National and transnational identities of intra-European migrants

Braun, Michael; Müller, Walter

National and Transnational Identities of Intra-European Migrants

Michael Braun and Walter Müller

The analysis of national and supra-national identification of native popula-
tions constitutes an important research agenda in several fields of social
research. It is relevant both for how ethnic minorities are perceived and
treated in a country (Citrin/Sides 2004), for the positioning of a country
towards foreign countries and, in particular, for cooperation in the frame-
work of supra-national units, such as the European Union, or even in the
world society (Deutsch et al. 1957). Though the amount of identification
necessary for the stability of a political system is controversially discussed,
it can be taken for granted that in the case of high claims on solidarity, a
minimum of identification is imprescindible (Kohli 2000).

Most studies have come to the conclusion that there is no incompati-
bility between national and European identifications and that they are
complementary rather than incompatible (Bruter 2005; Citrin/Sides 2004;
Díez Medrano/Gutiérrez 2001; Mau/Verwiebe 2009; Westle 2003). An
exception is the study by Carey (2002), but the author has used support for
membership in the European Union instead of identification as a depend-
ent variable, which is conceptually different (Bruter 2005; Duchesne/
Frognier 2002).

Haller (1999) forcefully argues that, under the particular conditions of
the long history of strongly developed nation states in Europe, it will de-
pend on the action potential preserved for nation states whether a com-
plementary rather than a competitive relationship between national and
European identity will emerge. The more such potential is preserved and
European institutions confine themselves to complementing nation states
and deliver useful functions, "the more it will be possible for national and
European identity to develop in a complementary way" (Haller 1999, 272).
Yet, given the diversity of national histories, of different structural loca-
tions of countries within Europe, and hence varying interests in European
integration between different countries and social groups, it is unlikely that

a homogenous European identity will develop. Also, as Haller (1994) observes, Europe lacks various conditions that in general facilitate identifying with a collectivity. Europe is culturally highly heterogeneous, has neither a common language nor religion. Still today there are clear limits to common mass communication media reaching beyond national borders. And in spite of all processes of globalization, for large segments of the population, labor markets and regional mobility remain contained in national economies. It is therefore not surprising that among most people identification with Europe is much weaker than with one's nation or region (Westle 2003; Immerfall et al. 2010).

Studies usually point to the important role of gender, age, and education in determining the respective attitudes of the native population (Díez Medrano 2008; Fligstein 2008). Women, the elderly and the less educated, show weaker identification with the European Union than men, the younger, and the highly educated. As hypothesized in Deutsch's transactionalist theory (Deutsch et al. 1957), transnational relations of national populations, such as frequent foreign travel, knowledge of foreign languages, and foreign friends have also been demonstrated to increase identification with larger regional units. However, transnational interactions are highly stratified across society, and the younger and highly educated are much more frequently involved in these interactions than the elderly and less educated (Kuhn 2011). As a consequence, the level of identification with Europe in a country does not homogeneously rise in tandem with an increase in transnational interactions. Instead, the stratification with regard to interactions is reflected by a stratification with regard to identification.

In this paper we focus on European identification of migrants, more specifically of intra-European migrants. The study of migrants introduces an important additional aspect, because migrants can relate, in addition to supra-national units, to two different countries in a much more encompassing sense than members of national populations with transnational contacts. According to Mau and collaborators, transnationalism can be understood as involvement in cross-border interactions and mobility (Mau et al. 2008). Kuhn (2011) subdivides transnationalism into three dimensions: transnational background, transnational practices, and transnational human capital. Transnational background includes migration experiences, transnational practices involve the interaction with non-national actors and sojourns abroad, and transnational human capital includes foreign language proficiency and general education. It is the first of these dimensions, trans-

national background, in which migrants are qualitatively different from the non-migrant, "stayer" part of a population.

Traditionally, studies of migration and integration have focused nearly exclusively on the relationship of the migrants to both their country of origin (CoO) and country of residence (CoR), ignoring their stance with regard to more encompassing units, such as the European Union. Usually, four domains of integration of migrants into a CoR are distinguished: cultural, structural, social, and identificational integration. Cultural integration includes CoR language proficiency, structural integration deals with citizenship rights and the placement of migrants in the system of social stratification, and social integration involves ethnic intermarriage and having friends from the CoR. Finally, identificational integration consists in a strong feeling of belongingness or at least the acceptance of the values of a social system. Analyses in this tradition have focused on whether migrants have achieved (or are likely to achieve in the nearer future) full integration into their CoR or tend to segment, i.e. remaining primordially oriented to their CoO or their co-nationals living in the CoR.

The barriers to integration of intra-European migrants in some of these domains are clearly lower than that for migrants from non-EU countries, and the gap between these two groups of migrants seems to be increasing in many of the European countries as a consequence of growing disparities in the conditions for integration, especially among traditional, lower-class migrants. For example, freedom of movement within the European Union precludes the stipulation of language proficiency as an entry requirement. In addition, (nearly) equal rights in the political realm are accorded to intra-European migrants, even without having obtained the citizenship of the CoR. Thus, when politicians encourage migrants to strive for CoR citizenship, intra-European migrants are usually not included.

The focus on intra-European adult migrants thus provides an interesting setting. To a large proportion, intra-European migration includes highly-skilled labor, study, and "quality-of-life" migration, which are becoming increasingly important both quantitatively and qualitatively (Castles/Miller 1998; King 2002; King et al. 1998). These groups constitute what Favell (2008) refers to as "free movers", who make highly individualized moves, independent of chain migration and not (primarily) motivated by economic or political motives. On the contrary, traditional integration research is largely restricted to low-skilled labor migration and family reunification. Conditions of their integration differ from those of Intra-Euro-

pean migrants. The latter profit most from the dramatically increased freedom of movement across national borders which is facilitated both by the conferral of rights and advances in transportation (Recchi 2008). Indeed, intra-European migrants can be considered as a group in Europe to which European integration provides particularly large gains. Thus, it can be expected that their identification with the European Union is not only stronger in comparison to other migrant groups, but also compared to the native ("stayer") populations, and this is what actually has been found to be the case (Rother/Nebe 2009).

However, in this paper, we are not so much interested in the level of different identifications but in their determinants. Therefore, it is useful to review how the accounting of the integration of migrants is usually performed. A rational-choice approach, for example, draws on the concepts of motivation, opportunities, efficiency, and costs (Esser 2006). Motivation relates to incentives to invest (such as job prospects, higher income or social contacts). Opportunities refer to the chance to realize certain courses of action (such as making CoR friends, which can be restricted by prejudices on the part of the native population). Efficiency relates to the resources of the migrant in order to implement certain actions (such as learning capacities or economic resources). Costs can be related to social distances between ethnic groups but also to cultural distances (such as linguistic distance) or opportunity costs. These four constructs make up or mediate the effects of different explanatory variables. Bridging assumptions must be adopted to link these four constructs with the explanatory variables. This is no easy task, as the measured variables are only crude indicators for the constructs, and some variables may relate to more than one construct at a time.

With the help of adequate operationalizations of these constructs, differences between migrants in the first three domains can be accounted for to a relatively high degree (e.g., for language proficiency, see Esser (1982; 2006), and Braun (2010) for the intra-European migrants analyzed in this paper). For at least two reasons, this cannot be expected to work as smoothly for identificational integration. First, with regard to identificational integration, most of the relevant explanatory constructs are quite difficult to operationalize. For instance, what is motivation in regard to requiring an identification? How is it related to efficiency and costs? As a consequence, a rational-choice explanation of identificational integration should work less well than for other forms of integration. Of course, these

considerations would also apply to the explanation of European identification of national, i.e. non-migrant, populations and can help explain the relatively small differences between subgroups and the low amount of explained variance typically found for them (Citrin/Sides 2004; Mau et al. 2008). Second, it is difficult to establish what "identification" implies. There are both conceptual and empirical problems involved. On the conceptual side, Kohli (2000) cautions against assuming that national and supra-national identifications are easily comparable. On the empirical side, Díez Medrano (2010) observes that respondents might give questions regarding supra-national identification a simple geographical interpretation.

The sociology of integration usually distinguishes different integration patterns of migrants: assimilation, segmentation, multiple inclusion, and marginality (Esser 2006). As a rule, multiple inclusion would be regarded as an ideal but hardly realistic option for the majority of migrants, while assimilation should normally be targeted (by both individual migrants and the CoR). With regard to identificational integration, assimilation means a complete lack of identification with the CoO, while segmentation means that identification with the CoR is entirely absent. Multiple inclusion refers to a strong identification with both the CoO and the CoR, while marginality implies identification with neither the CoO nor the CoR. When integration into supra-national units, such as the European Union or Europe, is the focus of research or the aim of policy measures, the traditional classification becomes insufficient. Assimilation of migrants into unmodified national "containers" is not the issue anymore. In particular, for the newer forms of intra-EU migration, de-nationalized patterns of integration might be more characteristic. In addition to segmentation, i.e., confining migrants into an enclave of their CoO in the CoR, also full CoR assimilation, i.e., the traceless inclusion in the pre-existing and unchanged national container of the CoR, would become undesirable. Instead, variants of the multiple-integration type, which normally are defined by high levels of identification with both the CoO and the CoR, might come into existence. They would combine more or less strong identification with both the CoO and the CoR with strong identification with a higher-level unit, such as the European Union.

At the same time, for intra-European migrants, marginality might lose its dramatic aspects altogether. Migrants might not be affected strongly any more by the country in which they are located; they might feel well everywhere, and even the borders of the European Union might become irrele-

vant to them. This kind of entirely unproblematic "marginality" could also exist in the realm of cultural integration if migrants either have a large repository of foreign languages between which they are able to switch naturally or use only a lingua franca in everyday contacts with national populations. Such more positive forms of marginality, however, are usually not open to low-qualified migrants, whose jobs require at least some proficiency in the local language.

The following research hypotheses take into consideration (1) the traditional assumptions regarding the integration of migrants into their CoR, (2) what is specific for identificational integration compared to cultural, structural, and social integration, (3) what has been learned from the study of supra-national identification of native populations, and (4) what might be specifics with regard to migrants.

Hypotheses

As a general mechanism for the generation of identification with a group, community or a collective, we rely on the assumption that identification develops when individuals gain from associating with a group, community or collective (Immerfall et al. 2010). In this sense, identification with Europe emerges through the same basic mechanisms as identification with the CoO or the CoR. As especially intra-European migrants are likely to experience various benefits from European integration, one can generally expect a higher degree of identification with Europe among them than among the native non-migrant population.

— *Age, age at migration, and duration of stay in the CoR*: Older migrants experienced, at least in their formative years, less processes of globalization and (individual) transnationalism. Therefore, we expect them to have higher identification with their CoO and lower with their CoR and the European Union than younger migrants. Migration at young ages is hypothesized to be associated with higher levels of identificational integration, both with regard to the CoR and the European Union, as the opening to new environments and opportunities took place in the formative years. A longer duration of the stay is expected to increase identification with the CoR and also with the European Union and to decrease identification with the CoO. These effects can be conceived as

mainly mediated by opportunities, in that a longer stay increases the exposure of migrants to new environments. Unfortunately, these theoretical propositions cannot be tested precisely, given the database we use (see below).

— *Gender*: From the literature on European identification among stayers one can conclude that women have a higher identification with their CoR and CoO, but a lower identification with the European Union. The underlying processes, however, are not entirely clear.

— *Education*: From the literature on European identification among stayers, one can conclude that higher educational qualifications should lead to a stronger identification with the European Union. From traditional research on migration, we would predict that identification with the CoR should also increase with educational qualification. Finally, identification with the CoO should be lower for the higher educated than for the less educated.

— *Previous sojourn in the CoR*: Whether a migrant has previously lived in the CoR should have similar effects as a longer stay in the CoR and, thus, increase CoR identification. Effects of repeated sojourns may be particularly strong, because returning to a country in which a migrant had lived before may derive from a particular attachment to the country or may be due to earlier positive experiences. In this context, previous intergroup contacts might also have an effect, but this is controversial. Sigalas (2010), for instance, found that Erasmus students mostly socialize within their own ethnic group.

— *Previous sojourn in a third country*: The European Union is largely responsible for the opportunities migrants have to move freely between European countries. This advantage is particularly visible for migrants who have experienced multiple moves. Thus, a protracted previous stay in a third country is assumed to strengthen identification with the European Union only.

— *Quality-of-life migration*: Migrants for reasons of higher quality of life (often people in retirement) should show higher identification with the CoR and the European Union and lower with the CoO than migrants who moved for other reasons (notably work, family/love, and study motives). Quality-of-life migrants are likely to have based their decision to migrate on a particular positive balance of benefits over costs (advantages over disadvantages).

— *CoR language proficiency*: Language proficiency at the time of migration and at the time of the interview should strengthen identification with the CoR and also – as an additional educational effect – with the European Union. Present proficiency should be even more important than proficiency at the time of migration, because it is temporarily closer to the dependent variable.

— *Ethnic origin of the partner*: We expect that having a partner from the CoO strengthens CoO identification and that having a partner from the CoR strengthens CoR identification. Identification with the European Union should be particularly enhanced by having a partner from a third country.

— *Ethnic composition of the friendship network*: Similarly, friends from the CoO should increase CoO identification (and reduce CoR identification), friends from the CoR should increase CoR identification, and friends from third countries should strengthen European identification (and might reduce identification with the two other units).

— *Contacts with family and friends in the CoO*: Transnational ties to the CoO prevent a complete reorientation of the migrant towards the CoR. Thus, frequent contacts with family members and friends in the CoO should have positive effects on CoO identification, while they should not be conducive to CoR identification. As they prevent strong identification with the CoR, they might also enhance identification with the European Union as a more encompassing unit.

— *Media usage*: The frequency of usage of CoO media is expected to impact positively on CoO identification and identification with the European Union. Usage of CoR television should further CoR and European identification (to the detriment of CoO identification).

— *Discrimination experiences*: Experiences of discrimination in the CoR should negatively affect identification with the CoR and this negative effect should also extend to the European Union. Having experienced discrimination, migrants should react with a compensating strengthening of CoO identification.

Data and methods

The analyses presented in the following are based on the "European Internal Movers' Social Survey" (EIMSS) conducted as part of the PIONEUR project ("Pioneers of Europe's Integration 'from Below': Mobility and the Emergence of European Identity among National and Foreign Citizens in the EU") funded by the European Commission in the 5th Framework Program (Recchi/Favell 2009). In each of five countries – Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain – approximately 250 telephone interviews were conducted with nationals of each of the other four countries who had migrated between 1974 and 2003, were 18 years or older at the time of migration, and had lived in the CoR for at least one year (Braun/Santacreu 2009). A total of 4,902 interviews were conducted. Linguistic screening of names in telephone directories guaranteed that only migrants belonging to the CoOs' main ethnic groups were considered. This excluded Germanic minorities in Italy and France, for example, who had migrated to other countries as well as former migrants and their offspring who had returned to the home countries of their parents. Nevertheless, the sampling strategy was not perfect, e.g. there is undercoverage of migrants without an entry in a telephone directory. As this might, in particular, have affected female migrants married to CoR men, a small network-sampling component was included in the design by asking respondents for telephone numbers of women married to CoR men.

A standardized multilingual questionnaire was administered by bilingual interviewers in computer-assisted telephone interviews. The average duration of the interviews was slightly less than half an hour. The aims were to collect quantitative information about migration experiences, political behavior, attitudes, and European identity. The survey began in early May 2004 and was originally scheduled to terminate by the date of the European Election in June. However, problems in some of the fields meant that this goal was not fully achieved. In fact, in Britain, the field period only ended in early 2005. Non-response bias is almost impossible to quantify because in contrast to surveys of the general population, it is not known whether those who could not be contacted or who refused to participate belong to the target population. The target sample of the EIMSS survey would have been much smaller than the gross sample, even if the screening of ethnicities had worked perfectly. This is because the population was restricted to those who came to the respective countries of residence after

1973 and were 18 years or older at the time of settlement which is consequently a much smaller group. As a consequence, what appeared to be a non-contact or a refusal could be neutral to the sample.

This survey has several advantages: First, the study was conducted in five different countries with the same countries being used as both CoO and CoR. The studies of the five countries are comparable, as random samples of the migrant populations were drawn according to the same sampling schema in each country. The same questionnaire and the same kind of interviewers (bilinguals) as well as the same interviewer instructions were also employed. Second, in contrast with previous studies, particularly in terms of the CoO of migrants, the selected countries are all highly developed countries without huge differentials in economic performance. This enables the analysis to be extended to groups other than those mainly studied in the past, such as refugees/asylum seekers, low-skilled labor migrants, and those arriving as part of family reunification. Finally, the data also cover variables which usually cannot be obtained from census data, such as interethnic friendships.

The dependent variables

The dependent variables, identification with the European Union, the CoR, and the CoO were measured by the questions: "How attached do you feel to [...] [CoO]/[CoR]/the European Union?" Response alternatives were "very attached", "fairly attached", "not very attached", and "not at all attached". All three variables are reverse-coded.

Age, age at migration, and duration of stay as independent variables

In cross-sectional surveys of the general population, it is – without further assumptions – not possible to differentiate between cohort and life-cycle interpretations of age. This is further complicated in the survey of migrants we use here. In this study, age is a linear combination of the age at the time of migration and the duration of the stay in the CoR. In most studies of integration of migrants, the latter two variables are attributed a crucial importance as explanatory variables, i.e. integration into the CoR is usually assumed to be furthered by a low age at the time of migration and a long

duration of stay in the CoR. If both of these variables are included, an independent effect of age – be it in a cohort or life-cycle interpretation – cannot be estimated. In addition, as this study is a cross-sectional survey collected at only one point of time, duration of stay in the CoR is confounded with the period of migration, i.e. those who have already stayed for a long time in the CoR are exactly those who came early in the time period under investigation. Thus, there is also no unambiguous interpretation of the variable capturing the duration of the stay in the CoR. What is attributed to duration of stay could as well be an effect of heterogeneity of migrants between different periods of migration, which is further complicated by selective remigration to the home countries. Unlike in the case of language proficiency where by means of an additional retrospective measurement of the same variable at the time of migration it is possible to separate period and maturation effects (as improvements ensuing in the course of the stay can be largely interpreted as maturation effects), duration of the stay cannot be separated from the period of migration in the present case.

Therefore, strong theoretical assumptions are necessary to guide the interpretation. The plausibility of such assumptions varies with the dimension of integration under investigation. For example, with cultural or structural integration, it is more likely that age itself (at the time of the interview) has less importance and the effects of age at migration and duration of stay can be meaningfully interpreted. With identificational integration, this is more problematic. A look at stayer populations might be helpful in this case: Previous studies show that identification with the home country is higher for older than for younger respondents (which most likely is a cohort and not a life-cycle effect), and the reverse is true for identification with Europe. As mentioned before, for the migrants analyzed here, age is simply the sum of age at migration and duration of stay. If identification with the European Union declines with age, this might mean that identification with the European Union should be higher for those who migrated earlier in their lives but have stayed in their CoR for a shorter time period. While the former is plausible, the latter is not.

Young age at migration is probably not as important for identificational as it is for cultural integration, e.g. for language acquisition, where young age greatly enhances the capacity to learn. Though one could also muster similar arguments for the duration of stay, i.e. that it does not take a particularly long time to change one's identification, this variable does not have to be interpreted in a learning context. A long duration of stay in the CoR

simply points to satisfaction with this country (demonstrated by not re-turning to the CoO, which would have been easy in the European con-text), and also indicates to the migrant a potentially long future in this country. As the inclusion of age is mandatory to capture potential cohort effects, it seems that the simultaneous introduction of age and duration of stay makes the most sense. Nevertheless, the effects of both variables have to be interpreted with great care.

Other independent variables

Gender is a dummy variable with men as the baseline category, i.e. the effects presented pertain to women. Education is entered as three dummy variables for intermediary and upper secondary as well as university educa-tion (with those having a lower secondary education or less constituting the baseline). Previous sojourns in the CoR and a third country of at least three months are included as two dummy variables. Migration motives were measured by an open question. One dummy variable is used, which pits pure quality-of-life motives (which are not combined with work, fam-ily/love or study motives) against all other. Partner status is entered as three dummy variables: no partner, partner from the CoR, and partner from a third country (partner from the CoO serves as the baseline).

Language proficiency at the time of the interview was measured as a self-assessment on a 5-point scale: "And how well do you speak [language of CoR] now?" Response categories offered were "almost as well as native language", "quite well", "just so-so", "poorly", and "no knowledge". This question was asked after a self-assessment of language proficiency at the time of migration. Both questions are reverse-coded. Language skills are usually measured by a self-assessment on a 5-point scale, in particular in non-specialized surveys, and this has been demonstrated to work quite well (Braun 2010; Van Tubergen 2004).

Relationship to friends in the CoR who come from the CoO, the CoR, and a third country were measured by the question, "Of your circle of friends where you live, we'd like to know how many are from [home country], how many from [destination country], and how many from other countries?" Answer categories were "none", "a few", and "several". These variables are treated as quantitative variables, although they were measured on an ordinal scale only.

Communication with family and friends in the CoO was asked by the following two questions: "How frequently do you communicate (by phone, mail or e-mail) with family members in [home country]?" and "And with friends in [home country]?" Seven answer categories were presented for both questions, ranging from "everyday" to "never". An additional category was presented for those, who do not have any family member or friend in the home country. This category is collapsed with the "never" category. These questions are reverse-coded.

Media consumption was measured by the following question: "On an average weekday, how much time, in total, do you spend watching television stations from [home country] and [destination country]?" and "And how much time reading newspapers from [home country] and [destination country] on an average weekday?" Eight answer categories were presented for these items, ranging from "no time at all" to "more than 3 hours".

Discrimination experience was measured by the question "Have you ever felt discriminated against in [destination country] because you are foreigner?" Response categories were "no, never", "yes, sometimes", and "yes, frequently". This variable is treated as a quantitative variable, although it was measured on an ordinal scale only.

Analytical procedure

The results section begins with some preliminary analyses. First, descriptive information is provided on the distribution of the sample with regard to gender, age, and education in the different CoO/CoR combinations. Second, the means for European, CoR, and CoO identification as well as the correlations between them are presented.

Third, multilevel models of the three kinds of identification are estimated. Multilevel or hierarchical linear models (Raudenbush/Bryk 2002; Snijders/Bosker 1999) are appropriate when variables pertain to several levels. In the present case, we distinguish two levels: the migrant-group level (the CoO/CoR combinations) and the migrant level. First, a so-called "empty" or variance-component model is estimated. This model shows how much of the variance in the dependent variable is located on the different levels. A comparison of the variance components of the empty model with the final model shows how much variance can be explained at both levels. The explanatory power of the individual-level variables at the

group level is related to a composition effect, i.e. differences between groups in these variables. We restrict the analyses to the 4,522 cases for which information on all three kinds of identification as well as all independent variables is available.

Stata Version 10 (Rabe-Hesketh/Skrondal 2008; StataCorp 2007) is used for all analyses.

Results

Tables 1–2 present descriptive information on age and education for the different migrant groups.

Table 1: Mean age in the different migrant groups

	France	Germany	Britain	Italy	Spain
French	–	40.6	45.0	47.2	57.8
Germans	50.9	–	47.2	53.1	61.5
British	54.5	45.2	–	49.9	60.3
Italians	47.5	45.0	45.1	–	54.1
Spanish	41.0	43.8	42.6	42.2	–

Note: $N = 4,522$.

Table 2: Percentages of migrants with university degree in the different migrant groups

	France	Germany	Britain	Italy	Spain
French	–	67.9	72.3	58.4	49.8
Germans	48.0	–	22.4	47.4	16.4
British	57.3	51.7	–	62.0	36.6
Italians	38.0	6.2	48.2	–	31.1
Spanish	47.8	33.5	46.8	40.6	–

Note: $N = 4,522$.

Migrants to Spain are considerably older than those moving to the other destinations (Table 1). This mainly reflects their different ages at migration,

e.g. the British were on average 51 years old when they moved to Spain, and the Italians and Spanish where in their mid-twenties when they came to Germany (Braun/Arsene 2009). While the former are mainly (pre-) retirement migrants, the latter are predominantly less qualified work migrants. While, on the whole, migration of the highly educated is quite dominant, there are characteristic exceptions (Table 2): Very few of the Germans in Spain and the Italians in Germany hold a university degree.

Table 3 presents the group averages for European, CoR, and CoO identification. In addition to the single CoO/CoR combinations, the right column contains information on the different CoO groups, pooled over all CoRs, and the bottom row contains information on the different CoRs, pooled over all CoO groups. The diagonal cells contain information on the stayer populations of the respective countries, based on data from the Eurobarometer 58.1 study collected in 2002. For the stayer populations, identification with the European Union is markedly lower than identification with their CoO. Furthermore, identification with the European Union is markedly lower for the stayer compared to the mover populations. This difference is most pronounced for the British and least for the Italians. Migration to another country within Europe is, thus, connected with higher identification with Europe.

Among movers, European identification is in most cases weaker than CoR and CoO identification. The British in Germany and Spain as well as the Italians in Germany show particularly low levels of European identification (which ranges from 2.6 through 3.1). The reverse is true for Spanish in Germany as well as for Germans in Spain. For CoR identification (which ranges from 2.8 through 3.4), Italians in Britain have particularly low values, while the British in France show a particularly high value. Overall, the different origin groups are very similar with regard to European and CoR identification (with the only exception of the British whose European identification – also among non-migrants – is markedly lower than their CoR identification). With regard to CoO identification, the differences between origin groups are bigger, with the British groups least and the southern European groups most attached to their CoO. As analyses not reported here show, these differences are only partly due to a higher importance of family and friendship networks in the southern European countries. The Italians and the Spanish also miss the lifestyle and the weather of their native countries, and this has an impact on their CoO identification.

Table 3: Average European, CoR, and CoO identification of migrant groups and stayers (in diagonal)

		France	Ger-many	Britain	Italy	Spain	In all CoRs
French	European	2.5	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	2.9
	CoR		3.0	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.1
	CoO	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.2
Germans	European	2.9	2.5	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.0
	CoR	3.2		3.0	3.2	3.3	3.2
	CoO	2.9	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.1
British	European	2.9	2.6	2.0	2.7	2.6	2.7
	CoR	3.4	3.0		3.3	3.3	3.3
	CoO	2.7	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.9
Italians	European	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.9
	CoR	3.0	3.0	2.8		3.3	3.0
	CoO	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.4
Spanish	European	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.9	2.4	3.0
	CoR	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1		3.0
	CoO	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.1	3.5
From all CoOs	European	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.9	
	CoR	3.2	3.0	2.9	3.2	3.3	
	CoO	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.1	

Note: Identification measured on a 4-point scale from 1 (not at all attached) to 4 (very attached); EIMSS: N = 4,522; Eurobarometer 58.1: N = 5,870.

On the individual level and over all migrant groups, the correlation between European identification and CoR identification is .23, between European identification and CoO identification .14, and between CoR and CoO identification .11. This means that there is not only no competition between the three kinds of identification, they even support each other to some degree. The only exception here are the British migrants, for whom European and CoR identification are uncorrelated, i.e. they tend to identify either with Europe or with their CoR but not with both entities at the same time.

Multilevel analysis of identification

In the following, random-intercept models are estimated, starting with empty models without any explanatory variables which help determine explained variance later. For identification with the European Union, the empty model has a variance component of .022 on the migrant-group and

of .722 on the migrant level, which means that only 3.0 percent of the variance is located on the migrant-group level. For identification with the CoR the corresponding figures are .026 and .531 (i.e., 4.7 percent of the variance is located on the migrant-group level) and for identification with the CoO .075 and .639 (i.e., 11.5 percent of the variance is located on the migrant-group level). Thus, especially European identification varies little between the migrant groups from and to the various countries. Variation among individuals within these groups is much larger. Table 4 presents the random-intercept models showing all individual-level effects controlling for differences among migrant groups from different CoO in different CoR. Z-ratios are given, which better inform about the strengths of an effect than unstandardized regression coefficients. Values above 2 are statistically significant at the .05 level.

The small effects of age are in the same direction for all three identifications, with higher age being more conducive to identification. A longer duration of the stay in the CoR increases identification with the latter, but leaves the other two identifications entirely unaffected. As noted above, these results have to be interpreted with caution.

Women tend to maintain a higher identification with their CoR, but lower identification with the European Union than men. There is no gender difference with regard to the CoO.

Education has no effects on either CoR or CoO identification, but has a strong positive effect on identification with the European Union. The effect of having a university degree is particularly strong.

Whether a migrant has previously lived in the CoR for three months or more does not impact any of the identifications, though the coefficient with regard to CoR identification is in the expected direction (but not significant). A protracted previous stay in a third country strengthens identification with the European Union only.

Quality-of-life migrants show markedly higher CoR identification and markedly lower CoO identification than migrants who moved for other reasons (notably work, family/love, and study motives). There is no difference when it comes to identifying with the European Union.

CoR language proficiency at the time of migration has a positive effect only on identification with the European Union. However, language proficiency at the time of the interview facilitates both identification with the European Union and CoR identification.

Table 4: Random-intercept model for identification (z ratios)

	EU identification	CoR identification	CoO identification
Age	2.1*	3.2*	2.3*
Duration of stay in CoR	1.1	4.3*	2.0
Female	-3.3*	2.6*	1.7
Education (base: lower secondary or less)			
Intermediary secondary	3.5*	1.6	.5
Higher secondary	3.4*	.7	-.4
University	6.1*	1.0	.2
Previous sojourn in CoR	.2	1.8	.7
Previous sojourn in 3rd country	3.0*	-1.8	-.7
Quality-of-life motive	.5	4.1*	-5.1*
Language at time of migration	2.0*	.7	1.4
Language at time of interview	2.2*	2.8*	-.1
Partner (base:from CoO)			
No partner	-1.7	-1.4	-.5
Partner from CoR	-.4	.3	3.3*
Partner from 3rd country	.2	-2.2*	-2.5*
Number of CoO friends	.2	1.6	4.4*
Number of CoR friends	1.8	9.1*	-4.1*
Number of 3rd country friends	4.1*	-.5	-.4
Communication with family in CoO	1.8	.7	4.5*
Communication with friends in CoO	1.6	.0	5.6*
CoO television	1.9	.2	3.9*
CoR television	-1.0	2.0*	1.4
CoO newspapers	.3	-1.2	4.2*
CoR newspapers	4.1*	5.2*	-.9
Discrimination experience	-1.7	-7.8*	1.3
Variance migrant-group level	.023	.024	.063
Variance migrant level	.687	.486	.602

*Notes: N = 4,522; * = effect significant on the .05 level.*

The ethnic origin of the partner has no effect on the identification with the European Union. However, having a partner from a third country reduces

both CoR and CoO identifications. Surprisingly, having a partner from the CoR strengthens identification with the CoO. It must be noted that the partner effects look quite differently in the bivariate case. Upon introduction of the friendship variables, however, they partly change in a dramatic way. In the bivariate case, a partner from a third country is conducive to identification with the European Union and is also a much stronger inhibitor of CoR and CoO identifications than in the multivariate case. Having a partner from the CoR also has a positive effect on CoR identification. Still, in the bivariate case, there is no effect of having a CoR partner on CoO identification. These results – surprising at first glance – can be explained by the crucial role the ethnicity of a partner has on the friendship network. Once the latter is controlled for, particular effects of the partner might vanish or emerge. The positive impact of a CoR partner on CoO identification might arise when – if the composition of the friendship network is kept constant – the partner shows a particular interest in the migrant's CoO, which makes the latter identify even stronger with the CoO. This is a phenomenon simply out of scope in traditional migration research, which is preoccupied with simple assimilation and where the CoO is regarded of minor value, at least in the long run, even to the migrant.

In contrast to the ethnicity of the partner, the effects of the ethnic composition of the friendship network do not present any surprises. The number of friends from the CoO increases only CoO identification, while the number of friends from the CoR increases CoR identification and are detrimental to CoO identification. Finally, friends from third countries strengthen European identification only.

Frequent contacts with family members and friends in the CoO have positive effects on CoO identification only. Contrary to our expectations, their impact on identification with the European Union is not significant. The frequency of usage of CoO television impacts positively only on CoO identification (the corresponding effect on identification with the European Union is again not significant). The frequency of usage of CoR television has a positive effect on CoR identification. The frequency of reading CoO newspapers strengthens CoO identification only. It is only the usage of CoR newspapers – a more demanding task – which is related to both CoR and European identification.

Experiences of discrimination in the CoR negatively affect this country only. Possible effects related to a compensating strengthening of CoO

identification as well as a negative repercussion on identification with the European Union are not significant.

In summary, when we change the perspective from looking at independent variables to the three kinds of identification, the following general observations can be made:

Identification with the European Union is mainly enhanced by two classes of variables: (1) education, whether formal or informal, and (2) contacts to third countries and their citizens. In addition to formal education (which shows a significant effect only for the case of European identification), CoR language proficiency – both at the time of migration and at the time of the interview – and CoR newspaper usage, which probably indicates particular interest in the new environment and requires a particularly good command of the foreign language, are contributing to European identification. The importance of contacts with third countries and their citizens is exemplified here by a previous stay in a third country and contacts to third-country nationals in the CoR.

Identification with the CoR is particularly facilitated by a prolonged stay in this country, CoR language proficiency (at the time of the interview only), contacts to CoR friends, and CoR television and newspaper consumption. It is also stronger for quality-of-life migrants when compared to other motives for migration. It is negatively affected by a partner from a third country and especially by discrimination experiences. It is notable that educational effects are conspicuously absent, while for other kinds of integration (in particular, cultural and structural integration), the pivotal role of education has been demonstrated. Other variables found to be relevant for other kinds of integration, but obviously not relevant in the context of identificational integration into the CoR, include language proficiency at the time of migration, having a partner from the CoR (compared to a partner from the CoO), and a negative effect of having many friends from the CoO.

Finally, identification with the CoO is enhanced by CoO friends, frequent contacts with family and friends in the CoO as well as CoO television and newspaper consumption. It is also facilitated by a CoR partner, but inhibited by CoR friends as well as a partner from a third country. Quality-of-life migrants also show lower CoO identification.

On the individual migrant level, all variables together explain 4.8 percent of variance for European identification, 8.5 percent for CoR identification, and 5.7 percent for CoO identification. On the migrant-

group level, after the inclusion of all explanatory variables, the variance of the identification with the European Union even increases slightly. This means that the different composition of the migrant groups cannot explain the differences between these groups in the average of identification. However, on the migrant-group level, 7.7 percent of the variance of CoR identification, and 16.0 percent of the variance of CoO identification is explained by the migrant-level variables. Adding a simple dummy variable for northern (Germany and Britain) versus southern European CoOs as a macro-level variable shows that the northern European migrants have lower CoO and a slightly higher CoR identification than the southern European groups, but that there is no difference with regard to identification with the European Union.

Finally, we can compare two extreme groups with regard to some of the relevant explanatory variables: (1) Movers with university education who have already lived in a third country, have several third-country friends, speak the CoR language at least quite well, and read (at least sometimes) CoR newspapers (214 cases), and (2) movers with lower or intermediary secondary education who have never lived in a third country, have no third-country friends, speak the CoR language less than quite well, and never read CoR newspapers (145 cases). While both groups do not differ with regard to CoR identification at all (3.0) and only slightly so with regard to CoO identification (3.2 for the first and 3.3 for the second group), differences in identification with the European Union are remarkable: 3.2 for the first and 2.7 for the second group. European identification in the first group is on a similar level as national identification of the non-migrant German, British or Spanish population.

Conclusions

The migrant groups analyzed here are homogenous in so far as they all stem from highly developed member countries of the European Union and cultural and social distance to their CoRs can be safely assumed to be relatively minor. More importantly, however, is the fact that they differ markedly from traditional migrants who move mainly for economic, political or religious reasons. The demands put upon them by the receiving countries upon entry and in the course of their stay are much lower, in particular in

regard to the need to integrate into their CoRs in the usual ways, such as learning the CoR language or acquiring CoR citizenship. At the same time, they are free to go back to their CoO again or move throughout the European Union without restrictions. Under these conditions, pursuing a pure assimilation strategy with regard to the CoR would be rather counterproductive. Their identification with Europe is markedly higher than among their home-staying compatriots.

As already summarized, most of the hypotheses formulated above have been confirmed. Different mechanisms foster CoR and European identification. While CoR identification is fostered by age, duration of stay in the CoR, CoR friends, language proficiency, and media consumption, European identification grows especially with age, education, language competence, third country experience and friendship contacts as well as information seeking outside the CoO (CoR newspapers). Identification with the CoO remains strong through continued contacts with CoO family and friends and use of CoO media. Circumstantial experiences such as being discriminated or particular quality-of-life migration motives also have the expected consequences.

In more general terms, groups who make use of the new liberties in Europe, especially migrants with higher education, language proficiency, and wide social contacts can be seen to constitute a kind of vanguard in identificational attachment with Europe. To some extent, the creation of conditions encouraging movement across national borders in Europe, thus, seems to support political aims of European identity formation. Yet, as identification with Europe is complementary rather than competitive with both CoO and CoR identity, intra-European migrants appear to be able to reconcile multiple identities and find ways of multiple inclusion, transcending one-sided patterns of integration, both exclusive attachment to the CoO and assimilation to the CoR as well as marginality.

In future research, it might be helpful to distinguish between different kinds of transnationalism. In the original sense, transnationalism refers to being rooted in more than one country. Contacts to third countries and their citizens actually tend to strengthen identification with the European Union and also tend to weaken ties to both the CoR and the CoO. Thus, they prevent a too narrow form of nationalized integration into the CoR and direct the migrant to the bigger European context. Transnationalism in this sense might also transcend identification beyond the borders of the European Union (which continues to shift in any event by including ever

more countries) in the sense of a more encompassing cosmopolitanism. Unfortunately, we cannot test this on the basis of the present survey. Most of current research on transnationalism, however, has used a narrower concept. Transnationalism in this narrower sense is constituted by ties between a CoR and a CoO (in particular, contacts to family and friends in the CoO, as well as CoO media consumption) created by the behavior of migrants (Glick Schiller et al. 1992). The maintenance of ties to the CoO, however, did not prove to be a strong source of European identification, though it is clearly not detrimental to it either.

References

Braun, Michael (2010), "Foreign Language Proficiency of Intra-European Migrants: A Multilevel Analysis", *European Sociological Review* Vol. 26: 603–617.

Braun, Michael/Arsene, Camelia (2009), "The Demographics of Movers and Stayers in the European Union", in: Recchi, Ettore/Favell, Adrian (eds.), *Pioneers of European Integration. Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*, Cheltenham and Northampton: 26–51.

Braun, Michael/Santacreu, Oscar (2009), "Appendix A. Methodological Notes", in: Recchi, Ettore/Favell, Adrian (eds.), *Pioneers of European Integration. Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*, Cheltenham and Northampton: 241–254.

Bruter, Michael (2005), *Citizens of Europe? The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*, Houndmills, Basingstoke.

Carey, Sean (2002), "Undivided Loyalties: Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?", *European Union Politics* Vol. 3: 387-413.

Castles, Stephen/Miller, Mark J. (1998), *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*, Houndmills, London.

Citrin, Jack/Sides, John (2004), "More than Nationals: How Identity Choice Matters in the New Europe", in: Herrmann, Richard K./Risse, Thomas/Brewer, Marilynn B. (eds.), *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU*, Lanham: 161–185.

Deutsch, Karl W./Burrell, Sidney A./Kann, Robert A./Lee, M. Jr./Lichterman, Martin/Lindgren, Raymond E./Loewenheim, Francis, L./Van Wagenen, Richard W. (1957), *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area. International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*, Princeton NJ.

Díez Medrano, Juan (2008), *Europeanisation and the Emergence of a European society*, IBEI Working Papers 2008/12, Barcelona.

Díez Medrano, Juan (2010), *A New Society in the Making: European Integration and European Social Groups*, KGF Working Paper 12, Berlin.

Díez Medrano, Juan/Gutiérrez, Paula (2001), "Nested Identities: National and European Identities in Spain", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* Vol. 24: 753–78.

Duchesne, Sophie/Frognier, André-Paul (2002), "Sur les dynamiques sociologiques et politiques de l'identification à l'Europe", *Revue Française de Science Politique* Vol. 52: 355–373.

Esser, Hartmut (1982), "Sozialräumliche Bedingungen der sprachlichen Assimilation von Arbeitsmigranten", *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* Vol. 11, No. 3: 279–306.

Esser, Hartmut (2006), *Sprache und Integration: Die sozialen Bedingungen und Folgen des Spracherwerbs von Migranten,* Frankfurt a. M./New York.

Eurobarometer 58.1 (2007), First Edition, ZA 3693.

Favell, Adrian (2008), *Eurostars and Eurocities: Free Movement and Mobility in an Integrating Europe,* Oxford.

Fligstein, Neil (2008), *Euroclash. The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe,* Oxford.

Glick Schiller, Nina/Basch, Linda/Blanc-Santon, Cristina (1992), *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered,* New York.

Haller, Max (1994), "Epilogue. Europe as a New Nation or Community of Nations?", in: Haller, Max/Richter, Rudolph (eds.), *Toward a European Nation? Political Trends in Europe, East and West, Center and Periphery,* Armonk: 226–263.

Haller, Max (1999), "Voiceless Submission or Deliberate Choice? European Integration and the Relation between National and European Identity", in: Kriesi, Hanspeter/Armingeon, Klaus/Siegrist, Hannes/Wimmer, Andreas (eds), *Nation and National Identity. The European Experience in Perspective,* Chur: 263–295.

Immerfall, Stefan/Boehnke, Klaus/Baier, Dirk (2010), "Identity", in: Immerfall, Stefan/Therborn, Göran (eds.), *Handbook of European Societies. Social Transformations in the 21st Century,* New York: 325–353.

King, Russell (2002), "Towards a New Map of European Migration", *International Journal of Population Geography,* 8, 89–106.

King, Russell/Warnes, Anthony M./Williams, Allan M. (1998), "International Retirement Migration in Europe", *International Journal of Population Geography* Vol. 4: 157–182.

Kohli, Martin (2000), "The Battlegrounds of European Identity", *European Societies* Vol. 2: 113-137.

Kuhn, Theresa (2011), "Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism: An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory", *European Journal of Political Research* Vol. 50, No. 6: 811-837.

Mau, Steffen/Mewes, Jan/Zimmermann, Ann (2008), "Cosmopolitan Attitudes through Transnational Social Practices?", *Global Networks* Vol. 8: 1–24.

Mau, Steffen/Mewes, Jan (2010), "Horizontale Europäsierung und Identifikation mit Europa", in Soeffner, Hans-Georg (ed.), *Unsichere Zeiten: Herausforderungen gesellschaftlicher Transformationen,* Wiesbaden.

Mau, Steffen/Verwiebe, R. (2009), *Die Sozialstruktur Europas,* Konstanz.

Rabe-Hesketh, Sophia/Skrondal, Anders (2008), *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata,* 2nd edition, College Station TX: Stata Press.

Raudenbush, Stephen W./Bryk, Anthony S. (2002), *Hierarchical Linear Models,* Thousand Oaks.

Recchi, Ettore (2008), "Cross-State Mobility in the EU", *European Societies* Vol. 10: 197–224.

Recchi, Ettore/Favell, Adrian (2009) (eds.), *Pioneers of European Integration: Citizenship and Mobility in the EU,* Cheltenham.

Rother, Nina/Nebe, Tina M. (2009), "More Mobile, More European? Free Movement and EU Identity", in: Recchi, Ettore/Favell, Adrian (eds.), *Pioneers of European Integration. Citizenship and Mobility in the EU,* Cheltenham, Northampton: 120–155.

Sigalas, Emmanuel (2010), "Cross-border Mobility and European Identity: The Effectiveness of Intergroup Contact During the ERASMUS Year Abroad", *European Union Politics* Vol. 11: 241–265.

Snijders, Tom A. B./Bosker, Roel J. (1999), *Multilevel Analysis: An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Multilevel Modelling,* London.

StataCorp (2007), *STATA Longitudinal/Panel-Data Reference Manual. Release 10,* College Station TX.

Van Tubergen, Frank (2004), *The Integration of Immigrants in Cross-National Perspective: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects,* Utrecht.

Westle, Bettina (2003), "Europäische Identifikation im Spannungsfeld regionaler und nationaler Identitäten. Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Befunde", *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* Vol. 44: 453–482.