

Measuring transnational behaviours and identities

Pöttschke, Steffen

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Pöttschke, S. (2012). *Measuring transnational behaviours and identities*. (EUCROSS Working Paper, 4). <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395325>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



**The Europeanisation of Everyday Life:
Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications
Among EU and Third-Country Citizens**

Measuring Transnational Behaviours and Identities

Steffen Pöttschke

EUCROSS Working Paper # 4

November 2012

This series of working papers originates from the research project *The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third-Country Citizens* (acronym: EUCROSS).

The EUCROSS research project is funded as part of the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme ('Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities', activity 8.5: 'The Citizen in the European Union'; call identifier: FP7-SSH-2010-2; Funding scheme: collaborative project – small and medium-scale focused research projects; grant agreement: 266767). The project started on April 1, 2011 and is scheduled to end on March 31, 2014.

The research consortium is formed by:

- Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara, Italy (coordinator: Ettore Recchi);
- GESIS–Leibniz Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Mannheim, Germany (coordinator: Michael Braun);
- Aarhus Universitet, Denmark (coordinator: Adrian Favell);
- IBEI–Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals, Spain (coordinator: Juan Díez Medrano);
- University of York, United Kingdom (coordinator: Mike Savage);
- Universitatea din Bucuresti, Romania (coordinator: Dumitru Sandu).

The EUCROSS project and this working paper series are coordinated by Ettore Recchi at the Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara.

For additional information: www.eucross.eu.

This is Deliverable D9.5 of Workpackage 9 (Dissemination and exploitation strategies)

Release date: November 8, 2012

Contents

<i>Executive summary</i>	4
<i>EUCROSS in brief</i>	5
<i>Measurement of identification with Europe</i>	6
General identity	6
Ethno-cultural, political and economic dimensions	9
<i>Individual transnational relations and cross-border practices</i>	15
<i>References</i>	23

Executive summary

While the first EUCROSS working paper (Favell et al. 2011) laid down the theoretical groundwork of our project in a 'State of the Art Report' (SoA) and the second one (Hanquinet and Savage 2011) discussed issues around the operationalisation of three key concepts – European identity, cosmopolitanism and cross-border practices – this paper elaborates on the measurement instruments which have ultimately been chosen and, thus, form the core of the EUCROSS questionnaire. Hence, as the title suggests, the paper describes how we measure 'transnational' behaviours and identities. In particular, it outlines the questionnaire items developed to capture those phenomena, which the SoA referred to as 'cross-border practices', and their influence on individual identification with Europe or a cosmopolitan stance.

**The Europeanisation of Everyday Life:
Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications
Among EU and Third-Country Citizens
*Measuring Transnational Behaviours and Identities***

Steffen Pöttschke

EUCROSS in brief

As mentioned in the previous working papers, EUCROSS aims to investigate ‘Europeanisation from below’ (Favell et al. 2011, 7) taking a structuralist approach with regards to the formation of collective identities (Recchi 2012). To that end, the research project surveys social practices of border crossing and their impact on the identifications of individuals. EUCROSS is interested in *identifications*, as it assumes, in line with recent research on Europeanisation, that identities are nested in each other rather than mutually exclusive (see Díez Medrano and Gutiérrez 2001). The conceptualisation of identities applied by EUCROSS and the respective research interest have been summarised in the operationalisation document stating that “Identities are [...] socially constructed. This is at least our orientation in this research. Our purpose is to measure *active individual identification* among EU and third-country citizens living in Europe [...]” (Hanquinet and Savage 2011, 5). Furthermore, special attention is paid to the distinction between the identification with Europe and a general cosmopolitan attitude, directed towards the world as a whole rather than confined to the European continent. As discussed in the operationalisation paper, cosmopolitanism is understood as a multidimensional ‘disposition of cultural openness’ (Hanquinet and Savage 2011). Finally, the most important independent variables, which have to be captured by our operationalisations, are aspects that fall into the broad category of ‘cross-border activities’. Those include practices that entail the physical crossing of geopolitical borders (e.g. travelling for leisure or international migration) as well as activities of a more mundane nature in which the act of traversing frontiers does not involve any change of physical location (e.g. transnational communication via mail, internet or phone, business transactions, consumption of cultural goods).

The EUCROSS study will address the following questions: Which cross-border practices influence identifications and what are the effects of cross-border practices? Which activities are promoting a stronger identification with the European Union (EU)? Which activities contribute to cosmopolitan attitudes? Can we draw a distinction between European identification and cosmopolitanism? Finally, how can we characterise individuals who are most likely to have a positive stance towards the EU or cosmopolitan attitudes (also in terms of cross-border experience of those individuals)?

In order to address the questions outlined above EUCROSS uses Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI) with nationals, as well as Romanian and Turkish migrants in six EU member states. Eligible for these migrant samples are individuals who were born in Turkey or Romania, who hold the respective citizenship of their country of origin (CoO) and who are currently living in one of the surveyed countries without having acquired its citizenship.¹ Corresponding to the empirical reality of migration as a basic condition of human life (Bade 2000, 11) and the implications this has for European societies, it is to be expected that nationalised migrants will form part of the national samples as well. Therefore, the questionnaire contains items designed to identify such individuals and their direct descendants (often referred to as ‘second generation migrants’).

Measurement of identification with Europe

The EUCROSS operationalisation document, which analysed and discussed several contemporary approaches to the measurement of identification with Europe, outlined four basic dimensions of such identification: ‘general’, ‘ethno-cultural’, ‘political’ and ‘economic’ identity components (Hanquinet and Savage 2011, 13-19). According to this classification, individual identification as the central dependent construct in EUCROSS research will be measured by a number of variables. The following sections will elaborate in detail on the main items used to measure these dimensions.

General identity

The core of our operationalisation of European identity consists of two items, which are directly inquiring about self-ascribed identifications. The first item measures the degree to which individuals feel that they belong to geographically and, with some restrictions, politically defined entities of different scope. The item uses a five-point Likert scale and asks about the level of agreement with the following statements²:

I feel as a citizen of the town where I live	[1]
I feel as a citizen of the [region] where I live	
I feel [CoR]	
I feel European	
I feel as a citizen of the world	

(Source: EUMARR, adapted)

This item will allow a first evaluation of the affective dimension of individual territorial attachment. Keeping in mind the concept of ‘nested identities’, participants will not be asked

¹ Due to foreseeable sampling problems no Turkish migrant sample in Spain was included in the study.
² Please note that the numbered items [1, ...] shown in the text are taken directly from the EUCROSS questionnaire. Short reference to sources, from which the items are taken or by which they are inspired, are stated in brackets. Information, instructions and/or answer categories in italics are not read out to the participants.

to name exclusive categories at this point.

Nevertheless, since the research focus is on the degree of identification with different entities, interviewees are asked in the following question to evaluate the emphasis they put on their belonging to their country of residence (CoR) versus the emphasis they put on Europe. The question reads as follows:

Do you consider yourself as being...

Interviewer: Read out list.

[CoR] only
[CoR] and European
European and [CoR]
European only
<i>Don't know</i>

[2]

(Source: EIMSS, Eurobarometer, adapted)

In the questionnaire designed for migrants, the item wording refers to the CoO instead of the CoR. Again, it has to be stressed that the latter item should be seen as an addition to the former, as it does not include explicit reference to other geographical or political entities. However, while most categories are read out to the interviewees, the questionnaire also contains three answer categories which are not read and which combine regional identity and Europe, as well as, for those nationals who have not been born in the CoR, answer possibilities that use their country of birth instead. Though, as suggested above, these options are not meant to be actively offered to respondents but they are only to be used if the participants refer themselves to either of these combinations instead of choosing one of the answers proposed by the interviewer.

Items similar to the ones described above have been used in established quantitative surveys such as the Eurobarometer and the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). Their exact design and inclusion in the EUCROSS questionnaire has, on the one hand, been influenced by the concern to produce data suitable for comparative analysis. On the other hand, the findings and recommendations of Richard Sinnott who tested different measurement instruments of this type were taken into consideration (Sinnott 2005).

However, while those items allow a first assessment regarding the attachment to Europe, it has been criticized that they leave one major question unanswered: What is this 'Europe' respondents identify with? Furthermore, the question remains if the definition that the respondents use is congruent with the ideas or concepts that researchers have in mind and which are the main building blocks of data analysis. These aspects are also discussed by Michael Bruter (2005) with regards to his experimental study on European identity. Bruter points out that it is crucial "to better understand what most respondents mean when they say that they 'feel European' and [...] to understand whether they identify primarily with the

European Union as a relevant institutional context defining them as citizens, or to Europe as a cultural community or ‘civilisation’ to which they identify ‘socially’” (Bruter 2005, 104). As Bruter suggests, there are numerous and different ideas of and about Europe that people could have in mind when answering questions such as those presented above. It also has to be considered that the answers are shaped to a certain degree by public discourse about Europe. Furthermore, it is important how the European Union presents itself, and how it is depicted by prominent political figures, opinion leaders and the media in national contexts. To get an insight into ‘what most respondents mean’ when they answer the respective questions, the EUCROSS questionnaire contains the following item:

If you hear the term „Europe“, which of the following is most likely to come to your mind first?

Interviewer: Read out list. Tick just one answer!

The European continent
The European Union
A shared European culture and history
The Christian Religion
<i>None of these</i>
<i>Don't know</i>

[3]

(Source: new)

In order to control for primacy and recency effects this battery is rotated. While the categories included in this list are fairly broad they allow determining at least a tendency as to what the core of respondents’ definition of Europe is. The answer categories represent, in a compressed form, the most important images of Europe, which dominate both public and scientific discourses. Importantly, these categories were not chosen randomly but as a result of a secondary content analysis of data gathered as part of another GESIS project.³ Participants in the respective survey were asked to elaborate on their understanding of Europe. While the range of possible answers was naturally very wide, the majority of them fell into one of the four stated categories. However, some categories (in particular the reference to Christianity and its supposedly predominant role in shaping Europe) were mentioned far less often than others. Nevertheless, the four categories will allow differentiating between an understanding of Europe in terms of political identification (EU), sheer physical location (continent), as a space that is structured by perceived cultural communalities or by a single religion. The latter two might also be (weak) indicators of the conceptualisation of Europe as a closed space in terms of culture and ethnicity (Hanquinet and Savage 2011, 9). Of course, additional variables have to be included in the analysis before any conclusions can be drawn in this respect. Here lies also one of the big methodological advantages of the EUCROSS project: Its mixed methods structure will allow

³ Project title: Enhancing the validity of intercultural comparative surveys. The use of supplemental probing techniques in internet surveys. For further information see: http://www.survey-methodology.de/en/projekt12_en.html.

for a more thorough investigation of the predominant perceptions of Europe and their content in qualitative interviews. Finally, due to its nature the item actually leads to the ‘ethno-cultural’ dimension.

Ethno-cultural, political and economic dimensions

Different scholars (see e.g. Bruter 2005; Risse 2010) have argued that identifying with a supranational political entity such as the European Union also means positioning oneself with regards to what this entity is aiming to achieve and have already achieved (in political, economical and social fields). Furthermore, the identification with such an organisation should also correlate with a recognisable degree of agreement to the philosophical and political values and concepts it is founded on. This argument builds, among others, on Deutsch et al. who identified the sum of these characteristics as a ‘distinctive way of life’ within a community, which they saw as a condition that would favour its further integration (Deutsch et al. 1957, 133-134). Therefore, based on the suggestions made by Hanquinet and Savage, the EUCROSS questionnaire includes a number of items, which measure these aspects. However, while it might be possible to separate these items – more or less clearly – into the above stated dimensions in analytical terms, such a clear division is not necessarily the best solution with regards to how and at which point of an interview the respective data should be collected. Since a questionnaire should (ideally) motivate the participants to go on with the interview in a concentrated manner, unnecessary repetitions and a confusing order of questions should be avoided (Krosnick and Presser 2010; Porst 2011). Therefore, on the one hand, several batteries throughout the EUCROSS questionnaire include items that belong to two or more dimensions. On the other hand, at the analysis stage a number of individual items might be included in the operationalisation of more than one indicator belonging to different dimensions (i.e., the Euro is in the same way relevant as a symbol of the EU as it is as part of the economic dimension). Table 1 outlines the remaining three dimensions of European identity and the main variables used in EUCROSS to measure them.

Table 1: Dimensions of the identification with the European Union
(‘General Identity’ as 4th dimension is not included in the Table)

Ethno-cultural dimension	Political dimension	Economic dimension
Solidarity within the EU	Democracy and human rights	Economic stability
Appreciation of foreign cultural products	Perception of EU symbols	Perception of the common currency
Positive stance towards diversity	Appreciation of the EU as such	Willingness to actively support the financial welfare of other member states
	Use of rights as EU citizen	Freedom of movement
	Support of the achieved political integration	
Inclusion of additional European countries (enlargement)		

Central to the measurement of the three dimensions in Table 1 is a battery which includes several objectives that are pursued by the EU.⁴ Here the participants are asked to assess the importance of each of the objectives on a five-point scale reaching from ‘not at all important’ to ‘very important’. The following statements are included in the list:

Solidarity between the peoples in the EU
Democracy and human rights in the single EU countries
Economic stability in the single EU countries
The right to work in any country of the EU
A common currency

[4]

(Source: new)

All of those topics are often discussed in the media and decision makers refer to them continuously in order to justify political decisions.

‘Solidarity between the peoples in the EU’ is on the top of the list as an item of outstanding importance especially during the current financial crisis and the effects it has on European economies and societies. However, the single item is hardly sufficient to allow an assessment of the role that solidarity between EU members plays in the eyes of respondents. Therefore, EUCROSS will break the theoretical, sometimes even abstract question of solidarity down to a level where the direct interests of respondents are concerned. In particular, two additional items will probe if individuals believe that state funds, i.e. tax payers’ money, should be used to help other EU member states in time of need. The first of these items refers to the on-going global financial crisis and to a very specific strategy the EU and its member states are following in the attempt to cope with it. More precisely the item asks whether the respondents agree with the fact that EU member states create collective funds to stabilise the financial situation of other member states in need of such assistance.⁵

In spite of the significance of the financial crisis it seems necessary to counterbalance the concentration on this topic, as it is feasible that any rejection of the mentioned policy may be rooted in the unwillingness to support fiscal and political systems perceived as inefficient and/or corrupt, and not in a principal lack of solidarity with the respective societies. Therefore, the second item does not refer to the solution of a ‘man-made’ problem but to natural catastrophes:

⁴ The following sections will elaborate on several of the points mentioned in Table 1. However, the text will only underline the main building blocks of possible analytic operationalisations. Therefore, it will neither describe in detail *all* respective items of the questionnaire nor will it present an in-depth discussion of those dimensions and variables, since these systematic considerations were already included in the EUCROSS Operationalisation Document (Hanquinet and Savage 2011) and in the State of the Art Report (Favell et al. 2011).

⁵ “The EU member states are currently pooling national state funds to help EU countries having difficulties in paying their debts. 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 this measure? (Source: new)”.

[...] [P]lease imagine that another member-state of the European Union was struck by a natural disaster. Who do you think should make financial contributions to its reconstruction?

Interviewer: Read list

Only the respective country
All member states of the European Union
<i>Don't know</i>

[5]

(Source: new, inspired by EUMARR)

In order to control for a general unwillingness to support other geo-political entities, a similar item will ask whether administrative units within the respondents' nation states should be supported in the same situation.

Another dimension of identification with the EU highlighted in the EUCROSS operationalisation document is the positive assessment of its basic philosophical principles. Two of the most important of them are the unconditional commitment to democracy and a positive stance towards cultural pluralism (prominently emphasised in the official motto of the EU: 'United in Diversity'). The former will be probed with the second element outlined in question [4]. In order to measure the stance towards cultural pluralism two items will be used. The social aspect of diversity will be captured by asking respondents to express their view on diversity as a basic element of modern societies, while the cultural aspect will be measured with an assessment of influence of foreign cultural products on domestic culture.⁶

In the same way as a positive attitude towards the philosophical foundation of the EU can be seen as a precondition of the identification with this entity, in the 'culturalist' research tradition (focusing primarily on the exposure to EU-centred cultural contents) described in the EUCROSS working paper no. 3 (Recchi 2012), the EU symbols are seen as promoting European identification. Some studies have thus tried to evaluate the relation between symbols such as the EU flag or anthem and individual identification in general (Bruter 2005) or, more specifically, the effect of exposure to such symbols on answers given to EU-specific questions during an interview (Cram, Patrikios, and Mitchell 2011). While the approaches of both studies are as inspiring as their results are enlightening, EUCROSS could not build on them directly.

The EUCROSS survey mode constitutes the most important restriction with regards to measuring the influence of symbols. CATI does not allow using visual priming, as Cram et al. (2011) did in their experimental online panel based work. The non-experimental character of EUCROSS also makes it different from the approach chosen by Bruter (Bruter 2005, Appendix

⁶ Together both items form a battery. Using a Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' participants are asked to position themselves with respect to the following statements: a) "It is a good thing for a society to be made up of people from different ethnic groups, religions and cultures. (Source: new)" and b) "Increased exposure to foreign films, music, and books is damaging national and local cultures. (Source: ISSP)".

2). However, besides the fact of using specific stimuli during the experimental treatment, Bruter has also been cited on numerous occasions in the operationalisation document, since his questionnaire included several items which specifically referred to the EU symbols, for instance:

“What would best describe your reaction if you saw someone burning a European flag?

I would be shocked and hurt.
I would be shocked but not hurt.
I would not mind.
I would be happy.”

(Bruter 2005, 185)

Whilst Bruter controlled the general stance of the individuals towards flags by including country specific items, such a question seems nevertheless highly problematic in the context of intercultural research. After all such design does not take into consideration the cultural differences which might exist in attitudes towards flags in general and country-specific legal restrictions in particular. On the one hand, in countries where the burning of flags is punishable by law, people might be shocked simply because burning of the flag is an illegal action. In such case, it would be unclear whether respondents are shocked (and possibly hurt) by the ‘symbolic meaning/content’ of the action, i.e. because they see it as an attack on a community they identify with, or whether they simply react negatively to the breach of law, without taking the ‘symbolic meaning’ of the action itself into consideration. Hence, participants who do not identify with Europe at all could still feel hurt if they saw someone burning a European flag (i.e., a *supranational* symbol), if they considered that unlawful act as a sign of disrespect against their *nation* state and its laws. On the other hand, in countries where such action is either not against the law or where the legal situation is at least less clear (like the United Kingdom), participants who state in the same way that they are shocked might refer to the ‘symbolic meaning’ with a much higher probability. Yet, the most important distinction might be the following: Do people think about someone burning a flag that this is his or her own flag or a publicly owned flag? Those who do not know that, in some countries, the burning of the national flag is forbidden, even if the person owns that very same flag, might automatically assume that the question is referring to the destruction of public property. Hence, we have to consider that the observation of the same political act (i.e., burning a flag) might cause the same reaction but for different reasons in the countries included in the survey, which is similar to the way a political action itself might convey different meanings depending on the national context, as Sidney Verba already noted in 1969 (Verba 1993, 70).

To tackle these methodological challenges EUCROSS follows a dual approach. In the first step, participants will be asked to assess the significance of the Euro – as one of the main EU

symbols – as part of the battery shown above [4]. In the second step, instead of trying to measure the affective evaluation of the EU flag, reference will be made to participants’ daily exposure to the flag. Again, two items will be used:

Please think about the last seven days. Did you see the flag of the European Union or an image of the flag during this time?

Yes
No
<i>Don't know</i>

[6a]

(Source: new)

Only if the participant answers positively to this question he or she will be asked the following:

And where did you see the flag of the European Union?

<u>Flag as such</u> (e.g., in front of a public building, during a TV broadcast, in a newspaper picture)
<u>Pictogram</u> ... on <u>license plates</u> of cars on <u>money</u> (i.e., EURO paper money and coins) on <u>passport, ID cards</u> on <u>drivers licenses</u> in <u>official publications</u> or <u>documents</u> of state or EU institutions (i.e., everything that has been published by those institutions)
<i>Other</i>

[6b]

(Source: new)

The underlying assumption here is that individuals in EU member states almost certainly encounter the flag or a respective pictogram at least once within seven days. This also holds true for the United Kingdom and Romania even though the degree of ‘exposure’ is expected to be smaller in these countries since they do not use the Euro as their currency.

As mentioned above, it goes without saying that the Euro is not just a symbol of the EU but also an integral element of its economic system. Hence, the individual’s viewpoint on the currency forms part of the economic dimension as well. The same holds true for the importance respondents attribute to the economic stability of EU countries and the fact that EU citizens are allowed to work in each member state (see [4]). Since the latter is also a political right it can in turn also be interpreted as part of the measurement of the political dimension. In this case EUCROSS will not just tap into the theoretical appreciation of this right by survey participants, but the respondents’ migration biographies will allow

investigating to which extent this right has been actually used.

Finally, the last of the aspects stated in Table 1, the stance towards the enlargement of the European Union, should be mentioned as it forms part of all three dimensions. It is ‘ethno-cultural’ since it indicates whether or not the respondents have a perception of the EU as a closed ‘members-only club’ with already fixed boundaries. This means it should help to determine whether there are signs of a clearly ‘exclusionary’ site, in terms of dominant religious character and perceived cultural heritage to European identity (see Risse 2010). Furthermore, it is political, since the institutional inclusion of further European states is a fundamental goal of the European Union. Finally, this question also has an economic aspect, since all member states share a common market. In total three questions are used to capture the respondents’ stance towards enlargements:

I am now going to read to you the names of some countries. Please tell me whether you think that it would be a good or bad idea to admit each of them to the European Union. Please use a scale from one to five, where one means “very bad idea” and five means “very good idea”

Would it be a good or a bad idea to admit ...

[7a]

	Turkey
What about ...	Croatia
and ...	Ukraine
and ...	Norway

(Source: new)

Now, still using the same scale, I would like to ask you a similar question in retrospect: For each of the following countries, do you think that it was a good or a bad idea to admit them to the European Union.

Was it a good or a bad idea to admit ...

[7b]

	Finland
What about ...	Greece
and ...	Poland
and ...	Bulgaria

(Source: new)

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 each of the following statements.

The EU should not continue to accept new member states.

[8]

(Source: new)

In order to control for design effects, the countries listed in [7a] and [7b] will be rotated.

As the items show, EUCROSS takes into account that the measurement of attitudes towards EU enlargement in itself has to be multidimensional. Therefore, a) the items refer to different points in time, b) the societies of the states included are characterised by different religions or denominations, and c) the countries differ in terms of their political systems and their economic performance. Nevertheless, an empirical separation of the different dimensions will not always be possible.

Individual transnational relations and cross-border practices

While the orientations towards Europe, the nation state and its regions are the main dependent constructs within the EUCROSS project, transnational practices of the people living in selected EU member states serve as independent variables. Table 2 shows a systematic overview of those aspects which will be measured. In addition to cross-border activities (which will be discussed below), the individuals' private networks and the cultural as well as geographical aspects of their social background are of outstanding importance. There are two main reasons why these aspects are not included into the category of cross-border practices. First of all, they are – in their own right – neither activities nor practices, e.g. the respondent's place of birth and the origin of his or her friends. Secondly, while one could argue that they are the cause, or at least promoters, of such practices, they could fall in all three dimensions of cross-cultural activities. Hence, the descendant of migrants might travel to visit his or her parents' families abroad (physical mobility), he or she might regularly talk to them by phone (virtual mobility) or the person might speak the parents' language(s) in addition to the one of the CoR (cosmopolitan competency). The additional category 'transnational background and private networks' includes what Theresa Kuhn labelled 'transnational background' in her model of individual transnationalism (Kuhn 2011, 819f). However, it also differs from this specific conceptualisation as the category used by EUCROSS does not only contain a person's given background but also individual networks created (friends) or strengthened (family) by the individual during the life-course. Therefore, this category is meant to capture more than 'just' a person's background.

What is more, in his recent work Steffen Mau has shown that transnational networks are not a phenomenon which is exclusively related to migrants, since nearly one half of the participants in his German study were part of transnational networks and had, on average, 3.35 contacts in other countries (Mau 2010, 52). Furthermore, he found that these networks were not evenly distributed across the globe, but concentrated in North America, Europe and Australia. By inquiring about the geographical whereabouts of family members and friends that EUCROSS participants have abroad, the study will gather similar data on a cross-national level.

Table 2: Cross-border practices and transnational characteristics surveyed as part of EUCROSS

Cross-border practices				Transnational background and private networks
	Physical mobility	Virtual mobility	Cosmopolitan consumption and competencies	
Mundane practices	Number of countries visited before reaching the age of 18	Frequency of communication with family members and/or friends abroad	Following sports on an international level and/or in another country	Being born abroad
	Number of trips abroad (which included at least one overnight stay) within the last 24 months.	Number of e-mails received from abroad within the last 12 months	Consumption of undubbed foreign language TV content, both on TV and online (frequency)	Having the citizenship of more than one country
		Frequency of work related contact with people abroad	Preference of music styles	Having a parent/parents who was/were born abroad
			Favourite foreign cuisine(s)	Having a spouse/partner who was born abroad
			Buying products from abroad without being physical mobile (e.g., via internet)	Having family members and/or friends (in the country of residence) who were born abroad
Extraordinary practices	Having lived 3 months or more abroad before reaching the age of 18 (+ period)	Willingness to relocate abroad	Knowledge of foreign languages	Having family and/or friends abroad
	Having lived 3 months or more abroad since reaching the age of 18 (+ period + reason)	Willingness to relocate to the country of origin	Sending money abroad (+ beneficiary + frequency)	
	Migration to the CoR (+ year + reason)	Willingness to send children abroad	Money received from abroad during last 12 months (+ benefactor)	
	Participation in an EU exchange program		Adhering to international associations	
			Having property abroad	
			Familiarity with other country/ies (space-set)	
	Including measurement of spatial dimension			

The main part of Table 2 shows the three dimensions of cross-border practices which are measured in our survey. These are: physical mobility, virtual mobility and cosmopolitan consumption and competencies. As such this classification is a slightly simplified portrayal of the classification presented in the operationalisation document (Hanquinet and Savage 2011, 41-42). While the latter included several additional aspects for discussion purposes, the overview presented here should be seen as its more specified practical implementation. Nevertheless, as Hanquinet and Savage already pointed out, those categories, the distinction between categories and the groupings of items within categories are by no means as clear cut as their presentation in a table might suggest. As the authors point out, international travel could, e.g., be seen not just as a form of physical mobility but also as a cosmopolitan consumption practice. It could also be argued that the consumption of 'foreign' TV content is engaging the individual in a form of 'virtual mobility' or that the familiarity with other countries is usually rooted in physical mobility.

Again, several items in all three dimensions also measure the spatial dimension. In this context spatial is not just meant in terms of geographical distribution (e.g., Where do respondents spend their vacation?) but also in terms of cultural spaces in which they act (e.g., Which languages do they speak?). In the case of questions for which the use of countries' names is appropriate, the battery contains all current EU member states, all non-EU states of the Schengen-area, Turkey, the North American countries and few additional entries, with all remaining countries combined into categories such as 'other European country', 'Asian country' and so on.

Furthermore, Table 2 shows the distinction between mundane and extraordinary practices. This derives directly from the statement made in the State of the Art report:

“[W]hen speaking of 'cross-border practices', we intend to focus on behaviours that are performed by any possible individual agent in any aspect of everyday life. Moreover, we are interested in studying such practices 'from below' focusing on the internationalisation of mundane social activities.” (Favell et al. 2011, 19)

The category mirroring those 'mundane activities' is labelled 'extraordinary' above, yet this term does not refer to the contents of the practices themselves, but rather to the fact that they are not expected to be part of the 'daily life' for the majority of participants.

Using the described design we will further investigate Neil Fligstein's finding, “that citizens of Europe who interact with each other are more frequently likely to view themselves as Europeans” (Fligstein 2009, 156). Due to the constraints of the Eurobarometer data that Fligstein used, he relied mainly on travelling behaviour and language proficiency as indicators of such interaction. In turn EUCROSS will provide us with much more detailed data, both on direct interactions as well as on more general cross-border activities.

The investigation of the duality of practices, on the one hand, and the plurality of mobility styles, on the other hand, also serves the purpose of overcoming the often implicitly assumed distinction between movers and stayers (Favell et al. 2011, 24). Hence, the assumption here is that it would be more fruitful to distinguish between types and degrees of cross-border mobility rather than trying to split people into 'the mobile' and 'the immobile' in a more general manner.

Obviously, physical mobility is the most straightforward of all dimensions of mobility examined by EUCROSS. In line with Ettore Recchi's distinction between mobility practices of high and low permanence (Recchi 2012, 9), mundane activities in this field would scarcely be interpreted by individuals as extremely relevant to their 'life projects'. In this sense holiday trips are understood as 'mundane activities'. This classification is backed by Eurobarometer figures from 2011 which showed that, even in an economical challenging period, between 60 (Denmark) and 25 per cent (Spain) of respondents in the countries which are included in EUCROSS planned to spend their vacations in another country during the on-going year (European Commission 2011, 91, Table 14a).

Having stayed abroad for a long time or being an international migrant are expected to be major determinants of an individual's biography or socialisation. As mentioned above, the EUCROSS questionnaire includes items which will measure the geographic range of these experiences. Furthermore, the relevant years or periods will be recorded. This means that it will be possible to differentiate between mobility experiences with respect to social and political changes of historical significance (e.g., pre and post 1989) as well as to investigate the links between mobility and the degree of institutional integration of origin and destination countries into the EU and the Schengen area at specific points in time. The latter, of course, only applies to European countries.

When considering 'virtual mobility' all aspects listed either link individuals directly to countries other than the one they live in or ask them to consider the prospect of engaging directly or indirectly in acts of long term physical movement. The mundane activities surveyed in this context are all related to inter-personal communication. The importance of communication and interactions in strengthening supranational organisations has already been underlined by Deutsch and colleagues more than half a century ago (Deutsch et al. 1957). Furthermore, Deutsch stressed the importance of communication and interaction as a main feature of any community and as a necessity in the formation process of a nation state (Deutsch 1966). As mentioned, Fligstein showed that comparable interactions on a European level seem to go hand in hand with higher individual identification with Europe. What is more, relevant research has posited that communication – and more precisely the availability and use of new communication techniques – is among the driving forces behind the growing significance of transnational social lifestyles and spaces (Glick Schiller, Basch, and Szanton Blanc 1995; Pries 2008).

EUCROSS will survey direct communication with family members and friends abroad using the following three items:

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?

Interviewer: Read out list. Tick "never" if the respondent does not use any of these ways of communication in general. By communication using a computer we are referring to the use of packages like Skype or Google talk, including video chat etc.

[9]

Every day
At least once a week
At least once a month
Less often
Never
Don't know

(Source: new)

And how frequently did you communicate with them by mail or e-mail?

Interviewer: Read out list. Tick "never" if the respondent does not use any of these ways of communication in general. This question is still referring to the last 12 months.

[10]

Every day
At least once a week
At least once a month
Less often
Never
Don't know

(Source: new)

And how frequently via social networks? (e.g. Facebook, Hi5, Google+ etc)

Interviewer: Read out list. Tick "never" if the respondent does not use any of these ways of communication in general. This question is still referring to the last 12 months.

[11]

Every day
At least once a week
At least once a month
Less often
Never
Don't know

(Source: new)

Besides measuring the sheer occurrence of communication, the shown items allow for the differentiation of its various types as we will ask separately about oral and audio-visual conversations [9], 'traditional' written communication [10] and finally more recent forms of 'interactive' written communication [11]. Along the lines of the research on (migrant) transnationalism mentioned earlier, this will provide the possibility to evaluate whether or not such communication occurs frequently enough to be considered a stable and constant form of 'virtual co-presence' (Pries 2008, 49). The measurement of work-related contacts abroad serves the same purpose, while the relative amount of received e-mails from abroad is a somewhat weaker indicator of 'virtual mobility'.

Another important part of EUCROSS is the investigation of 'cosmopolitan consumption practices and competencies'. Especially, cosmopolitan consumption practices have seldom been key aspects in the research on European or cosmopolitan identification so far. As Hanquinet and Savage stress, it is a highly disputed question to which extent such practices are indicators of the European or cosmopolitan identifications. However, it could be argued that "cosmopolitan consumption practices could be one of the first steps in openness to others: these goods could help people cross symbolic national boundaries" (Hanquinet and Savage 2011, 39). Therefore, one of the aims of our study is to further investigate whether such a relation exists on an empirically significant level.

In order to investigate this, the survey will, first of all, look into the media usage and cultural orientations of participants. The former is done by inquiring whether and with which frequency respondents watch foreign movies, TV shows etc. (which have not been dubbed), on 'classical' TV channels or via the internet. Since computers and mobile devices are rapidly gaining in importance, the internet as a distribution channel has been included in this question. In line with this assessment, a recent Eurobarometer found that already 16 per cent of Europeans 'watch television via the Internet' at least once a week (7 per cent do so even on a daily basis) with another 11 per cent on a more irregular basis (European Commission 2012, 5). Furthermore, the internet allows access to foreign language content in a much less complicated way than longer established means of media distribution, which makes it all the more relevant in the context of our research.

What is more, EUCROSS will also ask about orientations with respect to aspects that could hint at cultural preferences. Items asking about the respondents' tastes in music genres and their favourite foreign cuisines will be used as outlined below:

On a scale from one to five, where one means “Not at all” and five means “Very much”, how much do you like the following kinds of music?

Interviewer: Read out list one by one. Tick “don’t know” also if the respondent does not know any songs of the type.

World music (e.g. Brazilian, African, Caribbean, Middle Eastern)
Classical music
Jazz and Blues
Traditional and folk music from [COR]
Traditional and folk music from other European countries
Metal
Pop
Rock
Hip-hop and R’n’B

[12]

(Source: new, inspired by EUMARR)

Please think about foreign cuisine, i.e., all which is originally from outside [CoR]. Which national cuisines do you like best?

Interviewer: Multiple answers possible. Tick the first three countries (or respective regions) mentioned. Regarding nationals the CoR and regarding migrants the respective CoO are not valid answers. However, you can tick the CoR in the case of migrant respondents.

[13]

[Country list]
<i>I don’t like/eat any foreign dishes</i>
<i>Don’t know</i>

(Source: new, inspired by EUMARR)

Both questions will, again, allow us tapping into the spatial dimension as well. This means that, should there be indications of a cosmopolitan orientation, it would be possible to differentiate whether it is directed towards the EU or whether it has a broader character.

As mentioned above, according to Fligstein the knowledge of one or more foreign languages is a sign of potential cross-border activities (people usually study a language in order to use it) (Fligstein 2009, 147). In EUCROSS linguistic proficiency is measured as part of the ‘extraordinary’ practices of the third dimension shown in Table 2. This classification is due to the fact that the empirical situation, as Jürgen Gerhards argues, is far away from the promoted goal of the European Union “that its citizens should speak two foreign languages or more [since] [o]ver half of EU citizens cannot speak any foreign language at all, about one-quarter speak at least one foreign language, and only fifteen percent speak

two or more” (Gerhards 2012, 125).

Some of the other consumption practices included in this dimension will moreover allow linking our findings to results of more traditional migration research. For instance, EUCROSS investigates the extent of transnational financial transactions. Yet by doing so, the project focuses not only on groups which are usually considered as ‘movers’ (i.e., migrants), in which cases such money flows are considered remittances, but also on ‘stayers’. Thus EUCROSS recognises that people who are themselves not at all mobile on an international scale could, for example, be regularly sending money abroad to support their children during their education. In the same way, the project intends to widen the perspective on the ownership of property abroad and to overcome the aforementioned dichotomy of the two mutually exclusive categorisations of individuals (mobile vs. immobile).

Finally, by inquiring the participants’ familiarity with regions in the CoR and with foreign countries, EUCROSS also investigates the respondents’ ‘space-sets’. The latter concept has recently been introduced by Ettore Recchi and Theresa Kuhn (Recchi and Kuhn 2012). It basically describes the total set of geographical locations which are socially relevant to an individual. These do not only include geographical spaces in which an individual regularly acts and is physically present, but also spaces which are more distant and therefore visited less often. If such space-sets were to contain other countries, they could be interpreted as part of a transnational orientation. Therefore, the questionnaire includes the following item:

Apart from [CoR], are there one or more other countries that you are very familiar with – that is, that you know well enough to feel comfortable in?

Interviewer: Read out list.

[14]

Yes, one
Yes, two or more
No
<i>Don't know</i>

(Source: new)

Those participants who answer positively to the stated question are asked to specify further which countries they referred to and to state the reasons why they are ‘very familiar’ with them. With respect to the intended differentiation between cosmopolitan attitudes and European identification, EUCROSS gathers data on the spatial characteristics of the participants’ space-sets on a national and transnational level.

References

- Bade, Klaus J. 2000. *Europa in Bewegung. Migration Vom Späten 18. Jahrhundert Bis Zur Gegenwart*. München: Beck.
- Bruter, Michael. 2005. *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cram, Laura, Stratos Patrikios, and James Mitchell. 2011. "What does the European Union Mean to its Citizens? Implicit Triggers, Identity(ies) and Attitudes to the European Union." Paper prepared for presentation at APSA, Seattle, September 2011. <http://ewds.strath.ac.uk/Portals/106/APSA/CramPatrikiosMitchell2011.pdf> (retrieved on November 11, 2011).
- Deutsch, Karl W. 1966. *Nationalism and Social Communication. An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. 2 print ed. Cambridge/Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.
- Deutsch, Karl W., Sidney Burrell, Robert Kann, Maurice Lee, Martin Lichterman, Raymond Lindgren, Francis Loewenheim, and Richard van Wagenen. 1957. *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area. International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Díez Medrano, Juan and Paula Gutiérrez. 2001. "Nested Identities: National and European Identity in Spain." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (5): 753-778.
- European Commission. 2012. *Eurobarometer 76. Media use in the European Union. Report*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- . 2011. *Eurobarometer Flash N°328. Survey on the Attitudes of Europeans Towards Tourism . Analytical Report*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Favell, Adrian, Ettore Recchi, Theresa Kuhn, Janne Solgaard, and Juliane Klein. 2011. *State of the Art Report*. EUCROSS Working Paper 1. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=35&Itemid=157 (retrieved on January 13, 2012).
- Fligstein, Neil. 2009. *Euroclash. the EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Reprint ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Gerhards, Jürgen. 2012. *From Babel to Brussels. European Integration and the Importance of Transnational Linguistic Capital*. Berlin Studies on the Sociology of Europe (BSSE). No 28. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, Linda Basch, and Christina Szanton Blanc. 1995. "From Immigrant to Transmigrant. Theorizing Transnational Migration." *Anthropological Quarterly* 68 (1): 48-63.
- Hanquinet, Laurie and Mike Savage. 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&g

- id=57&Itemid=157 (retrieved on February 20, 2012).
- ISSP Research Group. 2003. *International Social Survey Programme (ISSP): National Identity II. Study documentation*. ZA 3910. Distributor: GESIS Cologne Germany.
- Krosnick, Jon A. and Stanley Presser. 2010. "Question and Questionnaire Design." In *Handbook of Survey Research (Second Edition)*, edited by Peter V. Marsden and James D. Wright, pp. 263-313. West Yorkshire, England: Emerald Group.
- Kuhn, Theresa. 2011. "Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism. An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory." *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (6): 811-837.
- Mau, Steffen. 2010. *Social Transnationalism. Lifeworlds Beyond the Nation-State*. London: Routledge.
- Porst, Rolf. 2011. *Fragebogen. Ein Arbeitsbuch*. 3rd ed. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Pries, Ludger. 2008. *Die Transnationalisierung der Sozialen Welt. Sozialräume jenseits der Nationalgesellschaften*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Recchi, Ettore. 2012. *Transnational Practices and European Identity. From Theoretical to Policy Issues*. EUCROSS Working Paper 3. www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=58&Itemid=157 (retrieved on June 12, 2012).
- Recchi, Ettore and Theresa Kuhn. 2012. *Europeans' Space-Set and the Political Legitimacy of the EU*. In *A Political Sociology of Transnational Europe*, edited by Niilo Kauppi. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Risse, Thomas. 2010. *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press.
- Sinnott, Richard. 2005. "An Evaluation of the Measurement of National, Subnational and Supranational Identity in Crossnational Surveys." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 18 (2): 211-223.
- Verba, Sidney. 1993. "The Uses of Survey Research in the Study of Comparative Politics. Issues and Strategies." *Historical Social Research* 18 (2): 55-103 (first published in 1969).