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Abstract

This thesis explores the current attitude towards EU migrants and seeks to understand what role job mobility and European identity play in the current “pre-crisis recovery era”. Europe seems to be divided in two ideological factions having on one side eurosceptics who try to curb and terminate the law of freedom of movement and describe migration as a threat to their country and on the other side a pro-Europe movements who claim support for a more “unified” Europe. For a lot of young people (mainly the Millennial or Y generation) matters of the European Union seem to be quite theoretical and there is little they feel connected to. I conducted quantitative and qualitative interviews to summarize and analyze their hopes and aspirations and to determine what young Millennials expect and think about the future European Union.
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1. Introduction

*Migrant policy, at whatever level it is developed, has to address the reality that European countries have become countries of immigration. Immigrants, asylum-seekers and refugees are present and are challenging the myth of national cultural homogeneity. They are a multicultural presence in everyday practice, and are indicative of the fact that cultural identity is not constant but variable* (Martiniello, 1997; Cesari, 1997)

*(Jef Huysmans)*

With the major enlargement of the European Union in 2004, which saw the admission of new member states including Hungary, a lot of changes and opportunities occurred but with it also problems and difficulties in the labour sphere. The aim of this thesis is to investigate the pattern of job mobility and free movement in Europe comparing new EU countries to old ones as well as crisis hit countries\(^1\) to countries with a relatively stable economy\(^2\) and what role European identity plays in it. Ten states joined the EU in 2004 after a long process of reuniting a separated Europe which was divided for half a century through the iron curtain and huge economic differences (Europa.eu, 2015).

A lot more possibilities opened up in terms of employment and with it the chance of job mobility in almost all European countries. The “freedom of movement” is an important concept in the EU regulations and enables every citizen of the European Union to move freely between the member states. Freedom of movement is enshrined within the EU and was established in 1957/58 in the Rome Treaty for the European Economic Community and was adjusted a few times in the following years regarding the following enlargements and establishment of the European Union. The latest

---

\(^1\) Crisis hit countries will refer in the whole thesis to the EU countries who were getting IMF loans: Greece, Latvia, Romania, Poland, Lithuania, Portugal, Spain, Cyprus, Hungary, Slovakia, Ireland are included in my data.

\(^2\) Economically stable countries will refer in the whole thesis to the countries who did not need loans: Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Sweden, UK, Finland, Denmark are included in my data

regulation in 2004 states that every EU citizen has the right to live three months in an EU member country after this period a proof of work, education or family status is required. Together with the free movement of goods, services and capital it is part of the four fundamental rights in the Union (Europa.eu, 2015).

1. Figure: Increase in the number of EU mobile workers after EU enlargement

Now young people (the so called “millennial generation”) are entering the job market. Several key questions can be explored on this issue. How popular is working in another country and how many and who will take advantage of such opportunities? What are the consequences of the policy of free movement in the EU, what are the main reasons millennials move to other countries and how is it supported by the national governments?

This thesis seeks to find out what connections and which consequences have occurred due to these changes of policies, the enlargement and the crisis. Is society changing as well? Are people more open minded and cosmopolitan? And to which degree is the success of job mobility and European identity correlated with the entering of the millennial generation into the job market? Is it the start of a “new Europe”?

This thesis explores in detail the views, hopes and aspirations of potential young job migrants. To this end the research examines a case study based on a recent high profile policy debate and a small number of qualitative interviews with young people and a bigger sample in the form of an online survey, which includes the cultural, social and
economic views of Millennials from crisis hit countries on one side, and economic stable countries on the other.

The thesis also investigates the importance of European identity and assesses whether Millennials - who were raised in the EU- really feel like European citizens. Also here the thesis will analyze on a comparative basis. The Eurobarometer 81 (Eurobarometer 81, 2014) conducted a survey about European citizenship. According to that, European identity is rising across Europe. This could be correlated to job mobility and higher tolerance to migrants from other EU countries.

2. Figure: European Identity

![European Identity](Source: Eurobarometer 81, 2014)

However, it should be noted that there is some opposition to the free movement of labour within the EU. In the UK for example the conservative Prime minister David Cameron tried to violate the law of free movement by setting up migration restrictions to limit the migrants coming especially from the new EU countries. (The Guardian, 2014). Because of the fear of misuse of social benefits many old EU countries tend to be afraid of a “wave” of migrants from Romania, Bulgaria, Poland etc. I would like to find out, how evolved the nature of euroscepticism is and how millennials think about it. The buzzword in whole Europe nowadays is “euroscepticism” and the question of how to integrate migrants is a commonly discussed topic (Constant, 2011). One could even say,
that it became fashionable to say that migration has become a security problem. (Christina Boswell, 2007) Migrants are being correlated with crimes and economic downturns. One could argue, that this so called “securitisation of migration” helps national governments to find excuses to enforce their immigration policies. (Christina Boswell, 2007).

With the big enlargement in 2004 a lot of changes and challenges came along for the European Union and their economy. Studies show that the number of migrants going to another country increased significantly since the accession to the European Union (IOM, 2014).

The UK independence party has called for an end to free movement which clearly violates the main principles of the European Union. In a second case study I will explore therefore media and political reports/statements and assess whether the aspirations of the millennial generation might differ or match with the views of politicians. The thesis assesses two competing visions of Europe both of which have the potential to have a profound impact on the direction of the European project.

**Research questions:**

- How does job mobility affect the future working structure of Europe and what are the factors that make people choose to move to another country and what is the reaction of locals?
- Do people think that migrants are a threat to the economy of their country?

Some of the key concepts raised in this introduction such as xenophobia against migrants, securitization of migration and the millennial generation will be explored in more in depth in the literature review.
1.1 Literature Review

First of all I would like to define and describe the meaning of job mobility and migration. It is important to focus on both micro and macro levels. Why do people decide to leave their country? Theoretical perspectives can be derived from both points of view. Seen from a macro level, economy and labor market can play a role. Industrialization and post-industrialization with its flexible working hours and places are crucial factors to foster job mobility (Detlev Lück, Ruth Limmer et al., 2006). Globalization and innovations like new technologies have changed the job market as well. Theories like Durkheim’s modernization theory or Weber’s rationalization theory can be used to describe these new phenomena. My main issue is to find reasons behind why people nowadays choose to work in another country. The concept of migration dates back to many years ago and is, seen from a sociological point of view, a structural-functional approach. Detlev Lück, Ruth Limmer et al. state in their work, that there is a number of theoretical concepts which could explain job-related mobility and its consequences. The most important are gender, generation and position in the life course, family background, social networks and socio-economic status. The causal relation to mobility the authors state “is rather reciprocal than one-sided” (Theoretical Approaches to Job Mobility, Detlev Lück, Ruth Limmer, Wolfgang Bonß, 2006).

Several methods are used to find reasons behind mobility. The Parsonian paradigm of pattern variables for example can be used to analyse the mobility of a population. Parson describes a shift from tradition to modernization. According to this theory spatial mobility is highly correlated with impersonal attachment that is connected to modernization which means that the more industrialized and modernized a state is, the higher the rate of mobility (Sociologyguide.com, 2015). Reasons why people tend to migrate can be summarized with the push and pull theory which was conducted in the 1960s by Everett S. Lee. Push factors, which means reasons for citizens to leave their countries are: few opportunities, no jobs, war etc. Pull factors are reasons for migrants to go to a certain country, like functioning economy, good quality of life etc. M.P Todaro introduced a theory from a more economical point of view. The cost and benefit model describes the more rational reasons for people to move. If there is an opportunity to get better wages or better quality of live somewhere else, job migration is higher. In this model the costs describe not only the money needed to move to another country,
but also the risks, like psychic costs, first periods of unemployment, training for a new job etc. If the benefits (higher wages, higher living standard) outweigh the costs, people decide to migrate.

Zai Liang describes in his article a model migration schedule developed by Rogers and Willekens (1986). It states that migration is like fertility and mortality an age-dependent social behaviour. They define three stages/components of migration associated with the life-cycle: “pre- labor force component, labor force component and post- labor force component”. Two sets of parameters, Profile (age) and level (magnitude of migration). One outcome of this study was, that all countries share a universal profile, but differ by level.

Oded Stark was one of the developers of the “new economics of migration”. He made two main statements which are: Firstly migration decisions are not made by isolated individuals but rather by families or households and secondly economic conditions in the migrant-sending and receiving regions are negatively or weakly associated (Zai Liang, 2006)

As noted in the introduction, migration and free movement within the EU has the source of some tension in recent years. Nevertheless studies also show, that although the treaties state that work applications of people from the new member states (NMS) should be preferred, the percentage of European citizens who work in another MS is relatively low compared to immigrants of non-EU countries. The share is only 0,02% (Constant, 2011). Amelie F. Constant states that reasons for this low motivation in job mobility could be: “the accelerating ageing of the work population, the rise of female employment in dual income households, the continuous rise in homeownership, lack of innovation dynamics, decline in the number of available new jobs and the changing of traditional jobs to digital ones. Institutional barriers such as administrative delay and variation in the level of payments of social security benefits, limited transferability of (supplementary) pensions, legal and administrative problems concerning the different taxation systems, differences in health care systems, and limited portability and recognition of education degrees and qualifications” (p.5, ll. 5-11) also different language and culture can of course play a role. Because there were deficiencies in the original Lisbon treaty on the EU concerning job mobility, in 2003 new evaluations were started like for example the Job mobility action plan. The results led to the new targets
One of the main issues is also the digitalization of the European labour market. The knowledge based European economy needs new trained and flexible workers who can adapt fast to the changing structure. This is why the free movement of workers can be a favourable asset for the future (Constant, 2011).

The 2009 European Commission Eurobarometer states that one in two citizens in the EU were afraid of Job losses because of the enlargement. Nevertheless only in December 2013 borders were totally abolished and also the last three new member countries could freely move without any extra restrictions. This led to a new discussion about how much freedom those Member states should get. In Germany it led to a big debate also among the citizens and the word “Sozialtourismus” (Social tourism) became the title of the “critical word of the year” which is chosen every year and describes the most problematic issue discussed throughout the year. The word “Social” refers here to the fact that people think that immigrants especially from Eastern Europe come to Germany only to get the social benefits and therefore just enjoy in a “touristic” manner being in a welfare state (Unwortdesjahres.net, 2013). However the “flood” of eastern Europeans was not as big as anyone expected. Has this view changed today? What do young people who are just entering the job market think about the current situation?

In this literature discussion it is useful to refer to the situation in crisis hit EU member states on one side and economically stable EU member states on the other side given that my thesis contrasts those through a case study. If we take Hungary and Germany OECD statistics show, that from 2003 until 2010 the number of immigrants from Hungary to Germany doubled. It increased from 14,972 to 28,099. Germany is to be seen the most popular country of destination.

One of the reasons behind people leaving Hungary might be also the current Prime Minister Victor Orban. With statements like “We do not want a significant minority with different cultural characteristics and backgrounds living among us, we would like Hungary to stay as Hungary is,” (Dailynewshungary, 2015) he has made not only friends in his country. Nora Haidu from the opposition party E14 stated that the problem

---

3 Data extracted on 15 Jan 2015 17:00 UTC (GMT) from OECD.Stat
Hungary is facing is not high immigration, instead it is the large number of Hungarians leaving the country because of Orban’s extreme viewpoints and policies (Freehungary.hu, 2015).

Human capital flight or also called “brain drain” is a typical phenomenon in radical regimes. Already in the 1950s eastern European countries who were invaded by the Soviet Union were afraid of opening the boarder because of the wave of educated and expertized citizens that could leave the country.

Another focus of my study will be the relationship between young people, the so called millennial generation, and job mobility. Common names are also “the millennials” or Generation Y. This generation, born around the 80s and 90s years, experienced a lot of political changes concerning the European Union and were also raised in it. What do they think and feel about their future work life? What are their expectations or fears? Demographical changes show that the European population is ageing and that there will be probably more job positions than there will be employees. That means that also employers have to adopt to the new situation and make their workplace more comfortable. A study carried out by the PwC company in 2007 shows that 80% of young people would like to work abroad and 70% expect to use other languages during their career. Another important factor for millennials is corporate responsibility. In the study 88% said, that they would choose employers who have common social values and 86% would be even leave their job if corporate social responsibility values would not match anymore. This shows a big shift in expectations and I would like to investigate this phenomenon on a comparative basis between eastern EU countries and western EU countries. How is the relationship and what role has the fact of easy travelling between EU countries.

Another interesting factor on finding a job in another country could be social, cultural and economic capital. How important are different skills having a good network and money. How do people nowadays find jobs abroad and how successful are they? I will not go deeper into this field since it is not part of my research but I find it an interesting and important background information which contributes to some topics I refer to later. Vlad Manole and Maurice Schiff state that employers tend to prefer immigrants with different skills from those of natives. Either “high-skilled” workers like engineers or “intermediate- skilled” employees like nurses who have different skill
compositions. Also common is the demand for unskilled workers who are mostly used by the industry to carry out “low-end jobs” for example in the house cleaning, agriculture or service industry. (Vlad Manole, Maurice Schiff, 2004)

The main works about the different forms of capital is provided by Pierre Bourdieu. He developed the idea of cultural and economic capital and argues that economic capital reproduces cultural capital like different skills, qualifications and knowledge which helps you reaching a higher status in society. Social capital can be gained through memberships in certain groups where we build networks which can help us e.g. in finding a job in the future. (language as capital, 2012). Also Zai Liang states in his paper that networks play a crucial role in the migration process.

Networks can be used to increase the benefits of migration by lowering the costs of moving away. Important information and help can be given by former migrants. (Liang, 2006)

As mentioned before, the working sphere is changing and evolving into a service and information economy. 80 % of a company’s worth is tied to its people. (Human Capital White Paper, 2007). People’s knowledge and know-how is the most important asset nowadays.

**European Identity**

But how is European identity connected with job mobility?

European identity can be defined in many ways. It is first of all a set of beliefs which are shared by all its citizens (Oneeurope, 2013). The European Union was built after centuries of years of fighting and terror regimes to make sure history stays history and Europe lives in peace. (opendemocracy, 2015) European Identity was first set in the “Declaration of European Identity” in the Copenhagen summit in the 1970s. European

---

4 In the Copenhagen summit, a document was published at the 14. December 1973 by the 9 foreign ministers of the member states. European identity was defined as follows:

“-reviewing the common heritage, interests and special obligations of the Nine, as well as the degree of unity so far achieved within the Community,

-assessing the extent to which the Nine are already acting together in relation to the rest of the world and the responsibilities which result from this”(Cvce.eu,2013)

-taking into consideration the dynamic nature of European unification
integration and cohesion should be stabilized and reinforced during the years. In 2001 in the Laeken Summit which was followed by the big enlargement, the respect for European member states national identity was reinforced and strengthened. This clash of national identity and European identity is part of many discussions since. However, the aim of the EU is not to abolish national identities but more to enforce the existence of “European people”. A multicultural society with more identities. (opendemocracy, 2015).

Since the crisis in 2008 European Identity was again hotly debated. The crisis led again to big financial gaps between member states which was not beneficial to European unity. The importance of holding together as a union has gotten much more important.

The well known thinker and political philosopher Jürgen Habermas states in his Book “The crisis of the European Union” that the problem of Europe is that it does not have a clear status. It does not acquire a “state-like character” and that is why people also “do not enjoy the status of state citizens” (Habermas, 2012). However, there is the expectation that due to rising mutual trust among the European peoples, a form of civic solidarity will emerge. Habermas claims that the Union was established not by the people, but by the political elites back in time. Since then the unification process acted in favor of the European citizens and nowadays the importance of a united Europe is bigger then ever.

According to Habermas Germany’s Austerity program was “deeply damaging” and had “severe social consequences in crisis countries (…) sparkling a new wave of nationalism across Europe” (TheTOC, 2014). Also George Soros states that a way need to be found to “reinvent the European project”. However he admits that this would lead to a “shotgun marriage” because European citizens would have to be forced together looking at the current situation of big economical differences in Europe. He emphasizes that the positive spark before the crisis has to be “rekindled” (CEU, 2011).

**Securitization of migration**

I already mentioned the term securitization earlier in the introduction and will come back to it now because I think it is closely linked with the issue of xenophobia against immigrants. Securitization of migration refers to the trend of seeing immigrants as a

---

5 Habermas speaks about the importance of distinguishing European people and European citizens.
threat to the own country. Jes Huysmans states in his article that “The securitization of migration is a structural effect of a multiplicity of actions”. That means that it is mostly not only some agencies like the far-right wing parties in a country which foster the belief in seeing immigrants as a threat to security. He argues that multiple actors such as governments, media etc. also play their part. The three main factors which led to a higher securitization of migration in the EU member states are according to Huysmans: “internal security, cultural identity and the crisis of the welfare state” (Huysmans, 2000). This gives a good summary of the content of my literature review. One could argue that this can also evolve out of the fear of multiculturalism or an Europeanization.

3. Figure: Attitude towards migration

Percentage of citizens in UK, EU, Western Europe, and Scandinavia who rank immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country

(Source: Europppblog)
2. Methodology and ethics

The most important issue in sociological research is organising your work according to the common ethical standards. That includes the following main “guidelines”. Firstly it has to be voluntary. If I would force somebody to participate in a questionnaire, people would might give me wrong information or would be highly demotivated to give trustful and personal information. Also the person must always be informed about the risks and procedure of the study. He/she has to fully agree with the way of surveying. If the dimensions of the study is explained beforehand, the participant will feel safer and will know what he or she has to expect. Also it is not allowed to put participants in a situation of either physical or psychological harm. This relates also to the right of anonymity. If there is a situation where the participant is telling private issues and he or she does not want to be put in relation with the issue by relatives or friends, it must be sure that the person remains anonymous. Anonymity is in my opinion one of the main basic rules in sociological research. It must be assured that people not involved in the study will not get any identifying information. Nevertheless in qualitative interviews, which I am planning to do, the person must be asked before his or her information can be used and if he or she wants to keep anonymous or agrees to be cited. Thus it can be seen that I conform to the main tenets of the International Sociological Association Code of Ethics (Isa-sociology.org, 2015)

As a basis and to get an overview I set up a survey that could be filled out unanimously. This was to be conducted online to reach as many young Europeans as possible to figure out what people think of migrants coming to their home countries and how they feel about the EU (see appendix 7). A number of millennials were selected for more indepth interviews to probe and explore further the findings of the general survey (see appendix 5). They were students from the crisis countries Spain, Portugal and Cyprus and from the economic stable countries Austria, France and Belgium.

One face to face interview was being conducted with an expert on my field of study. I would like to compare their views (decision makers) with the views of young millennials.

In the study the speech of Lászlo Andor formed a case study. This means that I did an in-depth, and detailed examination of his speech and compared it with my findings giving personal insights into attitudes of Job mobility.
Rationale for research approach

With the research questions mentioned in the introduction in mind, I would like to use qualitative and quantitative methods. I will refer to numbers and material already published but also examine my interviews and survey.

Since I have answers from people of different countries in Europe I analysed my findings on a Macro level. I analysed the results from two angles, the interpretive and the positivist point of view. Both facts and personal experience are important to get more insight in the topic. The more rational online survey gave me some facts and an overview over the situation. To also get some individual viewpoints I used an interpretative approach. This means that not everything can be explained in a rational manner and it rather depends on the individual people and their actions and behaviours. People act unpredictable and are therefore hard to study only in a quantitative generalizing way.

3. Analysis

As mentioned in the Methodology section, a survey was conducted in the frame of my first case study. I interviewed five students and one professional from six different countries in Europe. To get a larger sample I conducted also an online questionnaire with 148 participants which I analysed using SPSS. Firstly I will summarize the findings of both surveys separately to give the reader an overview. Later on I will compare these findings and discuss differences and common points.

3.1. Quantitative Survey

In my online survey I intended to reach as many Millennials from different countries as I could. I intended to get an overview over what young people think about the EU and working abroad. I also clarify that my results are not representative and cannot be generalized.
Demographic facts:

The average age in my survey is 24.8. The distribution between male and female participants is quite even. 54.79 % were female and 45.21 % male. On the following graph you can see a chart of the distribution of countries. To make it more compact and easier to analyse, I put the countries into groups of old and new member states and Crisis hit countries and more economically stable countries. For analysis I created dummy variables.

4. Figure: Share of respondents from old and new member countries

Share of respondents from Old member countries (before 2004) and new member countries (joined after 2004)
To narrow down my analysis I would like to come back to my main working hypotheses. The aim of this thesis is to investigate and analyse the differences of attitudes between the EU countries and to analyse the connection between European.

To make it more precise I stated five main hypothesis related to my research questions:

1. People who would like to work in another country or have been working in another country tend to feel more European.
2. European identity is stronger in Old EU member states.
3. Securitization of migration can make people feel less European.
4. People who choose to work in another country believe in a changing job market situation in the future.
5. People who do not see themselves as Europeans, tend to be more critical towards Migrants in their country.

As we can see on the chart below the vast majority (107) answered to the question “Would you like to work in another country than your own” with “yes”. The main reasons people would like to work abroad are firstly “better salary” and on the second place, “personal reasons” like having a partner in another country. (See Appendix5)
6. Figure: would you like to work in another country than your own?

**Would you like to work in another country than your own?**

![Pie chart showing responses to the question](image)

The overall mean on the question “Would you say about yourself that you are European?” is 5.07 (retrieved from a 1-10 scale) which is a rather low number considering the high number of people answering “yes” at the first question. By using crosstabs and comparing those two variables I got the following results:

1. Table: Relation of European identity and job mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you like to work in another country than your own?</th>
<th>Do you feel European?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (11)</td>
<td>72,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (104)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure (30)</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (145)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that People who would not like to work in another country also do not feel European. 72,7% of the respondents who said they would not want to work abroad
also do not feel European at all while only 51% of the respondents who would like to work abroad said the same. The total numbers also show, that the majority do not consider themselves as Europeans. To tackle the reasons behind this number let’s look at another variable like the interest in EU politics and if people think that they get enough information about the EU politics. 32,9 % stated that they are not interested at all in European politics and 48,6 % stated that they are very interested into what is happening in the EU parliament. I also asked the question if people think that they get enough information about the European Union. Here the data shows a very clear result. 71,6 % stated that they do not get enough information about the decisions of the European union.

My second hypothesis that “people from Old member states feel more European seems to be not valid looking at the data. Only 34% of the respondents living in Old member states stated that they feel as a “full European” whereas 45,7% of the respondents from New member states considered themselves as European. These results are surprising and I will come back to it later on in my analysis.

Looking at the third hypothesis “In countries where securitization of migration is stronger people feel less European” we can first take a look at the overall situation. According to my data 64,5 % of the respondents think that immigration is discussed negatively in their countries. Only 8,5 % think it’s positive and 19,9% think its neutrally discussed.

When we compare these findings with the European identity variable the results show that 47% of whom said that immigration is discussed negatively also do not feel European and 38,9% in this group feel very European. If I refer to my findings in the literature review it states that securitization of migration was rather strong in countries like UK and Germany where there were the most immigration flows. So if we assume that those are the economical stable countries, European identity should be lower and securitization higher in those countries.
7. Figure: How is immigration discussed by politicians and media in your country?

8. Figure: How European do you feel?
On the graphs we can see that respondents from economically stable countries have a much higher rate in both “not feeling European” and higher rates of negative media outcomes (according to their perceptions). I will come back to this in my conclusion.

The fourth hypothesis is “People who choose to work/or would like to work in another country believe in a changing job market situation in the future”. My findings here are very clear. By running crosstabs the data shows that none of the respondents who said that they would not like to work abroad stated that they believe in a change of the job market. After all 23,3% of the respondents who feel positive about going abroad believed in a change. I also asked in the form of an open question in my survey if people think that there is or will be a change in the job market. The most common answer is that there are too many young professionals with a university degree who are not able to find a job. Competition has got higher so job mobility could be a good solution to find a job that fit ones expectations. Also the higher importance of working abroad experience was mentioned. Although some stated that personal experiences weigh more nowadays, to another question where the respondents had the possibility to tick on 3 different answers, 48,3 % think that high ranked universities are crucial to find a good job. However 31,8 % do believe that personal development and qualities are important too. Nevertheless the majority thinks that overall work experience is the most important factor to get a job. 42% think foreign work experience is necessary to have in the CV.

In my last hypothesis I will discuss my findings about the statement “People who do not see themselves as Europeans, tend to be more critical towards migrants in their country.”. The overall mean stating the grade of tolerance towards migrants is 6,04 (out of a scale from 1-10). The hypothesis seems to be true, since the mean in the group of people who said that they do not feel European lies by 5,17 and for people who feel like a full European by 6,90.
3.2. Qualitative Survey

Due to the desire to provide anonymity I changed the names of the Interviewees. It has to be noted that all of them have or had already experiences in studying or working abroad and are having or had a secondary education. Laurent, Nicolas, Nena and Max are Erasmus students from the Corvinus University. Miguel from Portugal is a professional who is working currently in Budapest. Nicolas is a Master student making an internship in Paris. I summarized the main points on a chart to give the reader an overview over my findings in my qualitative research. In my analysis I will also refer to “group 1” including Laurent, Nicolas and Max coming from economically stable countries and group 2 including Miguel, Piedro and Nena from crisis hit countries. As crisis hit countries I describe countries who needed help by the IMF/Troika funds as stated in the introduction. (tbtimes.com, 2015).
2. Table: Overview qualitative interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Laurent, 22 Belgium Student Major: Business</th>
<th>Nicolas, 22 France Student Major: Finance</th>
<th>Max, 27 Austria Student Major: Marketing</th>
<th>Miguel, 25 Spain Student Major: Physical Education</th>
<th>Piedro, 27 Portugal Professional Job: Marketing supervisor</th>
<th>Nena, 21 Cyprus Student Major: Sociology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to work in another EU country?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to go abroad because there is no job for me in my country.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to work abroad to get new experiences</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Migrants are generally good for my country</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European migrants are generally good for my country</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels like a European citizen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of movement is beneficial</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job market is changing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 + = agrees ,  + = rather agrees,  - = disagrees ,  - = rather disagrees
As we can see on the table all interviewees were willing to work abroad. The main differences here can be found in the reasons of why people want to move. Miguel, Piedro and Nena answered to the question “why would you like to work abroad?” all the same. Miguel states that in Portugal it is “kind of impossible to find a job”. On the other hand Nicolas, Max and Laurent give as a main reason to move the “gaining of work experiences”. This could be explained by changing job patterns. According to all the interviewees it is necessary nowadays to have international experience. Max even states that “it is even weird (nowadays) if you don’t have exchange experience”. This is an indicator of how popular and successful the concept of the barrier free movement in Europe is. After his studies Laurent is sure to find his first job abroad. He states: “in our world everything moves fast and you don’t have to stay in your country”, ”everything is getting more dynamic and its improving business between the countries.”. Also Nicolas states that he would like to work after his studies in another country to gain experience but return after to France. Everybody agrees that international experience is crucial these days.

Also all interviewees said that they do not see a problem or threat in European migrants. However group 2 stated that they do think that the freedom of movement is more beneficial for people of their countries. Miguel states that it is “better for us to leave, than for the others to come” to Portugal. Nena referred to her Erasmus exchange semester and states that coming to Budapest for Erasmus made her see things differently and encouraged her in working abroad in the future.

Nevertheless problems were mentioned as well. Nena referred to the problem of social dumping. Migrants, she said, get more financial help from the government than Cyprians and get also more jobs because they can be paid less. Also Miguel stated that Migrants often work for less money and send it then home to their families instead boosting the Portuguese economy. However, Nena emphasizes that she believes that it is not the migrants, but the governments fault. Miguel even stresses: “the origin of the problem is the government”. The huge corruption is the main causal factor.

Group 2 on the other hand stated that EU migrants are only beneficial to their countries’ economies. Laurent mentioned the aging society and that migrants are important to make sure the countries’ economy are flourishing.
An interesting fact I discovered during my interviews is that everybody seems to tolerate EU migrants but when it comes to non-EU migrants like Africans or Turkish people the interviewees seem to have a more radical view on restriction of job mobility. One hypothesis could be, that non-Europeans coming from poorer countries tend to occupy the lower paid professions and do it often illegally since it is harder for them to get a work permission. This could be another topic to discuss which needs further research.

What is also interesting is that the feeling of European identity does not seem to be correlated to the countries the interviewees came from. Nicolas, Miguel and Nena stated that they feel like European citizens. Nena states that she is “proud to be European” and that “it is a benefit to be a European citizen”.

Piedro was rather skeptical. He said that if the feeling of European unity should be strengthened, it has to come from the government first. All interviewees agreed that a stronger unity is only then possible if all the economic and financial differences are overcome. Also Nicolas who says about himself that he feels firstly European before being French also admits that these problems exists. “For Europe to be strong we have to be united” he says, “we cannot squeeze each other out”.
3.3. Summary of both researches

To sum up my findings in both surveys I would like to come back to my main research questions.

Research question 1: How does job mobility affect the future working structure of Europe and what are the factors that make people choose to move to another country and what is the reaction of locals?

According to my findings the majority of people believe in a change of the working structure. Because we can move freely nowadays people see it as a necessity to be at least once outside their country. The reasons why people chose to move to another country differed from their country of origin. People from more crisis hit countries move rather for financial reasons and due to lack of possibilities in their country. My findings show that people from countries like France and Austria rather move in order to gain experience and would like to come back to their own countries afterwards. My findings show also that most people do not see migrants as a threat to their economies but especially my quantitative interviews showed that there is rather a high level of xenophobia against non-european migrants. I did not recognize xenophobia against new member state countries like Romania or Bulgaria. Instead the interviewees referred to the wish for a more united Europe including the poorer countries.

Research question 2: What role does European identity play?

In my research I tried to investigate some relationships between European identity and job mobility and found some surprising results. In crisis hit countries people seem to feel more European than in economical stable states. This could be connected with high rates of securitization in those countries with high migration flows. My quantitative research showed also that people who do not feel European also tend to stay in their countries. In my indepth interviews I could not find proof of this statement. Everybody was willing to work abroad but only the half of the interviewees felt European. Nevertheless everybody agreed to the fact that European identity should be strengthened so there will be less discrimination and to foster economic equality.
Research question 3: What role does the national government and the media play?

We could see that the attitude of the media and the government could have an influence on the degree of how people feel about European identity. 64% think that immigration is discussed negatively in their country. This is very alarming since it can give people a completely wrong picture about job mobility. In my qualitative research I found out that especially in the crisis hit countries people seem to have a general bad view on their government. Corruption and unfair migration policies were buzzwords used by the interviewees and made clear that people do not have trust in their politicians any more.
3.4. Case study

“*The truth, and indeed it might be "inconvenient" for some, is that the vast majority of people who move from one EU country to another do so in order to work. They don’t do it in order to claim benefits. These workers are in fact of considerable benefit to the economies, and to the welfare systems, of the receiving countries.*”

- László Andor

To get a deeper understanding in what the EU government thinks about job mobility and its side effects I will summarize the speech of László Andor with respect to my interview with Biro – Nagy. Andor was Commissioner responsible for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion from 2010-2014. I had the possibility to speak with András Biro- Nagy who was working as a political advisor as a member of the cabinet of Hungary’s commissioner. He thus gained some close insights into job mobility which was hotly discussed in 2013.

Lászlo Andor held a speech at the University of Bristol in February 2014. In this speech he tackled “the inconvenient truth” of Job mobility in Europe and focuses mainly on facts and statistics stating the changes after the major enlargement and especially after the addition of Romania and Bulgaria. “In Britain, and some other EU countries, we have been witnessing increasing unease, animosity, and sometimes hostility towards migrant EU workers, in particular with regards to the rights of citizens from other EU Member States to various forms of social benefits in host countries.” (Europa.eu, 2015)

According to Biro- Nagy, Andor took the invitation of the University of Bristol as a chance to bring a clear and comprehensive view of the situation of job mobility in
Europe to the UK. As I explained already in my literature review the UK is seen as a rather eurosceptical country so one of the main goals according to Biro–Nagy was that he wanted to “give the facts and try to fight against those myths” (like abuse of the social welfare systems by EU migrants), that were raised first of all by UKIP.

A lot of British newspapers reacted to statements Laszlo Andor made earlier about the UK where he mentioned that Britain is “developing a nasty image” (The Independent, 2013) after the Premier David Cameron was demanding changes concerning the freedom of movement. (The Guardian, 2014)

“EU Commissioner Laszlo Andor: I never said that Britain was nasty…”
- The Independent

“He accused British politicians of stirring up an uninformed populist furore not based on facts or evidence. In Bristol he is expected to attack politicians who "pander to prejudice or xenophobia".”
- The Guardian

“Britain is 'hysterical' over immigration and risks becoming the 'nasty' country of Europe, EU commissioner says”
- The Telegraph

“We can never control immigration while we continue to be members of the European Union.”
- UKIP manifesto

Andor states clearly against the views of the UKIP which argue that migration and job mobility is damaging to national interests by arguing that “Free movement of labor can give more flexibility to the labour markets of both the host countries and the countries of origin.”

“We should fight the abuse, not the principle” states Andor. This is a statement also Biro – Nagy refers to. The commission supports the freedom of movement first of all because it is one of the main principles of the EU. Every country should be equal and
there shouldn’t be restrictions or special treatments to only some countries. Also, Biro-Nagy states, mostly the freedom of movement is a win-win situation for both the receiving and the sending countries. In some areas in Germany for example there is a shortage on workers and if there would be no migration flow the social system might be at risk, and not able to function anymore. If there are problems with an overflow of migration then EU funds are available to solve those problems. Andor refers also to the geographical mobility which is in the “East-to-West direction” and argues that this could show that “income and wage differentials are among the main push factors for labour mobility, as well as short-term job prospects and expectations.” This supports my findings in my research. Since people from the crisis hit countries started to move more, or are at least more interested in working in another country (especially in southern European countries).

9. Figure: Impact of crisis on job mobility

The main problems of the bad image of migrants Biro-Nagy sees in the lack of division and clear differentiation of the term “Immigrant”. A distinction has to be made between European immigrants and Non-Europeans who are working illegally under mostly horrible conditions. Politicians see here two different problems which have to be treated separately. Also the so called “benefit tourism” I also referred to in my literature review, is not proven or based on facts claims Andor in his speech. People come to work in the country not to take the benefits. A negative side effect is rather the loss for
the sending countries. Highly educated people leave the countries where they think they are not going to be able to find a job which fits to their degrees. According to Biro-Nagy the best solution would be therefore to eliminate poverty in those countries so people do not even want to leave. That is why Europe should hold together. Also Andor states in his speech “Indeed, in a situation where there is great divergence in unemployment and job vacancy rates in the Member States and regions, labour mobility should play a larger role in adjusting to the situation and should therefore reduce geographical mismatches.” Therefore higher job mobility might help bringing the EU countries together. Connected to my topic referred to earlier namely that of securitization, Andor says clearly in his speech that he did not get any factual evidence that “so called benefit tourism is systematic and widespread”. “All that we have received is a series of anecdotes about cases of criminal fraud and vicars performing sham marriages” he claims about the UK. Government and media see migrants as a threat and this mood is rather counterproductive for a functioning and harmonizing Europe.

However, Biro-Nagy sees no immediate importance in the European identity. He believes that still most people feel their national identity first before stating they are European. Nevertheless the countries should stay together and not be only “28 countries each having their own agenda”. Europe should be “united in diversity” which is the main motto of the union (Europa.eu, 2015). Biro-Nagy says, that if there is a problem Europe has to have common solidarity mechanisms that improve social and employment conditions to create and improve chances for all in Europe, also the poorer areas.

“In order to strengthen European identity you have to have the feeling that you share not only responsibility but also opportunities in Europe.” Biro- Nagy states. If people think that they are better off in the EU European Identity might be stronger.

With his speech Andor wanted to give especially the UK where 80% of the citizens are hostile towards migration an overview about the facts and make clear that the perceptions people have, do not have anything to do with the reality.
4. Conclusion

I would like to start the conclusion of this thesis with a quote made by the UK deputy prime minister Nick Clegg:

“The UK is not going to leave the European Union. Of course not. We are inextricably wound up with Europe. In terms of culture, history and geography, we are a European nation.”

This statement summarizes quite well one aim of this thesis to show the connection between European identity, job mobility and rising migration xenophobia in some member states. In my thesis I tried to give some insights into problems the EU government should tackle to become stronger and more successful. One aspect is to put more effort into shaping the image of European identity. If people would be more informed and included into the decisions made in Brussels, xenophobia and other negative prejudices especially in crisis times might be reduced. As Nick Clegg stated, nonetheless how different each countries culture is, somehow we are all “inextricably wound up”. That is why I think it is totally unproductive when politicians or the media just state negative propaganda stating that migrants are bad for the country, if numbers and statistics say something else.

My findings showed that most people feel that they are not well enough informed and that they mostly hear negative news about immigration in their country. In my indepth quantitative interviews I found out, that most of my interviewees admitted that they do not mind European migrants but rather non- EU migrants. This could be explained by the recent terrorist attacks which brought about a wave of islamophobia with it. Also a factor could be the fact that people who come from outside Europe have it much harder to integrate. But these are only assumptions and need further research.

Also another study from Hungary is supporting this statement. Hungarians seem to approve Austrians, Hungarians from neighboring countries, Germans, English and Americans and to a ambiguous degree southern Europeans more than Romanians⁷, Chinese, Arabs, Africans and Russians (Melegh et al, 2006).

---

⁷ At the time of the study Romanians were not in the EU yet.
In the literature review I described some theories to which I would like to come back to now. My research confirms the logic of the cost and benefit model. The main reasons for people to move were because of financial matters. The reasons for people who wanted to stay in their country were personal reasons which could indicate that for them the cost of moving away is just too high.

What I found out is that there are different push and pull factors for young people coming from economic stable and economic weak countries. For economical weak countries the main reason logically is the lack of job opportunities. What I found interesting was that job mobility is also popular for people who are from economically stable countries. Here the main reason was also because of higher salaries but the interviews showed me that the gaining of experiences played the bigger role here. This could indicate that especially through this enlargements experience abroad are trivial to find a job even in the home country. This could mean that there is a trend to a higher and more flexible job mobility. People do not plan to stay their whole life abroad, but for a certain period of time. Since I examined the situation of millennials with higher education I can state that this new generation of knowledge workers are highly motivated to work abroad and did or are planning to use the freedom of movement.

I feel that my thesis supports the statement made by Amelie F. Constant that the “knowledge based European Economy” needs new and fast adaptable workers who go with this changing structure.

I also tried to show in this thesis the importance of more cooperation between the government and the citizens. People who are actually interested in what is happening in the EU feel that they do not get enough information and if, the majority stated that it is negative.

A more united Europe requires not only economic equality but also a more developed feeling of unity. Andor refers in his speech to the fact that job mobility could help solve economic differences in the EU. Also in my research I could find indicators that job mobility could foster more tolerance towards other cultures in Europe and also European Identity. Nevertheless my results also showed that tensions could arise, since migrants are not yet fully tolerated by citizens. My results indicated that people do not feel that migrants are good for their country.
If the EU government want to achieve a more united Europe I believe that it will not work without working together with the citizens of Europe. As mentioned in the literature review, after the crisis the trust and motivation to stand up for Europe decreased dramatically especially in the severe crisis which hit countries like Greece and Spain. With the EU and especially Merkel’s strict austerity plan (fiscal compact), Greeks felt treated unfairly and a wave of demonstrations against Merkel came up.

Also other voices are getting louder and claim that a German hegemony could arise. Jürgen Habermas states in one of his articles that “the German government holds the key to the fate of the European Union in its hand” and even refers to a “German Europe”(The Guardian, 2013). Redistribution should be considered as a mechanism which might create more solidarity across Europe.

If countries’ governments cannot co-operate properly how do they expect from the citizens to feel united? Only with common and shared politics accepted by every country Europe will have a chance to establish in the fast growing world market. If people would have been better and more neutrally informed and the government would have worked more together this rise of xenophobia against Germany and its fiscal compact might have been avoided.

The majority of my sample does not feel European but would like to work in another country of the EU. This raises the question of if we actually need a European identity to foster economy in Europe. I think the question should be here rather what kind of European Identity we need. The main principle of the EU states that its many cultures and national identities should be preserved. It would be interesting to make a further research on that.

Nonetheless in my point of view and based on the material I could collect in this thesis I think that for the future it is getting more and more important that people are getting conscious of their second European citizenship. Demographic changes will force people to move in order to get a satisfying job and having the feeling of belonging together will make it easier. Europe needs a flexible and mobile workforce to maintain its economic importance at the world market.

“The people of Europe must learn that they can only preserve their welfare-state model of society and the diversity of their nation-state cultures by joining forces and working together. They must pool their resources – if they want to exert any kind of influence on
the international political agenda and the solution of global problems. To abandon European unification now would be to quit the world stage for good.”

(The Guardian, 2012)

The image of migration has to be changed in order to avoid further waves of xenophobia and to be braced for the next global crisis, which is never far away. One way to foster unity is to start involving the youngest citizens. European policy should be more present in schools and participation in elections should be more promoted. By discussions with family and friends I realized that barely any of them were making efforts to vote or did even know who the current leading party in the parliament is. Overall only 42, 61% participated in the voting in 2014.

Positive examples are organizations like the AEGEE (Association des États Généraux des Étudiants de l’Europe). This independent non-profit organization was formed in 1985 in Paris and is now established all over Europe. Its main goal is to “strive for a democratic, diverse and borderless Europe, which is socially, economically and politically integrated, and values the participation of young people in its construction and development” (AEGEE.org, 2015).

However, as long as national governments and media are continuing to spread negative “rumors” and assumptions out of only a few negative examples about European immigrants, people will still see them as a threat.

Kant defined cosmopolitanism as a combination of the universal and the particular. “The Nation and the world citizenship”(Uricchio, 2008) This is what the European union should strive for.
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6. Appendices

Appendix 1:

Would you say about yourself that you are European, or rather your own nationality?

Appendix 2

How interested are you about the EU and its politics?
Appendix 3

![Bar chart showing the count of responses to the question: Do you think there will be or is there already a change in the job market (in your country)?]

Appendix 4

What do you think is important nowadays to have in your CV?

- High ranked universities
- Work experience
- Personal development
- Abroad work experience
- Others

High ranked universities, Work experience, Personal development, abroad work experience, Others
Appendix 5

What would be the main reasons to go abroad?

Appendix 6:

Online Survey:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1SyI3IVzXcjIlbD8SqTmoTB0kLQFYroE9iXAZVJQmxgY4/viewform
Appendix 7:  

Questionnaire Biro-Nagy:  

1. What was your role working with Laszlo Andor in the EU commission?  

2. When Andor spoke at the Bristol University he gave a speech for the “inconvenient truth”. Do you know what his main incentives were to give this speech? Who is it mainly directed at?  

3. Why does the EU commission support the free movement of labour? (beneficial for all countries?)  
   (In the speech it says, that migrants do mostly jobs nationals don’t want to do. Is this one reason? Aging society.)  

4. Do you think that securitization of migration is counterproductive to member states and the EU cohesion? (Especially now since terrorism is such a big topic. Orban speaks in France about Immigration as a thread) What do you think?  

5. What are the biggest risks of freedom of movement? (social dumping, race to the bottom)  

6. With the new Millennial generation do you think European identity will emerge? Are there any campaigns of the EU that supports this? What is its value?  

Appendix 8:  

Questionnaire students:  

1. Would you like to work in another country than your own?  

2. (If yes) What would be the main reasons for you to go to work in another country?  

3. What do you think about migrants in your country?  

4. Do you think that migrants are bad or good for your own country?  

5. How is immigration discussed by politicians and the media in your country?  
   What are your thoughts on this?  

6. Would you say about yourself that you are European, or rather your own nationality or give another answer? Is there a European identity? If yes what is it?
7. What are your thoughts on the EU?
8. If not mentioned above – What are your thoughts on the free movement of workers?
9. What do you think is important nowadays to have in your CV to get a good job? (In your country)
   (work experience, grades, languages, personal experience (traveling, living abroad etc.)
10. Do you think there will be or is there already a change in the job market (in your country)?
11. If yes, what kind of change?

Appendix 9:

Signed consent

The objectives and conditions of the research have been explained to me

I

I do / do not give my consent to be recorded
I do / do not give my consent for my name to be cited

Date/Signiture: