Hendrik-Jan C. REBEL*

European Citizenship: Conceptualisation and Contextualisation of a Construct

Abstract

This article is partly based on a preparative article for the European Citizens Conference at the Romanian National University of Political Studies and Administration and some notes for the keynote speech, Bucharest, November 5, 2013. It contains an epistemological (concept formation) and methodological (operationalisation) approach to the construct of European Citizenship. In the epistemological part occurs a confrontation between the socio-legal conceptual development of the idea of national citizenship (400 BC – 1945 AD) and the politico-legal construction of the idea of European Citizenship after 1945 until the present day. The latter gives rise to a bifurcation of the European part (the space) and the devalued local part (the place), where national citizenship comes in between, such that we deal with a tripartite citizenship construct. The confrontation between these three forms is shown particularly in EU communication efforts through PR and PD, which result in a gradual crystallization of the trend in public opinion on the citizenship idea. The epistemological developments should have an effect on the methodology of measurement, for which some indices are constructed as example. These indices form a critical counterpoint against the measurement devices in the Eurobarometers that do not reckon with other relevant disciplines besides social-psychology.

Keywords: European citizenship; European Union; comparative methodology; positivism approach.

1. Introduction

When a researcher uses the notion of ‘construct’ he acknowledges that the phenomenon he wants to assess that way is an intricate one, that should be treated with utmost precision. It should be *defined* and *analysed* properly and the user should be aware that the construct could stand in a certain *context* or in multiple contexts. European Citizenship is such a construct.

Calling European Citizenship a ‘construct’ draws it into the realm of two as such completely different social-scientific traditions. The first is the classical positivistic tradition that started as the preferred epistemology of the natural sciences since the early twentieth century. It was taken up in Europe in the social sciences after WW II as the most influential form, due to the American financed UNESCO research efforts on country (enemy) images all over Europe. It was technically based upon survey sampling techniques and the then newest statistical insights. As the juridical sciences are also acquainted with the idea of ‘positive’ law, it stands to reason to find equivalent reasoning in that domain as well. Positive law encompasses concrete rules based upon certain principles. In her study on European Citizenship, iden-

* HU-Utrecht, the Netherlands, hjcrebel@kpnmail.nl.

tity and immigration in the European Union, Kostakopolou (2009) referred to the ‘liberal’ and ‘communitarian’ principles as the most relevant when dealing with citizenship.

The second tradition started in the same period as the positivistic tradition, but in this case based on the sociological views of Max Weber, who argued for a culture specific understanding of social phenomena which is not contrary to causal reasoning, but which unfolds first and foremost on the basis of *understanding* (Verstehen) of reality (cf. Weber 1968, pp. 84 – 94). The citizen is conceived of against the background of civil society with ‘bureaucracy’ as the purest form (Weber 1968, pp.215 – 218). One might assert that the concept of Citizenship *describes or prescribes* the relationship between inhabitants of an area and the area as such. We will argue later that the general idea of ‘area’ comes in three major forms, 1. the local area (or *place*), 2. the historical area (or *nation-state*) and 3. the constructed area (or *space*). The outer forms of place versus space have been defined as such by the journalist historian Geert Mak (2013), the inference of the nation-state is due to 300 years of historical developments between about 1650 and 1950. The complexity of the construct is further enhanced by the number of disciplines that were used to analyse it: philosophy, history, social –, political –, and legal sciences and international relations.

2. Positivistic Conceptualisation

Citizenship as a construct in the first tradition is a *concept* in the epistemology of positivism (top-down operationalised variables apt for explanation (*erklären*, in Max Weber’s terms). “A construct”, wrote Cronbach and Meehl (1978), “is defined implicitly by a network of associations or propositions in which it occurs.” (p. 236) Although not explicitly expressed, they here refer to the *semantic* properties of a construct, acknowledging, however, that some of the propositions are causal indicators rather than meaningful associations. The semantic properties constitute a nomological network, different in content, but equivalent in structure from a causal model. For the semantic character of a construct they advise to use a series of tests to assess the relations between properties, the relations between a property and observations, and measures of stability over time, in combination (so-called: *construct validity*). In an earlier article with MacCorquodale (1948) Meehl referred to the ontological concepts as ‘hypothetical constructs’ and semantic concepts as ‘intervening variables’. In this way he made the former into testable theories and the latter into inferential elements that could be abandoned, if need be, and replaced by better ones. Applying these positivistic views to the term of citizenship, one might call it an identity formed throughout history and finally based on the legal and political category of the state (17th – 18th century) (Kostakopolou, 2009, pp. 20).

The concept of citizenship has from origin been linked to the idea of democracy (*demos* = people, *kratein* = ruling, i.e. self ruling of the people) which was legally established by Solon of Athens (640 – 560 BC) and philosophically by Plato and Aristotle. Citizenship in this case is related to *place*. In that context, present day discussions must be understood on whether European citizenship is based on a true European ‘demos’, interpreted as a common predicament of the European population (cf. Tambakaki, 2011). The second original conception of citizenship was much more encompassing and was mainly geared to certain rights under Roman law. In the Roman empire rights were enlarged to encompass certain legal rights and duties mainly pertained to taxpaying (cf. Faulks, 2000, pp. 14-21), i.e. a relationship between the citizen and the Roman *space*. So from the origin about the 4th century BC, citizen-

ship implied *rights* and *duties*, albeit that they were merely reserved for the male freemen of the city (polis), whence the concept of politics (ta politika, i.e. the things of the city). For a very long time – from around BC 400 to far into the 15 th century AD, and in some cases of the city-states even later – the idea of citizenship was connected to the rights and duties of the ‘city-dweller’. *Rights* were conceived of as the opportunity to vote or to let one’s voice heard, *duties* as the obligation to participate in common decisions and to defend one’s city against external predators (cf. Faulks, 2000, pp. 53 – 83). The Roman Empire constituted the context with a general space-like relationship with the law of the governing elite. Thus a double tracked identity of citizenship (place and space) was the rule, and this continued up to the Renaissance when the empires following the Roman one gradually died out. According to Davies, Christian theologians like St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas and Martin Luther made the same distinction, albeit that they attributed it to the perishable ‘city of men’ versus the eternal ‘city of God’ (cf. Davies 2011, pp. 729 – 730 et passim).

In 1576 the philosopher and jurist Jean Bodin published a study in the *Six Books of Commonwealth*, in which he concentrated the space idea in the *Majestas* (*majesty*) of the ‘sovereign’ and the place idea in the family, headed by the ‘father’. In between the sovereign and the head of family he distinguished, in a very modern way but, of course, related to the time and place of the then contemporary France, all kinds of societal organisations, which we call Intermediary Frameworks in communication science at present. In this way sovereignty has been introduced for the first time into the concept of citizenship. In 1648, a great number of diplomatic conferences made an end to the decennia long religious wars – 80 years between Catholic Spain and Protestant Netherlands, and 30 years between the North German Protestants and the South German Catholics and their allies in the north Denmark and Sweden and in the South the Spanish and French – in the Westphalia Peace Treaty (Peace Treaties of Münster and Hannover, respectively). It stamped the Sovereignty in the respective *nations*, which could be monarchies or republics, and brought the individual citizens under the protection and ruling of their respective governments. After 1648, the rights were connected to external relations of the states (enter international relations or diplomacy as discipline) and after 1848 to general democratic principles, and the duties to internal ones, within the ‘state’. The last idea of duties within the national borders was actually rather weak, as people showed more affinity to their region or locality than to their nation. In 1798, however, the Napoleonic general and later minister Jean-Baptiste Jourdan, introduced the ‘levée en masse’ (conscription) as a means to provide the French army with sufficient soldiers. In order to make it acceptable for the population he took refuge to propaganda techniques to instigate a feeling for the ‘nation’, thus combining the ideas of state and nation into the concept of the *nation-state*. This seems to correspond with the notion of citizenship that Niznik describes as a ‘tacit axiological dimension in a symbolic universe, which constitutes the basic matrix in the individual’s life’ (cf. Niznik, 2013, pp. 204-209). After Napoleon’s defeat at Waterloo (1814), almost all European states took up the challenge of nation-building, which led to the successful construction of the present European countries, but which at the same time caused several devastating wars between France and Germany (1871), and two World Wars (1914-1918; 1938-1945). The nation-state became an important subject for socio-political research.

After 1945, the general mood in Europe was ‘never war again’ and several scholars (e.g. Spinelli, 1941; Mitrany, 1943), politicians (Churchill, 1946; Schuman, 1950) and public administrators (Monnet, < 1945) all over Europe started thinking, some even during the war, about a common Europe both from a diplomatic perspective (inter-governmentalism; Hoff-

man) and from a political one (functionalism; Haas). [See for an overview of sources the reader by Nelson & Stubb, 2003]. This finally resulted in the 1951 European Community of Coal and Steel and the 1957 Treaty of Rome between France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. The functionalist approach and the inter-governmentalist one actually highlighted the European *space* and the *nation-state* like entities, which in 1961 was legally interpreted by the established European High Court of Justice as comprising all individual citizens. It took more than 30 years, after the entry of 9 other European countries, until the formal legal entity of a European Citizen was recognised in the Maastricht Treaty (1992). All new candidate members had to accept this development further-on as constituting an element of the essence of European cooperation (*acquis communautaire*) Given the structural political developments of ‘devolution’ in almost all European countries, the old paradigm of local citizenship has returned over the last decades. In that perspective we must realise that the idea of citizenship now is a multi-layered one, pertaining to *space*, *nation-state* and *place*. Therefore, it makes sense to consider the relationship of citizenship and (European/national/ regional) identity to be a nomological network. But are they mere semantic categories or also ontological ones, or both?

In my article on Citizenship, Identity and Historical References in the European Union (2012), I have attempted an operationalisation of the citizenship concept (2012, pp. 60-62), based on the idea (principle) of ‘rights and duties’ of the subject, but I stuck with a characterisation of types of citizenship regimes, not with a typology of individuals. Here we want to develop the individual perspective more thoroughly by translating the rights and duties in normative operational categories: ‘what should a subject do or leave in order to be called a citizen and in what circumstances?’ So far official research by the European Union through its Euro-barometer only dealt with the (positive) rights of the Euro-citizens, and not with the obligations (duties), that from origin belong to the local or national ideas of citizenship (cf. Rebel, 2012, pp. 48-49). The referential object of Citizenship is an unclear concept if it concerns European Identity, however, which is quite contrarious with the idea of the national identity and in several cases even regional identities. The idea of national identity and in some cases a regional one involves a combination of common historical experience, a common spoken language and a form of geographical vicinity. If these elements are supported by educational activation, the national/ regional identity will be clear to most inhabitants. To the contrary if we speak of the European identity, which is not fixed and open to new developments whenever a new member is accepted by the community, and which is not actively propagated by the EU through ‘public diplomacy’.

3. Hermeneutic Constructivism

“One of the complicating factors in social research”, I wrote in 1983, “is the status of our objects. There are not only clearly recognisable real objects (either concrete or abstract), but also, what one may call, virtual objects (objects, the existence of which one infers from the traces they make, like neutrons in a Wilson chamber ...)” These are the type of constructs Paul Meehl dealt with in the articles mentioned above. “They only exist, ontologically speaking, with reference to (other) minds, namely the mind of the researcher. [...] By stipulating that there is no ontology possible without a knowing subject, I clear the way for the next step, namely the ac-

knowledge that every (scientific) concept has – epistemologically speaking – an interactional character.” (1983, pp. 153-154). This notion is characteristic for the second tradition.

A *construct* in the second tradition is based upon Weber’s idea of *Verstehen* (*understanding*) for which the *Idealtypen* function as building block (cf. Weber 1968, pp. 42-62). In order to repudiate Nagel’s rejection of the ‘understanding’ in science Alfred Schütz (1979, pp. 25-36) introduced the idea of 1st order construct. *Verstehen* is not the observation of things to be explained, but a common sense understanding of them, he wrote. Therefore, *Verstehen* is an understanding of what human actions mean in the *Lebenswelt* (term borrowed from Husserl). On that basis mental constructs (*Idealtypen*) are formed. “The thought objects constituted by the social scientist have to be founded upon the thought objects constituted by the common sense thinking of men...” (Schütz, 1979, p. 31), and “Thus, the constructs of the social sciences are, so to speak, constructs of the second degree, that is, constructs of the constructs made by the actors on the social scene, whose behaviour the social scientist has to observe and to explain in accordance with the procedural rules of his science” (Schütz, 1979, p. 32). Thus, a construct in this tradition can be described as a bottom-up process: a concept in the tradition of Hermeneutics.

Very much influenced by the thinking of Alfred Schütz, Berger and Luckman (1966) wrote a classical text on the sociology of knowledge ‘The Social Construction of Reality’. They characterised constructs as ‘identity types’ (p. 194; *my italics*), which are the result of the interaction (dialectics in their terminology) between experiences (by personal identities) and social reality. As the social realities may differ from situation to situation, the identity types are not stable. “The analysis of objectivation, institutionalisation and legitimation are directly applicable to ... the theory of social action and institutions” (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 207) and “... the analysis of the role of knowledge in the dialectic of individual and society, of personal identity and social structure, provides a crucial complementary perspective for all areas of sociology” (p. 208). To apply that to the idea of citizenship, citizenship differs along the historical dimension of the now 28 member states of the EU. Citizenship understanding in Poland is different from citizenship understanding in the UK, or in Romania, or in the Netherlands, or in Germany or France, etc. Paraphrasing Berger and Luckmann, one could say, that ‘radical changes in the social structure may result in concomitant changes in the psychological reality (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 200). Or in a generalised form: ... man produces reality and thereby produces himself [as citizen, n.m.] (p. 204). Citizenship in this tradition is a social category grown through self understanding of the nation in the 19th century, and eo ipso the self understanding of the European community. Despite all the differences between the member countries, the EU can be characterised as a unitary political institution in this one important aspect: it is a *value community*. In the 3rd (in 1991 2nd) article of the consolidated Maastricht treaty the value structure of the EU is summarised shortly: “The Union’s aim is first to promote *peace*, its *values*, and the *well-being* of its people.” So, *peace* is the super-value below which solidarity, cohesion, respect for cultural diversity a.o. human rights are arranged. *Solidarity* has long been the second independent value behind the EU. A third important common value grew practically out of the enlargement of the European Union with 3 former dictatorships (Greece, 1981 and Spain and Portugal, 1986). Reflections on what the EU needed to function as a stable community led to the acknowledgement of *democracy* as the third basic value of the European Union, which so far had just been taken for granted. The second aim (super-value) of the European Union peace and solidarity, mentioned above, are the result of reflections on imposing events, and developments in the

value domain have always been the result of practical “international organisation in the light of *historical experience*”, as Karl Deutsch (1966) has remarked.

This entails that European citizenship cannot be only based on the citizenship ideas of the national citizenships, as they are also a reaction to contemporary historical developments and as they are couched in disparate systems of values. Or, in the words of Delanty & Rumfort (in Sievert, 2013, p. 92) “The European public sphere differs from conventional public spheres, whether national or transnational, in that it is poly-vocal, articulated in different languages and through different cultural models and repertoires of justifications and occurs in very different institutional contexts.” European citizenship-as-a-construct is thus a combination of the first and the second semantic traditions, which entails that European citizenship is a politico-legal concept based upon European values, but dependent upon historical-local contextual understanding. That could cause misunderstandings in the citizenry, as European citizenship deals with a public *space*, and national or regional citizenship deals with public *place*, as the journalist Geert Mak (2013) recently argued.

For that reason, we could use the positivistic approach best for the assessment of *factual knowledge and reputation* of the European Union and the hermeneutic approach for the assessment of the *sense* of European citizenship, but neither without the other. A tentative definition of this subject of public opinion could read:

European Citizenship is a ‘system of rights’ guaranteed (top-down) by the European Union in combination with a ‘system of obligations (duties)’ expected (bottom-up) from its citizens.

When and where European space and national/ local place meet they form an uneasy combination of views of national members of the European Union, in which the citizen is torn apart between the *European challenges* and the *national and local loyalties*. Strict European communication of the public diplomacy type (down-stream) should in this context be the precondition of the up-stream interest representation through public affairs. Down-stream communication and up-stream communication are thus to be conceived of as consecutive movements in the minds of European citizens.

Public Space constitutes the context for the values of peace, well-being and democracy. *Peace* comprises DG-activities like Regional Policy, and Justice and Citizens’ Rights (internal peace and solidarity), Enlargement and Foreign/Security Policy, and Development and Humanitarian Aid (external peace and solidarity). *Democracy* comprises the work of the DG-s of Culture and Education, Science and Technology, the EU Institutions, and the DG Customs and Tax (i.e. any activity supporting cooperation in Europe and the very existence of the EU). *Well-being*, finally, is covered by all other economic and social DG-s: Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Environment and Energy, and Transport and Travel, Economy and Finance, Employment and Social Affairs, and Health. However, the essence of the reasons behind the DG-activities is seldom if ever made known to the European citizens. EU communication (organised by DG-Com), is mainly geared to acknowledging that some activity is really an EU action and not about its content. Informational content is left to all the other DG’s, that may differ greatly in their content-handling. In this respect one might distinguish 5 types of EU-communication:

1. Informational Public Relations (the type most often used by the European Commission DG’s)
2. Persuasive Public Relations (a type mainly left in the care of the member states)

- 3. Transactional communication (formal *Citizen's Initiative* and Consultations, organised and executed by the General Secretariat of the EU Commission)
- 4. Educational Public Relations. (Erasmus and Grundvig programs, but otherwise mainly left for the member governments to execute)
- 5. Transformational Public Diplomacy (the actual task definition of the DG-COM)

(cf. Rebel, 2012, pp. 19-36)

Local Place is differentiated according to the history of the region/ nation, different media- landscapes and composition of civil societies, and interacts at all levels with the aforementioned communication activities, being liable to the *principle of subsidiarity* in the first place. Overall, for each member country we can take its media landscape and the structure of its civil society to constitute the *channels* of EU communication, besides the official channel of the *European gateway*. This yields the following model depicting the effect of European communication upon European reputation and the *sense* of European citizenship. Given the fact that lower level (national or regional) loyalties may be more outspoken, one should depict them as (possible) intervening variables (cf. et Boomgaarden et al., 2011, pp. 256-60)

Figure 1. Effects of EU Communication.

After having indicated the sense of European Citizenship being the variable-to-be-explained, one could finally sketch the history of the Citizenship idea in the years after World War II as an example of the trend that started during the War and grew in recognition in the Press until 1957, that got momentum in the years 1960 – 1990 by the influence of Intermediary Frameworks, to crystallize out during the political discussions on the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, to end today in an uncertain situation either to be rejected or to make a fresh start.

Figure 2. Crystallizing Public Opinion on EU Citizenship.

Glossary:

1. Phase Zero: a non-issue {< 1940}
2. Latency Phase: vague unrest {1945/ 1946}
3. Emergency Phase: first problem description {1951}
4. Diffusion Phase: strong problem spread {1957}
5. Crystallization Phase: problem definition: an Issue; fixed distribution in pros and cons (cf. hoc tempore Gallup President Jan Stapel; 1978);
6. Reaction Phase/ Reactance Phase {2003}
7. Extinction Phase/ Resurgence Phase {> 2013}

[The depiction of the trend might be somewhat counter-intuitive, running from right down to left up, but it is actually caused by the historical perspective from the top – the EU – to the bottom, i.e. the citizens]

4. Comparative Methodology

This given needs to be applied in a ‘comparative research design’, which should become the very basis for European research into the ‘sense of European citizenship’. In his very elaborate account of comparative political survey research Frederick Frey (1970) indicated three different domains of research problems: 1. Conceptualisation, in particular concept equivalence; 2. Research Design; and 3. Choice of Countries (Frey, 1970, pp. 187 – 202). To answer the last questions, it is obvious to use all 28 present members of the European Union as objects of research. The only question that may remain in this respect is whether candidate countries should be incorporated as well. Much more difficult to answer are the first two

questions, in particular as conceptualisation and research design are not mutually exclusive domains. As we may infer from the previous analyses, the construct of European Citizenship might be used a. in a very general way, with no specific reference, but as hermeneutic device – the idea of a concept as ‘approach’ (cf. Merton, 1967, pp. 139 – 155), or in b. a very detailed operational form, e.g. the specific concept of *participation*. The definition suggested at the end of section 3 is an example of the former. It is the latter very specific concept, that may refer to completely different practices in distinguished political cultures. To hook on to the *political participation* concept, it may mean voting behaviour in general, (formal) membership of political parties, using local/ national lobby practices – which are sometimes considered as unethical in some Northern contexts, and at other times as acceptable forms of clientalism in more Southern countries – or the participation in protest movements, like anti-nuclear arms rallies in the UK and the Netherlands in the last three decades of the previous century, or present day pro-environment actions of Greenpeace (cf. Eurobarometer 373).

If we may distinguish social scientific research as occurring in 3 dimensions:

a. *Problems* (definition of ...); b. *Questions* (wording of a ...); c. *Respondents* (the objects of research), and reckon with 2 contextual dimensions: *Space* (social context), and *Time* (concurrent or successive) [PQRST], we can infer 6 different types of research problems haunting the idea of European Citizenship, that call for close scrutiny before embarking on common research activities [in practice most items are chosen outside a theoretical frame].

1. What is the definition of problem (d.o.p.) in different academic (legal, historical, political science, social – and communication sciences) and/or political contexts (28 odd member countries and lower level political institutions)? {PxS}.

2. What is the definition of problem in different time frames (historical inferences)? {PxT}

3. What are the wordings-in-use to describe the construct of the d.o.p. (operationalisation and *validity* in each participating political culture)? {QxS}

4. How adequate are the wordings-in-use? (operationalisation and *reliability/ stability*) {QxT} [*Classic research criteria are in italics*]

These 4 topics deal with the ‘functional equivalence’ and ‘formal similarity’ factors in all kinds of realistic transnational-oriented research (cf. Frey, *ibid.*: 243 *et passim*; Sievert, 2013: 95), ... and:

5. What are the political roles played by the respondents? {RxS}

6. What are the developments in the political culture of the participating respondents? {RxT}

The last 2 topics yield the frame of reference for interpreting the results of the questionnaires and are thus *control variables* for further research (cf. Desmet et al., 2012, p. 1080).

The 6 research questions together form the epistemological and methodological essence of a research design, which usually starts with (A) a. ‘description in natural language that each participant will understand’ (cf. DeTombe, 1994, pp. 248 *et passim*). The common languages-in-use in the European Union are: English, French, and German, where British English will be the most general, although all member countries have the possibilities to have official documents translated into their specific language and British English is not the language indigenously spoken by most of the Europeans. Although British or American English is the language-in-use in academia, one should be aware, not to import specific meanings and connotations from the UK or the US and stick to official EU-English. Any other usage should be debatable, and the heuristic cycle demands that after reporting a general check

should be made, whether the language makes sense to most of the intended European readers. The description is preferably translatable into a *model* of causal, functional or final form.

The second step (B) is most conspicuous, viz. the formal definition of the major concepts. Definitions could be a. nominal (lexical or stipulative); b. referential (etymological or scientific usage); real (ostensive or enumerative). The definition of European Citizenship is in the first place a referential one, with historical and scientific roots (see above), and its complexity is due to all the factual interpretations and academic approaches that have been used in the past. [The ostensive or enumerative definitions are used for index constructions.]

The third and last step (C) in the semantic phase of operationalising deals with specification. Aspects of specification have been discussed previously in a disparate form, but will be treated more systematically now. Concepts may have different meaning, given certain *contexts*: citizenship being dependent upon the European space and/or national or local place. Moreover they may be legal, social or political constructs, depending on the phase of development. It should therefore be made clear what this context pertains. Concepts may be compound from different independent aspects, which may ask for a *facet* design derived from the 30 odd DG-activities in the EU domain. Finally, concepts may have one or several *dimensions*, in the case of citizenship a set of rights and a set of demands, which have a specific relationship, viz. *inverse opposition*, which means that a combination of an absence of rights and the presence of duties is possible (a dictatorship), a combination of the absence of duties and the presence of rights (present day European Union?), and the presence of both rights and duties (present day nation-states). Only an absence of rights and duties is not very well conceivable or it would be called a 'failed state' (cf. Rebel 2012: 60 – 62). Contexts, facets and dimensions are aspects of concepts which should be assessed and negotiated in the first phases of common research. If we then know what we are talking about, we can go over to the practice of assessing and/or measuring the concepts, by *index construction*, *item formulation and choice of observation terms*, activities that should be 'bound' by the essence of the first three semantic steps, but open as to the national or regional context.

We will give some examples of items that could be used in the measurement of the construct of European citizenship, that differ from the usual ones in the Euro-barometers:

A. Formulate normative items (rights) on the idea of European Citizenship, e.g.:

- *Europe should guarantee free travel for all inhabitants of the European Union.*
- *All inhabitants of EU countries should be allowed to work all over the European Union.*
- *European citizens should have a minimum wage guarantee.*
- *European citizens should have a safe working environment.*
- *European citizens should have overall social security.*
- *European citizens have the right to be adequately informed on all political decisions taken in Brussels (typical communication item)*
- *European citizens have the right to participate in political decision making*

B. Formulate normative items (duties) on the idea of European Citizenship, e.g.:

- *The European Union should first of all strive for international peace*
- *The European Union should stress solidarity within the Union*
- *The European Union should always take heed of its democratic character*
- *The European Union should be able to levy taxes to pay for their expenditures*
- *European citizens should always participate in European elections*
- *The European Union should be open to local informational input (communication item)*

– *European citizens have the duty to participate in political decision making*

C. Assess the ‘sense of citizenship’ in comparison to the sense of national citizenship and the feeling of local/ regional sense of belonging. [Indicator D may function as ‘probe’]

- *I am a citizen of my country in the first place*
- *In the present world it is imperative to be a European rather than a national citizen.*
- *I prefer my own region over the nation I live in and the European Union*

The best answering format for these items are the 10 points Stapel scale (1981), as this is proven in marketing research to be understood in any culture on earth in the same way.

After having answered the questions – which should be mixed randomly in order not to suggest their hidden meaning – all the patterns should be analysed with a *confirmatory factor analysis* on the basis of the following expected patterns:

- Right + and Duty + : EU member countries
- Right – and Duty + : dictatorship
- Right + and Duty – : actual EU situation
- Right – and Duty – : non existent

D. Could you indicate with a cross (X) where on the scale below your loyalties lie?

{The operationalisations are tentative and open to critical scrutiny and amendments}

5. Consequences of European Citizenship

The operationalisation as suggested above differs substantially from the operationalisations in use in previous research activities in the Netherlands (Boomgaarden et al., 2011; Elenbaas et al., 2012). Although we do acknowledge that a difference should be made between EU political knowledge and EU performance judgements, as has been used in those previous researches, the inconsequential relationship between the two sets is in our view mainly due to the lack of semantic relationship between the competence and the performance measures. If one wants to assess the influence of EU activities on the opinions about the EU, one should at least assess the *relevant* intervening knowledge variables, such as: knowledge about the diverse decision making processes, and not who-ever is a chairperson in one of the institutions, or how many members the EU actually has, etc. Such knowledge is rather inconsequential for most performance measures. The very same judgment has, by the way, also been made by the authors in the discussion part (ibid., p. 746). Measures on EU-citizenship, however, might have more impact on performance judgments. It is the same inconsequentiality, as we have encountered in our secondary analysis on aggregate EU Barometer data, when trying to assess a causal relation between down-stream information (EU PR and PD.) and the expectation of the possibility of up-stream communication influences (EU PA.).

On the solid basis of understanding, what it is to be a European citizen, and on the readiness to act upon it by approaching the EU to show the support for and demands on (cf. Easton, 1965) the institutions and to provide it with information (cf. Deutsch, 1966) for policy arrangements, a common future is made possible for the Europeans. Individual action is facilitated *directly* through a. the ‘European Citizens’ Initiative’, and b. by using the public consultation device ‘Your Voice in Europe’, and *indirectly* by contacting local MEP’s, representatives on advisory committees ‘the Committee of the Regions’ and ‘the Economic and Social Committee’, and making use of the regional ‘Advice and Information Services’. Collective actions – lobbying – are made officially possible by registration of your organisation (profit or non-profit) in the Transparency Register, which provides one unlimited access to the European Commission and the European Parliament. All those registered in the Transparency list belong to Civil Society, which is described in the White Paper on European Governance (2002: 6) as “... the principle structures of society outside of government and public administration, including economic operators not generally considered to be “third sector” or NGOs.”. At present, lower level governments and public administrations are more and more going over to lobby-activities as well, besides the actions of representatives from Civil Society, but they have other and sometimes better ways of access and need not be registered in the Transparency list.

The European Union, particularly the European Commission, does its utmost to be open to the diversity of interests in European society at large, and to include all those that want to have influence on policy-measures. It is only through thorough and enduring *educational* communication on the ‘role of the European Citizen’- e.g. by enhancing cultural policy (cf. Niznik, 2013) – that the Europeans may sense their common predicament.

References

1. Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
2. Boomgaarden, H.G., Schuck, A.R.T., Elenbaas, M. & de Vreese, C.H. (2011). Mapping EU-attitudes: Conceptual and empirical dimensions of Euroscepticism and EU-support. *European Union Politics*, London: Sage (www.sagepublications.com).
3. Cronbach, L., & Meehl, P.E. (1979). Construct validity in psychological tests. In J. Bynner and K. M. Stribley (eds.) *Social Research: principles and procedures* (pp. 225 – 239). New York: Longman.
4. Davies, N. (2011). *Vanished Kingdoms, the History of Half-Forgotten Europe*. London: Penguin.
5. Desmet, P., van Spanje, J. & de Vreese, C. (2012). ‘Second-order’ institutions: national institutional quality as a yardstick for EU evaluation. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 19 (7), 1071-1088.
6. De Tombe, D.J. (1994). *Defining complex interdisciplinary societal problems*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers
7. Deutsch, K.W. (1966). *The Nerves of Government, models of political communication and control*. New York: The Free Press.
8. Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for Political Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs (N.J.): Prentice Hall.
9. Elenbaas, M., de Vreese, C., Boomgaarden, H.G., & Schuck, A.R.T. (2012). The impact of information acquisition on EU Performance judgments. *European Journal of Political Research*, 51 (6), 728 – 755.
10. Faulks, K. (2000). *Citizenship*. London: Routledge.
11. Frey, F.W. (1970). Cross Cultural Survey Research in Political Science. In R.T. Holt and J.E. Turner (eds.). *The Methodology of Comparative Research* (pp. 173 – 295). New York: The Free Press.

12. Kostakopoulou, T. (2009). *Citizenship, identity and immigration in the European Union, between past and future*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
13. Merton, R.K. (1967). *On Theoretical Sociology*. New York: The Free Press.
14. MacCorquodale, K., & Meehl, P.A. (1948). On a Distinction between Hypothetical Constructs and Intervening Variables. *Psychological Review*, 55, 95 – 107.
15. Mak, G. (2013). De kracht en de macht van het fenomeen plaats (The Power and Might of the Phenomenon Place – Abel Hertzberg Lecture), in *TROUW (De Verdieping)*, 6 – 9.
16. Niznik, J. (2013). European citizenship and the cultural policy of the EU. In L. Radu, A. Bargaoanu A. And N. Corbu (eds.). *The Crisis of the European Union, Identity, Citizenship and Solidarity Reassessed* (pp. 203 – 221). Bucharest: Comunicare.ro Publishing House.
17. Nelson, B.F., & Stubb, A. (eds) (2003). *The European Union. Readings on the Theory and Practice of European Integration (3rd Edition)*. Houndmills (Basingstoke): Palgrave MacMillan.
18. Rebel, H.J.C. (1983). Fearing the Army and the Enemy – Logical Possibility, Psychological Probability, Social Reality. In H.-U.Kohr and H.-G. Räder (eds.) (1983). *New Social Movements and the Perception of Military Threat in Western Democracies*, München: SOWI.
19. Rebel, H..J.C. (2012). Citizenship, Identity and Historical References in the European Union. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, vol. 14 no. 2, 47 – 65.
20. Rebel, H..J.C. (2013). The Idea of a European Identity. Introductory Remarks. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, vol. 15, no. 1, 9 – 15.
21. Rebel, H..J.C. (2013). European Citizenship, Whence and Whither. In L. Radu, A. Bargaoanu A. And N. Corbu (eds.). *The Crisis of the European Union, Identity, Citizenship and Solidarity Reassessed* (pp. 175-203). Bucharest: Comunicare.ro Publishing House.
22. Schutz, A. (1979). Concept and Theory Formation in the Social Sciences In J. Bynner and K. M. Stribley (eds.) *Social Research: principles and procedures* (pp. 25-37). New York: Longman.
23. Sievert, H. (2013), Same Same But Different – also in Europe. A New Methodological Approach in Cross-Country Analysis of Communication Structures Applied to Five EU Member States. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, vol. 15 no. 1, 75 – 91
24. Stapel, J. (1978). Simulation of Polarization. *Acta Politica* VIII, 275 – 280.
25. Stapel, J. (1981). *Card with little Boxes*. Amsterdam: WAPOR.
26. Tambakaki, P. (2011). Agonism and the Reconception of European Citizenship. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol 13, 567 – 585.
27. Weber, M. (1968). *Methodologische Schriften*. Frankfurt am Main: S.Fischer.
28. *** European Commission (2002). *White Paper on European Governance*. Luxemburg: EU-Press.