What do Respondents Mean when they Report being ‘Citizens of the World’? Using Probing Questions to Elucidate International Differences in Cosmopolitanism.

Michael Braun, Dorothee Behr, and Juan Díez Medrano

Quality and Quantity. 2017. DOI: dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0507-6.

Abstract

The measurement of cosmopolitanism, i.e. the feeling to be a citizen of the world and the corresponding openness towards other cultures and peoples, has proved to be challenging and several scholars have questioned its validity. In this paper, we use web probing, i.e. implementing probing techniques of cognitive interviewing in web surveys, to elucidate the meaning of a frequently used direct measure of cosmopolitanism that asks respondents to what extent they feel they are “a citizen of the world”. As a single-item measure, it cannot be treated by statistical approaches such as confirmatory factor analysis. We compare results from Spain, Denmark, Hungary, Germany, Canada, and the U.S. Though the majority of the respondents show an understanding of the item which corresponds to the intention of the researchers, a large part of them does not. In addition, some country differences in the open answers make sense but other differences between countries are hard to explain. We conclude that doubts regarding the validity of the measurement cannot be dissipated.

Keywords: cosmopolitan attitudes; international comparisons; open answers; web probing.

What do respondents mean when they state to be "citizens of the world"? Using probing questions to elucidate international differences in cosmopolitanism

1. Introduction

The measurement of cosmopolitanism, i.e. the feeling to be a citizen of the world and the corresponding openness towards other cultures and peoples, has proved to be challenging and its validity is often questioned (e.g. Pichler 2012). Most of the big international social science survey programs, e.g. the European Values Study (EVS 2016), the International Social Survey Program (ISSP Research Group 2015), and the Eurobarometer surveys (European Commission 2009), have their own question versions (Sinnott 2005). However, all of them use a single item that asks respondents to what extent they feel they are "a citizen of the world". As statistical approaches such as structural-equation modeling require several items to gauge the validity of items, these approaches cannot be used in this case. Hence, qualitative approaches for assessing validity are called for.

Pichler (2012) finds, on the basis of data from the World Values Survey, that people in less globalized countries show more global identity, that is, they see themselves more as citizens of the world. In order to explain this unexpected finding he suggests a mixed-methods approach to find out what lies behind this global identity, i.e. what people have in mind when answering the respective item. In a conceptual paper, Skey (2012) also asks for qualitative studies that get at the meaning of cosmopolitan behavior and attitudes for the people involved. To the best of our knowledge, such qualitative evidence for the cosmopolitanism item has not yet been collected, though there is some related research using qualitative approaches. Calcutt, Woodward, and Skrbis (2009) and Skrbis and Woodward (2007) use focus groups to discuss various aspects of globalization and, in particular, how "otherness" is conceptualized. Duchesne et al. (2010, 2013) also use focus groups but with a special focus on European identification and attitudes towards European integration.

Latcheva (2009) and Gaxie et al. (2011) conduct cognitive interviews but with a focus on national pride and European integration, respectively.

In this paper, we are following this path of collecting qualitative evidence but concentrate specifically on cosmopolitan attitudes. We use web probing, i.e. implementing probing techniques of cognitive interviewing in cross-national web surveys. This allows us to generate a sufficiently large number of cases to compare the qualitatively collected evidence in a quantitative manner across countries, in our case Spain, Denmark, Hungary, Germany, Canada, and the U.S.

2. Theoretical Background

The literature on “cosmopolitanism” has grown exponentially since the 1990s as part of a general interest in the processes and transformations concomitant with or following globalization (for all-encompassing overviews, see Vertovec and Cohen 2002; Delanty 2012). The term “cosmopolitan” means different things to different scholars in general and, in particular in different disciplines of the social sciences. In particular, it has been used to describe individuals (e.g. Szerszynski and Urry 2002), places (e.g. Rumford 2014), and political projects (e.g. Beck 2006). The removal of barriers to trade and the resulting increase in the mass consumption of foreign products mean that we are all cosmopolitan to a smaller or greater extent. Several scholars dismiss this type of cosmopolitanism as “banal”, however, and prefer to focus on its more reflective expressions (Beck and Grande 2004, Skey 2012).

When used to characterize individuals, definitions of what it is being “cosmopolitan” focus on aspects as to how these individuals relate to cultural diversity. These definitions include specific experiences and practices (e.g. travel, migration, contact and ties with people from other cultures, purchases abroad, consumption of foreign goods), skills and competencies (e.g. fluency in foreign languages), and outlook (e.g. interest in and tolerance

of cultural diversity). Szerszynski and Urry (2002), for instance, list the following dimensions of cosmopolitanism among individuals: mobility, capacity to consume many places and environments, curiosity about people and places, ability to map one's own society in terms of historical and geographical knowledge, semiotic skills, openness towards other people and towards new skills. The most demanding definitions add to the range of above attributes by describing cosmopolitanism as solidarity to others (e.g. Calhoun 2002) and an aspiration to global forms of government (Held 1995; Kaldor 1999).

Given the multidimensional nature of the theoretical concept, it does not come as a surprise that a variety of approaches have been used for the measurement of cosmopolitanism. Some scholars concentrate on a direct "identity measure" that taps into respondents' identification (e.g. "To what extent do you feel you are a citizen of the world?") and then take attitudinal variables as a criterion to evaluate it (e.g. Pichler 2008). Others use composite measures where the stances of respondents towards a broad array of pertinent attitudes are taken into consideration. (e.g. attitudes towards supranational governance or immigrants, see Mau, Mewes, and Zimmermann 2008). Still others combine single items and sets of items (Haller and Roudometof 2010; Olofsson and Öhman 2007, Roudometof 2005) or compare them with each other (Pichler 2009). We will focus here on the economical single-item measure of cosmopolitanism, which most major comparative survey programs have used. We would like to find out what respondents have in mind when they answer this item.

3. Data and Methods

In this paper, we report results from web surveys conducted in Spain, Denmark, Hungary, Germany (eastern and western), Canada (English speaking, only), and the U.S. We selected the countries with regard to their experiences with immigration (as of 2011 when the survey

was conducted): Canada and the U.S. are classical immigration countries, and western Germany and Denmark newer immigration countries. Only in the late 1990s Spain has changed from a country of emigration to one of massive immigration, attracting particularly Romanians, Morrocans, and Southern Americans looking for a job. Eastern Germany and Hungary as formerly socialist countries still host only a comparatively limited number of foreigners.

The respondents to our web surveys were drawn from nonprobability online panels. Any generalizations to the entire populations, therefore, have to be treated with extreme caution. Survey participation was restricted to citizens of the respective countries aged 18 to 65. A net sample of approx. 500 respondents in each country/region was targeted using quotas for age (18-30, 31-50, and 51-65), gender, and education (lower vs. higher education). Data were collected in October 2011. The question on cosmopolitanism was implemented in one random split of the survey. In total, 1,883 respondents across all countries completed this split version. As the surveys were based on quota samples, standardized response rates cannot be computed (Baker et al. 2010).

3.1 Questionnaire

The battery on identification with different geographical units was a modified (and adapted to the North American context) version of a Eurobarometer instrument[1]:

"People might think of themselves as being European, [citizen of country] or inhabitant of a specific region to different extents. Some people say that with globalization, people are becoming closer to each other as 'citizens of the world'.

[1] The Eurobarometer (European Commission 2012) used the following question: "I would like you to think about the idea of geographical identity. Different people think of this in different ways. People might think of themselves as being European, [nationality], or from a specific region to different extents. Some people say that with globalisation, people are becoming closer to each other as 'citizens of the world'. Thinking about this, to what extend do you personally feel you are 1) European, 2) [nationality], 3) inhabitant of your region, 4) a citizen of the world.

Thinking about this, to what extent do you personally feel you are…

... inhabitant of your region?

... citizen of [country]?

... European/North American?

... a citizen of the world?”

All items were displayed on separate screens. Response alternatives were “to a great extent”, “somewhat”, “not really”, and “not at all”. In addition, a “can’t choose” category was offered. For the analyses, we recoded the answers to a scale from 0 (“not at all”) to 3 (“to a great extent”).

After the third item, respondents were asked the following probing question (on a separate screen): “Please tell us why you feel [respondent’s answer to closed question] that you are a European/North American.” And after the last item, they were asked the probing question: “Please tell us why you feel [respondent’s answer to closed question] that you are a citizen of the world.” Respondents were not obliged to answer the probing question. They received a reminder if the text box was left blank but they were still able to proceed without answering. The present paper exclusively deals with the last item, measuring cosmopolitanism, and the corresponding probing question.

3.2 Translation of Open Answers

The Spanish, Danish, and Hungarian answers to the probes were translated by professional translators who had been briefed on the particularities of these answer texts as well as on translation and coding needs. The English and German answers were not translated but immediately coded.

3.3 Development of the Coding Scheme

We developed the coding scheme of the open answers to the probing questions on the basis of a broad theoretical concept and then modified it, if necessary, on the basis of the answers given by the respondents.

The coding scheme contains three main sections: (1) “problematic” answers, (2) (probable) reasons for high scores of cosmopolitanism, and (3) (probable) reasons for low scores of cosmopolitanism. “Problematic” answers include non-response, unintelligible answers, those which cannot be categorized, and those which do not fit to the item. Reasons for high or low scores of cosmopolitanism are those which, in principle, can motivate the respective attitude. However, whether the corresponding argumentation patterns are actually used in support or in opposition to cosmopolitanism is an empirical question, because the coders were unaware of the answers the respondents had chosen for the closed item. Examples from the respondents’ answers are given in parentheses with corrected spelling, if necessary.

3.3.1“Problematic” answers

Non-response answers, that is, the failure to provide a useful answer to the probing question, include explicit “don’t knows”, refusals, incomprehensible answers, etc.. *Other answers* are those which we could not easily integrate into a substantive category (“It’s a too wide-ranging term for me, I can’t do anything with it” or “No connection to the world as a global citizen”). Some of these answers come close to a “don’t know” kind of non-response, others are not intelligible in their meaning, still others were simply not mentioned often enough to warrant the addition of another substantive code. Finally, in a third problematic answer pattern respondents make a *reference to a previous answer*, to the item on the feeling to be a European or North American, respectively (which was located immediately before the cosmopolitanism item in the questionnaire). We do not consider the answers to that previous

question here, as one aim of the probing was to get at specific reasons for the answer to the single item on cosmopolitanism.

3.3.2 Reasons for high scores of cosmopolitanism

We will group the argumentation patterns of the respondents and differentiate between three broader types of cosmopolitanism, a “banal” form (e.g. with a reference that we are all living on the same planet), a behavioral form (where cosmopolitanism expresses itself mainly in a transnational behavioral style), and an attitudinal form (e.g. where the interest in foreign countries and people come to the fore). The third form matches the intention of researchers when designing the survey question on cosmopolitanism best, while the first form largely misses the point.

One argumentation pattern uses a *geographical reference*, that is, the fact of living on this planet is given as a reason to feel as a citizen of the world (“Because everyone born on this planet is a part of the world”). *Facilitated border crossing* is coded when respondents refer to the opportunity to travel anywhere at any time (“I live in a country with the opportunity to travel around anywhere in the world”). Respondents also mention *technology*, such as new ways of communication systems that make people feel closer to each other and also give the possibility to learn quickly what is happening in the world (“Because with the way technology is nowadays, we are able to interact with people all over the world. it makes the world seem closer and can bring people together”). These three argumentation pattern might not be valid against the background of the meaning researchers such as Beck and Grande (2004) attribute to the cosmopolitanism item and reflect in their terms merely a banal cosmopolitanism.

Transnational experience is coded when respondents mention being an immigrant, travel experiences in the past, living in a multicultural place or being involved with different

cultures (“I have traveled extensively throughout the world throughout my life”). Two related codes are *ancestry and relatives*, where the ancestors of respondents come from another country (or different countries), or relatives live in other countries (“My ancestry is half German, half British, and I have relatives all over the world”). Respondents’ *friends* in other countries or from different ethnic groups are also used to explain the feeling to be a world citizen (“I know many people from all over the world [especially thanks to going to a very multicultural private school]”). These three patterns refer to behavioral cosmopolitanism.

Unrelated to behavioral experiences is the code *openness* where respondents even though they cannot report the respective experiences declare their openness and curiosity with regard to such experiences and their tolerance and respect for other people (“I like to think that I am tolerant of all people”). In a pattern we call *globalization*, global interests, caring about a global world (feeling of responsibility for the world), and the idea of interrelations and dependency are mentioned (“There is no longer the option to just be from one state or region. What is done locally does have impact on the global economy and as a result what is done in Greece is affecting me and our country ...”). Finally, respondents who mention *common sharings* tend to see more similarities between people than differences and think of common goals of humans in the world (“I feel as though we are all human beings and should treat each other as if there are more similarities among us rather than differences”). These three categories tap into *attitudinal cosmopolitanism*.

3.3.3 Reasons for low scores of cosmopolitanism

As we have done with the potential reasons for high scores of cosmopolitanism we will also group the argumentation patterns of the respondents here and differentiate between broader types of (non-)cosmopolitanism.

Respondents mention *absence of transnational experiences* which makes it impossible for them to feel as a world citizen (“I have never traveled the world”). *No ancestry and relatives* and *no friends* were coded to check whether the opposite of the respective positive categories is also mentioned or not. These three categories form the negative counterpart of behavioral cosmopolitanism described in the last section. Accordingly, we call it behavioral non-cosmopolitanism.

Nationalism includes respondents who express that they primarily feel to be a citizen of the country or the world region they live in (“I am a citizen of the United States first. I am proud to be an American”). *Non-globalization* refers to a perceived lack of interconnectedness, lack of representation or the unimportance of one’s own country in a global perspective. Respondents also mention *differences* (cultural, regional, ethnic, religious, etc.) between different peoples or countries (“The world will never be one country. Other countries have different views and methods that do not necessarily agree with my beliefs. There will always be differences between the geographical locations of the world”). These three categories form the negative counterpart of attitudinal cosmopolitanism described in the last section. Accordingly, we call it attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism. A corresponding negative counterpart of banal cosmopolitanism is not so easily conceivable and was not found in the data either.

3.4 Coding

Multiple substantive coding was allowed. However, an “other” category was only coded if no substantive category was applicable. After the establishment of a final coding, a research assistant not involved in the development and implementation of the coding scheme coded the probe answers again. Inter-rater agreement ranged from 0.78 in Canada to 0.87 in the U.S. Deviations were discussed, arriving at a final version used in this paper.

3.5 Analytical Procedure

In a first step, we will compare the web survey data with the available Eurobarometer data, even though this can only be done with a focus on the European countries in our web survey because the Eurobarometer does not include Canada and the U.S. Similar patterns of mean scores in the Eurobarometer and the web survey are a prerequisite for using the web survey data to suggest explanations for the Eurobarometer data. The web survey is based on non-probability online panels, and it might not be justified to generalize to the populations if mean scores are not similar. For the identification of similarity of the patterns, respondents’ identifications with the region, the country, Europe/North America, and the world are considered. Then, the categorized probe answers will be presented to elucidate respondents’ meaning assigned to the cosmopolitan measure. Finally, six selected groupings of categories will be regressed on demographic variables and variables measuring transnational behavior of the respondents. These selected groupings of categories are non-response answers, banal cosmopolitanism (the categories *geographical reference*, *facilitated border crossing*, and *technology*), behavioral cosmopolitanism (the categories *transnational experiences*, *ancestry and relatives*, and *friends*), attitudinal cosmopolitanism (the categories *openness*, *globalization*, and *common sharings*) as well as the negative counterpart of the latter two groups, behavioral non-cosmopolitanism (the categories *no transnational experiences*, *no ancestry and relatives*, and *no friends*) and attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism (the categories *nationalism*, *non-globalization*, and *differences*). The following are used as explanatory variables: *Age* is entered as a quantitative variable, *gender* and *education* as dummies. The dummy variables *foreign born* and *parent(s) foreign born* indicate whether the respondents and one or both of their parents were born abroad. *Partner with foreign citizenship* is also a dummy. *Ever lived in foreign country* is a dummy variable indicating whether the

respondents have ever spent three months or more in a foreign country. *Travel to foreign countries* contains the number of visits the respondents have made to foreign countries during the last three years. *Foreign friends in country* and *foreign friends abroad* measures whether the respondents have no, a few or several friends who originate from other countries and live in the country of residence or abroad, respectively. *Native friends abroad* give corresponding information on friends originating from the country the respondents live in, but who are currently living abroad.

4. Results

4.1 Replication of the Pattern in the Eurobarometer Data

To begin with, we compare the web survey and the Eurobarometer results for the European countries. The comparison shows that very similar patterns are present in the Eurobarometer data and in the web survey (Table 1). Cosmopolitan attitudes are on average stronger in Spain and weaker in the former socialist societies (Hungary and eastern Germany) compared to Denmark and Western Germany. The U.S. and Canada are also on the same level with Denmark and Western Germany. Cosmopolitanism is the weakest form of identification everywhere, with the exception of Spain where cosmopolitanism and the identification with Europe are on the same level.

– Table 1 about here –

A similar pattern in both surveys – the Eurobarometer and our survey – is also obtained with regard to non-response (Table 2), though on a different level. This difference probably reflects a mode effect, the Eurobarometer being a face-to-face survey, where respondents don't offer a "don't know" easily. However, the particularly high non-response level of the Danish respondents in the web survey is at least partly a consequence of the specific sample;

it also occurs for other questions from different domains covered in this web survey. However, we do not know the reason for this bias. While the highest non-response occurs with the cosmopolitanism item in the majority of the cases, the non-response level itself is not dramatic. The similarity between the Eurobarometer survey and our web survey allows us draw conclusions from our survey as far as the qualitative evidence is concerned.

– Table 2 about here –

In the following, respondents with a missing value on the cosmopolitanism variable were excluded, as they were not asked the probing question. This leaves 1,778 cases.

4.2 Open Answers to the Probing Question

Table 3 shows the across-country distribution of the different argumentation patterns we have extracted from the open answers to the probing question. Some of the patterns do not occur very frequently. However, we have nevertheless decided to keep them here, as they show that some of the theoretically important patterns are rare either generally in all of the countries (e.g. "friends" and "no friends") or with notable exceptions (e.g. "ancestry and relatives").

– Table 3 about here –

4.2.1 "Problematic" answers

Non-response answers are much more frequent than *other answers* (which could not easily be integrated into the category scheme) and a *reference to a previous answer* (i.e. to the question on feeling European or North American). Taken together, the problematic answers are quite

frequent but not really exceptional for difficult items (compare Braun, Behr, and Kaczmirek 2012, for an immigrant probe, and Behr, Braun, Kaczmirek, and Bandilla 2012, for civil disobedience). The relatively high frequency of problematic answers is probably related to the difficulties respondents have to imagine what “feeling to be a citizen of the world” really means, and what the requirements are for being considered a cosmopolitan. The distribution of the “problematic” answers across countries is unequal. For example, Danes have a higher probe non-response with the cosmopolitan item than the others, in particular compared to respondents in the U.S.

4.2.2 Reasons for high scores of cosmopolitanism

A *geographical reference* is established very unequally in the different countries, ranging from a low of 6% in Denmark to a high of 22% in Spain. Across countries, *facilitated border crossing* is not mentioned by more than 4% of the respondents, and this pattern in virtually absent in North America. This does not come as a surprise because open borders are associated with recent political changes in Europe rather than with developments in North America. *Technology* (such as a reference to new ways of communication systems) is virtually non-existent in Spain but mentioned by 5% of the respondents in western Germany.

Taking their own *transnational experience* as an indicator of their attitudes is a comparatively frequent answer pattern, shared by 4% to 8% of the respondents in the different countries. Few respondents mention that their *ancestry* is from another country or that they have *relatives* in other countries. This pattern is virtually restricted to Canada and, to a smaller degree, to the U.S. and Spain. Mentioning *friends* in other countries or from different ethnic groups is equally very rare and restricted to Denmark, Canada, and the U.S. where a maximum of 1% of the respondents share it.

Openness with regard to transnational experiences comprise between 4% of the respondents in Canada and 11% in Hungary. The pattern we call *globalization* (which comprises global interests and caring about a global world) is very unequally distributed across the countries: from 4% in Germany to 15% in Denmark. Finally, the reference to *common sharings* is also unequally distributed, ranging from 2% in Denmark and Hungary to 6% in Spain. Unfortunately, we are uncertain as for the reasons of the country differences.

4.2.3 Reasons for low scores of cosmopolitanism

In the former socialist societies of Hungary and eastern Germany as well as in the United States, there are particularly many respondents who declare an *absence of transnational experiences* (13%-19%). On the contrary, this answer pattern is particularly rare in Denmark and Spain (4% and 5%, respectively). *No ancestry and relatives* and *no friends* are virtually not used as an argumentation pattern by respondents.

Nationalism is particularly strong in the United States and Canada (19% and 16%, respectively) but also shared by nearly 10% of the respondents in Europe. The incidence of *non-globalization* ranges from 3% in Spain, Denmark, and the U.S. to 10% in Hungary. Between 4% of respondents in Hungary and 12% in eastern Germany mention *differences* between different peoples or countries.

4.2.3 Distribution of selected (groups of categories) across countries

From the detailed categories we now construct six selected broader categories. The first is related to *non-response* at the probing question. The second to fourth category are groups of categories which could motivate a positive view with regard to cosmopolitanism. They refer to banal cosmopolitanism (the categories *geographical reference*, *facilitated border crossing*, and *technology*) in the sense of Beck and Grande (2004), behavioral cosmopolitanism (the

categories *transnational experiences*, *ancestry and relatives*, and *friends*) and, finally, attitudinal cosmopolitanism (the categories *openness*, *globalization*, and *common sharings*) as the most emphatic notion of cosmopolitanism. The two last broader groupings are behavioral non-cosmopolitanism (which constitutes the negative counterpart of behavioral cosmopolitanism and comprises the original categories *no transnational experiences*, *no ancestry and relatives*, and *no friends*) and of attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism (which constitutes the negative counterpart of attitudinal cosmopolitanism and comprises the original categories *nationalism*, *non-globalization*, and *differences*).

Table 4 shows the distribution of non-response answers, the three forms of cosmopolitanism (banal, behavioral, and attitudinal) and the two forms of non-cosmopolitanism across countries.

- Table 4 about here -

Banal cosmopolitanism is much more frequent in Spain than in the other countries. It is particularly infrequent in eastern Germany, Hungary, and Denmark. As multiple coding of the respondents' answers was allowed, this does not mean that these respondents have only used argumentation patterns which we consider to be forms of banal cosmopolitanism. However, even if we consider only the pure form of banal cosmopolitanism, that is, where respondents did not mention any other argument, still between 7% (eastern Germany) and 23% (Spain) can be classified in this broader category. For behavioral cosmopolitanism Canada is standing out, and Denmark comes next. Denmark is at the top for attitudinal cosmopolitanism, followed by Spain. Behavioral non-cosmopolitanism is particularly frequent in the former socialist societies of Hungary and eastern Germany, as well as in the U.S. For the former socialist societies this may be a long-lasting effect of reduced travel opportunities under the former socialist rule, while for the U.S. it might be due to the lack of

necessity to travel abroad. Attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism does not differ to the same degree across countries. The particularly low values for Spain might be explained by the general higher level of cosmopolitanism in this country (which makes mentioning reasons for non-cosmopolitanism meaningless). In Denmark, on the contrary, the high non-response reduces the possible size of all forms of cosmopolitanism and non-cosmopolitanism.

4.2.4 Regression of the selected (groups of) categories on socio-demographic variables and transnational behavior

Table 5 shows the regression of the selected (groups of) categories on age, gender, and education as well as a number of variables denoting the transnational background of the respondents (*foreign born, parent(s) foreign born, partner with foreign citizenship*) and their transnational behavior (*ever lived in foreign country, travel to foreign countries, foreign friends in country, foreign friends abroad, native friends abroad*).

- Table 5 about here -

Only 3% of the variance of *non-response* is explained by these variables together. Older and higher educated respondents tend to lower nonresponse compared to the younger and less educated. Nonresponse is independent of the transnational background and behavior of respondents.

Banal cosmopolitism can hardly be explained by the explanatory variables (only 1% of explained variance). The higher educated respondents mention at least one of the categories of this form of cosmopolitism more often than the lower educated. All the other variables do not show any significant effect. On the contrary, 11% of the variance of what we call behavioral cosmopolitanism can be explained, in particular by two variables denoting

transnational behavior, *ever lived in foreign country* and *foreign friends abroad*. 4% of what we have labeled attitudinal cosmopolitanism, the most emphatic form, can be explained by the variables used in this analysis: The younger, the higher educated, those with a foreign partner, those who have traveled frequently to foreign countries, and those who have foreign friends in the country of residence embody this form of cosmopolitanism.

For behavioral non-cosmopolitanism 4% of the variance can be explained. Women, the higher educated, and those who do not have foreign friends abroad are particularly likely to use a pertinent argumentation pattern. Only 2% of the variance of attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism are accounted for. However, no single variable reaches the conventional significance level (having never lived in a foreign country and having no foreign friends abroad are borderline, though).

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we evaluated a one-item measure for cosmopolitanism which most internationally comparative surveys have used regularly. It consists of asking respondents to which degree they feel to be “citizens of the world”. We used web probing to find out what respondents actually have in mind when answering this question, and to which degree this corresponds to the intended meaning of the question.

When scholars talk about cosmopolitan attitudes, they have mainly behavioral and attitudinal cosmopolitanism in mind, which focus on transnational experience and transnational ties, solidarity and an aspiration to universal forms of government. Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of respondents in all countries understand the cosmopolitan item in this way, which is reflected in the argumentation patterns used to motivate their cosmopolitanism or, conversely, the lack of it. However, there is also large number of respondents who think of themselves as cosmopolitans but give reasons for this which

scholars would not regard as valid. We distinguished three argumentation patterns for which this is the case: First, a *geographical reference* is made by respondents, that is, the fact of living on this planet is given as a reason to feel as a citizen of the world. Second, a reference is made to *facilitated border crossing*, that is, the opportunity to travel anywhere at any time. Finally, respondents mention *technology*, such as new ways of communication systems that make people feel closer to each other and also give the possibility to learn quickly what is happening in the world. These reasons just reflect a “banal” cosmopolitanism, because respondents who mention only these reasons are not necessarily affected in terms of their behavior or attitudes.

Country differences in the argumentation patterns could partly be expected, e.g. in the case of *facilitated border crossing* or *no transnational experience*, in the sense that the former should occur more frequently in the European context and the latter in the U.S. and former socialist societies. That *nationalism* (in the sense of exclusive identification with the own country or the world region) is predominantly found in North America and not so much in Europe is related to strong national pride in the former two countries. It is not obvious, however, why *ancestry and relatives* and *friends* (and their absence) are so infrequently mentioned, though the fact that Canada makes an exception with regard to ancestry and relatives does not come as a surprise. Other differences between countries (such as *geographical reference*, *technology*, *openness*, *globalization*, *common sharings*, and *differences*) are also hard to explain.

Thus, our results indicate that the cosmopolitan item belongs to the problematic measures in comparative research. Potential solutions include the design of additional items for the direct measurement of cosmopolitanism, and the indirect measurement via attitudes which can be regarded as results of cosmopolitanism. However, both of these possibilities are not without drawbacks either. It might not be easy to construct additional items which

directly measure cosmopolitanism on the same abstract level as the item under investigation here, though transforming the argumentation patterns we have distinguished into items may be one option. Indirect measurement, via related attitudes, has been used in the past. However, such measures regard more the consequences of cosmopolitanism and less the concept itself.

References

Beck, U.: The Cosmopolitan Vision. Polity Press, Cambridge (2006)

Beck, U., Grande, E.: Kosmopolitisches Europa. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main (2004)

Behr, D., Braun, M., Kaczmirek, L., Bandilla, W.: Item comparability in cross-national surveys: Results from asking probing questions in cross-national web surveys about attitudes towards civil disobedience. Qual. Quant. 48, 127-148 (2014). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-012-9754-8

Braun, M., Behr, D., Kaczmirek, L.: Assessing cross-national equivalence of measures of xenophobia: Evidence from probing in web surveys. Int. J. Public Opin. Res. 25, 383-395 (2013). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/eds034

Calcutt, L., Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z.: Conceptualizing otherness: An exploration of the cosmopolitan schema. J. Sociol. 45, 169-186 (2009). doi: 10.1177/1440783309103344

Calhoun, C.: The class consciousness of frequent travelers: Towards a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism. In: Vertovec, S., Cohen, R. (eds.) Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice, pp. 86-100. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2002)

Delanty, G. (ed.): The Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitan Studies. Routledge, New York (2012)

Duchesne, S., Frazer, E., Haegel, F., Van Ingelgom, V.: Citizens‘ Reactions to European Integration Compared. Overlooking Europe. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndsmill (2013)

Duchesne, S., Haegel, F., Frazer, E., Van Ingelgom, V., Garcia, G., Frognier, A.-P.: Europe between integration and globalisation. Social differences and national frames in the analysis of focus groups conducted in France, francophone Belgium and the United Kingdom. Politique européenne 2010/1 (n° 30), 67-105. doi: 10.3917/poeu.030.0067 (2010)

European Commission: Eurobarometer 71.3. TNS Opinion & Social [Producer]; GESIS. Cologne [Publisher]. ZA4973, dataset version 3.0.0, (2012). doi: 10.4232/1.11135 (2009)

EVS: European Values Study 2008: Integrated Dataset (EVS 2008). GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA4800 Data file Version 4.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.12458 (2016)

Gaxie, D., Hubé, N., Rowell, J. (Eds.): Perceptions of Europe. A Comparative Sociology of European Attitudes. ECPR Press: Wivenhoe Park (2011)

Haller, W., Roudometof, V.: The cosmopolitan local continuum in cross-national perspective. J. Sociol. 46, 277-297 (2010). doi: 10.1177/1440783310371401

Held, D.: Democracy and the global order. Polity Press, Cambridge (1995)

ISSP Research Group: International Social Survey Programme: National Identity III. ISSP 2013. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5950 Data file Version 2.0.0, doi: 10.4232/1.12312 (2015)

Kaldor, M.: New and Old Wars. Polity Press, Cambridge (1999)

Latcheva, R.: Cognitive interviewing and factor-analytic techniques: a mixed method approach to validity of survey items measuring national identity. Qual. Quant. 45, 1175-1199 (2011). doi: 10.1007/s11135-009-9285-0

Mau, S., Mewes, J., Zimmermann, A.: Cosmopolitan attitudes through transnational social practices? Global Networks 8, 1-24 (2008). doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0374.2008.00183.x

Olofsson, A., Öhman, S.: Cosmopolitans and locals: An empirical investigation of transnationalism. Curr. Sociol. 55, 877-895 (2007). doi: 10.1177/0011392107081991

Pichler, F.: How real is cosmopolitanism in Europe? Sociol. 42, 1107-1126 (2008). doi: 10.1177/0038038508096936.

Pichler, F.: “Down-to-earth” cosmopolitanism: Subjective and objective measurements of cosmopolitanism in survey research. Curr. Sociol. 57, 704-732 (2009). doi: 10.1177/0011392109337653

Pichler, F.: Cosmopolitanism in a global perspective: An international comparison of open-minded orientations and identity in relation to globalization. Int. Sociol. 27, 21-50 (2012). doi: 10.1177/0268580911422980

Roudometof, V.: Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and globalization. Curr. Sociol. 53, 113-135 (2005). doi: 10.1177/0011392105048291

Rumford, C.: Cosmopolitan Borders. Palgrave, London (2014)

Sinnott, R.: An evaluation of the measurement of national, subnational and supranational identity in crossnational surveys. Int. J. Public Opin. Res. 18, 211-223 (2005). doi:10.1093/ijpor/edh116

Skey, M.: We need to talk about cosmopolitanism: The challenge of studying openness towards other people. Cult. Sociol. 6, 471-487 (2012). doi: 10.1177/1749975512445434

Skrbis, Z., Woodward, I.: The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: Investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness. Sociol. Rev. 55, 730-747 (2007). doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00750.x

Szerszynski, B., Urry, J.: Cultures of cosmopolitanism. Sociol. Rev. 50, 461-481 (2002). doi: 10.1111/1467-954X.00394

Vertovec, S., Cohen, R.: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2002).

Table 1

Identification with different geographical units in the web survey (Web) and the Eurobarometer (EB), based on the closed items

	Spain		Denmark		Hungary		W. Germany		E. Germany		Canada	U.S.
	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	Web
Region	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.8	2.1	2.3
Country	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.8	2.8
Europe/ N. America	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3
World	2.3	2.3	1.8	2.0	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.8

Note: Eurobarometer (EB) 71.3 (2009), QE4; identification measured on a scale from 0 ("not at all") to 3 ("to a great extent").

Table 2
Non-response to the closed items (in %) in the web survey (Web) and Eurobarometer (EB)

	Spain		Denmark		Hungary		W. Germany		E. Germany		Canada	U.S.
	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	EB	Web	Web
Region	0.7	0.2	8.7	1.1	2.6	1.0	0.0	0.3	1.7	0.2	5.6	6.9
Country	1.8	0.3	4.9	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.1	1.7	0.5	2.4	3.3
Europe/N.America	1.4	0.8	9.1	0.5	2.6	0.2	1.6	0.3	3.5	0.5	4.8	6.2
World	2.5	0.8	12.1	1.9	5.2	0.8	2.8	1.7	6.3	0.9	4.0	6.2

Note: Eurobarometer (EB) 71.3 (2009), QE4.

Table 3
Distribution of the different argumentation patterns across countries (in %)

	Spain	Denmark	Hungary	Western Germany	Eastern Germany	Canada	U.S.
"Problematic" answers							
Non-response answers	26	34	24	27	28	22	16
Other answers	5	5	4	6	9	7	9
Reference to previous answer	4	7	4	3	4	1	3
Reasons for high scores							
Geographical reference	22	6	8	11	8	13	14
Facilitated border crossing	3	3	4	4	2	0	0
Technology	0	4	2	5	2	3	2
Transnational experiences	4	8	6	5	5	8	7
Ancestry and relatives	1	0	0	0	0	4	1
Friends	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Openness	9	8	11	8	7	4	6
Globalization	5	15	5	4	4	8	7
Common sharings	6	2	2	4	3	5	5
Reasons for low scores							
No transnational experiences	5	4	19	9	13	8	16
No ancestry and relatives	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
No friends	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nationalism	8	9	9	12	11	16	19
Non-globalization	3	3	10	4	6	5	3
Differences	5	6	4	10	12	7	6
N	276	233	256	248	269	238	258

Note: Except for the "non-response answers" and "other answers" multiple coding was possible.

Table 4
Distribution of the different (groupings of) argumentation patterns across countries (in %)

	Spain	Denmark	Hungary	Western Germany	Eastern Germany	Canada	U.S.
Non-response answers	26	34	24	27	28	22	16
Banal cosmopolitanism	25	14	13	17	12	16	16
Behavioral cosmopolitanism	5	9	6	6	6	11	7
Attitudinal cosmopolitanism	20	23	17	15	14	17	18
Behavioral non-cosmopolitanism	5	4	19	9	15	8	17
Attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism	16	18	22	24	26	26	27
N	276	233	256	248	269	238	258

Note: Except for the "non-response answers" and "other answers" multiple coding was possible.

Table 5
Logistic regression of groups of argumentation patterns on demographic variables and transnational behavior (z-values)

	Non-response	Banal cosmopolitanism	Behavioral cosmopolitanism	Attitudinal cosmopolitanism	Behavioral non-cosmopolitanism	Attitudinal non-cosmopolitanism
Age	-3.6*	.3	.1	3.2*	-1.6	1.7
Gender (female)	-1.8	1.4	2.0	-.1	3.1*	.1
Education (high)	-4.5*	2.2*	1.5	3.7*	2.9*	.0
Foreign born	.6	-.5	-1.0	-.8	.08	-1.5
Parent(s) foreign born	.9	-.5	-.7	-1.2	-1.7	.5
Partner with foreign citizenship	-1.1	-.7	1.9	2.0*	-.7	-.3
Ever lived in foreign country	.1	-1.9	2.9*	.03	.6	-2.0
Travel to foreign countries	-.9	-1.7	1.8	2.1*	-1.1	.5
Foreign friends in country	-.7	.1	.3	2.4*	-.9	-1.5
Foreign friends abroad	.4	1.8	4.6*	1.5	-3.0*	-1.9
Native friends abroad	-.4	-.3	-1.0	-.2	.3	-.7
Pseudo R square	.03	.01	.11	.04	.04	.02