost half of German residents had, at that date, social contacts that spanned national borders: the geography of these international social networks was not random, but embedded in specific geographical, cultural and historical contexts.

While the means and use of virtual communications developed fast, Boden and Molotch (1994) highlighted a persisting compulsion of traditional face-to-face contacts, a biographically and historically primary mode of communication. Proximity allows for communication with words, but also with eye contact, body language and touch, all ingredients of a more dense and rewarding

interaction. This is particularly important in the case of personal relations, but also business contacts when more complex understandings are needed.

Non-physical mobility in Urry's typology can become an imaginative movement when travel takes place using TV sets or the radio (2000). Traditional and web-based social media allow the user to connect to distant places remaining at the same physical location (see for instance Tussyadiah and Fesenmaier 2008). Cross-border consumption practices involving media, including television, have, so far, been examined largely within migration literature. We include them in our analysis as these practices imply that people cross national boundaries with their imagination in a symbolically meaningful way (Hanquinet and Savage 2013).

Objects also travel in other ways, and in between real and virtual space. Migration scholars in particular have been interested in global flows of remittances (e.g. Mansoor and Quillin 2006; De Haas 2007), in terms of their directions, sizes and use. However, sending and receiving money is not limited to migrants and their households back home. Internet banking and other virtual payment systems like Paypal have made cash flows across borders easier, cheaper and faster than they have ever been.

What is more, shopping across borders has grown in importance in recent years. While for the affluent classes this may mean buying property abroad (Aspden 2005), practices of online shopping have become more widespread (Li and Zhang 2002). Indeed, online shopping is one of the most popular ways in which the Internet is used. Electronic commerce adds value, compared to more traditional retail stores, by time-saving and by providing easily accessible information. However, online shopping activities are more popular among those who are competent users of new technologies. And, again the EU may facilitate online shopping, without custom duties charges and controls that apply when customers shop outside the EU borders. As a matter of fact, a primary shopping outlet like Ebay.com has now implemented an EU-wide search as a customary tool, when clients surf from an EU-based IP address.

So far we have drawn a broad yet hardly exhaustive picture of everyday cross-border practices, pointing to their possible interactions. Mapping these practices spatially requires attention given that '[m]obility may well be the key difference and otherness producing machine of our age, involving significant inequalities of speed, risk, rights, and status' (Salazar and Smart 2011: 4-5). Consequently, one risk of concentrating on mobility is that we overlook the determinants and outcomes associated with *immobility*. This is why, instead of drawing a dichotomy of mobile versus sedentary (like Recchi and Favell 2009), we suggest thinking about a continuum of cross-border practices. These form a kind of menu from which individuals select their own relations with physical and virtual spaces. Their choices, we contend, are not random, fully individualised and agency-driven. Rather, they reflect pre-existing structures and, in turn, cut across societies in a significant way.

Migration-type mobility more often involves the lower social strata moving in search of a better life. Contrarily, though travel has become ever more accessible with lowering costs of connections offered by carriers (especially in Europe), the extent of physical mobility may still depend on the material resources that people possess. Access to virtual mobility tends to depend more on cognitive skills and generational cultures, where younger cohorts in particular are both more accustomed and more competent in making use of information and communication technologies (Duggan and Brenner 2013). More generally, cross-border practices tend to be linked with 'transnational background' – that is, holding a nationality other than the one of the country of residence and/or having parents born outside the country of residence (Kuhn 2015).

Thereafter, mobility patterns can affect future life chances and identities. At an aggregate level, it has been claimed that interactions across national borders facilitate learning from the 'Other' and develop confidence in the individual, collective and institutional partners involved (see e.g. Salamońska 2016 for an analysis of effects of social transnationalism on sentiments towards EU

migrants). This is why, in the European context, cross-border practices may legitimise and strengthen European integration (Deutsch *et al.* 1957; Fligstein 2008; Recchi and Kuhn 2013; Recchi 2015).

Data

This paper is based on data coming from the EUCROSS study (2012-2014) financed by the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme. EUCROSS (The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third-Country Citizens, www.eucross.eu) examined the relationship between the many different cross-border activities of EU residents (nationals, mobile EU citizens, and third-country nationals) and their collective identities. The sample consisted of EU residents, including nationals and Romanian and Turkish migrants resident in six countries (Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom). In this paper we focus on diverse mobility practices as reported by nationals of six European countries, because it is reasonable to consider migrant transnationalism as qualitatively different from the transnationalism of nationals. Migrants have, by definition, engaged in migration experiences, which is only the case for a minority of nationals who are returnees now resident in their countries of origin. Migrants are also assumed to be more mobile in other ways, as they are more likely to connect to significant others abroad and travel, particularly to their countries of origin.

As other studies pointed out how modernisation and globalisation on the country level affect short-term mobility and personal networks across borders in the European context (Mau and Mewes 2012), the sample covers a range of European countries which differ in size, GDP, intensity of globalisation processes (as measured by the KOF index), and length of EU membership.

In total, 6000 respondents were interviewed in 2012, that is, 1000 *per* country. The same questionnaire (in different languages) was adopted across all six countries. The questionnaire focused on three dimensions of cross-border practices: physical mobility; virtual mobility; and cosmopolitan consumption and competences (Pötzschke 2012). The questionnaire included questions about transnational practices that expanded on items previously asked in Eurobarometer surveys (particularly EB65.1 and EB 67.1: for a thorough analysis, see Kuhn 2015). The EUCROSS questionnaire gathered detailed information about different physical, virtual and imaginative mobilities in order to capture not only the quantity of mobility, but also qualitative differences between different patterns of individual transnationalism in Europe. A range of indicators tapped physical short-term and long-term mobility, movements of objects, and non-physical mobility practices (see Table 2). Where indicated, mobility practices were referred to the EU space.

Table 2 Latent class analysis indicators

No.	Indicator	Question(s)
1	Migration experiences	‘Have you ever lived in another EU country for three or more consecutive months before you turned 18?’; ‘Have you lived in another EU country for three or more consecutive months since you turned 18?’
2	Recent tourism experiences	‘Please think of trips abroad (within the EU) which included at least one overnight stay. How many of these trips have you had in the past 24 months?’
3	Communication with family/friends abroad talking via phone/computer and via mail/email	‘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?’; ‘How frequently did you communicate with family/friends abroad by mail or e-mail?’
4	Communication with family/friends abroad via web-based social networks	‘And how frequently did you communicate with family/friends abroad via social networks? (e.g. Facebook, Hi5, Google+ etc.)?’
5	International money transfers	‘Do you ever send money abroad for reasons other than purchasing goods or services?’; ‘In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?’
6	Shopping abroad	‘Thinking about the last 12 months, have you purchased any goods or services from sellers or providers who were located abroad (within the EU)? That is, for example, via websites, mail, phone, etc.?’
7	Following TV in foreign language	‘The following question is about TV content (e.g. movies, sitcoms, news broadcasts etc.) in other languages than [official CoR language] <<and your native language>>: 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?’

Source: EUCROSS (2012)

Methods

In order to examine patterns of mobility practices among EU citizens, we resorted to latent class analysis (LCA). Using Mplus 7.2 (Muthén and Muthén 1998-2014) we performed exploratory LCA aimed at grouping individuals into classes with similar patterns of cross-border mobilities (as from the list of indicators described in Table 2). We weighted EUCROSS data on the basis of age, gender and education as in Eurobarometer 77 (2012). The model fit measures, including statistical information criteria, did not provide clear guidance on the number of class selection (see table 7 in the Annex). The BIC (Bayesian Information Criterion) and sample-size adjusted BIC decreased progressively moving from two to four class models and increased for five and six class solutions, suggesting that the four classes provide the best model fit. Similarly, the Vuong-Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test and the Lo-Mendell-Rubin adjusted LRT test converge in indicating a four class solution as the best fit for the data. In contrast, the entropy measure decreases from two to five class models and rises afterwards, therefore leaning towards a five class solution.

From the substantive point of view, the two class solution is clearly hinged on a rough mobile-immobile dichotomy and seems not to capture mobility configurations. The three class solution introduces a group of respondents that are characterised by a very high probability of tourist-type mobility. With the four class solution a new group appears. This group is characterised by a high probability of connecting via traditional and new communication tools (phone, mail and email). The

five class solution adds to the above a group combining above average levels of travel and virtual connectivity aimed at friends and family abroad. With the sixth class there appears an additional extremely transnational class. One indicator, on which two highly-mobile classes differ in the six class model, is international money transfers, with two groups having being either very likely or very unlikely to use this practice. This distinction, in fact, is not that important from a substantive point of view, because international money transfer is a relatively marginal practice. All in all, we deem that the five-class solution provides a good compromise in terms of model complexity and the detail of the latent structure of cross-border practices.

Our focus on *configurations* of mobilities provides a new perspective on EU citizens' transnationalism, which is an alternative to existing analyses that examine, instead, the overall *volume* of transnationalism (Mau 2010; Mau and Mewes 2012; Kuhn 2015). From a sociological point of view it also matters how these mobility types are socially structured, that is how different resources shape access to different forms of mobility. To this end, we conducted multinomial regressions with class assignment (that is, most likely LCA membership) as dependent variable to examine the impact of social background and demographics. Persons with more resources, not least educational and socio-economic resources, are expected to be among the most mobile types. In particular, we anticipated that financial resources would have a positive effect on the likelihood of belonging to classes in which physical mobilities are an important component. Latent class types relying on virtual mobilities may be more socially inclusive, but in turn we expected younger age and better education to have an impact on being virtually mobile. We also hypothesised that 'transnational background' (Kuhn 2011 and 2012) matters for cross-border practices.

Our analysis of the social determinants of mobilities places European transnationalism in context. However the ultimate test of the typology is provided by checking to what extent LCA-based configurations can predict attitudes. We contend that our approach will advance and fine-tune what existing research on the impact of volume of transnationalism has demonstrated (particularly, Kuhn 2015). We will thus examine how people differ in terms of everyday transnationalism, but also how there are qualitative differences in mobility in Europe. A combination of quantity and quality of movement is presumed to have attitudinal consequences. This leads to the third step of our analysis, where LCA membership is used as an independent variable, along with other predictors, in multinomial logistic regression models, with identification with Europe as the outcome.

Findings on cross-border practices in six European countries

A first look at cross-border practices as registered by the EUCROSS dataset shows that national populations in the six European countries are astonishingly mobile. Table 2 gives an overview of the range of practices on which we will focus. All the indicators were dichotomised, with code 1 assigned to individuals who reported that they engaged in a given cross-border practice within the reference period (if any was stated).

Table 3 reports the breakdown of each mobility indicator by respondents' nationality. Over one in two Romanians, Spaniards and Germans interviewed declare keeping in touch with family and friends abroad by phone/computer/mail or email. The majority of Danes, Germans and Romanians watches TV in another language. This practice is most popular in Denmark (85.6 per cent), and least so in Italy and Spain (below 40 per cent). Danes most often purchase from sellers located abroad, but it is Romanians who transfer money internationally most often. What is more, over half of Danes, Germans and Britons had travelled to another EU countries in the last 24 months. Going on holiday abroad is less common among Italians and Spaniards (at just above 40 per cent) and Romanians (34.5 per cent). Romanians more often cross borders in other ways, being remarkably well networked internationally. The number of Romanians who were in touch with significant others abroad via phone and email was over twice the number of those who travelled abroad within the EU in the last two

years: respectively 71.4 and 34.5 per cent. They also often interact with other people in a foreign country via web-based social networks.

Not surprisingly, physical mobility of long permanence is the least common among cross-border practices examined here. Undertaking migration carries perhaps most risks and costs compared to other forms of mobility. Here Romanian residents, though newcomers to the EU, rank on top as the sampled nationality with the highest probability of having migration experience.

LCA reveals that respondents differ not only in how much they cross borders, but in the ways they do so (see table 4). To begin with, this classification invites us to think about mobilities in non-dichotomous terms, as we distinguish five groups ranging from most mobile transnationals to the least mobile locals. Classes in-between the two extremes of such a continuum provide an interesting insight into the intersection of different mobilities.

Locals form the most numerous latent class, accounting for just over 30 per cent of the entire EUCROSS sample. They relatively rarely cross national borders, either physically or virtually, standing well below the average for overall population. When compared to the whole sample, quite sedentary locals are a minority, albeit a sizeable one. Most respondents do in fact display diverse patterns of cross-border mobility.

On the other end of the mobility continuum there are *transnationals*. What is distinctive about this cluster of respondents is that they score above average on all indicators of cross-border practices. They show higher probabilities of having had some migration experience and they are also likely to have travelled abroad recently. At the same time, transnationals are very much used to moving in the virtual world maintaining connections with family and friends located abroad via phone and computer-assisted modes of communication. They also make more regular use of online shopping and money transfers across borders relative to other groups. Finally, they are competent movers who also follow TV content in the original language regularly. Just below eight per cent of the EUCROSS sample belongs to this group.

Between the two extreme cases represented by locals and transnationals, our classification points to a rich constellation of physical and virtual mobilities. *Visitors'* use of communication technologies in order to keep in touch with friends and family abroad is matched with above average levels of short-term physical mobility. Their travel experiences, therefore, seem to be well informed and culturally embedded. Visitors make up 12 percent of the EUCROSS sample. Similarly to transnationals, *tourists* (one quarter of the sample) engage in short term physical cross-border practices, but they rarely stay in touch with people abroad as their journeys are not sustained by personal ties. Tourists also follow TV content in another language relatively often.

The networked individuals may seem similar to locals in that they seldom travel, shop online or watch TV in other languages. Unlike locals, however, they are remarkably well connected internationally through family and friendship networks. They rely heavily on phones and the Internet to connect with these networks. They are also more likely to send or receive money internationally than the average. Networked respondents may lead local everyday lives in spatial terms, but cyberspace makes them well connected to others who are spread around the world. They constitute around one quarter of the EUCROSS sample.

Table 3 Cross-border practices by country (% , national residents only)

Indicator/Country	Denmark	Germany	Italy	Romania	Spain	United Kingdom	Total
Communicates by phone/computer/mail/e-mail with family, friends regularly	42.3	46.2	47.9	71.4	54.8	60.5	53.8
Watches TV in another language	85.6	54.6	38.7	57.0	38.6	41.0	52.7
Visited EU countries in the last 24 months	72.3	63.5	43.2	34.5	41.8	58.8	52.4
Communicates via web-based social networks with family, friends regularly	23.7	20.5	26.9	41.3	31.2	35.2	29.8
Purchased goods or services from sellers or providers who were located in another EU country over last 12 months	33.3	20.5	12.6	10.0	14.8	12.3	17.3
Sent or received money from abroad over last 12 months	16.2	13.4	14.4	26.4	13.3	15.4	16.5
Lived in another EU country for three or more months	12.9	11.5	9.8	15.3	12.1	14.9	12.7

Source: EUCROSS 2012, N=5838, weighted data

Table 4 Latent classes of cross-border practices (probabilities)

Indicator/Latent Class	Local	Trans national	Visitor	Tourist	Networked	Whole sample
Lived in another EU country for three or more months	0.056	0.474	0.096	0.125	0.128	0.128
Visited EU countries in the last 24 months	0.234	0.968	0.656	0.817	0.395	0.516
Communicates by phone/computer/mail/e-mail with family, friends	0.097	0.998	0.973	0.271	0.995	0.533
Communicates via web-based social networks with family, friends	0.013	0.684	1.000	0.008	0.476	0.275
Sent or received money from abroad	0.048	0.384	0.213	0.151	0.235	0.167
Purchased goods or services from sellers or providers who were located in another EU country	0.028	0.508	0.318	0.303	0.052	0.170
Watches TV in another language	0.256	0.895	0.865	0.727	0.389	0.510
<i>Sample proportions</i>	<i>0.309</i>	<i>0.077</i>	<i>0.121</i>	<i>0.244</i>	<i>0.245</i>	<i>1.000</i>

Source: EUCROSS 2012, N= 5538

Cross-border practices – their structuring and effects on identity

We expected to find not only different mobile types, but also to uncover how different socio-demographic factors shape these configurations, beyond a simple link between individual characteristics and transnationalism. This is why we run multiple logistic regression analyses with latent classes as outcome. This was possible as we assigned most likely probabilities of class membership to each respondent. Predictors included a set of individual characteristics which are crucial to understanding how access to mobilities is facilitated or hindered: gender, age, education level, labour market status and socio-economic status (as subjectively reported in terms of relative affluence). We also included independent variables controlling for ‘transnational background’ (language knowledge, one or two parents of different nationality). Finally, the models included country dummies.

Table 5 shows that gender is an important factor in structuring mobilities. Men are more likely to be part of the transnational, tourist or visitor classes. Younger and tertiary-educated respondents are less likely to be local. On the other hand, being unemployed increases the probabilities of being immobile (that is, local). Clearly, access to physical mobilities (which is far more common in the transnational, tourist and visitor classes) is facilitated by economic resources. Networked respondents do not statistically significantly differ from locals with regards to their economic standing. Having transnational background traits (good knowledge of foreign language, having one or both parents of another nationality) generally decreases the probability of being local. Danes are more likely to be transnationals, visitors or tourists (than Germans, the baseline category) and this even after controlling for individual socio-economic status. Romanians are more likely to belong to the networked and visitor class than to the locals (the baseline category).

Existing research has focused on the effect of the volume of transnational activities on attitudes. This section outlines, instead, the distinction between different types of transnationalism in order to provide a better understanding of the links between cross-border activities and identifications with Europe. Thus the multinomial logistic regression models presented in table 6 include a number of predictors, among which is the most likely Latent Class, which was assigned to each individual.

In line with previous research, some form of European identification (rather than only national identification) is more likely among men and the tertiary educated. Individuals with better household finances have higher probabilities of feeling national and European (than only national). Unemployed persons and those positioning themselves on the political right are more likely to consider themselves national only. Unsurprisingly, there are also differences by nationality, with British and Danish citizens considering themselves to be more national. Crucially for the interests of this paper, configurations of mobilities matter for identifications with Europe. All the clusters, that is transnationals, visitors, tourists and the networked, are more likely than locals to hold national and European identifications/mainly European identifications than to feel solely national. Furthermore, their probability of declaring themselves ‘European’ are graded in terms of the specific combinations of volume and personal involvement in mobility practices. That probability is highest among transnationals, and progressively lower among visitors, tourists, and networked respondents.

Table 5 Multinomial logistic regression with LC as an outcome (reference: local)

		Transnational		Visitor		Tourist		Networked	
		Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Gender (reference: female)	Male	0.521 ***	0.128	0.262 *	0.106	0.401 ***	0.083	-0.151 *	0.073
Age		-0.028 ***	0.006	-0.049 ***	0.005	-0.015 ***	0.004	-0.010 **	0.003
Tertiary education (reference: below tertiary)		1.586 ***	0.136	1.114 ***	0.111	0.887 ***	0.089	0.447 ***	0.082
Status (reference: at work)	In education	0.089	0.293	0.032	0.232	0.365	0.212	0.201	0.211
	Unemployed	-0.647 *	0.307	-0.397	0.216	-0.601 **	0.197	-0.157	0.137
	Retired	-0.417	0.227	-0.591 **	0.215	-0.239	0.134	0.081	0.114
	Doing other	-0.368	0.327	-0.370	0.242	-0.241	0.193	-0.337 *	0.145
Household financial situation (reference: find it difficult/very difficult to live on money they have)	Living very comfortably	1.335 ***	0.298	1.055 ***	0.233	0.988 ***	0.181	0.074	0.156
	Living comfortably	0.657 *	0.269	0.770 ***	0.195	0.701 ***	0.152	0.056	0.109
	Making ends meet	0.669 *	0.270	0.521 **	0.196	0.095	0.158	-0.027	0.107
At least one parent of a different nationality		1.131 ***	0.222	1.029 ***	0.197	0.226	0.183	1.094 ***	0.153
Has a good knowledge of foreign language		0.054 ***	0.013	0.026 ***	0.005	0.019 ***	0.003	0.009 ***	0.002
Country (reference: Germany)	UK	1.224 ***	0.210	1.166 ***	0.179	1.120 ***	0.128	-0.127	0.161
	Romania	0.032	0.244	0.076	0.194	-0.469 **	0.139	0.498 ***	0.125
	Italy	0.635 **	0.235	0.790 ***	0.187	-0.474 **	0.162	1.458 ***	0.131
	Spain	0.362	0.227	0.182	0.190	-0.462 **	0.141	0.798 ***	0.124
	Denmark	0.528 *	0.229	0.545 **	0.194	-0.193	0.141	0.946 ***	0.127
Constant		-2.161 ***	0.403	-0.282	0.309	-0.401	0.243	-0.217	0.206

Source: EUCROSS 2012, N=5623

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Table 6 Multinomial logistic regression with identification as an outcome (reference: national identity only)

Independent variables/Outcomes		National and European identity		Mainly European identity	
		Coef.	Std. Err.	Coef.	Std. Err.
Gender (reference: female)	Male	0.208 **	0.078	0.609 ***	0.105
Age		0.010 **	0.004	0.006	0.005
Tertiary education (reference: below tertiary)		0.325 ***	0.085	0.489 ***	0.112
Status (reference: at work)	In education	0.055	0.186	-0.209	0.261
	Unemployed	-0.347 *	0.170	-0.636 **	0.234
	Retired	-0.478 ***	0.123	-0.236	0.167
	Doing other	-0.055	0.178	0.007	0.242
Household financial situation (reference: find it difficult/very difficult to live on money they have)	Living very comfortably	0.364 *	0.161	0.058	0.214
	Living comfortably	0.397 **	0.135	0.054	0.175
	Making ends meet	0.095	0.135	-0.165	0.176
Positioning on the left-right political scale (reference: left)	Centre-left	0.466 ***	0.130	0.022	0.162
	Centre	0.120	0.127	-0.357 *	0.164
	Centre-right	0.069	0.129	-0.503 **	0.169
	Right	-0.360 *	0.140	-0.990 ***	0.204
	Left/right do not exist	-0.148	0.181	-0.187	0.217
Latent class (reference: locals)	Transnational	1.070 ***	0.202	1.561 ***	0.241
	Visitor	0.712 ***	0.154	1.082 ***	0.197
	Tourist	0.435 ***	0.111	0.414 **	0.152
	Networked	0.276 **	0.101	0.413 **	0.135
Country (reference: Germany)	UK	-1.479 ***	0.130	-1.988 ***	0.175
	Romania	0.104	0.157	-0.862 ***	0.210
	Italy	0.410 **	0.149	0.005	0.180
	Spain	1.016 ***	0.163	0.621 **	0.190
	Denmark	-0.738 ***	0.128	-1.868 ***	0.182
Constant		-0.173	0.252	-0.544	0.325

Source: EUCROSS 2012, N=4391

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01 *** p<0.001

Conclusion

In this paper we have argued that mobilities, in their plural and multidimensional manifestations, shape the everyday lives of Europeans on a much larger scale than has been recognised so far. Our interest lies particularly in cross-border mobilities, as these erode the ‘container’ nature of nation-state societies. Expanding on previous research on international migration within the EU, we contend that European integration goes hand in hand with globalisation and leads to enhanced relations among individuals that obliterate national boundaries. While we cannot track the evolution of cross-border activities over time, which may be a crucial test for the presumed growing interpenetration of European societies, we can, however, document the current spread and forms of these individual

mobility patterns. To this purpose, in the paper we outlined – on the basis of LCA analysis – a typology of ‘mobility configurations’ as experienced by European citizens sampled in the EUCROSS survey.

Our evidence shows that there are two polar social types: transnationals, scoring high on all forms of mobility; and locals, who remain aloof from them. Our estimates, on the basis of the weighted random six-country sample, show that these two extremes together account for about two fifths of EU citizens. The remaining sixty per cent, however, are not distributed along a simple continuum of gradients in terms of mobility, but rather fit into diverse constellations of mobilities that emphasise varying aspects of cross-border opportunities. While preliminary analysis indicates that country- and individual-level factors to some extent structure these ‘mobility configurations’, further modelling should investigate the relative weights and interactions of the macro and micro determinants of mobilities. There may be some truth in assuming that mobility is for the winners and immobility for the losers of Europeanisation/globalisation, but reality may be more nuanced revealing that social actors can carve a variety of mobility strategies to adjust to social change in European societies (see Andreotti *et al.* 2013). Importantly, the diversity of mobile lifestyles matters for individuals’ sense of belonging. Our analysis shows that non-local types tend not to have nationalist views. Further analyses should shed light if and to what extent these clusters of cross-border practices matter in a more general sense, affecting a wider range of attitudes towards the European project.

Annex

Table 7 Model fit measures for Latent Class Analysis

No of classes	2	3	4	5	6
BIC	43492.038	43049.188	42863.994	42893.732	42935.980
Sample-Size Adjusted BIC	43444.373	42976.100	42765.485	42769.801	42786.627
Entropy	0.750	0.668	0.611	0.624	0.678
LMR adjusted LRT test p-value	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5911	0.7614

References

- Andreotti, A., Le Gales, P. and Moreno Fuentes, F.J. (2013) 'Transnational Mobility and Rootedness: the Upper Middle Classes in European Cities'. *Global Networks* 13(1): 41-59.
- Aspden, D. (2005) 'Methodological Improvements to UK Foreign Property Statistics'. *Economic Trends* 619 (June): 54-60,
<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/search/index.html?newquery=Methodological+improvements+to+UK+foreign+property+investment+statistics> (accessed 20/05/2013).
- Benson, M.C. (2010) 'The Context and Trajectory of Lifestyle Migration'. *European Societies* 12(1): 45-64.
- Boden, D. and Molotch, H.L. (1994) 'The compulsion of proximity', in Friedland, R. and Boden, D. (eds) *NowHere: Space, Time and Modernity*. Oakland, CA: Univ of California Press, pp. 257-286.
- Clarke, N. (2005) 'Detailing Transnational Lives of the Middle: British Working Holiday Makers in Australia'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(2): 307-322.
- Cook, J., Dwyer, P. and Waite, L. (2011) 'The Experiences of Accession 8 Migrants in England: Motivations, Work and Agency'. *International Migration* 49(2): 54-79.
- De Haas, H. (2007) 'Remittances, migration and social development'. *UNRISD Programme paper* (34).
- Deutsch, K. W., Burrell, S., Kann, R., Lee, M., Lichterman, M., Lindgren, R., Loewenheim, F. and van Wageningen, R. (1957) *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mau, S. and Mewes, J. (2012) 'Horizontal Europeanisation in Contextual Perspective'. *European Societies* 14(1): 7-34.
- Eade, J., Drinkwater, S. and Garapich, M. P. (2007) Class and ethnicity: Polish migrants in London. In: ESRC (ed.) End of Award Report. Swindon: Centre for Research on Nationalism, Ethnicity and Multiculturalism.
- Elliott, A. and Urry, J. (2010) *Mobile Lives*. New York and London: Routledge.
- EU Commission (2008) *Employment in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Eurostat online database (2012).
- Favell, A., Recchi, E., Kuhn, T., Solgaard, J., and Klein, J. (2011) State of the Art Report..EUCROSS Working Paper 1.

http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=10&Itemid=110 (accessed 3/03/2013).

- Fligstein, N. (2008) *Euroclash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Oxford University Press.
- Grabowska, I. (2003) 'Irish Labour Migration of Polish Nationals: Economic, Social and Political Aspects in the Light of the EU Enlargement'. *PraceMigracyjne* No. 51.
- Hadler, M. (2006) 'Intentions to Migrate Within the European Union: A Challenge for Simple Economic Macro-Level Explanations'. *European Societies* 8(1): 111-140.
- Hall, C. M. (2005) *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Hanquinet, L. and Savage, M. (2011) Operationalisation of European Identity, Cosmopolitanism and Cross-Border Practices. EUCROSS Working Paper 2. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&g24id=57&Itemid=157 (accessed 20/02/2012).
- King, R. (2002) 'Towards a New Map of European Migration'. *International Journal of Population Geography* 8(2): 89-106.
- King, R., and Ruiz-Gelices, E. (2003) 'International Student Migration and the European 'Year Abroad': Effects on European Identity and Subsequent Migration Behaviour'. *International Journal of Population Geography* 9(3): 229-252.
- Koryś, I. (2003) 'Migration Trends in Selected EU Applicant Countries: Poland'. *CEFMR Working Paper*No. 5/2003.
- Koslowski, R. (ed.) (2011) *Global Mobility Regimes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krings, T., Moriarty, E., Wickham, J., Bobek, A. and Salamońska, J. (2013) *Polish Migration to Ireland post 2004: New Mobilities in the new Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kuhn, T. (2011) 'Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory'. *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (6): 811-837.
- Kuhn, T. (2012) 'Europa ante Portas: Border Residence, Transnational Interaction and Euroscepticism in Germany and France'. *European Union Politics* 13 (1): 94-117.
- Larsen, J., Urry, J., & Axhausen, K. W. (2006) *Mobilities, networks, geographies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Li, N., & Zhang, P. (2002) 'Consumer online shopping attitudes and behavior: An assessment of research'. *Eighth Americas Conference on Information Systems* (pp. 508-517).
- Mansoor, A. M. and Quillin, B. (eds.) (2006) *Migration and remittances: Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union*. World Bank Publications.
- Mau, S. (2010) *Social Transnationalism. Lifeworlds Beyond the Nation-State*. London: Routledge.
- Mau, S. and Mewes, J. (2012) 'Horizontal Europeanisation in Contextual Perspective'. *European Societies*, 14(1): 7-34.
- Muthén, L.K. and Muthén, B.O. (1998-2012) *Mplus User's Guide*. Seventh Edition. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Nylund, K. L., Asparouhov, T., and Muthén, B. O. (2007) 'Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study'. *Structural equation modeling*, 14(4): 535-569.

- Perea y Monsuwé, T., Dellaert, B. G. and De Ruyter, K. (2004) 'What drives consumers to shop online? A literature review'. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(1): 102-121.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L.E. and Landolt, P. (1999) 'The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 217-237.
- Pötzschke, S. (2012) 'Measuring Transnational Behaviours and Identities'. EUCROSS Working Paper # 4.
- Recchi, E. (2014) 'Pathways to European identity formation: a tale of two models'. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research* 27(2): 119-133.
- Recchi, E. (2015) *Mobile Europe: The Theory and Practice of Free Movement in the EU*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Recchi, E. and Favell, A. (eds) (2009) *Pioneers of European Integration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Recchi, E. and Kuhn, T. (2013) 'Europeans' Space-Sets and the Political Legitimacy of the EU', in N. Kauppi (ed), *A Political Sociology of Transnational Europe*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Recchi, E. and Triandafyllidou, A. (2010) 'Crossing Over, Heading West and South: Mobility, Citizenship and Employment in the Enlarged Europe', in G. Menz and A. Caviedes (eds), *Labour Migration in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Salamońska, J. (2016) 'Friend or Foe? Attitudes Towards Immigration from Other European Union Countries'. *Società Mutamento Politica* 7(13): 237-253.
- Salamońska, J., Baglioni, L.G. and Recchi, E. (2013) Navigating the European Space: Physical and Virtual Forms of Cross-Border Mobility among EU Citizens. EUCROSS Working Paper # 5.
- Salazar, N. B. and Smart, A. (2011) 'Anthropological takes on (im) mobility'. *Identities* 18(6): i-ix.
- Szerszynski, B. and Urry, J. (2006) 'Visuality, mobility and the cosmopolitan: inhabiting the world from afar'. *British journal of sociology* 57(1): 113-131.
- Tussyadiah, I.P. and Fesenmaier, D.R. (2009) 'Mediating tourist experiences: Access to places via shared videos'. *Annals of Tourism Research* 36(1): 24-40.
- United Nations and World Tourism Organization (1994) 'Recommendations on Tourism Statistics'. Statistical Papers Series M No. 83.
- Urry, J. (1990) *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Society*. London: Sage.
- Urry, J. (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty-first Century*. London: Routledge.
- Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wickham, J., Moriarty, E., Bobek, A. and Salamońska, J. (2009) 'Working in the Gold Rush: Polish Migrants' Careers and the Irish Hospitality Sector', in Bolton, S.C. and Houlihan, M. (eds) *Work Matters: Critical Reflections on Contemporary Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wickham, J. (2007) 'Irish Mobilities' in S. O'Sullivan (ed.) *Contemporary Ireland: A Sociological Map*, Dublin: UCD Press.
- Wiesböck, L., Verwiebe, R., Reinprecht, C., and Haindorfer, R. (2016) 'The Economic Crisis as a Driver of Cross-border Labour Mobility? A Multi-method Perspective on the Case of the Central European Region'. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-17.
- Woolgar, S. (2002) *Five Rules of Virtuality* in S. Woolgar (ed) *Virtual Society? Technology, Cyberbole, Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Author contacts:

Justyna Salamońska

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, EUI

Villa Malafrasca

Via Boccaccio 151

I-50133 Firenze (FI)

Email: Justyna.Salamonska@eui.eu

Ettore Recchi

Sciences Po - Observatoire Sociologique du Changement (OSC)

27 Rue Saint Guillaume

F- 75007 Paris

Email: Ettore RECCHI <ettore.recchi@sciencespo.fr>