The supranational dimension of voting in national elections across six european democracies

Fulya Apaydin

Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals

Ramon Trias Fargas 25-27

Barcelona 08005,

Spain

Email: fapaydin@ibei.org

Abstract

This paper tests Albert Hirschman's exit-voice-loyalty hypothesis within a supranational context using on an original dataset from the recent EUCROSS survey conducted across six European Union democracies. It finds that supranational loyalty to an entity other than one's own nation-state enhances citizen participation in the national elections while greater transnational mobility has no significant impact on national voter turnout. These findings have two important implications. First, supranational loyalties do not always discourage individuals from honoring their national political commitments. Second, member-state nationals who are loyal to the EU may not show up at the supranational ballot box if national institutions are perceived to be more powerful to influence decision-making in Brussels.

Keywords Supranational loyalty, voting, national elections, transnational mobility, the EU

INTRODUCTION

Does supranational loyalty to a political entity other than one's own nation-state increase the likelihood of participating in national elections? More specifically, are member-country nationals who exhibit a strong connection to the EU more likely to cast a vote in general elections of their respective countries? This study goes beyond domestic dynamics to understand the voting behavior of citizens by focusing on the responses of those who are simultaneously bounded by national and supranational institutions. Though conservative politicians in some EU member-states peddle Euro-skepticism in the hopes of claiming a greater share of the votes in national elections, and support for the EU took a deep plunge to an all-time low in the aftermath of the 2008 crisis, we know very little about the

implications of citizens' supranational commitment on their decision to participate in national elections.¹ This is important because decision-making processes on national political platforms have a notable impact on the institutional configuration and performance of the EU in its bid to build an ever-closer union (Raunio 2011).

Existing studies on voting usually invoke domestic factors to explain why ordinary citizens bother to go to the ballot box when they actually have little to gain in return. The list of usual suspects is long. Individual-level variables that are expected increase the likelihood of participating in national elections include higher socio-economic status (Lijphart 1997; Verba *et al.*, 1995), a sense of civic duty (Riker and Ordeshook 1968, Blais 2000), altruism (Fowler 2006) income (Verba and Nie 1972), education (Gallego 2010), social pressure (Gerber, Green and Shachar 2003; Gerber and Rogers 2009; Gerber, Green and Larimer 2008), face-to-face mobilization (Arceneaux and Nickerson 2009; Panagopoulos 2010; 2011), age (Jankowski and Strate 1995, Goerres 2007), marital status (Kingston and Finkel 1987; Solt 2008), residential mobility (Squire, Wolfinger and Glass 1987; Highton 2000), left-wing political orientation, national loyalty (Hirschman 1970) and family background (Plutzer 2002, Fitzgerald and Curtis 2012) and habit (Franklin and Hobolt 2011). All of these studies focus exclusively on domestic dynamics and assume that voter turnout in general elections are primarily influenced by individual experiences in one's native context. However, the changing landscape in Europe adds a new layer of complexity to these individual experiences, thanks to increased cross-border mobility and supranational political engagement. Most notably, the emergence of a new group of Europeans with supranational attachments introduces new challenges to participation in general elections by way of anchoring additional political commitments beyond national borders.

Building on the recent European experience, this paper argues that there is very little reason to expect multiple political loyalties to reduce incentives for participating in national elections. In fact, the results reveal a positive and robust relationship between supranational loyalty and decision to cast a vote in the national ballot box, controlling for most theoretically relevant factors. This is a surprising yet important finding, and has major implications. On the theoretical front, the findings challenge Albert O. Hirschman's assumption that loyalty attachments beyond one's nation-state reduce the likelihood of political participation by way of incentivizing exit opportunities. Empirically,

the study demonstrates how a sense of European loyalty increases the likelihood of participating in national elections. This also suggests that factors beyond domestic dynamics may also explain voter turnout and prompt ordinary citizens to rely on national platforms to induce change.

The next section formulates the puzzle by situating the debate in relation to Albert Hirschman's seminal work *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*, and underlines a prominent paradox in this model based on the recent European experience. This is followed by a conceptual discussion on political loyalty and supranational loyalty, where we also introduce the hypothesis. The subsequent section introduces the data and the method, and includes a brief description of each variable included in the models. The last section of the paper discusses the findings and concludes by highlighting the implications of this study.

RETHINKING EXIT, VOICE AND LOYALTY IN A SUPRANATIONAL CONTEXT

According to Albert O. Hirschman, in closed systems—such as nation states—political loyalty complements and enhances individual decisions to participate in politics. In his original model, the decision to cast a vote in the ballot box (*voice*) stands at the opposite end of the spectrum of participation to the *exit* option (i.e. by way of dropping membership and leaving a group) (Hirschman 1970, 1993). According to this approach, exit and voice coexist only on very rare occasions and otherwise work to undermine each other. This is because an easy availability of exit opportunities weakens the prospects of using public voice.

However, Hirschman also suggests that an intervening variable, *loyalty*, may alter the seesaw nature of this relationship and encourage passionate citizens to participate in politics even if exit is easy and less costly. This rests on the assumption that the emotional ties of an individual (i.e. to the society, official ideology, and/or the region) foster a strong sense of attachment, and encourage citizens to voice their criticism to initiate political change along their preferences. In turn, the ability to influence decision-making processes generates a feedback effect by lowering the probability of leaving one's native environment.

Though Hirschman's later discussion accommodates the possibility of exit and voice coexisting and sometimes reinforcing one another (Hirschman 1993), the model is much more vague about the precise circumstances under which loyalty induces or subdues voice. One problem behind this confusion is a functional attribute of the concept: loyalty is designated as a factor that 'keeps exit at bay and activates voice' (Hirschman 1970). This lack of conceptual clarity serves as a breeding ground for polarized debates on the relationship between voice and loyalty. While some suggest that loyalty suppresses voice (Birch 1975, Farrell 1983), others adamantly insist that it activates it (Barry 1974, LaPonce 1974). Others propose a middle ground, identify three different types of loyalty in his work, and argue that Hirschman is more interested in a *reformist type loyalty* where members of an organization are genuinely committed to reversing a possible decline (Graham and Keeley 1992). This stands opposed to *unconscious* or *passive loyalty* where citizens maintain their emotional commitment but exhibit a greater toleration by remaining silent. Nevertheless, in all of these models, loyalty is conceptualized as an indivisible type of attachment to a single organization.

Indeed, neither Hirschman's book nor his later discussions accommodate the possibility of multiple political loyalties as compatible and his model assumes that the relationship between different types of political loyalties is mutually exclusive (Hirschman 1978). If the presence of multiple attachments is formulated as a zero-sum arrangement, an extra-territorial loyalty is expected to reduce the likelihood of political participation in one's native context by way of rendering national loyalties insignificant. Accordingly, Hirschman's framework would predict a decline in national voter turnout when citizens exhibit strong loyalty to a supranational entity, arguably because such an attachment also makes exit easier. Indeed, Hirschman's model rests on the assumption that less loyal citizens will not bother to participate in decision-making, remain silent for a while and choose to leave at the first opportunity (Hirschman 1993: 197).

However, the European experience presents a more complicated picture. Recent survey results reveal that member-country nationals exhibit a dual attachment to national and supranational entities. Surely, European institutional arrangements accommodate and encourage the coexistence of dual loyalties where supranational bodies work towards enhancing emotional ties between the member-country nationals and the EU, and actively support programs that incubate a shared European identity and commitment to European solidarity. Despite these efforts, the relationship between national and

European loyalty may not be entirely frictionless (Egeberg 1999; Trondal 2002). In that sense, the presence of dual loyalties is curious, given possible clashes and contradictions between these two different types of commitments (Delanty 2003: 124). Therefore, understanding the implications of this relationship on political participation calls for a more nuanced assessment and empirical testing of the relationship between exit, voice and loyalty.

POLITICAL LOYALTY

Deriving cues from Hirschman's discussion (1970), Judith Shklar's earlier work (Shklar 1993), and later elaborations on this concept (Dowding *et al.* 2000, Delanty 2003) we define political loyalty as a deeply affective and voluntary attachment to a political entity based on a sense of belonging/identification (Dowding *et al.* 2000) and characterized by a willingness to show solidarity. Formulated as such, political loyalty does not necessarily entail a strictly rational justification. In fact, this emotional dimension is a key factor that delineates loyalty from other similar concepts such as sheer commitment and obligation (Shklar 1993). The intensity of these sentiments may be borne out of cultural, historical and social experiences that are not necessarily political in character. In that sense, political loyalty is a non-contractual relationship that feeds off diverse acquaintances. Together, these components give individuals reasons for declaring a voluntary attachment to an entity that is recognized as legitimate by its members (Delanty 2003: 125).

In addition to emotional attachments, identification with/belonging to a community is a fundamental component of political loyalty (Dowding *et al.* 2000, Delanty 2003) because self-declared membership constitutes a basis to justify current and future political preferences. In that sense, political loyalty may manifest itself in the form of civic nationalism and/or constitutional patriotism based on self-declared identification with a political community (Habermas 1996). It must also be noted that this is different from nationalisms where ethnic ties play a more predominant role. This is because a key feature of political loyalty lies in its voluntary character (Canovan 2000: 416). Finally, solidarity is a third definitive component of political loyalty because it encourages investment in maintaining/reproducing social networks, which are necessary to sustain a dependable community (Dowding *et al.* 2000). This is because political loyalties are better secured when repeated acts of

solidarity translate into routinized cooperation with fellow group members, and thereby reproduce emotional attachments to the broader political entity over time.

European loyalty is a manifestation of political loyalty ties at the supranational level and rests on three key pillars: European identification, emotional commitment to the EU and solidarity with fellow member-country citizens. Supranational loyalty may discourage participation in national elections when it directly competes with citizens' national loyalty attachments. When this is not the case, European loyalty may generate the opposite effect by encouraging citizens to influence national decision making processes—at the very least through voting—because EU-relevant decisions taken at the national level have a direct impact on the wellbeing, efficiency and survival of the EU. In the backdrop of this discussion and assumptions, we test the following hypotheses:

H1: Greater exit opportunities decrease the likelihood of participating in national elections.

H2: Greater sense of European loyalty increases the likelihood of voting in national elections.

THE DATA AND THE MODEL

The data for this research was collected between June and October 2012 as a part of the EUCROSS project, and is based on 6000 phone interviews with randomly contacted German, Danish, Romanian, Italian, Spanish and UK nationals. These countries were selected on the basis of their varying membership status in the EU: two founding members (Germany and Italy), three older members (Denmark, the UK and Spain) and one new member (Romania). The survey includes a wide range of questions that measure the physical and virtual mobility, political participation, European identification, solidarity, cultural preferences, income, and occupation of the participants, and also provides information on the demographic background of the respondents. To test the impact of supranational loyalty on national political participation, we apply logistic regression, controlling for transnational mobility, education, income, political orientation, gender, marital status, age, family background and citizenship.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: VOTING IN NATIONAL ELECTIONS (VOICE)

The dependent variable in the model, *voting in national elections* is a binary variable and is the key measure that assesses national political participation. To measure this, the respondents were asked whether they voted in the last general elections in their country of residence.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: EUROPEAN LOYALTY

To analyze the impact of supranational loyalty on national political participation, we test our models using a European loyalty index, based on items that measure respondent's level of identification with the European identity, willingness to demonstrate solidarity with fellow nation-states (both imagined and actual) and emotional commitment to the European Union. The index includes four items and the corresponding Cronbach's alpha score is 0.54 (see Table 1a and 1b in the Supplementary Materials). The values range between 0 and 15.

CONTROL VARIABLES

TRANSNATIONAL MOBILITY (EXIT)

Unlike their counterparts in much of the rest of the world, European Union (EU) nationals can freely relocate to live and work in a member state other than their own at a significantly lower cost compared to non-EU nationals. This opportunity to exit national borders is further sponsored by EU-funded schemes. At the same time, increased transnational mobility of citizens poses new challenges to political participation at the national level especially when they move their residence to a different member-country. For example, greater cost of registration for overseas voting and geographic distance from the ballot box (Dyck and Gimpel 2005) may reduce the probability of participating in national elections. Similarly, European citizens' cross-border experiences may reduce their incentive to cast their vote by way of making exit easier and less costly.

To assess whether opportunities to exit national borders influence the voting behavior of the national electorate in a given member state, we measure transnational mobility in two ways. First, we construct a transnational mobility index, adding the responses to questions that measure physical and virtual mobility experiences as well as transnational economic ties of the respondents (See Table 2a

and 2b in the supplementary materials for a detailed description of the index components and corresponding Cronbach's alpha scores). The index is deliberately constructed as a broad measure to include not only diverse transnational background and engagements but also respondents' cross-border networks to account for opportunities for exit. Second, taking cues from Salamonska et.al. (2013) we distinguish between two distinct types of mobility and construct physical and virtual mobility indices, based on the responses to the questions in Table 3a and Table 4a in the appendix (See Table 3b and 4b for corresponding Cronbach's alpha scores).

SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS

Deriving our cues from earlier studies that highlight a significant relationship between voting and higher socio-economic status, the models also control for factors such as education (Hillygus 2005, Campbell 2009, Gallego 2010, Smets and van Ham 2013), income (Verba and Nie 1972, Brady et.al. 1995), gender (Smets and van Ham 2013), marital status (Denver 2008; Solt 2008; Smets and van Ham 2013), age and age-squared (Jankowski and Strate 1995, Goerres 2007; Cutler and Bengtson 1974) and family background (Sandell and Plutzer 2005, Pacheco 2008) (See Table 6 in the supplementary materials for the corresponding questions and scales).

POLITICAL SOPHISTICATION

A major group of scholars further propose that political sophistication is a key predictor of voting behavior. According to this argument, cognitive abilities of voters play a major role in predicting their decision to participate in elections (Luskin 1987) because, arguably, cognitive process of decision-making is largely contingent on the level of an individual's political knowledge (Gomez and Wilson 2001). Conceptualized as such, political sophistication has at least three key dimensions: '1) a sufficient cognitive capacity; 2) motive or incentives toward collecting and using accurate information and 3) opportunity, or the availability of aforementioned information' (Gordon and Segura 1997: 129). This approach predicts that greater political sophistication is likely to increase voter turnout at the national ballot box.

Though our survey questionnaire does not include items that were specifically designed to measure political sophistication constructed as such, our model includes a proxy variable that nevertheless captures the effect of cognitive capacity, motivation, and access to information. In order to control and test for this effect, we include the frequency of consuming TV content in a foreign language as a separate variable (See Table 6 in the appendix for the corresponding measurement and scales). In doing so, we assume that individuals who are frequently consuming TV content in a language other than their native tongue have broader cognitive capacity to process information, exhibit greater motivation by pushing beyond their native comfort zone and get systematic access to information.

POLITICAL ORIENTATION

Some scholars argue that the position of an individual on a left-right spectrum predicts his/her voting behavior. Existing research on this issue points to a major divide among researchers: while some find that those who are on the left end of the spectrum are more likely to participate in national elections, especially when political competition pushes left parties to mobilize their voter base (Anderson and Beramendi 2012) and/or across settings where unions are strong (Radcliff and Davis 2000), others have suggested the opposite, arguing that those who are on the right are more likely to vote (Radcliff 1994, Pacek and Radcliff 1995, Rubenson et.al. 2007). The model controls for this by including a variable that assesses the political orientation of the respondents that ranges between 1(Left) and 5 (Right).

CITIZENSHIP

Finally, citizens of some countries may be more likely to go to the ballot box than in others. This may be due to several factors such as formal rules that require citizens to vote, sheer habit or a political culture that values participation in national elections. The model controls for this by including dummy variables for countries included in the survey, and designates UK citizenship as the comparative benchmark.

RESULTS

The respondents in the sample exhibit a high level of supranational loyalty with a mean of 11.39 (sd. 2.81) on a scale between 0 and 15. This suggests that the majority of EU nationals endorses a European identity, demonstrates solidarity and is emotionally passionate about the survival of the EU. The logistic regression results reveal that there is a positive relationship between European loyalty and voting in national elections, and this is robust even when we add different control variables. As Table 1 reveals below, the base model tests the impact of European loyalty on voting in the national elections in the absence of control variables, and reveals that greater European loyalty increases the probability of a member-country national casting a vote in general elections. The relationship is positive and the coefficient is significant at $p < 0.01$. This coefficient remains significant in all models (with $p < 0.05$ in Models 5, 6, 10 and 11), following the gradual introduction of theoretically relevant control variables. The direction of the relationship is positive in all tests.

---Table 1 Here---

As further revealed by Figure 1 below, the predicted probabilities for Model 6 show the scope of loyalty effect on voting: though the rate of increase in predicted probabilities appears modest, there is clearly a steady and positive trend of increase in individual voter turnout induced by European loyalty, controlling for theoretically relevant factors.

--- Figure 1 here---

The stepwise models 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 test the relationship between European loyalty and voting in national elections, including greater exit opportunities measured as an additive index. Interestingly, the results in Model 5 reveal that transnational mobility has a negative impact on individual decisions to cast a vote in national elections. However, this significance disappears once citizenship is introduced into the picture in Model 6. This finding stands as a partial challenge to Hirschman's initial formulation: while greater exit opportunities could reduce voter participation in national elections, other factors associated with national identification may render this negative effect not significant.

Moreover, when transnational mobility is disaggregated into its virtual and physical mobility components, there are further surprising consequences. The stepwise models 7, 8 and 9 reveal that physical mobility has a highly significant and positive impact on participating in national elections, while virtual mobility has the opposite effect and significantly reduces the likelihood to cast a vote in the ballot box as revealed in Models 7, 8, 9 and 10. However, both effects cease to be significant once citizenship is introduced into the model. This suggests that the inverse direction of the relationship between greater exit opportunities and lesser political participation as predicted by Hirschman may not be as robust as anticipated. At the same time, this pattern challenges Hirschman's revised assessment (1993) about the reinforcing effect of exit on voice: as Model 11 reveals, greater virtual and/or physical exit opportunities have no significant impact on the outcome, while European loyalty continues to have a positive and highly significant effect on voting in national elections in all these models.

Perhaps not so surprisingly, income and education are highly significant and positively correlated with voting in national elections in all models. This resonates well with the findings of earlier studies, which predict higher socio-economic status to encourage political participation. Relatedly, family background plays no significant role on the probability of voting in national elections. Neither the education level of the father nor the mother predicts the future voting behavior of the respondent. Similarly, income level of the household when growing up has no significant relationship with the dependent variable.

Demographic factors mostly confirm findings reported in earlier studies. First, respondents are more likely to vote as they get older but very old age decreases the likelihood of voting in national elections for senior citizens. The results also reveal that gender plays no significant role in participating in national elections. Moreover, marital status appears to have a significant (at $p < 0.01$) and positive relationship with national political participation in all models. This supports arguments that associate marriage with a natural disposition to perform civic duties such as voting (Swaddle and Heath 1989, Denver 2008), and challenges Solt's (2008) expectation: family responsibilities, such as childcare and other relevant commitments do not necessarily discourage individuals from participating in national elections.

Interestingly, political orientation does not appear to be significant in any of the models. Though the positive sign for this variable suggests that as respondents' political preference shifts to the right of the political spectrum, they are more likely to vote in national elections—which is in line with earlier findings of Radcliff 1994; Pacek and Radcliff 1995—there is very little empirical support for this claim in our sample.

On the other hand, our proxy measure for political sophistication—TV content consumption in a foreign language—has a positive and highly significant effect on voting as revealed in Models 4, 5, 9 and 10. However, this effect also ceases to be significant once citizenship is introduced in Models 6 and 11, suggesting that the combined effect of cognitive abilities, individual motivation and access to information on voting are subject to limitations once other factors associated with national identity are taken into account. It must be also added that citizenship presents quite an erratic pattern. Taking UK citizenship as a benchmark, we see that holding a Danish citizenship is the only reliable predictor of voting in national elections. However, none of the other citizenships have a comparably significant effect on the dependent variable.

IMPLICATIONS

The positive and significant relationship between supranational loyalty and voting in national elections suggests that individual attachments beyond one's territorial borders do not necessarily discourage individuals from fulfilling national political commitments. This is promising in the context of the post-crisis EU and suggests that Euro-skepticism sentiments may not be as formidable as some critics have predicted. Our results in Table 2 reveal that level of European identification is on average high across all countries but the UK. Interestingly, the percentage of respondents who agree with the statement 'I feel European' stands highest among the Spanish who have been most hardly hit by the crisis. These findings also resonate with recent Eurobarometer survey results, where the UK and Italian citizens score lowest on European identification while more than 70% of Spanish and German citizens declare to feel themselves as a citizen of the EU (See Table 3).

--Table 2 here--

--Table 3 here--

Moreover, a strong sense of supranational loyalty may further serve to build the habit of voting by means of triggering a self-reinforcing mechanism where emotional cues (such as identification, attachment, and solidarity) turn into tools for seeking electoral rewards. This may further crystallize into institutions that popularize and designate the act of voting as the preferred means of political participation (Bartolini 2005, 37). Second, greater exit opportunities enjoyed by the EU member nationals pose to no plausible threat on reducing the propensity to vote in national elections. The European experience reveals that *ceteris paribus*, a strong sense of political loyalty overrides any possible impact of exit on voice.

Yet, our findings also heed an important warning: sustained European loyalty depends on the continuous reinforcement of European identification, emotional attachment and solidarity. Therefore, cutbacks on the scope of policies and programs that focus on these components may depreciate supranational loyalty sentiments, especially at a time when the aftershocks of the 2008 economic crisis are still strongly felt among the public. This may partly reduce the motivation to vote by means of preventing the build-up of strong political attachments.

On a final note, a willingness to participate in national elections among European loyalists may also explain why voter turnout in European parliamentary elections is steadily on the decline since 1979 despite respondents' favorable statements that endorse European ideals. Existing works that explain this lack of interest in European elections put the emphasis on the weakness of European identification and emotional commitment to the EU (Hobolt et.al. 2009), and argue that those who least identify with Europe are less likely to participate in European parliament elections (Studlar et.al. 2003). These studies predict that citizens with such a parochial profile are more likely to voice their political preferences on national platforms (Carey 2002). Others invoke cognitive mobilization hypothesis, suggesting that those who are more informed about European politics and exhibit a fundamental understanding of how decision-making processes work are likely to turn up at the European ballot box (Inglehart and Rabier 1978; Fisher et.al. 2008). In reality, however, this relationship may be more complex: member-state nationals who exhibit loyalty to the EU may not show up at the supranational ballot-box if national institutions are perceived to offer more powerful

tools to influence decision-making processes in Brussels.² Under these circumstances, a sense of European loyalty may rather push citizens to voice their concerns on national political platforms.

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted as a part of ‘The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third Country Citizens’ (EUCROSS) project, funded by the 7th framework programme (Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities, Activity 8.5. The Citizen in the European Union, Section 8.5.2. Diversities and Commonalities in Europe). The author would like to thank Juan Diez Medrano, Ettore Recchi, Adrian Favell, Laurie Hanquinet, Steffen Poetschke, Irina Ciornei, Teresa Kuhn, Javier Polavieja, Dimitru Sandu, Michael Braun, Mike Savage, participants at the EUCROSS panels at the Council for European Studies Conference (2014), all the EUCROSS team-members, the two anonymous reviewers and the editorial committee for their comments and feedback on earlier versions of this paper. All errors are my own.

Notes

¹For declining level of public support for the EU based on a 2013 Eurobarometer survey, see <http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/394854/Support-for-the-EU-plunges-to-all-time-low-across-Europe>

² For example, Raunio and Wiberg (2009) find that national political platforms of member countries are increasingly occupied by issues pertaining to the EU even though national political parties are less cohesive on European integration (Raunio 2011)

References

- Anderson, .C J. and Beramendi, P. (2012) ‘Left Parties, Poor Voters and Electoral Participation in Advanced Industrialized Societies.’ *Comparative Political Studies*. 45(6): 714-746.
- Arceneaux, K and Nickerson, D W. (2009) ‘Who Is Mobilized to Vote? A Re-Analysis of 11 Field Experiments.’ *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (1): 1–16.
- Barry, B. (1974) ‘Review Article: ‘Exit, Voice, and Loyalty.’’ *British Journal of Political Science* 4 (01): 79–107.
- Birch, A. H. (1975) ‘Economic Models in Political Science: The Case of ‘Exit Voice, and Loyalty.’’ *British Journal of Political Science* 5 (01): 69–82.

- Blais, A. (2000) *To Vote Or Not to Vote?: The Merits and Limits of Rational Choice Theory*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Campbell, D. E. (2009) 'Civic Engagement and Education: An Empirical Test of the Sorting Model.' *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (4): 771–86.
- Canovan, M. (2000) 'Patriotism is not Enough' *British Journal of Political Science* 30(3): 413–432.
- Carey, S. (2002) 'Undivided Loyalties Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?' *European Union Politics* 3 (4): 387–413.
- Cutler, N. E., and Bengtson, V. L. (1974) 'Age and Political Alienation: Maturation, Generation and Period Effects.' *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 415 (1): 160–75.
- Delanty, G. (2003) 'Loyalty and the European Union' In M. Waller and A. Linklater (eds.) *Political Loyalty and the Nation-State*. London: Routledge, pp. 123–136.
- Denver, D. (2008) 'Another Reason to Support Marriage? Turnout and the Decline of Marriage in Britain.' *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 10 (4): 666–80.
- Dowding, K, John P. Mergoupis, T. and Van Vugt, M. (2000) 'Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Analytic and Empirical Developments.' *European Journal of Political Research*. 37: 469–495.
- Downs, A. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dyck, J. J. and Gimpel, J. G. (2005) 'Distance, Turnout, and the Convenience of Voting.' *Social Science Quarterly* 86 (3): 531–48.
- Egeberg, M. (1999) 'Transcending Intergovernmentalism? Identity and Role Perceptions of National Officials in EU Decision-Making.' *Journal of European Public Policy* 6 (3): 456–74.
- Farrell, D. (1983) 'Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect as Responses to Job Dissatisfaction: A Multidimensional Scaling Study.' *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (4): 596–607.
- Fisher, S., Phillips, L. L., Hobolt, S.B. and Curtice, J. (2008) 'Disengaging voters? Do plurality systems discourage the less knowledgeable from voting?' *Electoral Studies* 27, 89–104.
- Fitzgerald, J., and Curtis, A. K. (2012) 'Partisan Discord in the Family and Political Engagement: A Comparative Behavioral Analysis.' *The Journal of Politics* 74 (01): 129–41.
- Fowler, H. J. (2006) 'Altruism and Turnout.' *Journal of Politics* 68 (3): 674–83.
- Gallego, A. (2010) 'Understanding Unequal Turnout: Education and Voting in Comparative Perspective.' *Electoral Studies* 29 (2): 239–48.
- Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P. and Larimer, C. W. 2008. 'Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment.' *American Political Science Review* 102 (01): 33–48.
- Gerber, A. S., Green, D. P. and Shachar, R. (2003) 'Voting May Be Habit-Forming: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment.' *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (3): 540–50.
- Gerber, Alan S., and Rogers, T. (2009) 'Descriptive Social Norms and Motivation to Vote: Everybody's Voting and so Should You.' *The Journal of Politics* 71 (01): 178–91.
- Goerres, A. (2007) 'Why Are Older People More Likely to Vote? The Impact of Ageing on Electoral Turnout in Europe.' *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 9 (1): 90–121.
- Gomez, B. T. and Wilson, M. J. (2001) 'Political Sophistication and Economic Voting in the American Electorate: A Theory of Heterogeneous Attribution.' *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 899–914.
- Gordon, S. B. and Segura, G. M. (1997) 'Cross-National Variation in the Political Sophistication of Individuals: Capability or Choice?' *Journal of Politics* 59(1): 126–147.
- Graham, J.W., and Keeley, M. (1992) 'Hirschman's Loyalty Construct.' *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 5 (3): 191–200.
- Habermas, J. (1996) *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Highton, B. (2000) 'Residential Mobility, Community Mobility, and Electoral Participation.' *Political Behavior* 22 (2): 109–20.
- Hillygus, D. S. (2005) 'The Missing Link: Exploring the Relationship Between Higher Education and Political Engagement.' *Political Behavior* 27 (1): 25–47.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . (1978) 'Exit, Voice, and the State.' *World Politics* 31 (01): 90–107.
- . (1993) 'Exit, Voice, and the Fate of the German Democratic Republic: An Essay in Conceptual History.' *World Politics* 45 (02):
- Hobolt, S., Spoon, J.J. and Tilley, J. (2009) 'A Vote Against Europe? Explaining Defection at the 1999 and 2004 European Parliament Elections' *British Journal of Political Science*. 39(1): 93–115.
- Jankowski, T. B., and Strate, J. M. (1995) 'Modes of Participation over the Adult Life Span.' *Political Behavior* 17 (1): 89–106.
- Kingston, P. W. and Finkel, S. E. (1987) 'Is There a Marriage Gap in Politics?' *Journal of Marriage and Family* 49 (1): 57–64.
- Lijphart, A. (1997) 'Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma.' *The American Political Science Review* 91 (1): 1–14.
- Luskin, R. C. (1987) 'Measuring Political Sophistication.' *American Journal of Political Science*. 34:1, 856–899.
- Pacek, A. and Radcliff, B. (1995) 'Turnout and the Vote for Left-of-Centre Parties: a cross-national analysis.' *British Journal of Political Science*. 25(1): 137–143.
- Pacheco, J. S. (2008) 'Political Socialization in Context: The Effect of Political Competition on Youth Voter Turnout.' *Political Behavior* 30 (4): 415–36.
- Panagopoulos, C. (2010) 'Affect, Social Pressure and Prosocial Motivation: Field Experimental Evidence of the Mobilizing Effects of Pride, Shame and Publicizing Voting Behavior.' *Political Behavior* 32 (3): 369–86.
- Plutzer, E. (2002) 'Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood.' *American Political Science Review* 96 (01): 41–56.
- Radcliff, B. (1994) 'Reward without Punishment: economic conditions and the vote.' *Political Research Quarterly*. 47(3): 721–731.
- Radcliff, B. and Patricia Davis. (2000) 'Labor Organization and Electoral Participation in Industrial Democracies.' *American Journal of Political Science*. 44 (1): 132–141.
- Raunio, T. (2011) 'The Gatekeepers of European Integration? The Functions of National Parliaments in the EU Political System.' *Journal of European Integration*, 33 (3): 303–321.
- Raunio, T. and Wiberg, M. (2009) 'How to measure the Europeanisation of a National Legislature.' *Scandinavian Political Studies*. 33(1): 74–92.
- Riker, W. H. and Ordeshook, P. C. (1968) 'A Theory of the Calculus of Voting.' *The American Political Science Review* 62 (1): 25–42.
- Rubenson, D., Blais, B., Fournier, P., Gidengil, E. and Nevitte, N. (2007) 'Does low turnout matter? Evidence from the 2000 Canadian Federal Election.' *Electoral Studies*. 26(3): 589–597.
- Salamońska, J., Baglioni, L. and Recchi, E. (2013) Navigating the European Space: Physical and Virtual Forms of Cross-Border Mobility among EU Citizens. EUCROSS working paper 5.
- Sandell, J. and Plutzer, E. (2005) 'Families, Divorce and Voter Turnout in the US.' *Political Behavior* 27 (2): 133–62.
- Shklar, J. (1993) 'Obligation, Loyalty, Exile' *Political Theory*, 21(2): 181–197.
- Smets, K. and van Ham, C. (2013) 'The Embarrassment of Riches? A Meta-Analysis of Individual-

Level Research on Voter Turnout.' *Electoral Studies* 32 (2): 344–59.

Solt, F. (2008) 'Economic Inequality and Democratic Political Engagement.' *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (1): 48–60.

Squire, P., Wolfinger, R. E. and Glass, D. P. (1987) 'Residential Mobility and Voter Turnout.' *The American Political Science Review* 81 (1): 45–65.

Swaddle, K. and Heath, A. (1989) 'Official and reported turnout in the British general election of 1987.' *British Journal of Political Science*, 19(4): 537–551.

Trondal, J. (2002) 'Beyond the EU Membership-Non-Membership Dichotomy? Supranational Identities among National EU Decision-Makers.' *Journal of European Public Policy* 9 (3): 468–87.

Verba, S. and Nie, N. H. (1972) *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Verba, S., Lehman Schlozman, K. and Brady, H. E. (1995) *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

About the Author

Fulya Apaydin is AXA Research Fund postdoctoral fellow at Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals, Barcelona, Spain. She specializes in comparative politics and political economy of development. Previously, Fulya worked as a Postdoctoral Researcher as a part of "The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third Country Citizens" (EUCROSS) project, funded by the 7th framework programme (Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities, Activity 8.5. The Citizen in the European Union, Section 8.5.2. Diversities and Commonalities in Europe)

Appendix. Supplementary Materials (see the attached file)

Table 1. The impact of European loyalty on voting in national elections. Logistic regression results, standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
European Loyalty	0.0782*** (0.0124)	0.0774*** (0.0125)	0.0597*** (0.0159)	0.0588*** (0.0159)	0.0428** (0.0201)	0.0456** (0.0212)	0.0842*** (0.0126)	0.0641*** (0.0159)	0.0635*** (0.0160)	0.0472** (0.0201)	0.0455** (0.0213)
Transnational Mobility Index		0.00228 (0.00482)	-0.00397 (0.00689)	-0.0126 (0.00758)	-0.0198** (0.00923)	-0.0141 (0.00950)					
Virtual Mobility							-0.0355*** (0.00753)	-0.0261*** (0.00926)	-0.0395*** (0.0101)	-0.0442*** (0.0122)	-0.0250 (0.0130)
Physical Mobility							0.0951*** (0.0149)	0.0644*** (0.0194)	0.0593*** (0.0195)	0.0463 (0.0238)	0.00916 (0.0264)
Income			0.312*** (0.0439)	0.313*** (0.0440)	0.296*** (0.0542)	0.224*** (0.0573)		0.276*** (0.0451)	0.274*** (0.0452)	0.255*** (0.0559)	0.217*** (0.0578)
Education			0.249*** (0.0358)	0.252*** (0.0359)	0.259*** (0.0436)	0.288*** (0.0449)		0.248*** (0.0356)	0.250*** (0.0357)	0.253*** (0.0432)	0.283*** (0.0445)
Gender			0.00369 (0.0880)	-0.00324 (0.0881)	-0.0223 (0.108)	0.0194 (0.109)		0.0130 (0.0883)	0.00744 (0.0885)	-0.00750 (0.108)	0.0248 (0.109)
Marital Status			0.472*** (0.0980)	0.479*** (0.0981)	0.505*** (0.122)	0.518*** (0.124)		0.480*** (0.0981)	0.490*** (0.0982)	0.521*** (0.122)	0.521*** (0.124)
Age			0.140*** (0.0155)	0.144*** (0.0156)	0.146*** (0.0190)	0.149*** (0.0193)		0.140*** (0.0156)	0.145*** (0.0156)	0.148*** (0.0190)	0.150*** (0.0193)
Age2			-0.00101*** (0.000151)	-0.00104*** (0.000152)	-0.00105*** (0.000185)	-0.00109*** (0.000187)		-0.00101*** (0.000151)	-0.00105*** (0.000151)	-0.00107*** (0.000184)	-0.00110*** (0.000187)
Father's education			0.0101 (0.0416)	0.00874 (0.0417)	0.0154 (0.0495)	0.00955 (0.0502)		0.00270 (0.0419)	0.000116 (0.0419)	0.00586 (0.0497)	0.00779 (0.0503)
Mother's education			0.0469 (0.0444)	0.0386 (0.0445)	0.0694 (0.0533)	0.0348 (0.0548)		0.0264 (0.0447)	0.0142 (0.0450)	0.0433 (0.0539)	0.0292 (0.0550)
Income when 14			-0.0343 (0.0477)	-0.0350 (0.0477)	-0.000582 (0.0592)	-0.0325 (0.0600)		-0.0554 (0.0480)	-0.0585 (0.0481)	-0.0236 (0.0596)	-0.0391 (0.0602)
TV consumption in original language				0.0965*** (0.0360)	0.116*** (0.0446)	0.0461 (0.0491)			0.116*** (0.0362)	0.130*** (0.0448)	0.0551 (0.0494)
Political orientation					0.0537 (0.0416)	0.0780 (0.0428)				0.0612 (0.0415)	0.0795 (0.0428)
Danish						1.034*** (0.246)					1.007*** (0.247)
German						0.338 (0.198)					0.314 (0.199)
Italian						0.169 (0.204)					0.188 (0.206)
Romanian						-0.339 (0.205)					-0.273 (0.218)
Spanish						0.154 (0.198)					0.195 (0.202)
Constant	0.886*** (0.141)	0.861*** (0.150)	-5.125*** (0.464)	-5.198*** (0.465)	-5.089*** (0.592)	-5.105*** (0.620)	0.827*** (0.147)	-4.922*** (0.467)	-5.016*** (0.469)	-4.980*** (0.594)	-5.122*** (0.619)

Observations	6,016	6,016	5,164	5,164	4,240	4,240	6,016	5,164	5,164	4,240	4,240
--------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Table 2. Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I feel European’ (Values in %), Source: EUCROSS data.

	Germany	Denmark	UK	Italy	Romania	Spain
None	0.5	0.3	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.5
Strongly disagree	3.9	5.62	20.38	6.3	9.6	4.1
Somewhat disagree	5.89	6.61	16.38	8.2	9.8	5.3
Neither agree nor disagree	20.18	19.03	25.47	18.1	19.8	15.7
Somewhat agree	25.37	25.74	21.18	18.6	12.8	21
Strongly agree	44.16	42.7	15.68	47.9	47.4	53.4
Total ‘Agree’	69.53	68.44	36.86	66.5	60.2	74.4

Table 3. Distribution of responses to the following statement: ‘You feel you are a citizen of the EU.’ Source: Eurobarometer 2014 December (Values in %)

	Germany	Denmark	UK	Italy	Romania	Spain
Total No	25	25	49	51	29	28
DK	1	1	1	2	3	1
Total Yes	74	74	50	47	68	71

Figure 1. Predicted probabilities of the effect of European loyalty (measured on a scale from 0 to 15) on voting in national elections

Supplementary Materials for the Online Appendix

Table 1a. Items included in the European loyalty index

	Question	Range
Item 1	On a scale from one to five, where one means “strongly disagree” and five means “strongly agree”, please tell me how much you agree with the following statements? “I feel European”	None=0, strongly disagree=1...2...3....4...strongly agree=5
Item 2	Now please 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?	Only the respective country=1 All member states of the European=2
Item 3	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?	None=0, strongly disagree=1...2...3....4...strongly agree=5
Item 4	If you were told tomorrow that the European Union had been dissolved, would you be sorry about it, indifferent or relieved?	Sorry=3 Indifferent=2 Relieved=1 None=0

Table 1b. Corresponding Cronbach’s Alpha Scores for European Loyalty Index

	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Sign</i>	<i>Item-test correlation</i>	<i>Item-rest correlation</i>	<i>Average interitem correlation</i>	<i>Alpha</i>
Item 1	6016	+	0.6265	0.2961	0.2492	0.4989
Item 2	6016	+	0.6147	0.2797	0.2594	0.5124
Item 3	6016	+	0.6734	0.3636	0.2085	0.4415
Item 4	6016	+	0.6836	0.3787	0.1997	0.4282
Test scale					0.2292	0.5433

Table 2a. Items included in the transnational mobility index

Item	Question	Range
Item 1	The citizenship of which country or countries do you hold?	Cont. numeric value
Item 2	Have you ever lived in another country for three or more consecutive months before you turned 18?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 3	Please think about all your journeys abroad before you turned 18 (e.g. with your parents, other relatives, school or alone). How many countries did you visit before you turned 18?	None=0 One=1 Two=2 Three-Five=3 Six-Ten=4 More than ten=5
Item 4	Have you lived in another country for three or more consecutive months since you turned 18?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 5	Have you ever (e.g. as student or during your professional career) participated in an international exchange program that has been funded or co-funded by the European Union?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 6	Please think of trips abroad which included at least one overnight stay. How many of these trips have you had in the past 24 months?	None=0 One=1 Two=2 Three-Five=3 Six-Ten=4 More than ten=5
Item 7	Please think about all family members, in-laws and friends you have who live in [CoR]. I would like to know how many are originally from other countries	A lot=2 A few=1 None=0
Item 8	Do you have any family members, in-laws or friends who live outside [CoR]?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 9	Please think about the last 12 months: How frequently did you talk to family members, in-laws and friends abroad by phone or using your computer?	Everyday=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 10	And how frequently did you communicate with them by mail or e-mail?	Everyday=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0

Item 11	And how frequently via social networks? (e.g. Facebook, Hi5, Google+ etc)	Everyday=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 12	In general, irrespective of the level of your knowledge, have you ever learned any other language besides <<your native language and>> [official language of CoR]?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 13	Which other languages have you learned?	Cont. numeric value
Item 14	Please think about all private <u>and</u> business related messages you received by e-mail and, if you use them, via social networking sites during the last 12 months. Approximately which percentage of them came from abroad (excluding spam and junk messages)?	1 "Between 0-25%" 2 "Between 26-50%" 3 "Between 51-75%" 4 "Between 76-100%"
Item 15	In the last 12 months, have you in your spare time been active in any organization or group which is oriented towards other countries or cultures? (e.g. voluntary relief organizations, cultural associations, Salsa clubs etc.)	Yes=1 No=0
Item 16	Do you ever send money abroad for reasons other than purchasing goods or services?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 17	How often?	At least once a month=3 At least once a year=2 Less than once a year=1 None=0
Item 18	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?	Yes=1 No=0
	Yes from partner	
Item 19	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country? Yes from close relatives	Yes=1 No=0
Item 20	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?	Yes=1 No=0

Table 2b.
Corresponding
Cronbach's
Alpha
Scores for
Transnational
Mobility
Index

“Yes from other relatives”		
Item 21	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?	Yes=1 No=1
“Yes from other persons”		
Item 22	Do you <<or your partner>> own property in [CoR] or another country?	Yes=1 No=0
“Yes in another country”		
Item 23	Thinking about the last 12 months, have you purchased any goods or services from sellers or providers who were located abroad? That is, for example, via websites, mail, phone, etc.	Yes=1 No=0
Item 24	And do you follow sports on an international level or in another country (e.g. watching matches of the German Bundesliga or the Formula-One world championship)?	Yes, at least once a week=3 Yes, at least once a month=2 Yes, but less often=1 No=0
Item 25	The following question is about TV content (e.g. movies, sitcoms, news broadcasts etc.) in other languages than [official CoR language] <<and your native language>>: How often do you watch TV content which is in another language and <u>has not been dubbed</u>, either directly on TV or via the Internet?	Every day=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 26	In your work, how often did you interact with people (e.g. business partners, clients, colleagues) who are located in another country than [CoR] during the last 12 months?	Every day=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0

<i>Item</i>	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Sign</i>	<i>Item-test correlation</i>	<i>Item-rest correlation</i>	<i>Average Interitem correlation</i>	<i>Alpha</i>
Item 1	6016	+	0.1919	0.0858	0.0985	0.7321

Item 2	6016 +	0.2651	0.1614	0.0962	0.727
Item 3	6016 +	0.4063	0.3109	0.0919	0.7166
Item 4	6016 +	0.3876	0.2909	0.0924	0.718
Item 5	6016 +	0.2641	0.1604	0.0963	0.727
Item 6	6016 +	0.4954	0.4079	0.0891	0.7098
Item 7	6016 +	0.3038	0.2019	0.095	0.7242
Item 8	6016 +	0.5093	0.4232	0.0887	0.7087
Item 9	6016 +	0.5857	0.5082	0.0863	0.7025
Item 10	6016 +	0.5923	0.5157	0.0861	0.7019
Item 11	6016 +	0.5051	0.4185	0.0888	0.709
Item 12	6016 +	0.393	0.2966	0.0923	0.7176
Item 13	6016 +	0.501	0.414	0.0889	0.7093
Item 14	6016 +	0.4169	0.3223	0.0915	0.7158
Item 15	6016 +	0.3063	0.2046	0.095	0.724
Item 16	6016 +	0.3977	0.3016	0.0921	0.7173
Item 17	6016 +	0.3885	0.2918	0.0924	0.718
Item 18	6016 +	0.161	0.0542	0.0995	0.7342
Item 19	6016 +	0.1788	0.0724	0.0989	0.733
Item 20	6016 +	0.1772	0.0707	0.099	0.7331
Item 21	6016 +	0.218	0.1126	0.0977	0.7303
Item 22	6016 +	0.2711	0.1676	0.0961	0.7265
Item 23	6016 +	0.4088	0.3136	0.0918	0.7164
Item 24	6016 +	0.1867	0.0804	0.0987	0.7324
Item 25	6016 +	0.4297	0.3362	0.0911	0.7149
Item 26	6016 +	0.3691	0.271	0.093	0.7194
Test scale				0.0934	0.7281

Table 3a. Items included in the physical mobility index

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

Table 3b. Corresponding Cronbach's Alpha Scores for Physical Mobility Index

<i>Item</i>	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Sign</i>	<i>Item-test correlation</i>	<i>Item-rest correlation</i>	<i>Average Interitem correlation</i>	<i>Alpha</i>
Item 1	6016	+	0.5217	0.1934	0.1708	0.4517
Item 2	6016	+	0.6318	0.3379	0.1189	0.3505
Item 3	6016	+	0.5716	0.2569	0.1472	0.4085
Item 4	6016	+	0.4575	0.1161	0.2011	0.5017
Item 5	6016	+	0.6459	0.3577	0.1122	0.3358
Test scale					0.15	0.4688

Table 4a. Items included in the virtual mobility index

Item	Question	Range
Item 1	Please think about all family members, in-laws and friends you have who live in [CoR]. I would like to know how many are originally from other countries	A lot=2 A few=1 None=0
Item 2	Do you have any family members, in-laws or friends who live outside [CoR]?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 3	Please think about the last 12 months: How frequently did you talk to family members, in-laws and friends abroad by phone or using your computer?	Everyday=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 4	And how frequently did you communicate with them by mail or e-mail?	Everyday=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 5	And how frequently via social networks? (e.g. Facebook, Hi5, Google+ etc)	Everyday=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 6	Please think about all private <u>and</u> business related messages you received by e-mail and, if you use them, via social networking sites during the last 12 months. Approximately which percentage of them came from abroad (excluding spam and junk messages)?	1 "Between 0-25%" 2 "Between 26-50%" 3 "Between 51-75%" 4 "Between 76-100%"
Item 7	In the last 12 months, have you in your spare time been active in any organization or group which is oriented towards other countries or cultures? (e.g. voluntary relief organizations, cultural associations, Salsa clubs etc.)	Yes=1 No=0
Item 8	Do you ever send money abroad for reasons other than purchasing goods or services?	Yes=1 No=0
Item 9	How often?	At least once a month=3 At least once a year=2 Less than once a year=1 None=0
Item 10	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in	Yes=1 No=0

	another country?	
	Yes from partner	
Item 11	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?	Yes=1 No=0
	Yes from close relatives	
Item 12	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?	Yes=1 No=0
	“Yes from other relatives”	
Item 13	In the last 12 months, have you received money from someone who is living in another country?	Yes=1 No=1
	“Yes from other persons”	
Item 14	Thinking about the last 12 months, have you purchased any goods or services from sellers or providers who were located abroad? That is, for example, via websites, mail, phone, etc.	Yes=1 No=0
Item 15	And do you follow sports on an international level or in another country (e.g. watching matches of the German Bundesliga or the Formula-One world championship)?	Yes, at least once a week=3 Yes, at least once a month=2 Yes, but less often=1 No=0
Item 16	The following question is about TV content (e.g. movies, sitcoms, news broadcasts etc.) in other languages than [official CoR language] <<and your native language>>: How often do you watch TV content which is in another language and <u>has not been dubbed</u>, either directly on TV or via the Internet?	Every day=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0
Item 17	In your work, how often did you interact with people (e.g. business partners, clients, colleagues) who are located in another country than [CoR] during the last 12	Every day=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0

months?

Table 4b. Corresponding Cronbach's Alpha Scores for Virtual Mobility Index

<i>Item</i>	<i>Obs</i>	<i>Sign</i>	<i>Item-test correlation</i>	<i>Item-rest correlation</i>	<i>Average Interitem correlation</i>	<i>Alpha</i>
Item 1	6016	+	0.3574	0.2186	0.1073	0.6578
Item 2	6016	+	0.5839	0.4729	0.0945	0.6255
Item 3	6016	+	0.6703	0.5755	0.0897	0.6118
Item 4	6016	+	0.6468	0.5472	0.091	0.6156
Item 5	6016	+	0.5797	0.4681	0.0948	0.6262
Item 6	6016	+	0.4422	0.3115	0.1025	0.6463
Item 7	6016	+	0.3213	0.1799	0.1093	0.6626
Item 8	6016	+	0.4427	0.3121	0.1025	0.6462
Item 9	6016	+	0.438	0.3069	0.1027	0.6469
Item 10	6016	+	0.2029	0.0559	0.116	0.6773
Item 11	6016	+	0.2455	0.1	0.1136	0.6721
Item 12	6016	+	0.2116	0.0648	0.1155	0.6763
Item 13	6016	+	0.2485	0.103	0.1134	0.6718
Item 14	6016	+	0.3663	0.2283	0.1068	0.6567
Item 15	6016	+	0.2492	0.1038	0.1134	0.6717
Item 16	6016	+	0.3779	0.2409	0.1061	0.6551
Item 17	6016	+	0.3663	0.2282	0.1068	0.6567
Test scale					0.105	0.6661

Table 5. Socio-economic indicators

Question/Description	Scale
Gender	Male=1, Female=0
Marital status	Married=1, Otherwise=0
Which of the following descriptions comes closest to how you feel about how well off your household is today?	We are living very comfortably on the money we have=5 We are living comfortably on the money we have=4 We make ends meet=3 We find it difficult=2 We find it very difficult=1
Education level of the respondent	Primary education or less=1 Lower secondary education=2 In-between lower and higher secondary e=3 Higher secondary education (university)=4 Lower tertiary education=5 Higher tertiary education=6
Education level of the father	Primary education or less=1 Lower secondary education=2 In-between lower and higher secondary e=3 Higher secondary education (university)=4 Lower tertiary education=5 Higher tertiary education=6
Education level of the mother	Primary education or less=1 Lower secondary education=2 In-between lower and higher secondary e=3 Higher secondary education (university)=4 Lower tertiary education=5 Higher tertiary education=6
Which of the following descriptions comes closest to how you feel about how well off your household was when you were 14?	We were living very comfortably on the money we had=5 We were living comfortably on the money we had=4 We made ends meet=3 We found it difficult=2 We found it very difficult=1

Table 6. Proxy question for measuring political sophistication

<p>The following question is about TV content (e.g. movies, sitcoms, news broadcasts etc.) in other languages than [official CoR language] <<and your native language>>:</p> <p>How often do you watch TV content which is in another language and <u>has not been dubbed</u>, either directly on TV or via the Internet?</p>	<p>Every day=4 At least once a week=3 At least once a month=2 Less often=1 Never=0</p>
---	--

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics

VARIABLES	(1) N	(2) mean	(3) sd	(4) min	(5) max
Voting in national elections	6,016	0.853	0.354	0	1
European Loyalty	6,016	11.39	2.811	0	15
Transnationalism Index	6,016	15.18	7.707	1	50
Virtual Mobility Index	6,016	7.630	5.138	0	30
Physical Mobility Index	6,016	3.004	2.788	0	12
Income	6,016	3.492	1.031	0	5
Education	6,005	3.843	1.511	0	6
Gender	6,016	0.485	0.500	0	1
Marital Status	5,981	0.594	0.491	0	1
Age	5,951	51.31	16.34	20	94
Father's Education	5,395	2.714	1.548	1	6
Mother's Education	5,555	2.449	1.444	1	6
Household Income 14	5,953	3.506	0.981	1	5
TV content consumption in original language	6016	1.207	1.446	0	4
Political Orientation	4,856	2.821	1.263	1	5
Danish Citizenship	6,016	0.168	0.374	0	1
German Citizenship	6,016	0.167	0.373	0	1
Italian Citizenship	6,016	0.167	0.373	0	1
Romanian Citizenship	6,016	0.167	0.373	0	1
Spanish Citizenship	6,016	0.166	0.372	0	1