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ABSTRACT: Ageing, European integration and human mobility beyond national frontiers are three intertwined processes shaping Spain as an international retirement place. Insofar as the quality of democracy has to do with citizens’ political involvement, the aim of this paper is to analyse to what extent foreign EU retirees residing in Spain are using their right to vote in the local elections.

Interestingly, the last local elections, held in 2015, were part of a substantial change of the Spanish party system throughout the Great Recession. However, gerontomigrants’ mobilization has not been addressed up to this moment. This empirical study focuses on the characteristics and intensity in which foreign elderly citizens mobilized in the last Spanish local elections, with special attention to EU seniors. The previous elections, held in 2011, will be examined from a comparative perspective. Main data to be analysed will mostly be provided by the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE) – both the electoral register and the population census. They will be complemented with the MIRES3i survey, which, in 2011, addressed 720 foreign European retirees (pensioners aged 50 years and over) of 16 nationalities (those of the EU-15 plus those coming from Norway and Switzerland) living in Spain.

Following the formalisation of European citizenship and the freedom of movement and residence within the European Union for the citizens of the Member States, the EU has been transformed into a trans-national zone criss-crossed not only by tourists, but also by students, workers and patients, as well as retirees seeking a better quality of life (Benson and O’Reilly 2009). Throughout Europe, new areas of retirement settlement have emerged as a result. Spain encompasses some of the largest and most important territories in Europe receiving people in retirement age or close to it from other countries. Most international retirement migrants (Rodríguez 2005; Warnes 2004; King et al. 2000; Williams et al. 1997) or gerontomigrants (Echezarreta 2005) come from Northern and Central European countries. Most of them come from the fifteen older EU Member States (hereafter referred to as ‘EU-15’, Spain excluded) and to a lesser extent from both the rest of EU Member States1 and non-EU countries.

Whether traditional migrants or transnational migrants (see Favell 2009; Gustafson 2008 and 2004), and relocating either permanently or temporarily, they are certainly practicing the European rights both to move and reside within the Union. Along with them, European citizens have also been conferred the right at the core of democracy – the right to vote and stand as candidates in the Member State of residence, concretely, in both European and local elections. Thus, they become part of the political community. They are more than just foreign residents and consumers (see Janoschka and Durán 2014; Hueté and Mantecón 2012; Janoschka 2010a and 2010b; Durán 2005). This paper analyses the political engagement of elderly migrants to Spain at the local level by focusing upon their electoral mobilization.

---

1 The EU-15 comprises Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Following the collapse of their regimes in 1989, many former communist countries from central and eastern Europe became EU members in two waves, between 2004 and 2007. In 2013, Croatia became the 28th country to join.
Foreign European citizens living in Spain were made eligible to vote for the first time in 1999 and exercised this right for the fifth and last time by now, together with other foreign residents, in May 2015. To what extent? Scholars have observed that cosmopolitan European elite migrants – whom Favell (2009) refers to as “Eurostars” – seem to be fairly detached from local politics (see also Huete and Mantecón 2012; Collard 2010; Durán 2005).  

2 Scholars also derive from their empirical studies that political turnout in local elections among immigrants and foreign-born nationals is often quite low (Bird et al. 2011; Messina 2007), and that it is even lower in districts with a predominance of immigrants (Siemiatycki 2006; Jones-Correa 2005). Do foreign seniors with voting rights in Spain follow this pattern? Has there been any change as a result of the Great Recession or for any other reason? What factors help explaining such findings?

Being our case study the Spanish local elections held in 2015, the research draws upon basic data provided by the Spanish National Statistics Institute, responsible for the electoral census and the population register. Once the Spanish electoral system is summarized, specially attending to the main characteristics that affect foreigners’ participation and representation, the following section will deal with their distribution and concentration throughout the territory at the national, regional and local level. Then we will describe and analyse electoral mobilization by attending to a number of possible explaining factors – age, identity community, relative size of fellow migrants’ community, and population size of the localities where they have settled. Institutional and political variables will previously be addressed as would-be explanations of an unusually high level of inscription on the electoral roll.

In order to better understand seniors’ electoral practice of European citizenship abroad, we will address voter-turnout with regard to socio-demographic and political features such as gender, nationality, school level, income, time of residence in Spain both per year and as live time, amongst others. Data will come from the MIRES3i survey. In 2008, the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (Spanish National Research Council) together with seven Spanish universities started a representative, large scale, multi-method research project called MIRES3i (International Retirement Migration in Spain: Identity, Impacts, Integration) investigating the multiple facets of European retirement migration to Spain. The interdisciplinary research was carried out in the most important regions of retirement migration in Spain (Andalusia, Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, Catalonia, Murcia and Valencia) by means of a standardised questionnaire addressed to 720 foreign European retirees (pensioners aged 50 years old and over) of 16 nationalities (those of the EU-15 plus those coming from Norway and Switzerland) living in Spain more than three months per year. The face-to-face questionnaire survey was conducted between April 2010 and February 2011. It is the first European survey national in scope addressing to such a multinational population (see also Casado et al. 2004).

**Spanish electoral system and data gathering**

The Maastricht Treaty (1992) formally introduced for the first time in the European integration process the idea of a political union. European citizenship as a principle was formalized, and full-age European citizens residing in a Member State of which they are non-nationals were granted both voting rights and eligibility as candidates in local and European elections. The Spanish Constitution was amended to attend to this requirement that same year. Neither the Union nor Spain have granted other voting rights, such as the right of EU citizens to vote in regional or general elections or for non-EU nationals as a whole to elect any form of political representative.

In Spain, Norwegians have council election voting rights on a reciprocal basis since 1991. Suffrage right was also granted to nationals of six American countries (Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, and Peru) plus those of Cape Verde, Iceland and New Zealand for the 2011 local elections (see Rodríguez 2016; Durán and Martín 2008; Shaw 2011 and 2007; Messina 2007: ch.7; Earnest 2006). The right has been extended to nationals from the American Trinidad

---

2 For an analysis of the low level of political participation of EU citizens at European Parliament elections held in their host countries, see Vintila (2016).
and Tobago and from the Asian Republic of Korea since the 2015 local elections. Non-EU citizens are required a minimum of five years’ legal residence (three years in the case of Norwegians) in order to be able to exercise their suffrage rights.3

The Spanish electoral system was set forth in the pre-constitutional electoral law of 1977, and updated in 1985, seven years after the Constitution had been enacted. In order to vote, registration in the electoral census is essential. Unlike Spaniards, European Union and other foreigners with voting rights aged 18 and older must previously communicate their desire to vote in the municipal elections to the delegation of the Electoral Census Office of their province of registration either directly or through the Town Hall of their place of residence, once registered on the population roll.2 Constituencies coincide with municipalities in local elections.

The number of councillors to be elected in each municipality is determined, from a minimum of five, by the number of inhabitants of all ages (both natives and foreigners) registered on the local census of population. Seats are given according to the electoral D’Hondt formula.6 Candidate lists need to receive at least five per cent of the valid vote to be represented in town halls, namely the formula is not applied to those lists that fail to pass such a threshold, leading to their being ignored. The office-holders are drawn from each list using the exact ordering in which the candidates were listed.7

A different case are the localities with fewer than 250 residents. In these villages,8 the electorate does not choose among lists of candidates but among candidates themselves, and the aforementioned electoral formula is not applied. Each elector can vote for up to four candidates, whatever his/her list. The candidates that one-by-one sum up more votes are those who become officially invested as councillors, either 1 (fewer than 100 residents) or 5 (between 100 and 250 residents).

Foreign citizens that fill in the appropriate form stating their intention to vote are registered on the electoral roll. It is important to take this into account, insofar as there exists no official data collection of electoral participation either by age or by nationality. Absolute and relative data include both Spaniards and non-Spaniards.9 Therefore, social scientists find themselves obliged to draw participation figures from the electoral register. That is the reason why we will mostly

---

3 To be more accurate, the amount of time required is three years for citizens of Norway and five years for the rest of non-EU residents at the time of application, and all of them have to be both registered in the municipal register of inhabitants and in possession of a residence permit.
4 Provinces are Spanish administrative entities as well as the electoral constituencies in both regional and general elections.
5 Squire, Wolfinger and Glass (1987) have concluded that, even amongst fellow-nationals (they study the case of USA), the requirement that citizens must register after their change in residence constitutes the key stumbling block in the trip to the polls. For an insight into institutional constraints on both electoral participation and representation, see Pérez-Nievas et al. (2014), Bloemraad and Schönwälder (2013), and Bird, Saalfeld and Wüst (2011).
6 The D’Hondt formula favours larger candidate-lists more the smaller the magnitude of an electoral district. In other terms, it is more proportional the higher the number of representatives to be elected. Proportional results are achieved in local elections specially in constituencies with more than 10.000 inhabitants, thus electing at least 17 councillors (Márquez Cruz 1999). There were only 751 localities (9.2%) of that size in 2015. 517 of them are part of the seven regions where most of immigrants have settled in Spain (see below), thus amounting to 19.6 per cent of their whole 2,641 localities.
7 Insofar as lists are closed and blocked, there is no scope for the expression of preferences amongst different candidates of either the same or different parties.
8 The number varies from election to election. There were 2,741 localities (33.8%) with less than 250 inhabitants – whatever their age and nationality – registered in the population census in 2015. The figure dropped to 314 localities (11.9%) amongst the seven regions that concentrate most of the immigrant population in Spain (see below).
9 The electoral census distinguishes neither between Spaniards and foreigners nor, among the former, between native-born and naturalised or foreign-born citizens.
refer to electoral mobilization, instead of electoral participation or turnout. It is also worth noting that, unlike non-EU residents,\textsuperscript{10} foreign EU citizens settled in Spain have only to express their will to vote on the first occasion. However, although it can be assumed that an immigrant who is entitled to vote will exercise his/her right on this first occasion, registration and voting should not be confused. The probability that foreign EU residents will vote will not necessarily be the same regarding the first election after registering as in the following ones. The MIRES3i survey helps to partially fill this lack of knowledge (see below).

**Spanish geography of the foreign seniors’ settlement**

After being a country of emigration throughout most of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Spain has evolved into a country of immigration. Foreigners amounted in 1996 to fewer than 550,000 (1.4 per cent of the total population). There were more than 5,7 million foreigners registered on the 2011 population census, thus reaching the highest proportion (12.2\%) and increasing more than tenfold in a decade and a half.\textsuperscript{11} Spain’s migratory balance has become negative as a result of the Great Recession. Nonetheless, there were still more than 4,73 million foreigners registered on the 2015 census (see table 1), amounting to 10.1\% of the total population.\textsuperscript{12} Almost 2 million of them are European Union citizens or nationals from Norway or Island (hereinafter referred to as ‘EU+ni’).\textsuperscript{13}

![Table 1 about here]

According to Eurostat, the foreign population is younger than the national population for the EU as a whole. The distribution by age of foreigners shows, compared with nationals, a greater proportion of relatively young working-age adults. On 1 January 2016, the median age of the national population in the Union was 44 years, while the median age of non-nationals was 36 years.\textsuperscript{14} Spain appears as the European country receiving the highest amount of elderly foreign new residents throughout the last decade.\textsuperscript{15}

Whilst 13.4 per cent of immigrants age 55 years old and above, the proportion almost doubles it, rising to 21.6 per cent among EU+ni. The elderly are even more, in relative terms, among the nationals of the EU15+ni. Insofar as 36.8 per cent of this population are 55 and older, it is obvious we are dealing with an aged community. In fact, that figure is even higher than the percentage rate of this age group as a proportion of the overall population, Spaniards included (30.2\%).

\textsuperscript{10} Non-EU residents have to apply for inscription on occasion of each election. It is consequently an additional institutional constraint that increases the cost of voting.

\textsuperscript{11} Data from the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE). They are always actualised by 1 January each year. The number of foreigners registered on the 2017 population census has dropped to 4,549,858 (9.8\%).

\textsuperscript{12} 2015 is the year when the last local elections were held. The electoral census was not set up on January 1, but some weeks later. As a result, there are some municipalities with more citizens registered on the electoral roll than on the population census. In order to avoid misleading percentages, population data have been fit to electoral inscription in such cases in this paper.

\textsuperscript{13} There is a community of values among foreign EU-15 citizens and nationals from both Iceland and Norway. As stated above, the latter have also been granted council election voting rights while residing in Spain. Grouping those nationals under a single label is also justified because the host population has a common perception of all of them as a whole (vis-à-vis the rest of non-EU immigrants, and even vis-à-vis EU-13 residents). Anyway, they amount to a small number – 9,120 Norwegians and 249 Icelandics, both of them aged 55 and older on the 2015 population census. On the other hand, while the former reside in just 378 localities (4.7\%), the latter are settled in 61 of the whole 8,119.


The settlement of retirees is particularly concentrated in seven of the nineteen Spanish Autonomous Communities (Ceuta and Melilla included): Andalusia, Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, Catalonia, Madrid, Murcia and Valencia (hereinafter, ‘7SAC’). All of them are coastal (except Madrid) and Mediterranean regions (except Madrid and the Canary Islands). 81.0 per cent of registered migrants of all ages have settled in the 7SAC territory. The concentration of elderly foreign residents is even larger – 88.2 per cent of over-55 migrants living in Spain have settled in the 7SACs, and the proportion reaches 92.2 per cent among the over-65 immigrant population.

With regard to the origins of immigration flows, 22.4 per cent of 7SAC foreign residents are EU+ni citizens, and 18.9 per cent come from the EU-13 Member States of the last three expansions. Those proportions change substantially in considering age. As it can be seen in table 2, almost 60 per cent of 7SAC over-55 immigrants are nationals of a EU15+ni country, and the proportion rises to three quarters among over-65s. Thus, it makes sense talking about Spain as a place in the sun (King et al. 2000; O’Reilly 2000; Williams et al. 1997) or for lifestyle migrants (Benson and O'Reilly 2009; cfr. Huete et al. 2013).

Spain has certainly to be labelled as an European retirement place, but not only for EU-15 citizens. Actually, there is a growing population of migrants coming to an age of retirement or retired after having worked in Spain (see Parreño-Castejón and Domínguez-Mújica 2016), as well as there are older people coming to Spain via family reunification. Most of them are EU-13 nationals, but there are also non-EU nationals, either with or without voting rights.

The relevant territory from an electoral point of view is the municipality. Immigrants at large – and older ones in particular – are distributed throughout the entire country. Foreign citizens entitled to vote and aged 65 and over are registered in 81.4 per cent of the 2,641 7SAC localities. The figure rises up to 89.7 per cent when considering over-55s. 15EU+ni citizens aged 55 and above represent at least 20 per cent of the population of that age (Spaniards included) in 149 localities, all of them 7SACs. In 39 localities, they even make up more than 50 per cent of such a population, that is, they are localities where EU seniors outnumber even host nationals of the same age. The figures are higher if we focus upon the over-65-age group – those European elderly migrants represent at least 20 per cent of the whole population of that age in 158 localities and at least half of that population in 42 of them. They amount to 164 towns and villages, and pertain to Valencia (70 of them), Andalusia (49), the Canary Islands (18), Catalonia (13), the Balearic Islands (11), and Murcia (2).16 Such a setting is a unique situation in the European Union, and it has political implications.

On that regard, the EU has decided that some Member States may face electoral polarization between lists of national and non-national candidates when the proportion of non-national citizens of the Union of voting-age exceeds 20 per cent of the total number of citizens of the Union of voting-age who reside there. Member States over that threshold may restrict those citizens’ electoral rights.17 Based upon that argument, map 1 shows 7SAC localities around the 20-percent threshold. To be sure, the map visualises the 256 7SAC municipalities with full-age foreigners with voting-rights over 15 per cent of total full-age population with right to vote (the four shades of grey). 144 of those localities are above the 20-percent threshold, even though grouping together EU and non-EU foreigners. 132 of those localities are above the specific threshold (accounting just for EUs), and there are even 55 municipalities (coloured in the darkest grey) where EU-15 foreigners aged 55-and-above surpass the EU threshold. Those localities concentrate on two Andalusian provinces (Málaga and Almería, amounting to 9 and 7 municipalities, respectively) and two Valencian ones (Alicante and Valencia, being 36 out of the 37 localities in Alicante),

16 Madrid is not a region with a high concentration of elderly EU-15 residents at the local level. That is the reason why it did not form part of the MIRIES3i survey sample.

plus Murcia and the Canarian Santa Cruz de Tenerife, each of them with one locality. Neither EU-13 nor non-EU seniors surpass the threshold by themselves in any municipality.

Elderly foreign residents’ electoral mobilization: nation-wide and local-level data

As we have seen, suffrage has been extended in Spain to European and non-European residents for municipal elections. After the incorporation of Croatia to the Union in 2013, and once residents from Iceland can vote together with Norwegians, European citizens of twenty-nine foreign nationalities can go to local polls. Full-age citizens from ten additional non-European countries (Latin American most of them) have also been entitled to participate. More than 2.2 million immigrants with voting rights were registered ageing 18 years old and above in the 2015 national population census. 81.3 per cent of these immigrants live in the 7SAC. In other words, 7.9 per cent of the 7SAC’s potential electors are foreigners.

There are no official data regarding foreigners’ participation in Spanish local elections. But we know how many of them have registered to be able to exercise their right. As stated above, that is why we better talk about ‘electoral mobilization’, instead of ‘participation’. According to national statistics, about one-fifth (21.0%) of full-age foreign residents entitled to vote registered on the electoral census for the 2015 local elections (see table 3). Insofar as most immigrants reside in the 7SAC, the electoral mobilization is about the same in those regions. Even if most of the registered immigrants finally voted, it can be confirmed that foreign turnout in Spanish local elections is quite low, as it is in other democracies (Bird, Saalfeld and Wüst 2011; Messina 2007). Nonetheless, as the table 3 shows as well, whatever the final turnout, the rate of inscription in the electoral census among full-age inhabitants is lower than it is among foreigners aged 55 and over, which is also lower than among over-65s.

[Table 3 about here]

Thus, the age appears as a relevant variable affecting electoral mobilization. It is also the case of the identity community – no matter whether over-18, over-55 or over-65, electoral registration is higher among 15EU+ni citizens than among EU-13s, who at the same time register higher than non-Europeans. The percentages among 15EU+ni citizens (see table 3) are closer to the national turnout (64.8%) than ever in Spanish local elections. It is so even more if we take into account the mean of electoral mobilization. According to the MIRES3i survey, 21 per cent of retirees over 55 who settled before 2004 exercised their right to vote in the 2003 local elections. The figure rises up to 34 per cent with regard to the following local elections, held in 2007. Registering in the electoral census changed from 34 per cent among EU-15 seniors aged 55 and above in 2003 to 37 per cent in 2007 (see Durán 2010 and 2005).19 Electoral mobilization fell to 33.4 per cent in 2011, being 35.2 per cent among 15EU+ni retirees.20

Even though a more sophisticated examination could be an area for future research, four reasons of a different nature may explain that high rate of electoral mobilization in 2015, particularly among 15EU+ni seniors. Firstly, it is pointed out by the European Commission as a good practice Spain to be “the only Member State, among those who have adopted a non-automatic system of registration, to send an individual letter containing information on the electoral proceedings to all

---

18 Other reasons apart, it is worth remembering (see above) that, while most non-Europeans are Latin Americans, and thus sharing mother tongue with the host society, official requirements constrain inscription to a larger extent than among foreign EU citizens.

19 As to the total population of foreign residents entitle to vote, an estimated 24 per cent registered to do so in 1999. The percentage was only one point higher in 2007, following the last round of EU enlargement (Bird et al. 2011: 56).

20 Data from the 2011 population census (Spanish National Statistics Institute) and from the 2011 Census of Resident Foreigners in Spain for local elections (Electoral Census Office).
EU non-national citizens". Actually, and nonetheless the institutional constraints on voting referred to above, a similar letter is also sent to non-EU residents with voting rights.

Secondly, interest in politics has risen in Spain throughout the Great Recession nonetheless both the falling support for parties that have traditionally dominated national and local politics, and the increasing dissatisfaction with the way democracy is working (see Ruiz-Rufino and Alonso 2017; Armingeón and Guthmann 2014). As a result of both people political distrust and mobilization, new parties have emerged and entered the parliament, firstly the European Parliament (elections held in 2014), then the local and regional ones (2015), and finally the Lower House and the Senate (2015 and 2016; see Orriols and Cordero 2016). Closely related to that reasoning, a comparison between the 2003 and the 2007 Spanish local elections reaches to the conclusion that indignation against corruption scandals resulted in higher electoral mobilization on the part of the elderly EU-15 residents (Durán 2010). It makes sense them to have played a role in the new scenario.

The other reasons are not related to electoral mobilization as an act of will, but to a reduction of the population roll, no matter whether residents have really left the country or not. The population census is being checked since 2009 in such a way that, with effect since 2013 onwards, EU citizens who are no longer (officially) residing in Spain are deleted from the census, as non-EU nationals were before. Consequently, the decrease in the population roll has been higher than in the electoral one, so the proportion of citizens registered to exercise local suffrage has automatically increased. On the other hand, there are foreign residents who have opted for not being registered on the population roll. One reason for such under-registration is that a number of foreign residents (mostly pensioners) do not want to be registered to avoid having to declare all their assets in accordance with the regulation introduced by the Spanish tax authorities on foreign residents in 2013. For sure, this reason applies more the less the years of residence in Spain and the less the months per year they use to spend abroad.

A final reason has to do with electoral participation, even though in the British arena. British citizens aged 55 and above amount to 44.0 per cent of EU+ni seniors settled in Spain, and the proportion rises up to 46.6 per cent among over-65s. Britons may apply for a UK postal vote, but they are eligible only by virtue of having been registered to vote in their country within the previous 15 years. Those who have (officially) lived abroad for a longer time are automatically disenfranchised. The automatic exclusion rule has even been submitted to judicial review, and the Conservative government promised to give all UK citizens the right to vote in parliamentary elections. However, neither they were entitled to vote in the 2016 EU-membership referendum – the Brexit referendum – nor in the previous general elections, as they have not been enfranchised for the June 2017 snap ones. It is worth studying the extent to which a number of Britons have avoided registering in Spain to have his/her say in the in-out referendum, which was promised by the prime minister, Cameron, in 2013 and held in June 2016, once he was re-elected in May 2015.

II

What about electoral mobilization at the municipal level? Foreign seniors over 55 with voting rights registered to vote in the 2015 local elections in 78.9 per cent out of the 5,522 municipalities where they officially reside. Inscription in the electoral census by EU+ni seniors affected 83.8 per cent out of their 4,474 adopted places of residence. There are no more than 13 older foreign residents in each of the localities without them on the electoral register, and none of those localities are higher in size than 20,000 inhabitants. Actually, 83.5 per cent of such constituencies


22 478,982 in the 2011 electoral census vis-à-vis 464,058 in 2015. It implies a reduction of 3.1 per cent, while the population census (full-age foreigners with voting rights) has experienced a 25.75-percent decline.
have a population smaller than 2,500. Is there any relationship between inscription and either community size or population size, either in absolute or in relative terms? Let’s see it.

It was pointed out above that scholars have observed that political turnout among foreign-born citizens in local elections is even lower in districts with a predominance of immigrants. As it can be seen in table 1, it cannot be categorically stated that electoral mobilization among retirement migrants is related to their concentration at the aggregate level. There is no consistent relation, firstly, between the inscription in the electoral roll and the proportion of 15EU+ni elderly citizens residing in a given region. So it is either with regard to the total population of 15EU+ni residents (third column on the right of table 1) or with regard to the total population of the same age in that territory (second column on the right). Secondly, the electoral mobilization is neither higher or lower the higher or lower the rate of immigrants.

Table 4 shows that electoral mobilization is higher the higher the proportion of foreign residents in localities over 5 per cent. It is the case among the 7SAC municipalities only with an immigrant population over 11 per cent. However, in differentiating between groups of nationalities, that logic is so clear only among EU-13 seniors. It cannot be stated thus that electoral mobilization is related to the concentration of immigrants at the local level. It is confirmed, nonetheless, that mobilization depends both upon the community – whether 15EU+ni, EU-13 or non-European one – and upon the age group. As it is observed in table 3 as well, electoral inscription is higher among the 15EU+ni aged 65-and-above than among over-55s. In the case of the other communities, to the contrary, the registration is lower in almost all the groups of constituencies among the over-65s.

[Table 4 about here]

The proportion of each own community with regard to the total population does not appear as an explaining factor of electoral mobilization either (see table 5). Again, 1) inscription on the roll is always higher among 15EU+ni seniors than among EU-13s and even higher than among non-Europeans, and 2) it is higher among 15EU+ni over-65s than among over-55s, being just the opposite among non-Europeans (except in those 10 municipalities where they amount to at least 7.6 per cent of the whole population). There is no relationship between the age group and the 13-EUs’ electoral mobilization when taking into account their concentration as identity community, that is, there is not a consistent pattern behind differences between age groups given different proportions. However, it is the only community whose mobilization is affected by such a concentration – electoral mobilization of EU-13 seniors is higher the higher their predominance in localities over one per cent, and the relationship appears stronger among over-55s than among over-65s.

[Table 5 about here]

As it is showed in table 6, population size emerges as a clear explaining factor of electoral mobilization – both among the three identity communities and among the two age groups, inscription on the electoral census is higher the smaller the number of inhabitants of Spanish localities, with minor exceptions among EU-13 and non-European seniors living in cities between 20,001 and 50,000 residents. Among 15EU+ni seniors, political engagement in localities up to 2,500 inhabitants is over 61 per cent (citizens aged 55 and above), and it surpasses 66 per cent among retirement residents over 65. It is worth adding that such localities amount to three quarters of 8,119 Spanish localities (75.4%) and to more than half of 2,641 7SAC ones (54.8%). With regard to the EU 20-percent threshold, 15EU+ni seniors over 55 surpass it in 55 localities. 27 out of them are smaller in size than 2,500 inhabitants. The proportion amounts to 72.7 per cent in localities up to 5,000 inhabitants.

Thus, it may be concluded, firstly, that seniors mobilize more than the rest of voting-age foreigners. Secondly, that, while 15EU+ni seniors (the largest group of elderly foreigners) do not make more use of their voting power in relative terms either the more their community concentrate or the higher the proportion of immigrants at large, their electoral mobilization has a relevant

23 Researchers use to focus upon naturalized residents.
political effect – they outnumber other communities of nationals (EU-13s and non-Europeans), they engage to a larger extent than the latter, and they do it to the largest extent right in the most numerous localities, that is, the smallest in size. Due to the small size of their population, such constituencies are those in which it is easier a small number of voters to have a great effect in terms of elected councillors. As Janoschka has pointed out, “although lifestyle migration can be evaluated as an individual and rather apolitical expression of a politically intended mobility within the European Union, it may seriously alter political life within destinations” (Janoschka 2010b: 270), and not in a polarised way.\footnote{For an analysis of the political effects that could have derived from the antagonistic identitarian or communitarian vs. integration votes in the 2007 and the 2011 Spanish local elections, see Durán (2016).}

In the case of Andalusian Alcaucín, a Málaga city of less than 2,500 inhabitants on occasion of the 2015 local elections (2,375 to be sure), the electoral mobilization of 15EU+ni lifestyle migrants was over 75 per cent, and the Belgian Mario Jean Baptist Blancke (the first candidate on the list of the socio-liberal Ciudadanos) was elected its Mayor as a result.

Interestingly, foreign citizens on the parties’ lists are an additional factor explaining electoral mobilization and even participation. The MIRES3i survey indicates that 15.5 per cent of the 15-EU retirees in Spain would have not voted in the next, 2011, local elections. 68.7 per cent considered the participation of foreigners as positive for the municipality. Among those who would have voted, 28 per cent opted for a nation-wide party. The proportion of retirement migrants whose ballot would go for local candidate-lists rised to 34 per cent. One third (31.5%) of those who would vote for national parties conditioned their vote on the presence of foreign candidates on the party’s ticket. Even though less than four per cent of the foreign elderly would vote for a local party founded by foreign residents (actually, 72.3 per cent were against political parties founded and directed by foreigners), more than half (52.0%) of those who would vote for a local party conditioned their vote on the presence of foreign candidates on the party’s list.

There are still no official data available on the 2015 local elections so as to know where and how many foreigners standed as candidates, and how many of them were finally elected. As a matter of fact, host parties have incorporated immigrant candidates for political representation into their own lists in return for votes coming from their compatriots in particular and from their fellow foreign neighbours in general. It significantly happened for the first time in the 2007 elections (Durán 2010) and again in the 2011 ones (Durán 2016; Pérez-Nievas et al. 2014). As expected, it mostly took place in those towns and villages where immigrants with voting rights were sufficiently present at the local level so as to have a say in the election of local officials and even Mayors. Thus, more in tune with the USA case than with the French and British ones (Schain 2012), non-Spanish fellow neighbours are not appearing mainly as an issue to talk about throughout the electoral campaigns (an object), but as an active player (a subject).

**Socio-demographic and political characteristics: the MIRES3i survey on seniors’ voting**

Some additional factors may help understanding and even explaining both electoral mobilization and actual turnout. The MIRES3i survey is useful in that sense. Even though women represent 49 per cent of the sample (N=720), they amount to 53 per cent of those who say to have voted in 2007 (N=197). In looking at nationality, 30 per cent of UK seniors say they voted in 2007, three points more than the Germans, the second community in size. Both of them were followed by the rest (4-point gap). Evidence also shows that retirement migrants with middle school level are more likely to vote than those with elementary school level, if any. And the latter vote more than foreign 15-EU seniors with university degree. According to our survey, fewer than 10 per cent of the retired European newcomers have the lowest level of education (no graduation at all), and 76 per cent have a graduation level higher that primary school. While 29 per cent of citizens with secondary school level voted in 2007, the rate is two points lower in the case of elementary school
at most, and the gap is of another two points with regard to college degree. None of those three variables (sex, nationality and study level) are statistically significant.\(^25\)

It is not the case with age. There is only one point gap between those aged 65 to 74 on the one hand and over-75s on the other (30% of the latter voted in 2007). Nonetheless, if 31 per cent of citizens between 65 and 74 went to the polls,\(^26\) only 22 per cent among those retirees between 50 and 64 say to have voted.\(^27\) As to income, the statistical relationship is not significant,\(^28\) but the closer to middle levels the higher the voter-turnout. Most retirees worked as skill employees (60%) or as self-employed business owners (25%) before retiring, and 65 per cent have a net monthly income higher than 1,500 euros. Electoral participation risen up to 34 per cent in 2007 among those who got a monthly income between 1,500 and 3,000 euros, whilst the rate dropped to 29 per cent in the case of those who earned either more or less.

As might be expected, residents who use to live in Spain longer per year are more likely to vote. Significant from a statistical point of view, 9 per cent of those who lived in Spain in 2009 between three and six months voted in 2007.\(^29\) Among retirees living between seven and nine months that same year the turnout rises up to 18 per cent.\(^30\) Finally, electoral participation reaches a rate of 34.5 per cent when living more than nine months per year.\(^31\) Thus, being tourists excluded from the survey, it can be concluded foreign retirees to vote more in number the less cross-border movers they are.

Time residence as a variable defining senior voters’ profile has not only to do with months per year, but also with years themselves. 15.5 per cent of interviewed retirees (N=109) lived in Spain before 1991, 26 per cent (N=181) settled between 1991 and 2000, 31 per cent (N=217) in the 2011-2005 period, and 27.5 per cent (N=192) between 2006 and 2010. The majority of each period’s citizens have never voted in Spain. Nonetheless, we can clearly differentiate between those who established before 1991 (45% voter turnout in 2007)\(^32\) and those who settled either between 1991 and 2000 (34% voter turnout) or between 2001 and 2005 (34% voter turnout). In view of that similar electoral participation no matter whether citizens change their residence before or after 2000, it cannot be concluded turnout to be higher the more years them to reside in the host country.

Both years of residence and months of residence per year may be related to feelings of belonging. Our survey includes a question on the residents’ self-image in Spain. No matter whether they feel themselves as a tourist (6%), an immigrant (4%), a foreigner (12%), an European (45.5%), a Spaniard (10%), or an expatriate (16%), the most of them, always above 50 per cent, do not vote, that is, they had not voted up until then or had intention to vote in the 2011 elections. Nonetheless, abstention was higher among those who felt themselves as expats (69%), tourists (61%) or foreigners (60%).

Before proceeding into the mapping of foreign senior voters’ ideology and partisan preferences, it is worth stating that the MIRES3i survey also shows that ideology has no capacity to predict their electoral participation either. Elderly 15EU residents were asked whether they feel close to, far from, or neither close to nor far from six ideologies – conservatism, ecologism, liberalism, nationalism, socialism, and social-democracy. More than 50 per cent of each of those eighteen options or groups of persons have not voted in any council poll in Spain, even though they were

\(^{25}\) Corrected typified residues < 2.0.
\(^{26}\) Corrected typified residues = 2.1.
\(^{27}\) Corrected typified residues = -2.5.
\(^{28}\) Corrected typified residues < 2.0.
\(^{29}\) Corrected typified residues = -6.1.
\(^{30}\) The relationship between both variables is still negative, but not significant (corrected typified residues = -1.6).
\(^{31}\) Corrected typified residues = 6.5.
\(^{32}\) Corrected typified residues = 3.9.
formally allowed to do it at the moment because of nationality and year of residence. Beyond that, there is a positive relationship between voting in 2007 elections and feeling very close to either conservatism,\textsuperscript{33} socialism,\textsuperscript{34} or social-democracy.\textsuperscript{35} Thus, voting does not appear to be determined by ideology but the probability to vote is higher the closer a citizen is to one of those three ideologies.

Whatever the turnout rate of immigrants within a given country and whatever the capacity of ideology to predict it, a prevalent pattern among foreign-born voters is to support and vote for traditional parties on the left (Bird et al. 2011; Messina 2007),\textsuperscript{36} even though in Canada, for instance, and nonetheless regional variations, immigrants and visible minorities have traditionally been supporters of the centrist Liberal Party (Bird 2011). The Mires3i survey allows us to know whether lifestyle immigrants (most of them seniors) follow that pattern. On the contrary, political parties themselves tend to think at the local level that foreign elderly residents are conservative in their political views.

Most of those European citizens (64\%) do not feel close to socialism (positions 0 to 3 on a 0-10 scale), and, if only nationalism is less endorsed by them (having the same amount of rejection), no more than 17 per cent feel close to social-democracy (positions 7 to 10). It is the same percentage that when they are asked about liberalism. Liberalism and social-democracy almost get the same percentage of people feeling less close to each of them (47\% and 46\%, respectively). Conservatism gets higher support – while 38.5 per cent of respondents do not feel close to it, 30 per cent do. Conservatism is the second ideology less rejected and the second one more endorsed. The first one on both regards is ecologism – 31 per cent of European gerontomigrants feel close to it, while 35 per cent do not. It can hardly be expected these immigrants to vote for traditional left-wing parties. But it is neither obvious them to be right-wing oriented. Even less if we further take into account, firstly, that there are more people rejecting each of the different ideologies than positioning in the middle of the scale regarding the same ideology. Secondly, that there are also more people in that position that endorsing the ideology at stake, no matter which of the six ones under consideration.

Only one-third of survey respondents say to have voted in the 2009 elections to the European Parliament, either in Spain or in his/her country of origin. With 41 per cent of the sample not answering the question about the list of his/her option, 32 per cent of them affirmed that they opted for conservative or Christian-democratic parties, followed by social-democratic lists (15\%) and ecologist choices (6\%). The picture is different to some extent with regard to their local voting, but not in a significant way – while 43 out of each 100 of valid respondents\textsuperscript{37} affirmed them to have voted for the conservative Partido Popular in the last municipal elections they participated (hold in 2007), 21 per cent electors that voted did it for the PSOE, seven for a local party, four for an ecological list, three for a regional one, and less than two for leftist Izquierda Unida. Overall – and taking into account that 20 per cent of the valid respondents did not answer the question – our data show a preference for the PP among senior EU immigrants, while other survey studies conclude that the preference is for the PSOE among full-age extra-European immigrants, being them or having being labour migrants (Pérez-Nievas et al. 2014; Bird et al. 2011: 53-57; Morales and San Martín 2011). Thus, it is reasonable EU gerontomigrants to have been part of the resounding victory across Spain for the PP in the elections hold in 2011.\textsuperscript{38} But

\textsuperscript{33} Corrected typified residues = 2.3.
\textsuperscript{34} Corrected typified residues = 2.2.
\textsuperscript{35} Corrected typified residues = 2.2.
\textsuperscript{36} As to the policy positions of left and right parties regarding immigration, see Alonso and Claro da Fonseca (2011).
\textsuperscript{37} N=203 (28\% of the sample).
\textsuperscript{38} PSOE and PP got 70.5 per cent of the valid vote in 2007 local elections. The social-democratic party won 24,029 councillors, 681 town-hall seats more than the conservative list. In 2011, with 26,507 council
there are also reasons to expect them to have changed their vote in 2015, apart from having voted to a larger extent.

Conclusions

Spain is one of the leading countries home to international retirement migrants. Most of them come from EU-15 Member States. Spain is an European retirement place, both in absolute and in relative terms. With 37 per cent of 15EU+ni residents ageing 55 and older, it’s obvious we are dealing with an aged community. In fact, that figure is more than six points higher than the percentage rate of this age group as a proportion of the total population.

They have an impact on economic, social, cultural, environmental and other dimensions, largely but not exclusively at the local level. That being said, there is a growing population of foreign residents coming to an age of retirement or retired after having worked in Spain, as well as there are elderly people coming to it via family reunification. Most of them are EU-13 citizens, but there are also non-EU nationals. Politics is another dimension affected by foreign neighbours.

This paper has analysed the political engagement of gerontomigrants settled in Spain by focusing upon their electoral mobilization at the local level.

The Spanish municipal elections in 2015 is a case study that confirms, firstly, that migrants with voting rights engage to quite a lesser extent than host fellow-residents. Secondly, it has also been observed that, whatever the final turnout, the rate of inscription in the electoral census among full-age migrants with voting rights is lower than it is among the elderly. Actually, seniors’ electoral mobilization in 2015 has been unusually high, closer to the national turnout than ever in Spain amongst EU-15 gerontomigrants.

Age certainly appears as a relevant variable affecting electoral mobilization – full-age foreigners’ rate of inscription is lower than foreigners aged 55 and over, whilst the latter’s mobilization is also lower than among over-65s. Identity community helps explaining engagement insofar as, no matter whether over-18, over-55 or over-65, electoral registration is higher among 15EU+ni citizens than among EU-13s, which at the same time register higher than non-Europeans. Regarding age and community, it is worth noting that general numbers are affected by 15EU+ni residents being so many. In fact, while their mobilization is higher among the over-65s than among the over-55s, the contrary happens for EU-13s and non-Europeans. Institutional constraints may explain the latter’s low turnout, but that is not the case of EU-13s. Future researches will have to address possible explaining factors, such as political culture and migratory reasons (i.e., push and pull factors).

The largest group of elderly migrants (15EU+ni seniors) do not make more use of their voting power in relative terms either the more their community concentrate at the local level or the higher the migratory density there. They are neither explaining factors behind EU-13s (except the first one) or non-Europeans. Nonetheless, 15EU+ni seniors’ electoral mobilization has a relevant political effect – they outnumber other communities of non-Spaniards, they engage to a larger extent than such communities, and they do it to the largest extent right in the most numerous localities, that is, the smallest in population size. Due to their small size, they are constituencies in which it is easier a small number of voters to have a great impact on elected representatives, i.e., on the representatives finally elected. Nonetheless the majoritarian bias of the electoral system, so it is more the shorter the difference between competing lists of candidates.

Maybe they engage more because they see politics closer, namely, because they feel themselves able to have a say and/or because they feel they belong to the community they are part of, no matter each one nationality. In that sense, foreign candidates (not necessarily fellow-nationals) appear as an additional factor favouring voice versus exit, as well as it is a way of Spanish parties to opt for foreigners’ political integration in practice. On that regard, insofar as gerontomigrants seats, PP got 4,741 councilmen more than PSOE. Each party won less than 23,000 representatives in 2015 local elections, amounting to 52.1 per cent of the valid vote.
are few in numbers to successfully opt for communitarian candidates, there is room for favouring the integration vote. Democracy has not only to do with rules, but also with how actors play that game.

Time will say whether electoral mobilization in 2015 is part of a new pattern or has been a conjunctural situation. Arguments have been offered in this paper of a mostly short-term nature. Regarding the Great Recession and insofar as it is over, it is up to the new councillors – whether Spaniards or foreigners – to make citizens confident in their authorities and institutions and in themselves as part of the polis. We have also addressed Brexit as a factor affecting inscription on the electoral roll for the 2015 elections. There are no reasons to think of it as an outstanding factor. But it may be in the near future – Britons are the largest nationality of foreign seniors living in Spain and the community voting in the highest numbers, both in absolute and relative terms. Think of the above-mentioned Mayor Blancke – in Alcaucín, 381 Britons aged 55 and above (71.5% of those on the population census) formalised their will to vote. No party won more than 353 votes in 2015 local elections, and the difference between the first and the third lists was as shorter as 31 votes. UK gerontomigrants, amounting to 54.5 per cent of their fellow nationals, are who really may affect electoral outcomes in Spain. And it is still to be known whether they will enjoy the right to vote and to stand as candidates in the next and following local elections in Spain and other Member States, as it is still to be known whether, in such a case, they will enjoy suffrage with or without institutional constraints.
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Map 1. 75AC municipalities over the EU 20% threshold (2015 Spanish local elections)*

Legend
- A. Full-age foreigners with voting-rights over 15% of total full-age population with right to vote
- B. Full-age foreigners with voting-rights over 20% of total full-age population with right to vote. (All of them, A municipalities)
- C. Full-age European foreigners with voting-rights over 20% of total full-age EU population. (All of them, B municipalities)
- D. 15 EU foreigners aged 56 and above with voting-rights over 20% of total full-age European population. (All of them, C municipalities)

* According to the Council Directive 94/56/EC, foreign electoral participation may have a political effect in member states where the proportion of non-national citizens of the Union of voting age exceeds 20 per cent of the total number of citizens of the Union of voting age resident there.

Source: Own elaboration. Data from the Spanish Regional Statistics Institute.
### Table 1. Population and 15EU+ni seniors’ electoral mobilization. 2015 Spanish municipal election by Autonomous Communities with the highest rate of immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population census</th>
<th>Immigrant population</th>
<th>15EU+ni elderly citizens</th>
<th>Electoral census (15EU+ni seniors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15EU+ni</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andalusia</td>
<td>8,399,318</td>
<td>636,480</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balearic Islands</td>
<td>1,104,479</td>
<td>192,518</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Islands</td>
<td>2,100,306</td>
<td>253,107</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalonia</td>
<td>7,508,129</td>
<td>1,028,092</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>6,436,998</td>
<td>811,130</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murcia</td>
<td>1,467,288</td>
<td>208,359</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia</td>
<td>4,980,723</td>
<td>700,245</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>31,997,245</td>
<td>3,829,931</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46,625,056</td>
<td>4,730,318</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Percentage of EU-15 citizens (plus Icelandics and Norwegians) aged 55 and over with regard to the whole community of those nationalities residing in each territory.

** Percentage of EU-15 citizens (plus Icelandics and Norwegians) aged 55 and over with regard to the total population of foreign residents of that group age in each territory.

### Table 2. Foreign residents with local voting rights
**(2015 population register)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>55 years old and over</th>
<th>65 years old and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15EU+ni</td>
<td>EU-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Percentages by file and group-of-age. They sum up to 100% by adding the proportion of foreign residents without voting rights.

### Table 3. Electoral mobilization of foreign residents
**(2015 Spanish local electoral register)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-age citizens</th>
<th>55 years old and over</th>
<th>65 years old and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15EU+ni</td>
<td>EU-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>464,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)**</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean***</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>393,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign population in each locality</td>
<td>Number of localities</td>
<td>Inscription of citizens aged 55 and over on the electoral roll (%)</td>
<td>Inscription of citizens aged 65 and over on the electoral roll (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15EU+ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% thru 2.5%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6% thru 5%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% thru 10%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% thru 25%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% thru 50%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% and over</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration. Data from the 2015 population census (Spanish National Statistics Institute) and from the 2015 Census of Resident Foreigners in Spain for municipal elections (Electoral Census Office), both available at http://www.ine.es.
Table 5. Electoral mobilization of foreign residents by proportion of their own community vis-à-vis the total population (Spanish municipalities, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Each community as a proportion of total population</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Inscription of citizens aged 55-and-over on the electoral roll (%)</th>
<th>Inscription of citizens aged 65-and-over on the electoral roll (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% thru 0.5%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>52.0 19.9 7.9</td>
<td>56.0 19.4 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>51.3 20.1 7.3</td>
<td>54.0 20.5 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6% thru 1%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46.5 18.4 6.5</td>
<td>50.1 17.4 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>45.8 17.1 6.3</td>
<td>48.7 15.4 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1% thru 1.5%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>52.8 17.6 6.9</td>
<td>56.8 17.9 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>55.3 17.7 6.7</td>
<td>59.1 18.6 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6% thru 2%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>49.0 20.0 6.1</td>
<td>51.3 20.7 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>48.4 20.3 5.7</td>
<td>51.3 21.2 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1% thru 3.5%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46.5 18.4 6.1</td>
<td>50.3 18.1 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>46.8 18.7 6.1</td>
<td>50.3 19.3 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6% thru 7.5%</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>50.0 23.2 7.4</td>
<td>54.4 20.6 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>50.2 24.1 7.3</td>
<td>54.5 22.6 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6% and over</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46.5 27.8 7.0</td>
<td>50.9 26.3 8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>46.4 28.6 7.1</td>
<td>50.9 27.3 8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration. Data from the 2015 population census (Spanish National Statistics Institute) and from the 2015 Census of Resident Foreigners in Spain for municipal elections (Electoral Census Office), both available at http://www.ine.es.

Table 6. Electoral mobilization of foreign residents by population size (Spanish municipalities, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of population</th>
<th>Number of localities</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Inscription of full-age foreign 15EU+ni citizens on the electoral roll (%)</th>
<th>Inscription of foreign citizens aged 55 and over on the electoral roll (%)</th>
<th>Inscription of foreign citizens aged 65 and over on the electoral roll (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2,500</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>49.4 61.2 31.8 9.2</td>
<td>66.8 30.6 5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhabitants</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>51.6 61.6 33.5 8.3</td>
<td>67.1 31.3 3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,501 thru 5,000</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>34.5 53.6 28.5 8.7</td>
<td>58.9 24.3 5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>34.9 53.6 31.7 8.1</td>
<td>58.9 30.7 4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 thru 20,000</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>37.7 48.9 22.8 7.1</td>
<td>53.3 19.2 4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>39.0 49.2 24.8 7.0</td>
<td>53.6 21.7 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 thru 50,000</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>31.9 46.7 22.8 7.4</td>
<td>51.5 21.7 5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>32.5 46.8 23.9 7.5</td>
<td>51.6 23.1 5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50,000</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>30.0 42.9 19.8 6.1</td>
<td>45.7 19.4 4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>7SAC</td>
<td>30.0 42.8 20.6 6.0</td>
<td>45.5 20.5 4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration. Data from the 2015 population census (Spanish National Statistics Institute) and from the 2015 Census of Resident Foreigners in Spain for municipal elections (Electoral Census Office), both available at http://www.ine.es.