

Population mobility: moving away from a 'sedentarist' epistemology

Original

Population mobility: moving away from a 'sedentarist' epistemology / Paolo, Russo; Servillo, LORIS ANTONIO - In: Science in support of European Territorial Development and Cohesion. Second ESPON 2013 Scientific Report / ESPON. - ELETTRONICO. - Luxemburg : Espon, 2013. - ISBN 978-2-919777-53-2. - pp. 85-92

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2731392 since: 2019-04-22T10:40:00Z

Publisher:

Espon

Published

DOI:


Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

GENERIC -- per es. Nature : semplice rinvio dal preprint/submitted, o postprint/AAM [ex default]

(Article begins on next page)



Second ESPON 2013 Scientific Report
December 2013

Science in support of European Territorial Development and Cohesion



EUROPEAN UNION
Part-financed by the European Regional Development Fund
INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

ESPON 2013 Programme

Coordination Unit
4, rue Erasme
L-1468 Luxembourg
Grand Duchy of Luxembourg
Phone: +352 42 59 91 4700
Fax: +352 42 59 91 4701
Email: info@espon.eu

This publication is based on papers and the discussion of the ESPON Scientific Conference held on 12-13 September 2013. The papers were prepared by authors from transnational project groups carrying out applied research projects and targeted analyses for ESPON as well as authors from the professional and academic organisations AESOP, ECTP-CEU, ERSA, EUGEO and RSA.

The present publication was processed by the ESPON Coordination Unit and edited by Frank Holstein, Sabine Zillmer and Kai Böhme from Spatial Foresight. The single papers have been reviewed by Gordon Dabinett, Cliff Hague, Jacek Zaucha and Sabine Zillmer. Gordon Dabinett and Cliff Hague did the language editing of the papers.

Information on the ESPON Programme and projects, the complete reports and list of partners involved can be found at www.espon.eu

The ESPON website always presents the latest developments in the ESPON Programme and findings from ESPON projects. It offers the opportunity to consult in detail ESPON publications, tools, project reports and indicators available in the ESPON database.

ISBN 978-2-919777-53-2

© ESPON 2013 Programme and the authors
Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is sent to the ESPON Coordination Unit.

The ESPON Programme is managed by the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, Department for Spatial Planning and Development, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

Printed in Luxembourg, February 2014

Printed on paper produced environmentally friendly

Layout and graphic design by Imprimerie Centrale

In the same series of ESPON publications:
First ESPON 2013 Scientific Report:
“Scientific Dialogue on Cities, Rural Areas and Rising Energy Prices”, December 2010

Disclaimer:

The content of this report is based on the results of applied research projects by transnational teams of research taking part in the ESPON 2013 Programme. As such, the maps and texts do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

The ESPON 2013 Programme, the European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion, supports policy development with evidence and analyses on territorial dynamics within Europe. ESPON's main activity is to deliver new European facts and understanding for policy makers via applied research projects, targeted analyses and analytical tools.

One of the objectives of the ESPON Programme is to support the European wide research community in the field of European territorial science and to involve a wide European network of scientists and practitioners in the field of territorial research and its related fields. A large involvement is indispensable to get high qualified research capacity in ESPON projects and at the same time to increase interest and competences in research on European territorial structures, trends, perspectives and impacts of EU sector policy.

The ESPON Programme has hitherto promoted the scientific component of the programme through scientific conferences and workshops, cooperation with European organisations in the fields of regional science, geography and spatial planning, as well as with a dedicated series of ESPON reports ("blue series") mainly targeting the scientific community. The ESPON 2006 Programme published two Scientific Reports and the first ESPON 2013 Scientific Report was published in 2010.

This second ESPON 2013 Scientific Report presents papers from both ESPON projects and authors from several European professional and academic organisations. The report is the result of the ESPON Scientific Conference "Science in support of European Territorial Development and Cohesion" held on the 12th and 13th of September 2013 in Luxembourg. This ESPON Scientific Conference targeted territorial research and analysis and continued the building of a European scientific research community that can provide evidence capable of supporting a stronger territorial dimension in policy considerations. In this context, the conference was part of a scientific dialogue to support a stronger territorial dimension in policy considerations. This is reflected in the aim of the conference, which was on the one hand to provide a good overview and scientific dialogue of the progress made in the scientific field during the current programming period. On the other hand, on-going ESPON projects as well as researchers outside the ESPON network had the opportunity to exchange their views of new and innovative research.

This Scientific Report contains 34 scientific papers, prepared by researchers involved in ESPON projects and authors from the European professional and academic organisations AESOP, ECTP-CEU, ERSA, EUGEO and RSA. The papers were presented and discussed during the conference workshop sessions, after which they have been reviewed by Prof. Gordon Dabinett, Prof. Emer. Cliff Hague, Assoc. Prof. Jacek Zaucha and Dr Sabine Zillmer. All authors have used the remarks made by the reviewers to strengthen their papers. The results can be found in Chapters 2 to 4.

Chapter 1 gives an introduction to the policy framework ESPON is dealing with and provides an overview and structure of all papers included. In addition, a number of overarching points emerged which are discussed giving some ideas for the future.

A third ESPON 2013 Scientific Report is planned for end 2014 taking stock of the progress ESPON projects made in the scientific field of territorial development and cohesion.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	page	10
2	Understanding territorial realities	page	15
2.1	Regional disparities and territorial cohesion	page	15
2.1.1	Investigating regional diversity and integrative patterns in ESPON collaboration networks <i>Sylvie Occelli, Elena Poggio and Alessandro Sciullo</i>	page	15
2.1.2	A composite index to measure the achievement of the 'Europe 2020 Strategy' by regions and member states: how far are territories to emerge from the crisis? <i>Rubén C. Lois, X. Carlos Macía and Valerià Paül</i>	page	22
2.1.3	Regional disparities in Europe: Are they robust to the use of different measures and indicators? <i>José Villaverde and Adolfo Maza</i>	page	27
2.1.4	Sigma-convergence as a measure of territorial cohesion <i>Hy Dao, Pauline Plagnat and Vanessa Rousseaux</i>	page	32
2.2	Relations between regional and spatial integration	page	38
2.2.1	Effective planning and scientific Data <i>Jan Vogelij</i>	page	38
2.2.2	Spatial integration revisited – new insights for cross-border and transnational contexts <i>Tobias Chilla and Estelle Evrard</i>	page	44
2.2.3	Deconstructing and re-constructing territorial governance: findings from ESPON TANGO case studies <i>Lisa Van Well and Peter Schmitt</i>	page	50
2.2.4	Between self-organization and policies: spatial models of dynamic urban processes <i>Izabela Mironowicz and Magdalena Mlek-Galewska</i>	page	55
2.2.5	Rural development, female mobility and the provision of SGI – a target group oriented approach <i>Karin Wiest and Daniel Rauhut</i>	page	61
2.2.6	The location of logistics activities in Northwest Europe: an empirical analysis <i>Mathieu Strale</i>	page	68
2.2.7	European functional border regions: An urban potential typology <i>Christophe Sohn and Nora Stambolic</i>	page	74
2.2.8	Polycentric metropolitan development: policy and research demand <i>Rudolf Giffinger and Johannes Suitner</i>	page	79
2.2.9	Population mobility: moving away from a 'sedentarist' epistemology <i>Antonio Russo, Ian Smith and Loris Servillo</i>	page	85

3	Measuring territorial outcomes	page	92
3.1	Large data sets	page	92
3.1.1	Firm growth during stretches of recession: modes of resilience of Austrian firms 2002-2011 <i>Michael Steiner and Michael Wagner-Pinter</i>	page	92
3.1.2	What can we learn from the territorial innovation dynamics in China, India and the U.S.? <i>Riccardo Crescenzi</i>	page	97
3.1.3	Territorial capital, territorial cohesion policy and services of general interest: a SWOT analysis of SGI <i>Daniela-Luminita Constantin and Raluca Mariana Grosu</i>	page	103
3.2	Typologies of European regions	page	109
3.2.1	Analyzing land use change dynamics for policy development: identification of hot-spots of change <i>Rasmus Ole Rasmussen, Ryan Weber and Gemma Garcia</i>	page	109
3.2.2	A spatial typology for European seas <i>Dania Abdul Malak, Lynne McGowan, Alberto Lorenzo-Alonso and Marta Calvet</i>	page	114
3.2.3	Characterisation of urban sprawl in Europe <i>Jaume Fons-Esteve and Mirko Gregor</i>	page	120
3.3	Availability of data at various geographical scales	page	127
3.3.1	Evidence from micro-data as a complement to aggregate analyses on regional disparities. <i>Enrique López-Bazo and Vicente Royuela</i>	page	127
3.3.2	Small area estimation of at risk of poverty rates <i>Andrew Copus and Mike Coombes</i>	page	132
3.3.3	Macroeconomic conditions beyond territorial elements in forecasting regional growth: the MASST3 model <i>Roberto Camagni and Roberta Capello</i>	page	139
3.4	Innovative types of data	page	146
3.4.1	Exploring Big Data for analysing territorial development <i>Sofie Jæger, Kai Böhme and Erik Gløersen</i>	page	146
3.4.2	Spatial disaggregation of socio-economic data and combination with spatial data by means of OLAP technologies <i>Roger Milego, Maria José Ramos and César Martínez</i>	page	153
3.4.3	Data needs and workarounds for cross-border studies: experiences in ULYSSES <i>Andreas Putlitz and Wolfgang Jung</i>	page	159

4	Science-policy interaction revisited	page 164
4.1	Methods supporting policy decisions and implementation	page 164
4.1.1	Calculating regionalised scenarios meeting Europe 2020 objectives <i>Christian Lürer, Maria Tóptsidou and Sabine Zillmer</i>	page 164
4.1.2	Researching in geography beyond the spatial planning, matching science, theory and practice <i>Maria Prezioso</i>	page 169
4.1.3	A conceptual device for spreading (good) territorial governance in Europe <i>Umberto Janin Rivolin and Giancarlo Cotella</i>	page 175
4.2	Approaches to support participatory processes	page 180
4.2.1	Strengthen the capacity of citizen participation in urban projects <i>Dominique Lancrenon, Bruno Clerbaux, and Ignacio Peman</i>	page 180
4.2.2	The Delphi method in ESPON: State of the art, innovations and thoughts for future developments <i>Estelle Evrard, Tobias Chilla and Christian Schulz</i>	page 187
4.2.3	Qualitative method and territorial performance monitoring of macro-challenges: an integrated perspective <i>Loris Servillo</i>	page 192
4.3	Challenges in communication techniques	page 198
4.3.1	New ICT in planning practice: a permanent need to innovate in practice <i>Nuno N. Pinto, Dominique Lancrenon and Martin Berchthold</i>	page 198
4.3.2	Are maps sufficient? Using traffic lights and box plots for a better understanding of ESPON <i>Alina Munteanu, Ciprian Alupului, Mihail Eva and Daniel Tudora</i>	page 204
4.3.3	An innovative educational tool in disseminating the ESPON knowledge widely: Evaluation and perspectives <i>Stella Kyvelou, Nektaria Marava, Simos Retalis and Ioanna Pothitaki</i>	page 209

List of Maps, Figures and Tables

Map 2.1	Regional participation to the ESPON program (2007-2013)	page	18
Map 2.2	EU2020S aggregate index, 2009-2010	page	24
Map 2.3	Regional change in the EU2020S aggregate index, 2005-2010	page	25
Map 2.4	Europe's cross-border metropolitan regions and their integration into the global economy	page	47
Map 2.5	EU Level – Typology on sex ratios	page	66
Map 2.6	EU level typology on SGEI	page	67
Map 2.7	The location of logistics activities	page	70
Map 2.8	The geography of logistics activities in Northwest Europe	page	71
Map 2.9	Urban potential of functional border regions in Europe	page	76
Map 2.10	Typology of attractive regions by types and intensity of mobilities attracted	page	87
Map 3.1	Land Change Hotspots, 1990-2006	page	112
Map 3.2	Intensity of land-sea interactions in Europe	page	118
Map 3.3	European Land Sea typologies map	page	119
Map 3.4	Typologies of urban development, 1990-2000	page	122
Map 3.5	Estimated AROP rates for NUTS 3 regions of the UK 2005	page	136
Map 3.6	Average annual regional GDP growth rate forecasted by the MASST3 model, baseline scenario, 2012-2030	page	143
Map 3.7	Tweet density in Europe, measured in number of tweets per 1000 inhabitants	page	147
Map 3.8	Percentage of tweets in a foreign language	page	148
Map 3.9	Majority language used in Luxembourgish municipalities (LAU2)	page	149
Figure 2.1	A scheme of a reflective regional system	page	16
Figure 2.2	The network of ESPON regional collaborations	page	19
Figure 2.3	Region-complementary basin indices in ESPON programme for selected indicators	page	20
Figure 2.4	Evolution of disparities	page	31
Figure 2.5	Territorial cohesion: the concept approached by territorial objectives and indicators	page	32
Figure 2.6	Graph representation of an indicator	page	33
Figure 2.7	Coefficient of variation of GDP per capita in PPS, 2002-2008: by NUTS level (a) and by type of NUTS3 regions (b)	page	35
Figure 2.8	Coefficient of variation for the four indicators under the territorial objective “strong local economies ensuring global competitiveness” by NUTS0, 2000-2010	page	36
Figure 2.9	Homogenization as an important consequence from European Integration	page	44
Figure 2.10	Cross-border commuting in the case study regions of the Metroborder project	page	45
Figure 2.11	Inter-relations between the five dimensions of territorial governance	page	54
Figure 2.12	Rank-size distribution of (a) Spain and its provinces in 1998, (b) Europe and the European countries in 2000 and (c) the world and the continents in 2000	page	56
Figure 2.13	Application of the model for examining the impact of different networks on the Metropolitan Area of Wrocław	page	57
Figure 2.14	The impact on simulation results of different contact types represented by changes of selectivity parameter. Case study: Metropolitan Area of Wrocław	page	58
Figure 2.15	Simulation of Wrocław's metropolitan centres: (a) within the planned transportation network (b) final predilection of the bi-polar centre system and (c) municipal plan of developing three-centre system	page	59

Figure 2.16	Simulation of the imaginary structure of the Western Pole in Wrocław Metropolitan Area – results after 100 iterations with (a) 10 % (b) 100 % and (c) 1000 % increase of the source potential	page	59
Figure 2.17	Population in core border regions in 2006	page	77
Figure 2.18	Population change in core border regions 2001-2006 (%)	page	77
Figure 2.19	Indicators of metropolitan development in Central European agglomerations	page	80
Figure 2.20	Confronting features of PMD with strategic assessments	page	82
Figure 2.21	Layers of PMD in a processual dimension	page	82
Figure 3.1	Criteria for selection of „promising“ fields of landscape	page	94
Figure 3.2	Territorial drivers of innovation dynamics and streams of literature combined in the integrated framework	page	98
Figure 3.3	Methodological flow used to analyze prevailing land use characteristics	page	110
Figure 3.4	Illustrates the process of land- sea typology development	page	115
Figure 3.5	Urban development in cities and LUZ, 1990-2000 and 2000-2006	page	123
Figure 3.6	The AROP rate	page	133
Figure 3.7	Two alternative ways of using available data in UK	page	134
Figure 3.8	The vicious cycle of the crisis and the stability pact effects: endogenous and exogenous relationships in the MASST model	page	142
Figure 3.9	Overall, between- and within-country disparities (Theil indices), 2011-2030	page	144
Figure 3.10	Example of unique combination of units within a grid cell	page	154
Figure 3.11	General schema of data processing for OLAP integration	page	155
Figure 3.12	Schema of OLAP fact table built-up	page	155
Figure 3.13	Sample result of an OLAP Cube analysis within MS Excel	page	156
Figure 3.14	Screenshot of the OLAP web tool homepage	page	157
Figure 3.15	Screenshots of the OLAP web tool results after a query	page	157
Figure 4.1	R&D expenditures 2009&2020 (scenarios) in German NUTS1 regions [%]	page	166
Figure 4.2	Employment rates 2010 & 2020 (scenarios) in EU28 NUTS2 regions [%]	page	167
Figure 4.3	Evolutionary cycle of territorial governance	page	176
Figure 4.4	Evolutionary cycle of European territorial governance	page	177
Figure 4.5	Modes for the spread of (good) territorial governance in Europe	page	177
Figure 4.6	Typology of eight levels of participation proposed by Sherry Arnstein, 1969	page	181
Figure 4.7	The site of the case study “Tours et Taxis”, Brussels, and designs for the urban project	page	183
Figure 4.8	The case study Bondy, France: Site, designs and process	page	184
Figure 4.9	Structure of the monitoring process	page	195
Figure 4.10	Hypothetical example: a CBC compared to a country	page	205
Figure 4.11	Romania – Bulgaria CBC compared to successively to EU-27+4, all CBC Areas, Romania and Bulgaria	page	206
Figure 4.12	Example of box plots annexed to a map. GDP/hab. at the NUTS3 level in Romania – Bulgaria CBC Area	page	207
Figure 4.13	Overall idea of the educational programme	page	211
Figure 4.14	Overall experience within the ESPONTrain Virtual Learning Environment	page	212
Figure 4.15	Evaluation of the ESPONTrain project mainly related to professional and academic criteria	page	213
Table 2.1	Coefficient of variation of the economic and human capital indices	page	17
Table 2.2	Main centrality indices for the 10 top regions in the network	page	19
Table 2.3	Ten regions with the highest and lowest EU2020S aggregate index, 2009-2010	page	23
Table 2.4	Weights for composite indicators echoing HDI	page	29
Table 2.5	Summary of Simplified Findings	page	42

Table 2.6	Overview of the five dimensions and 12 indicators of territorial governance	page	51
Table 2.7	Place-based knowledge and target group oriented policy advice	page	63
Table 2.8	Life course, policy recommendations, levels of implementation	page	64
Table 2.9	Economic and labour market performance of cluster types	page	88
Table 3.1	The „top fields“: Overview	page	95
Table 3.2	Empirical Variables included in the model	page	99
Table 3.3	Territorial Innovation Dynamics in China, India and USA	page	100
Table 3.4	A SWOT analysis of SGI (short version)	page	105
Table 3.5	Ranking of CLC classes based on Land Use Intensity	page	111
Table 3.6	Some examples of regional disparities	page	129
Table 3.7	Specification of Model A	page	135
Table 3.8	Specification of Model B	page	135
Table 4.1	Implementation of the Delphi method in ESPON projects	page	188
Table 4.2	Thoughts for further implementation of the Delphi method in the ESPON programme	page	190
Table 4.3	Comparison between qualitative and quantitative methods	page	194

2.2.9 Population mobility: moving away from a ‘sedentarist’ epistemology

Antonio Russo*, Ian Smith# and Loris Servillo†

I. INTRODUCTION: INTEGRATING HUMAN MOBILITY IN TERRITORIAL ANALYSIS

The main challenge of the ATTREG project (*The Attractiveness of Regions and Cities for Residents and Visitors*) was to generate a conceptual and operational framework that would allow integrating the dimension of human mobility in ESPON policy development. To address this topic, mobility (flows, drivers, policy contexts) has been analysed in relation to different populations or ‘audiences’, which can hardly be positioned in the simple binary resident-visitor evoked by the project title, adhering instead to the notion – and a remarkable turn in the epistemology of social sciences – that sees contemporary society as ‘on the move’ rather than sedentary (Sheller & Urry 2006). This has bearings on the general approach of ESPON, as it compels to consider population mobility in its full complexity when analyzing the territorial impacts of external shocks and policies, or the formulation of future scenarios. This approach led us to analyse and contextualise different *mobilities* – the work-related migrations of different collectives, other lifestyle-related displacements, and the short-term, ‘unsticky’ mobility of tourists – under the same methodological lens, and focusing on their interrelations, synergies or conflicts.

This paper mainly focuses on the issue of relating ‘types of attractiveness’ to policy instruments within a multilevel perspective, advancing the notion that attraction *per se* is not always to be looked for, and should anyway be articulated in sophisticated strategies targeting specific audiences, taking into full account the spatial effects engendered. In the next section we introduce a typology of attractive regions. In the third we then relate it to specific policy spaces and instruments that regions in a specific class should be looking at. The fourth section refers back to the general EU policy objectives, and concludes reflecting on the validity of this work for the ESPON research approach.

II. FORMS OF INTER-REGIONAL MOBILITY AND THEIR INTERACTION

The three key bodies of literature on which our argument is built come from research looking at the relationship between migration and tourism (see Williams & Hall 2000; Hall & Müller 2004; Williams 2013), at substitution between commuting and migration (for instance Eliasson et al. 2003; Green et al. 1999), and at counter-urbanisation and ‘escalator’ regions where migration is differentiated by age/location within a career lifecycle (e.g. Champion 2012; Fielding 1992). The ATTREG project and subsequent work outlined the empirical regularities that appear to exist between indicators of these different forms of inter-regional mobility at the scale of NUTS2 regions across the EU for the period 2001–07 – namely, a picture of generalised mobility across Europe from north and east toward south and west that holds with regularity (increasing and positively correlated inward mobility for all working age groups and tourism) for three quarters of the regions for which we have data.

However in this short paper we are interested in exploring the policy implications of such interactions rather than reiterating the argument that forms of mobility inter-relate. Thus we have generated a regional typology according to forms of mobility attracted and their intensity, which relates to different challenges (or ‘policy spaces’) faced by policy agencies with an interest in regional development, with the aim to generate ‘districts in the multi-dimensional variables space’ in order to assess the nature of the mobility problematic in different regions¹⁵. Such typology is based on multi-year averages on four measures of mobility measured at the region of destination at the level of 287 NUTS2 regions

¹⁵ Clustering in the case of regional indicators tends to involve a degree of ‘messiness’ where clusters may have fuzzy boundaries. However this does not invalidate the discussion of the mobility challenges for the groups of regions: the clusters’ validity in terms of being able to distinguish between different characteristics has been tested using ANOVA tests on regional features that had not been used in the construction of the typology. The clustering algorithm is based on the use of the Ward method of hierarchical clustering (for methodological issues and applications, see Mangiameli et al. 1996: 402).

* University Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain (antonio.russo@urv.cat)

University of the West of England, Bristol, UK (Ian5.Smith@uwe.ac.uk)

† Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium (Loris.Servillo@asro.kuleuven.be)

across the ESPON space. These are the annual net migration rates generated through a residual population model for 2002-07; the rates of annual net migration for two age cohorts (15-24 and 50-64 years old); the visitor arrival rates as the number of recorded persons staying in registered commercial establishments per 1,000 head of resident population.

Map 2.10 maps out this typology. 218 regions are included in four 'mainstream' clusters (according to the theory): net migration rate at all ages correlates positively to visiting rates, and four combined levels of intensity of the two variables can be distinguished, ranging from negative/moderate to very strong attractiveness for visitors as well as migrants in the 2001-07 period.


- Cluster 1 (coloured light yellow in the map) includes 90 regions, half of which are in the post-2004 member-states but also include areas of Germany, the Netherlands and northern France, experiencing on average net out-migration of resident population across all age groups and relatively low rates of visiting;
- Cluster 2 (light green) is made up of 79 regions mainly in the older member-states of the EU15 with (on average) net in-migration rates and a mid-level visitor rate;
- Cluster 3 (darker green) groups 34 regions mainly located on the western Mediterranean arc from Catalonia to Lazio, the Italian Adriatic coast as well as the Atlantic seaboard, registering moderate to high levels of both net migration and visitor rates;
- Cluster 4 (light blue) is a group of 5 regions made up mainly of Mediterranean regions where the data suggests that there have been generally very high levels of net migration combined with high levels of visiting.

The remaining 69 regions are in four other clusters combining characteristics that remove them from the main axis of increasing attractiveness across all types of mobilities. In this regard they could be thought of as either having actively 'specialised' in attracting particular audiences or having become specialist by accident. These four clusters are:

- Cluster 5 (orange) where net migration rates for the younger age cohort (15-24 years old) are associated with net out-migration by those in the older age cohort (50-64 years old). This is a group of 37 regions, mostly metropolitan and capital city regions, plus some university-focused non-metropolitan areas, which are experiencing demographic rejuvenation.
- Cluster 6 (lilac) is a group of 23 regions where net in-migration by the older cohort is combined with net out-migration by those in the younger age cohort. These are mostly located in northern and Baltic Europe. They are mostly aging but could also be considered 'retirement regions' that attract because of their 'soft' amenities and natural endowments.
- Cluster 7 (darker blue) is a group of 16 'tourism specialist' regions that experience relatively modest rates of net migration in comparison to the rate of visitor arrivals. Among them there are mostly mature destination regions in the Alpine arc and recreational destinations in the EU core.
- Cluster 8 (red) is made up of 6 Spanish regions including the Madrid community, Catalonia and their neighbours, whose high attractiveness for tourism has reached the natural upper bound of maturity in the early 2000s but have continued to be attractive throughout the decade for both highly skilled mid-career migrants and younger low-skilled immigration related to the construction and tourism sectors.

Considering the characteristics of regions clustered together helps understanding something more of these mobility patterns. Thus, Cluster 1 regions recorded a statistically significantly lower per capita GDP and higher unemployment rates in 2001 than the other cluster averages, whereas Cluster 5 had a significantly higher average p.c. GDP. This can be interpreted as an economic push whereby there are low rates of visitor arrivals to – and net out-migration from – 'source' regions with low levels of economic wealth creation and high levels of unemployment.

Map 2.10 Typology of attractive regions by types and intensity of mobilities attracted



Regional typology of inter-regional mobility rates

NUTS 2 regions (2006)

NO DATA

Typology

Cluster 1 (low level net mobility)

Cluster 2 (mid level mobility)

Cluster 3 (mid to high level net mobility)

Cluster 4 (high level mobility)

Cluster 5 (young net in migration)

Cluster 6 (older net in migration)

Cluster 7 (tourism specialist)

Cluster 8 (high migrant low visiting)

However regions that have higher rates of in-migration and visitors are not readily distinguished amongst themselves by reason of their economic and labour market characteristics alone. As demonstrated in ESPON (2012), there are a bundle of territorial capital indicators other than the traditional set of economic and job market variables which may explain attraction in relation to mobile populations. For the purposes of this paper we are however more interested in exploring the relationship between the profiles of mobility and economic change. Hence Table 2.9 sets out a series of economic and labour market change indicators for the six clusters with a membership of at least 10 regions (Clusters 4 and 8 are thus not considered). These changes (averaged within each cluster) are recorded for a period both leading up to and following on from the fiscal crisis of 2007-08.

Table 2.9 Economic and labour market performance of cluster types

Cluster #	N	change in GDP per capita		change in residents in employment (LFS estimate)		change in resident unemployed (LFS estimate)		Ratio of annual net migration to 1 year cohort aged 20 years
		2001-07	2007-10	2001-07	2007-12	2001-07	2007-12	2004-07
1 (low level mobility)	81	57.6	3.0	5.6	-2.4	-14.2	35.9	-0.05
2 (mid-level mobility)	71	29.8	-1.2	7.4	-0.9	20.3	47.5	0.30
3 (mid-high level mobility)	27	28.2	-4.9	14.2	-0.9	17.5	93.8	0.90
5 (young net in-migration)	34	31.8	-3.7	6.7	2.7	31.7	40.3	0.30
6 (older net in-migration)	17	26.9	1.8	7.5	-0.8	4.1	51.0	0.00
7 (tourism specialist)	12	29.7	-4.2	8.0	-0.8	15.0	45.6	0.60

Source: own elaboration on EUROSTAT data

Whereas Cluster 1 regions tended to experience net outward migration in the period 2001-07, they experienced a significantly higher average growth in GDP per capita over this period than the other clusters and a significant decline in the number of working age adults recorded as unemployed. Thus, out-migration did not appear to have dampened economic activity in this cluster. On the contrary, the figures suggest that regions that received on average more people in the years preceding the economic crisis experienced the most torrid downturns in subsequent years: a larger slump in p.c. GDP and a significantly larger hike in unemployment for the period 2007-12. GDP growth however does not seem to correlate at all with increasing levels of inward mobility as it is not possible to distinguish between the clusters of regions receiving more mobile population from those that receive fewer people.

The size of a year cohort in their early 20s is indicative of the importance of young people living in the region who are moving into the regional labour market.¹⁶ The figures indicate that the regional labour markets in Cluster 3 are exposed to extra-regional labour migration by 90 % – by contrast Cluster 2 regions are only exposed to 30 %. Internal inter-regional migration data might suggest that Cluster 5 regions are also highly exposed to in-flows of labour, but that this is hidden in the net migration figures. These mainly metropolitan regions are operating as a form of escalator where in-

¹⁶ The OECD has used a similar indicator to measure the importance of migration to territorial labour market dynamics drawing a comparison to the ratio of foreign inward investment to indigenous investment within a regional economy as an indicator of foreign exposure (OECD 2010).

flows of younger adults are balanced by outflows of older workforce; they appear to have benefited benefit from migration-enhanced rejuvenation that contributes to high levels of economic output and the generation of employment even during economic downturns, although on-going economic growth in these regions does not appear to be greater than the accumulation of 'spare labour' since unemployment numbers grew both during the pre-2008 period of growth and during the economic downturn. Clearly these figures focus on gross flows of migrants and not actual flows. However even with this caveat, it might be argued (as is done in OECD 2010) that regions need to be mindful of their exposure to external inputs in their regional economies in order to benefit from the advantages that spring from the mobility of labour.

III. THE POLICY DIMENSIONS OF MOBILITY

Following up with the characterisation of clusters in the previous section, and using indications coming from the more qualitative work carried out in ATTREG at case-study level, our typology nuances a series of challenges or 'policy spaces' for regional policymakers who aim to mould regional development through the facilitation or influencing of mobility. For 'mainstream' Clusters 1-4, policymakers face opposite situations related with a generalised lack (1, and to a lesser extent 2) and excess (3 and 4) of inward mobility.

- For regions in Cluster 1, the low levels of inward mobility were not problematic throughout the early 2000s because outward migration appears to have helped tackle the issue of spare labour. However by 2007-08 these regions had (mostly) converged with the bulk of the EU, approaching a problematic juncture, whereby growth may deflate if it is not sustained by human capital development (and indeed regional disparities have widened in the last years). Opportunities in this sense may come from the facilitation of return migration, or the attraction of workforce from outside the EU (especially at its eastern border).
- For Cluster 2 regions, the main issue is to understand whether they are operating at levels of mobility that are easily integrated in the local structure of the labour market. Many of these arguably attract 'less than they could' given their territorial endowments and their resilient profile in terms of labour market exposure: thus policies that facilitate attraction and even more so retention (for instance, through investments in territorial capital and its branding) might be effective.
- Regions in Cluster 3 and 4 have needed to face up to the challenges of high levels of visiting and migration. Smith & Atkinson (2011) suggest that the high levels of migration may be at the very least a symptom of labour market vulnerability. Equally these regions are more heavily dependent upon tourism both in terms of exposing regional labour and housing markets to external pressures and shocks. Specific initiatives to favour labour market integration and regulate/upgrade tourism development were needed to prevent problems during the oncoming downturn; in most cases, that did not happen.

For the regions in the groups of 'specialist' clusters (5 to 8), where one of the dimensions of inter-regional mobility is working in the opposite sense to the other, the policy spaces face the challenges of potentially problematic interactions between inward mobilities.

- Cluster 5 can be simply accepted as regional escalators. Retention policies for students at the end of their career may allay their characteristic of being 'revolving door' regions with a transiency of talents; moreover careful campus development and planning may harness the gentrification processes typical of 'town and gown' contexts where the attraction of the young and talented favours the expulsion of the older and less protected citizens, leading to issues of exclusion.
- Cluster 6 regions experience the opposite situation of 'silver' in-migration and high visitor rates, but out-migration of the younger workforce. This may become problematic in the long term, although not necessarily in pure economic terms: these regions should be prepared to invest in health services and social support for an aging population.
- Cluster 7 regions may be effectively managing the demand for residence in the region but may then need to deal with a gentrification of residence. It may be appropriate in these circumstances to keep a tight grip on the housing market through regulatory arrangements and discourage potential low-income migrants that might be tempted by their lovely holidays.

- For Cluster 8 regions, which are currently under great strain from the crisis, an inversion of the immigration trend experienced until 2007 is natural and welcome; however they still need to think how to become attractive (or retentive) again without over-exposing themselves to the exhausted tourism and real estate-driven growth model.

IV. FINAL REFLECTIONS: FROM A LOCAL TO A PAN-EU APPROACH


In our approach, none of the ‘mobilities’ that regions have been able to activate (either outward or inward) are *per se* problematic, however they did show a certain correlation to trends and phenomena in the post-crisis period that opens the field for adequate responses and policy discourses. However, we want to conclude with a reflection on some mobility-related issues as well as some misunderstandings produced by a ‘sedentarist’ policy approach, shifting to a prescriptive pan-European approach to population mobility, including tourism (which is now mostly dealt with in purely sectorial terms). Among many more that are listed in the ATTREG final report (ESPON 2012) we focus here on the following pointers:

- It is not only work-related mobility that can produce positive externalities in target regions. For instance, ‘silver migration’ of affluent groups to certain southern regions or to coastal areas in northern countries has led to the development of a form of economy which goes beyond the traditional forms of tourism exploitation and is arguably more sustainable. In general, there is evidence that there is room for synergies between labour attraction and tourism-oriented strategies.
- Positive effects can be seen not only in destinations of mobility but also in origin regions (Katseliet et al. 2006; Gagnon & Khoudour-Castéras 2011), where over time, the prospect of better future opportunities abroad has encouraged people in origin countries to acquire education and skills. This may also have spilled over into an increase in educational policies and in general measures dedicated to human capital, including services to specific sectors for retaining population.
- The evidence provided by ‘overheating’ regions (Cluster 4 and 8 in our analysis) indicates the presence of thresholds representing a balance between inflows of new regional users and quality of life and access to resources for local residents, beyond which local economic systems may become less attractive and/or resilient. In this sense it may be appropriate to develop policies that support mobility of the working population, especially in situations when a region approaches a ‘critical condition’. Such approaches could be developed in terms of partnerships of shared responsibility between receiving and sending regions; this would provide greater flexibility for these regions and more security for the mobile population.

As a general conclusion of this short paper, we gave some hints that human mobility should be incorporated as an important and ‘dynamic’ variable in ESPON research supporting territorial policy. On one side, it is important to consider at all times that human mobility is determined by – and determines – changes of territorial performances. Therefore, projections of dynamics, visions and scenarios in the next decades cannot be considered mobility-free. On the other, attention needs to be paid to the full effects that specific policies engender and population movements contribute to ‘propagate’ in space, from the point of view of regional development and territorial cohesion, and touching upon all the key themes of the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF). The uneven development of EU regions and the identification of mobility patterns taking place in relation to changes in perceptions and regional opportunities should reinforce the idea of creating an agenda dedicated to supporting mobility in its various forms, thereby contributing to the ‘founding’ objective of a free circulation not only of goods but also of people (Servilloet et al. 2013). Rather than encroaching upon national sovereignty, an integrated approach should activate EU, cross-regional and regional initiatives that facilitate and in some cases even stimulate the mobility of population, promoting the possibility for people to spend part of their life-cycle in a different context and assisting all those existing forms of mobility that are neither just tourism-based nor life-long migration. As the methodological difficulties encountered in the ATTREG project demonstrate, this approach stands upon the development of a monitoring system able to provide updated EU-wide data on mobility at the finest possible scale.

REFERENCES

- Champion T. (2012), Testing the return migration element of the 'escalator region' model: an analysis of migration into and out of south-east England, 1966–2001. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 5(2), pp. 255–270.
- Eliasson K., Lindgren U., Westerlund O. (2003), Geographical Labour Mobility: Migration or Commuting? *Regional Studies* 37(8). 827–837.
- ESPON (2012). *The Attractiveness of Regions and Cities for Residents and Visitors – ATTREG.Final Report*. Luxembourg.
- Fielding A.J. (1992), Migration and Social Mobility: South East England as an Escalator Region. *Regional Studies* 26(1). 1–15.
- Gagnon J., Khoudour-Castéras D. (2011), *Tackling the Policy Challenges of migration. Regulation, Integration, Development*. OECD, Paris.
- Green A.E., Hogarth T., Shackleton R.E. (1999), Longer distance commuting as a substitute for migration in Britain: a review of trends, issues and implications. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 5(1). 49–67.
- Hall C.M., Müller D.K. (2004), *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes. Between Elite Landscape and Common Ground*. Channel View, Clevedon.
- Katseli L.T., Lucas R.E.B., Xenogiani T. (2006), *Effects of Migration on Sending Countries: What do we know?* OECD Working Paper No.250.
- Mangiameli P., Chen S.K., West D. (1996), A comparison of SOM neural network and hierarchical clustering methods. *European Journal of Operational Research* 93(2).402–417.
- OECD (2010), *OECD Territorial Outlook*. OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Servillo L., Atkinson R., Russo A.P. (2012), Territorial Attractiveness in EU Urban and Spatial Policy: A critical review and future research agenda. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 19 (4). 349–365.
- Sheller M., Urry J. (2006), The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38(2). 207–226.
- Smith I., Atkinson R. (2011), Mobility and the smart, green and inclusive Europe, *Local Economy* 26(6/7). 562–576.
- Williams A.M. (2013), Mobilities and sustainable tourism: Path-creating or path-dependent relationships? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 21(4). 511–531.
- Williams A.M., Hall C.M. (2000), Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism Geographies* 2(1). 5–27.



www.espon.eu

The ESPON 2013 Programme supports policy development in relation to the aim of territorial cohesion and harmonious development of the European territory. It provides comparable information, evidence, analysis, and scenarios on territorial dynamics, which reveal territorial capitals and development potentials of regions and larger territories contributing.

This Scientific Report publishes 34 papers on understanding territorial realities, measuring territorial outcomes and revising science-policy translation. The papers have been prepared by researchers involved in ESPON projects and by authors from the European professional and academic organisations AESOP, ECTP-CEU, ERSA, EUGEO and RSA.

The ESPON Scientific Conference “Science in support of European Territorial Development and Cohesion” held on 12-13 September 2013 in Luxembourg has been used to present, discuss and reflect upon the papers.

The close cooperation with the European professional and academic organisations mentioned ensured an exchange of experiences with other scientific researchers in the same field and enabled all authors to sharpen the methodologies used and presented.

The purpose of this report is to communicate and discuss scientific elements such as concepts, methodologies, indicators, typologies, tools, maps and models developed and/or used within the ESPON projects and the European scientific research community in the field of territorial development and cohesion. As part of the dialogue on territorial development and cohesion you are welcome to engage with ESPON via www.espon.eu.

ISBN 978-2-919777-53-2