

**ISSP 2014 –
Citizenship II –
Questionnaire development report**

Please use the following citation:

Jon Pammett, ed. 2016. ISSP 2014 - Citizenship II: Questionnaire development report. Ottawa.

ISSP CITIZENSHIP 2014

Drafting Group:

Jon Pammett (Canada) convenor

Johannes Andersen (Denmark)

Ann Carton and Francoise Vanderkelen (Belgium)

Carolina Segovia (Chile)

Eric Chen-hua Yu and Yang-chih Fu (Taiwan)

To understand the construction of the 2014 Citizenship survey, it is important to consider the previous Citizenship module, of 2004. The idea for this module was suggested at the 2000 annual Meeting (Lisbon), approved at the 2001 meeting (Umea), with the questionnaire being approved at the 2003 meeting (Obernai). Following is the document prepared for the Umea meeting, which gives a good idea of the reasoning behind the survey.

Proposal for ISSP-module on "Citizenship"

(Prepared by Denmark and Canada. For consideration at Umea meeting.)

The literature on citizenship is voluminous, and empirical studies have been made. In spite of this only a small amount of data exists that makes widespread comparative analysis possible. The ISSP has two modules, which touch on a few aspects of citizenship. The *National Identity* module provides the opportunity to study questions about national culture, nationalism, immigration, relations with other countries, etc. But the module contains very few questions aimed at analysing questions about *political* identity and culture, or about participation in social groups. The *Role of Government* module addresses important questions about people's attitudes toward what role the government should play in many areas. It also includes some questions that are relevant to citizenship, namely a few items on political participation, interest and political efficacy. However, this module is primarily concerned with the role of the state *vis-à-vis* the citizen, rather than the role of the citizen *vis-à-vis* the state, and other citizens. We are therefore proposing a new ISSP module on *citizenship* to fill in this gap in the available data, and provide a complement to the other two modules mentioned. This new module will provide comparative data to analyse citizenship from a bottom-up perspective, i.e., to analyse how people are empowered, how they participate in social and political life and how they are oriented toward the political system and community.

First and foremost, who are "members" and who are "non-members" of the political and democratic community? And how does this vary among countries? What role does the political culture of a country play? What impact does a country's institutional "set-up" have on people's participation and political identities? What institutions have an empowering effect, and what institutions may, on the contrary, have an alienating effect? We may also ask whether people in different countries respond differently in terms of participation and identification to structures and processes of economic, cultural and political globalization? Could country-specific conditions explain this, or are we experiencing the emergence of new modes of participation, political identities and cleavages that are independent of country-specific institutional and cultural characteristics? Are we seeing the foundation of a new kind of citizenship in which the borders of national political systems play a less significant role?

Citizenship; rights, participation and identity

Citizenship means different things to different people and it may be analysed from various angles and perspectives. However, many scholars agree that the following three dimensions are crucial when defining citizenship, namely: *Rights, identity and participation* (Barbalet, 1988; Lehning & Weale, 1997; Lister, 1997,1999; Heater, 1990, 1999; Delanty,

2000). According to the so-called “citizenship-approach” these three dimensions constitute the corner stones in an empirical-analytical concept of citizenship (Petersson, Westholm & Blomberg, 1989; Andersen et al., 1993; Goul Andersen et al., 2000; Goul Andersen & Hoff, 2001). One of the advantages of the “citizenship-approach” is that it bridges the instrumental and integrative approaches to citizenship, the normative and more empirical approaches, and the approaches that emphasise the juridical/legal status of citizenship and the practice of citizenship, respectively.

Basically, citizenship defines citizens as members of a political community or society. The point of departure is in the classical distinction between the relation between citizens and the political system/the state (the vertical dimension) on the one hand, and the relations between citizens (the horizontal dimension), on the other. In different ways and to different extents, rights, identities and participation are enacted within these vertical and horizontal dimensions.

Rights (and duties) specify the formal *status* of citizenship, i.e., the institutionalised rights and duties, first and foremost civil, political and social rights (Marshall, 1950). However, rights may also be interpreted in a sociological sense, utilising the concept of “empowerment”. Empowerment contains two dimensions: 1. An institutional dimension, i.e., the structure of civil, political and social rights in a given country and how these make up opportunity-structures for citizens, and 2. A subjective dimension, which focuses on citizens’ acquisition of competencies to utilise existing rights (Goul Andersen et al., 2000: 15).

Broadly speaking, *participation* defines any mode of participation in social and public life and in this manner it includes political as well as social participation. Participation is not restricted to citizens’ exploitation of their formal political rights (first and foremost the right to vote), but includes various modes of political participation (e.g., campaign and party activities, individual contacting, participation in political movements, political manifestations), and participation in social and cultural organisations and associations. In addition to this it is not only the actual participation that is important. From a political culture and in turn democratic perspective, citizens’ feeling of *political efficacy* is equally important. Political efficacy consists of two dimensions: “Internal efficacy”, a concept that is closely related to Almond & Verba’s (1963) classical concept of “subjective political competence” and “external efficacy”, citizens’ perception of the responsiveness of the political system.

A condition for a well-functioning democracy is that people agree on certain democratic norms. The dimension of democratic and more broadly political *identity* defines citizens’ orientations and attitudes as members of a political community. These orientations

and attitudes are related to the vertical as well as the horizontal dimension of citizenship. As regards the former it contains elements of support to the political system and regimes principles, and citizens' trust in the political institutions and political actors (Almond & Verba, 1963; Norris, 1999). Aspects of citizens' social and political tolerance, social trust and political solidarity with fellow-citizens relates to the horizontal dimension of political identity.

As mentioned, the empirical-analytical concept of citizenship allows scholars to apply different perspectives depending on their specific research interests. Nonetheless two general problem-areas may be highlighted: The problem of inclusion/exclusion (including the extent of rights) and the challenges of globalisation to citizenship. A tension is created by the power of citizenship to define who is included and excluded, respectively (Lister, 1999:3). This may be interpreted as a question of what groups possess certain political and social rights, both in a juridical/legal and sociological sense. Inclusion and exclusion on the basis of social class was the basis of the influential work of Marshall (1950). More recently, problems of exclusion have been raised in relation to immigrant groups, a problem that seems more and more urgent in the light of increasing globalization (Castles and Davidson, 2000; Benhabib, 1999). Equally important, traditional constructions of citizenship – in particular who are entitled to what rights and who are not – may also ignore perspectives of ethnic groups, women, disabled persons etc (Lister, 1999:4).

The problem of inclusion/exclusion is also applicable in a broader sense. This occurs first in relation to the increasing emergence of “governance” structures (i.e., more or less formal political institutions and networks, including transnational organizations, and trade agreements) and second in relation to other non-institutionalised modes of participation and political identification. The comparative study of citizenship will allow us to investigate which groups are perceived to possess rights, participate and identify as citizens, in the broader meaning of the concept and explore the democratic consequences.

The challenges of globalization to citizenship are two-sided. We may distinguish between analysing globalization as an independent variable, and an “embryonic” global citizenship as a dependent variable. The former focuses on the implications of globalization for citizenship in the respective nation-states, e.g., the problem of increasing immigration, and the effect of globalization on existing social rights in the nation-states (Goul Andersen & Hoff, 2001: Part II). The latter, on the contrary, focuses on the question of whether a kind of embryonic global citizenship is emerging from the level of citizens (“from below”), despite the lack of legal-political acknowledgement of global citizenship (Tobiasen, 2001a). In most modern accounts of citizenship it is assumed that citizenship only is an attribute of the state. This makes perfect sense since most legal-political rights and duties are constituted in the

respective national political systems. Considering the intensification of economic, cultural and political globalisation (see e.g., Held et al., 1999), however, it seems relevant to analyse whether people participate with the objective of trying to influence global political institutions and global issues, for example by participating in the organisations that define global civil society (Beck, 1998; Giddens, 2000; Tobiasen, 2001b).

Elements of citizenship-module

Political Identity

1. The nature of citizenship.

- Individual feelings of belonging to community or state.
- Feelings of belonging beyond the state (global citizenship)
- Social and Political tolerance
- Trust in a variety of political and social institutions
- Social trust (in other people)

2. The obligations of citizenship.

What is required of the democratic citizen? And what is optional?

Possible Measures:

What are the duties of the citizen? What is essential, desirable, optional?

- to vote
- to be well informed
- to help others
- to pay taxes in full
- to respect laws
- to be active in community

Political Engagement

3. Political and social participation

Possible Measures:

- How often participated in elections, general, local
- How extensively discussed politics, followed politics in media, acted in politics
- How often participated in political manifestations (demonstrations, strikes)
- Which groups or associations are you a member of (list) ?
- How extensively participate in group activities?
- What is view of proper role of groups in social action?

How interested are you personally, and how active should the state be, in each of the following issue areas?

- human rights in other countries
- global environmental problems, such as the greenhouse effect

- poverty in other countries (in less developed countries?)
- civil wars and military conflicts in other countries
- natural disasters in other countries
- political efficacy

4. **Institutions** of participation

Political parties

- Evaluations of the performance of political parties.
- Do parties?: encourage people to become active in politics
 - Give people real policy choices
 - Divide the country rather than unify it
 - Listen to the views of ordinary people

Elections

- Do elections?: establish policies
 - Allow gains for groups or classes
 - Provide opportunities for personal gain
 - Establish leadership

Referendums or Direct democracy

- Do referendums?: provide genuine choice on important matters
 - Allow manipulation of the public by elites

Direct Democracy: What institutions would allow it and how important is it?
What issues should be decided directly by the citizens

Social Groups and Movements: How legitimate are they?

The Extent of citizenship

5. The **limitations** of citizenship.

What are the boundaries? Birth? Residence? Nationality of origin? Other?

Possible Measures:

Who should be eligible for country's citizenship? Or eligible to vote in country's election?

- only people born in country or born of citizens
- only people of official national origin(s)
- people who have resided in country for a time regardless of birth
- people who have a certain amount of property or wealth
- people who have a certain amount of knowledge (well informed)
- people who have achieved a certain age

6. The **entitlements** of citizenship.

Possible Measures:

Should all citizens of country be entitled to

- an adequate standard of living
- an adequate level of social services
- a clean environment
- a job
- consultation

The issues of citizenship

7. How important is it:

- that women and men are equally represented in political institutions
- that the law respects the rights of minorities
- that the authorities treat everybody equally, regardless of their position in society
- that politicians listen to citizens before making decisions
- that everyone take some responsibility for the solution of society's common problems
- that everyone chooses goods and products that are good for society and nature even if they cost more
- that people pay their taxes without evasion

Reasons for political interest and activity

- for good of society
- for personal gain
- Resources available or devoted to citizen activities (time, money, civic skills)

Bibliography

- Almond, G. & Sidney Verba (1963): *The Civic Culture. Political Attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Andersen, Johannes et al. (1993). *Medborgerskab – Demokrati og politisk deltagelse*. Herning: Forlaget Systime.
- Barbalet, J.M. (1988) *Citizenship* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Beck, Ulrich (1998) [1997]: *Vad innebär globaliseringen? Misuppfattningar och möjliga politiska svar*. Göteborg: Bokförläget Daidalos AB.
- Castles, Stephen and Alistair Davidson (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging* New York: Routledge.
- Delanty, Gerard (2000). *Citizenship in the global age. Society, Culture, Politics*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony (2000). *Runaway world: How Globalization is reshaping our lives*. New York: Routledge.
- Goul Andersen, Jørgen, Lars Torpe & Johannes Andersen (2000). *Hvad folket magter. Demokrati, magt og afmagt*. Jurist og Økonomiforbundets Forlag.
- Goul, Andersen, Jørgen & Jens Hoff (2001 – forthcoming): *Democracy and Citizenship in Scandinavia*.
- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt & Jonathan Perraton (1999). *Global Transformations, Politics, Economics and Culture*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Heater, Derek (1990). *Citizenship: The Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*. London & New York: Longman.
- Heater, Derek (1999). *What is Citizenship?* Polity Press.
- Lehning, Percy B. & Albert Weale. (1997). *Citizenship, Democracy and Justice in the New Europe*. London: Routledge.

Lister, Ruth (1997). *Citizenship. Feminist Perspectives*. Macmillan Press Ltd.

Lister, Ruth (1999). Citizenship and changing welfare states. Paper presented to *COST A13 conference*, Brussels, September.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class, and other essays*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, Pippa (ed) (1999): *Critical Citizens. Global Support for Democratic Government*. Oxford University Press.

Petersson, Oluf, Anders Westholm & Göran Blomberg (1989). *Medborgarnas Makt*. Stockholm: Carlssons.

Tobiasen, Mette (2001a). Global Political Citizenship – a conceptualisation. Paper presented at the *NISA-symposium*. Copenhagen, Department of Political Science. 29-30. March.

Tobiasen, Mette (2001b): Global Civil Society – the Danish case. Unpublished paper.

The 2004 Citizenship module had as its heart an extensive battery of questions on political and social participation, as well as group membership. These questions were preceded by a set of questions on the perceived obligations of citizenship, as well as tolerance for extreme groups, and followed by a set of questions on the perceived rights of citizens. Following were sets of questions on political efficacy and interest, political and social trust, and the likelihood of discussing politics with others. Then came three questions on the amount of authority which should be given to international organizations and authorities. Turning to domestic politics, questions followed on political parties, referendums and elections as institutions for participation. There followed three questions on the activities of the public service and its degree of corruption. The questionnaire module concluded with three questions on how well democracy worked in the country of the respondent, today, 10 years ago and a projection 10 years into the future. Four optional questions were suggested on the nature of the respondent's media consumption of political news. The 2004 final questionnaire may be found on the ISSP website.

After the 2011 ISSP annual meeting voted to replicate the Citizenship module in 2014, the newly established drafting group (of whom Pammett and Andersen were returning members) proceeded to call for comments to be sent to them from ISSP members by September so that revision discussions could proceed in the fall. In addition, we canvassed scholars whom we knew had used the 2004 Citizenship survey as part of their own scholarship, including Professors Marc Hooghe and Russell Dalton. The replies from Hooghe and Dalton are reproduced below, with their permission:

Some comments on ISSP 2004 questionnaire from Prof. Marc Hooghe (University of Leuven, coordinator of Centre of Political Research)

Remark Q: refers to the question number in the questionnaire

Q1-Q10 Citizen obligations / good citizen

Crucial items for measuring citizen concepts. Cutting items seems not to be reasonable.

Q11-Q13 Tolerance

Works probably well in the USA, but not sure it works well within Europe. Not aware of any research working with those items.

Q14-Q21 Participation/ Q22-Q26 Group membership

Classical battery of items, no change is necessary.

Q37-Q38

In principle another formulation of political efficacy, necessary to keep?

Q40-Q41

Suggestion not to use these two items as results are not clear-cut, especially in Europe. Do the questions refer to 'politics in general' or 'government of specific parties?' Is 'government' all politicians or just politicians of the majority? Suggestion to replace those items by a more regular political trust scale.

Q46-Q47

Suggestion to delete as for most people these questions will capture a non-attitude.

Q49-Q51

Interesting items, will give insight in vision on parties and direct forms of democracy

Q60

Unclear question. Does the question refers to an evaluation of the political system in a country or is it a more general normative question. In the latter, reference to country is not necessary.

Optional Q61-Q64

A pity that those questions are only optional, they are just very important. Suggestion to incorporate into the questionnaire.

Optional Q65-Q66

Those questions seem not so useful.

General remark

Some of the comments are in line with those of prof. Dalton, e.g. keep items on good citizen, cut items on United Nations.

Q1-Q10 Good citizen/citizen obligations

As Q1-Q10 are essential for the citizenship module, suggestion not to change a lot.

Two possibilities for smaller changes:

1. Cut item on military service (not asked in all countries, high item nonresponse in some countries) and replace by an item on 'community service' (burgerdienst/Zivildienst), some service each young man/woman has to deliver to his/her country.
2. Suggestion of Jon to include some items of the original pretested battery such as:
 - a. To respect national symbols like the flag and the anthem (see idea Sarkozy in France)
 - b. To actively try to influence political decisions
 - c. To form your own opinion, independently of others
 - d. To subject your own opinions to critical examination
 - e. To keep informed about global issues such as environmental problems, human rights, and poverty in the world.

Preliminary analyses citizen rights in democracy (Q27-Q32 in the questionnaire/v30-v35 in ISSP-file)

1. Descriptive statistics all 38 participating countries in ISSP 2004

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	% missing	score 6 or 7
Rights in democr: All adeq stand o livng	51696	1	7	6,43	1,054	1,6	85,3
Rights in democr: Gov respect minorities	50896	1	7	6,15	1,290	3,1	77,3
Rights in democr: Gov equal treatment	51519	1	7	6,50	1,046	2,0	87,9
Rights in democr:Citiz oriented decision	51436	1	7	6,45	1,050	2,1	86,2
Rights in democr:Citiz involved decision	50729	1	7	6,12	1,226	3,5	75,4
Rights in democr:Civil disobedience acts	45631	1	7	4,82	1,992	13,2	44,0
Valid N (listwise)	44435						

Remark:

- On a scale from 1 to 7 (not at all important – very important) very high support for all items, except item 'civil disobedience acts'
- Not much variability in answer pattern, except again item 'civil disobedience acts'
- High item nonresponse item 'civil disobedience acts'
- For Brazil no data for item 'civil disobedience acts'

2. Principal component analysis all 38 participating countries in ISSP 2004

	Component
	1
Rights in democr: All adeq stand o livng	0,73
Rights in democr: Gov respect minorities	0,71
Rights in democr: Gov equal treatment	0,77
Rights in democr: Citiz oriented decision	0,78
Rights in democr: Citiz involved decision	0,72
Rights in democr: Civil disobedience acts	0,37
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.	
a. 1 components extracted.	
% explained variance	48,40

Remark:

- One dimension
- Loading item 'civil disobedience acts' rather low

3. Principal component analysis for each participating country (see excel sheet for details)

Remark:

- 21 countries with one factor solution: DE-West, USA, AT, HU, NL, CZ, SL, PL, BG, RU, NZ, PH, JP, ES, LT, SK, VE, CY, TW, ZA, KR-South; but:
 1. In 11 countries high loading ($\geq 0,50$) on all items
HU, SL, PL, BG, RU, PH, JP, LT, SK, CY, KR-South (East-European countries; East-Asian countries and Cyprus)
 2. In 10 countries low loading ($< 0,50$) on item 'civil disobedience acts'
DE-West, USA, AT, NL, CZ, NZ, ES, VE, TW, ZA
- 17 countries with two factor solution: AU, DE-East, GB, IE, NO, SE, CA, IL, FR, PT, CL, DK, CH, FLA, FI, MX, UY
 1. In 10 countries double loadings with one clear factor (first 4 items) and (sometimes) loadings on last two items (=Citizen involved decision and civil disobedience acts)
IE, NO, SE, CA, FR, DK, CH, FLA, FI, UY
 2. In 7 countries clear cut between 2 factors with 5/1 item (=civil disobedience acts)
AU, DE-East, GB, IL, PT, CL, MX

4. Principal component analysis for groups of countries (see excel sheet for details)

Central and South America:

Chile; Venezuela; Mexico; Uruguay

North America:

USA; Canada

(South)East Asia:

Japan; Taiwan; South Korea; Philippines

West-Europe:

Germany West; Great Britain; Austria; Ireland; Netherlands; Israel; France; Switzerland; Flanders

East Europe:

Germany East; Hungary; Czech Republic; Slovenia; Poland; Bulgaria; Russia; Latvia; Slovak

Republic;

North Europe:

Norway, Sweden; Denmark; Finland

South Europe:

Spain; Cyprus; Portugal

Oceania:

Australia; New Zealand

- 1 factor solution:
 1. High loading ($\geq 0,50$) on all items: South East Asia and East Europa
 2. Low loading ($< 0,50$) on item 'civil disobedience acts': South Europe
- 2 factor solution:
 1. Double loadings with one clear factor (first 4 items) and loadings on last two items (=Citizen involved decision and civil disobedience acts): North America and North Europe
 2. Clear cut between 2 factors with 5/1 item (=civil disobedience acts): Central South America, West Europe and Oceania.

Suggestion

- Delete item on 'civil disobedience acts' or change into a more comprehensible item which covers the same idea?
- Replace by some other items?
- Topics which are not covered right now, see original pretested battery
 1. That all citizens have a clean environment
 2. That all citizens have the opportunity to get a job
 3. That the government helps the poor and the needy
 4. That the authorities do not interfere with people's private lives
- However, the variability on these items may also be low.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED-RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

July 26, 2011

RUSSELL DALTON
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF DEMOCRACY
3151 SOCIAL SCIENCE PLAZA
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92697
rdalton@uci.edu

Professor Jon Pammett
Carleton University
International Social Survey Program

RE: Comments on ISSP Citizenship Module

Dear Jon,

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the new citizenship module being planned for ISSP in 2014. I have worked with the 2004 survey extensively, and think it is a very important data collection that should be continued. I am already looking forward to the eventual release of the new data.

I thought I would structure my comments in four categories. The first is what I think is most valuable and distinctive about the 2004 survey, and deserving of a priority for longitudinal comparisons. The second are items worth continuing, and close to the main ideas of citizenship. Third are items that could be cut because they are tangential to citizenship or are covered well in other studies. Fourth are my ideas for new questions to include.

Priority Questions:

- 1) Citizenship norms, what is important for a good citizen (Q1-Q10). This defines the citizenship module and has a strong theoretical base and has been used extensively. There is a theoretical basis for subgroups of these items, which are well-represented in the present 10 questions. (This is a better set of items than an earlier battery in ESS). This also has strong empirical effects. I would rate these as the most important items to include.
- 2) Participation (Q14-Q21) and political interest (Q39). Participation questions are included in other cross-national projects, but it is worth including here. The WVS has a very short battery, focusing on protest; the CSES sometimes includes elections. Europe-only surveys have too narrow a geographic coverage compared to ISSP. Only the ISSP has a cross-national battery of various aspects of participation that go beyond Europe. Moreover, there are continuing debates on the changing patterns of participation, and participation is a natural consequence of citizenship norms. Also, a general interest question, separate from activity, is good to include. One suggestion: an additional internet activity question and a question on campaign/electoral participation would be valuable additions.
- 3) Tolerance (Q11-Q13). It is hard to measure tolerance, and some will critique these specific questions. However, I think these are reasonable questions that are worth repeating. And issues of tolerance are related to citizenship and highly relevant to contemporary politics.

Good Questions

- 1) Group activity (Q22-Q26). This topic is important to citizenship, social capital, participation, etc. It's hard to ask 3-4 items that tap the variation in the ISSP nations, and there may be room for improvement. But some social group battery is very useful.
- 2) Trust and Efficacy (Q33-Q36, Q40-Q41). Another important topic to include in the survey. These are reasonable batteries and relatively brief.
- 3) Corruption (Q52, 53, 56). An important topic, worth keeping
- 4) Democracy (Q57-59). These measures prove useful for developing democracies. Not sure for the established democracies on the second two items.

Candidates for Cutting

- 1) United Nations (C46-48). It seems that the UN questions are tangential to the overall theme of the survey.
- 2) Civil Service (Q54-55). These questions also seem secondary to the project.
- 3) Political parties (Q49-51). Interesting questions, but perhaps too specialized for this module. Seem more relevant for CSES or some election project
- 4) Social trust (Q42-43). One item seems fine. Also ESS publications suggest that a 10 point scale produces more reliable results than a 2 or 4 category response, although I understand you might want to repeat identical question for trends.

New Ideas

For most of the ISSP countries, the questions of citizenship and immigration/foreign status have become more important, and will likely continue. Because of this, I would suggest you consult the 2003 national identity survey to include some of their batteries that tap the overlap between citizenship and nationality. For instance, Q3 on nationality/citizenship criteria, Q4 on national identity, or Q8 on perceptions of foreigners.

I see these two topics as related, and this would give something innovative to the new ISSP in linking them together—do people have an inclusive or exclusive view of citizenship. What aspects of citizenship norms affect these sentiments?

One additional suggestion. Almost every other cross-national survey project includes some version of the Left-Right scale, except for ISSP. Building a surrogate from party preference is difficult. Left-Right attitudes are clearly related to national pride and traditional images of citizenship. Comparing Left-Right participation can address questions in the quality of representation. Etcetera. It is one question with lots of value that should be considered for the ISSP core.

I hope these comments are helpful. I know how challenging it is to develop a questionnaire by committee. ISSP seems to do an excellent job of this task, and I hope the same will apply to the 2014 citizenship module. I am glad to help in any way I can.

Cordially,

Russell Dalton
Professor

Both of these letters gave early indications that many of the key batteries were seen by scholars as essential to the module, and important to keep more or less intact. This includes the batteries on citizen obligations and rights, participation, groups, political efficacy and trust, political interest, tolerance, civil service and corruption, and the evaluation of democracy.

At the same time, the drafting group reviewed all the elements of the 2004 survey with a view to determining where changes should be made. These reviews included empirical examinations of the 2004 to determine weaknesses in the factor structure of multi-item batteries, and also expected correlations of a number of relationships. A series of skype calls followed through the fall.

Ann Carton (Belgium) sent the following summation in November.

ISSP Citizenship 2014

Input talk November 7, 2011

New media

Some suggestions for questions to pretest

Source: Yearly face-to-face survey social-cultural changes in Flanders

Inspired by Eurostat model for the Community Survey on ICT usage in households and by individuals

2012, see module C and E http://circa.europa.eu/Public/irc/dsis/emisannexes/library?l=/data - database/theme_3 - popul/isoc/householdsindiv/questionnaire_2012/ EN 1.0 &a=d

Question 1:

The next question is about interacting with public authorities via the internet

How often do you use the internet for [*item*]?

- a) looking up information on the public authorities
- b) downloading public documents, such as forms, policy plans etc.
- c) interactive applications of the public authorities, such as looking up timetables of “De Lijn”, MIVB or NMBS (=public transport), looking for a job via the VDAB website, etc.
- d) transactions with the public authorities such a Tax-on-web, ordering training vouchers, etc.
- e) participating in digital debates or in an electronic forum on public policy
- f) contacting civil servants or politicians, e.g. by e-mail in order to ask questions on regulations and policy or in order to file a complaint

- 1: never
- 2: seldom
- 3: sometimes
- 4: regularly
- 5: often

6: no answer

Question 2:

How often do you use the internet [*item*]?

- a) for communication such as e-mail, telephone, SMS, chat ...
- b) to look up information on a certain topic or on goods and services
- c) to get in touch with the public authorities, e.g. asking for information, completing forms on line ...
- d) for financial services, such as internet banking, trading shares or concluding a loan or an insurance
- e) to purchase goods for private purposes
- f) to play games
- g) to watch/listen to music, films, radio, TV, video ...
- h) to download, music, clips, films in order to listen to them or watch them later using another device such as a mp3-player, an iPod or a DVD player
- i) to learn things through on line courses or through participation in debates, news groups, etc.
- j) to follow the news, to keep abreast of current events
- k) to bridge a real gap in a virtual way through videoconferencing or teleworking
- l) to offer video films, weblogs, websites on the internet
- m) to participate in virtual communities such as facebook, netlog ...
- n) to fill out questionnaires as member of an internet panel

- 1: never
- 2: hardly ever
- 3: a few times a week
- 4: 1 to 3 times a month
- 5: 1 to 3 times a week
- 6: almost every day

- 7: do not know
- 8: no answer

Question 3: (Eurostat ICT 2011)

For which of the following activities did you use the Internet in the last 3 months for private purpose?

(tick all that apply)

Communication

a) Participating in social networks (creating user profile, posting messages or other contributions to facebook, twitter, etc.)

Access to information

b) Reading or downloading online news / newspapers / news magazines

if yes to b) **b1)** Have you subscribed to news services or products to receive them regularly (including RSS)?

Yes

No

c) Seeking health-related information (e.g. injury, disease, nutrition, improving health, etc)

d) Looking for information about education, training or course offers

- e) Finding information about goods or services
- f) Downloading software (other than games software)

Civic and political participation

- g) Reading and posting opinions on civic or political issues via websites (e.g. blogs, social networks, etc.)
- h) Taking part in on-line consultations or voting to define civic or political issues (e.g. urban planning, signing a petition)

Learning

- i) Doing an online course (in any subject)
- j) Consulting wikis (to obtain knowledge on any subject (e.g. Wikipedia, an online encyclopaedia))

Professional life

- k) Looking for a job or sending a job application
- l) Participating in professional networks (creating user profile, posting messages or other contributions to LinkedIn, Xing, etc.)

Other on-line services

- m) Using services related to travel or travel related accommodation
- n) Selling of goods or services, e.g. via auctions (e.g. eBay)
- o) Telephoning over the internet / video calls (via webcam) over the internet
- p) Internet Banking

Question 4:

Source CID (cf. infra)

During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following (yes/no DK NA)

- a) Visited websites of political organizations or candidates
- b) Forwarded electronic messages with political content
- c) Participated in political activities over the internet

People's rights in a democracy (7-point scale not at all important – very important)

Given skype talk of September the idea was
to keep Q27-Q28
to drop Q29-Q30
to keep Q31-Q32
and to integrate Q60 into this battery

Alternative question for Q60: How important is it
That government(s?) respect democratic rights in whatever circumstances.

Additional items (inspired by CID): How important is it

- a) That gay men and lesbians are free to live their own lives as they wish
- b) That citizens be able to disagree about country's political direction

- c) That everyone is free to speak their mind in politics, even if some of things people say are obnoxious and offensive

Political trust

Suggestion for a more regular political trust scale

See for example Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) Survey Project 2005

(<http://www8.georgetown.edu/centers/cdacs/cid/CIDEnglish.pdf>)

<http://www8.georgetown.edu/centers/cdacs/cid/>

Please tell me on a scale of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust.

- a) Congress
- b) The Legal System
- c) The police
- d) Politicians
- e) The United Nations
- f) The US Supreme Court
- g) Local government
- h) Political parties
- i) Unions
- j) The media
- k) Multi-national corporations
- l) Anti-globalization protesters

See for example European Social Survey 2002 (module Citizenship)

<http://ess.nsd.uib.no/ess/round2/>

Using this card, please tell me on a score of 0-10 how much you personally trust each of the institutions I read out. 0 means you do not trust an institution at all, and 10 means you have complete trust (+ don't know). Firstly (read out) ...

- a) ... (country's) parliament?
- b) ... the legal system?
- c) ... the police?
- d) ... the politicians?
- e) ... political parties?
- f) ... the European Parliament?
- g) ... the United Nations?

Globalization

Self-assessment belonging to which level?

Suggestion

Source 1995 General Election Study Belgium (items c-g)

Which group do you consider yourself to be a member of in the first place and in the second place?

- a) World (added)
- b) Europe (added)
- c) Country
- d) Region within country
- e) Province
- f) Municipality or city
- g) Other

Source ESS2002

Policies can be decided at different levels. Using this card, at which level do you think the following policies should mainly be decided?

International level

European level

National level

Regional or Local level

(Don't know)

- a) protecting the environment
- b) fighting against organised crime
- c) agriculture
- d) defence
- e) social welfare
- f) aid to developing countries
- g) immigration and refugees
- h) interest rates

Globalization negative/positive

Source CID (cf. supra); ESS 2004; 2002

Would you say that (country's) cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries?

(11-point scale with 0: cultural life undermined – 10: cultural life enriched, DK NA)

In general, do you think that (country's) crime problems are made worse or better by people coming to live here from other countries?

(11-point scale with 0: made worse – 10: made better, DK NA)

Is [country] made a worse or a better place to live by people coming to live here from other countries?

(11-point scale with 0: worse place to live – 10: better place to live, DK NA)

Would you say it is generally bad or good for [country]'s economy that people come to live here from other countries?

(11-point scale with 0: bad for the economy – 10: good for the economy, DK NA)

How much you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

(5-point scale agree strongly – disagree strongly, DK NA)

- a) It is better for a country if almost everyone shares the same customs and traditions

- b) It is better for a country if there are a variety of different religions among its people+
- c) People who come to live and work here generally harm the economic prospects of the poor more than the rich
- d) People who come to live and work here help to fill jobs where there are shortages of workers

The convenor circulated the following document as a guide to the way the discussion was developing during the initial evaluations of the questionnaire:

A CONCEPTUAL GUIDE TO THE 2014 CITIZENSHIP MODULE OF THE ISSP

Citizenship denotes membership in a political community, and carries with it rights and obligations, including those of participation in the public sphere. There is both a legal and psychological (identity) dimension to the composition of the citizenry of any community. The community is usually associated with the state (often the nation-state) but may be conceived of in broader or narrower terms. A set of rights and privileges go along with citizen status, but citizens also have obligations to go along with those rights. Conceptions of the obligations of citizenship may be broad (participating actively in community activities) or narrow (obeying the laws). The democratic citizen blends a certain degree of trust of fellow citizens and public officials with a sense of empowerment for personal action in a variety of circumstances. The democratic state creates political institutions which encourage and accommodate participation by the citizenry at large. The well functioning democratic state engenders satisfaction among the citizenry with its performance.

Composition and Eligibility

A holistic conception of the dimensions of citizenship needs to include the identity of citizens, in particular the **composition** of the citizenry and the criteria for **eligibility** for citizenship. Many of these elements are currently in the ISSP National Identity survey. That module asks, not only whether people are citizens, but also a series of questions of who should be citizens of the national state. It also probes public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration.

Because the National Identity module was established prior to the Citizenship one, and was being fielded immediately prior to it (as continues to be the case in 2013/2014) the basic decision was made not to duplicate items on the composition of citizenship in the latter survey, even though a total picture of the subject should include it.

[JP COMMENT: WOULD THERE BE ANALYTIC BENEFIT TO INCLUDING A COUPLE OF ITEMS ON THE COMPOSITION OF CITIZENSHIP, AND IF SO WHAT MIGHT THEY BE? "Should non-citizen residents of [country] have the same rights and obligations as citizens?"]

Locations of Citizen Attachment (national/global)

Another dimension of the identity of citizens is currently included in the survey, namely the locations of citizen attachment. Citizenship involves the designation of a social/political community which not only controls membership (see previous section) but assures the rights and assigns the obligations (see next sections). Most commonly, the state does so, because it has the sovereign power to enforce its decisions. However, people may think of other entities, no matter how nebulous, and feel personal connections to them. In particular, it is important to know if people think beyond the nation-state when they conceive of rights, obligations and participation. One of the most obvious failings of the 2004 survey relates to the inability of Q46-48 to adequately measure the global dimension. Q48 could be retained for continuity and the others replaced.

Two possibilities for replacements would be an overall individual choice of level, and a choice of which level policies should be decided.

Globalization (From Ann's message of last October)

Self-assessment belonging to which level?

Suggestion

Source 1995 General Election Study Belgium (items c-g)

Which group do you consider yourself to be a member of in the first place and in the second place?

- h) World (added)
- i) Europe (added)
- j) Country
- k) Region within country
- l) Province
- m) Municipality or city
- n) Other

There is also ISSP National Identity Q2 ("How close do you feel to...town or city, province, country, continent" 4 questions)

[JP COMMENT: THE ISSP NI QUESTION DOES NOT INCLUDE THE GLOBAL DIMENSION, AND IS 4 QUESTIONS. PERHAPS WE COULD WORK ON THE 1995 BELGIAN ONE. PERSONALLY, I HAVE DOUBTS ABOUT THE PHRASING USING "GROUP" AND "A MEMBER OF" BUT DON'T HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE AT THE MOMENT.]

Source ESS2002

Policies can be decided at different levels. Using this card, at which level do you think the following policies should mainly be decided?

International level
European level
National level
Regional or Local level
(Don't know)

- i) protecting the environment
- j) fighting against organized crime
- k) agriculture

- l) defence
- m) social welfare
- n) aid to developing countries
- o) immigration and refugees
- p) interest rates

[JP COMMENT: IT IS NOT CLEAR WHAT “DECIDING POLICIES AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL” MEANS. IT COULD MEAN DECISIONS BY AN INTERNATIONAL BODY, OR IT COULD MEAN DECISIONS BY NATIONAL ACTORS NEGOTIATING INTERNATIONAL TREATIES. IMPUTING “GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP” TO SOMEONE WHO CHOSE THIS OPTION MIGHT BE PROBLEMATIC.]

Citizenship Rights

Achieving citizenship status is associated with certain rights and privileges which go along with that status. These are often held (but of course not with all people or countries) to dominate obligations (“My citizen obligation to vote is trumped by my citizen right to decide whether to vote or not.”)

The current rights battery (Q27-32) measures assessments of:

Q27 economic rights (adequate standard of living)

Q28 minority rights

Q29 equality rights (treat everybody equally)

Q30 citizen input rights

Q31 participation rights (people be given more opportunities to participate in d-m)

Q32 protest/opposition rights (acts of civil disobedience)

Our tentative decision in September was to propose the amendment of this battery by removing Q29 and Q30 for reasons of duplication and overwhelming agreement [JP COMMENT: DO WE HAVE OTHER JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THIS?].

One suggestion was to move Q60 to this format, in the form:

Qrightsnew “That governments respect democratic rights whatever the circumstances”

Three other suggestions made by Ann:

Additional items (inspired by CID): How important is it

- d) That gay men and lesbians are free to live their own lives as they wish
- e) That citizens be able to disagree about country’s political direction
- f) That everyone is free to speak their mind in politics, even if some of things people say are obnoxious and offensive

[JP COMMENT: WE SHOULD CONSIDER THESE IN THE LIGHT OF THE TOLERANCE ITEMS, Q11-13. ITEM a) SEEMS TO BE ANOTHER TOLERANCE ITEM, PERHAPS MORE SO THAN RIGHTS. ITEM b) SEEMS WEAK,

ESPECIALLY IN THE LIGHT OF Q12 (GROUPS WHO WANT TO OVERTHROW THE GOVT BY FORCE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO MEET). ITEM c) COULD BE MADE MORE GENERAL, AS IN: "That everyone be allowed to speak their mind, even if they offend others."]

Citizen Obligations

All conceptions of citizenship involve some duties of those designated as citizens, in a sense in return for their rights. The "good citizen" is prepared to subscribe to a variety of principles which may include actual participation (Q1, Q5, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q10), adherence to laws (Q2, Q3), attentiveness (Q4), and tolerance (Q6).

From Ann's memo of September: As Q1-Q10 are essential for the citizenship module, suggestion not to change a lot.

Two possibilities for smaller changes:

3. Cut item on military service (not asked in all countries, high item nonresponse in some countries) and replace by an item on 'community service' (burgerdienst/Zivildienst), some service each young man/woman has to deliver to his/her country.

[JP COMMENT: I LIKE THE IDEA OF REPLACING THE MILITARY SERVICE ITEM WITH A MORE GENERAL SERVICE ONE. FOR EXAMPLE, "To be willing to serve one's country when called upon." Or "To be willing to serve one's country." Or "To be willing to perform community or military service." WE COULD CONSIDER OTHER FORMULATIONS INCLUDING THOSE WHICH DID NOT SPECIFY "COUNTRY".]

4. Suggestion of Jon to include some items of the original pretested battery such as:
 - a. To respect national symbols like the flag and the anthem (see idea Sarkozy in France)
 - b. To actively try to influence political decisions
 - c. To form your own opinion, independently of others
 - d. To subject your own opinions to critical examination
 - e. To keep informed about global issues such as environmental problems, human rights, and poverty in the world.

[JP COMMENT: I BELIEVE EITHER c or d ON THE ABOVE LIST WAS THE ONE WE PROPOSED ORIGINALLY. EITHER ONE FITS THE "ATTENTATIVENESS" TYPE OF CITIZEN OBLIGATION (SEE ABOVE). SO WOULD SOMETHING LIKE "To keep informed about public affairs." WHICH WOULD SPECIFY A KNOWLEDGE DUTY.]

Participation

Participation is the key to the exercise of an active citizenship. It includes a wide variety of modes of activity in social and public life, although it is fair to say that political participation is emphasized in the citizenship survey because it most obviously transcends private activity which may or may not have a public interest component. Q14-21 comprises the most direct **participation** battery, but it can also be seen as encompassing the **Tolerance** questions (Q11-13) since these refer to public meetings. Also, the **Group Membership** questions (Q22-26) fall into the general participatory category.

The main question raised so far about the **participation** items has to do with "new media" of participation. Q21 asks about whether respondents have "joined an internet political forum or

discussion group.” This is not an all-inclusive measure of internet use, particularly the use of “social media” to communicate informally with others.

In her message prior to the November call, Ann circulated two question batteries which asked whether people had interacted with public authorities in a number of areas via internet, and also whether people used the internet for a set of other purposes (banking etc) including communication with others.

[JP COMMENT: GIVEN SPACE LIMITATIONS, OUR CONTINUING NEED IS FOR A SMALL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS SUMMARIZING INTERNET AND SOCIAL MEDIA USE. OTHER MEDIA QUESTIONS SPECIFY USE FOR “POLITICAL NEWS” Q61-64. WE SHOULD NOTE THAT Q64 REFERS TO THE INTERNET. ONE SUGGESTION THAT HAS BEEN MADE IS TO MOVE Q61-64 (POSSIBLY NOT INCLUDING Q63 (RADIO)) FROM OPTIONAL TO COMPULSORY QUESTIONS.]

Tolerance of those with opposing viewpoints is not only a potential obligation of citizenship (see earlier section) but involves the political actions of extreme groups, thereby affirming the centrality of participation to citizenship. At the moment, these questions refer to religious extremism, political insurrection and racial/ethnic prejudice.

Group membership is part of overall public activity, and is important for the investigation of social capital. Only one of the five questions at the moment is overtly political, namely belonging to a political party Q22. [JP COMMENT: Q26 “ANOTHER VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION” IS ONLY USEFUL FOR CUMULATING THE NUMBER OF GROUPS AN INDIVIDUAL BELONGS TO. IT WAS A COMPROMISE BECAUSE ORIGINALLY THERE WAS A LONGER LIST.]

Trust and Empowerment

An ideal conception of citizenship requires a certain degree of trust that citizens have in their public officials, and perhaps more importantly in each other. **Social trust** is one of the key concepts in the research on social capital. It involves expectations of the regularity and beneficial intent of random other people outside the friendship circle. Similarly, while citizens need not agree with the specific policies or actions of their public officials, it is important that those running the governments are seen as acting in general in the public interest. The social trust measures at the moment are Q42 and Q43, and the **political trust** measures are Q40 and 41.

Empowerment is a term reflecting the subjective feeling that citizens can understand and influence (to some degree) the actions of public officials and the government. It is usually measured by **political efficacy** questions divided into “external political efficacy” (Q33, Q34) and “internal political efficacy” (Q35 Q36). [JP COMMENT: IN MY MESSAGE OF NOVEMBER 3, I REPORTED ON SOME EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATIONS OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THESE EFFICACY ITEMS AND EXPRESSED DOUBTS ABOUT THE INTERNAL EFFICACY QUESTIONS.]

In an additional effort to measure feelings of empowerment, the survey includes two questions asking about people’s potential actions to counteract an “**unjust law**” (Q37 Q38) [JP COMMENT: IN MY MESSAGE OF NOVEMBER 3, I INVESTIGATED THESE QUESTIONS AND CONCLUDED THAT THE FIRST ONE PERFORMS BETTER THAN THE SECOND.]

Discussion of politics could easily be included under the **Participation** topic. The active citizen is one who is aware of public events and talks about them with others. Q44 and Q45 are designed to measure this idea. Frequency of political discussion (Q44) is to some degree a surrogate for political knowledge and attentiveness, not measured directly elsewhere in the questionnaire. Efforts to persuade others (Q45) is also a measure of political activity; none of the other participation items asks this kind of question, where people interact with others to try to influence their behaviour or opinion. [JP COMMENT: IN MY MEMO OF NOVEMBER 3 I INCLUDED ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF THESE QUESTIONS ON OTHER TYPES OF PARTICIPATION AND FOUND IT SIGNIFICANT.]

Political interest (Q39) is a basic indicator of active citizenship, though it raises as many questions as it answers.

Evaluations of Institutions

Citizen orientations toward participation are essential for the democratic community, but the state which is the legal manifestation of that community must provide adequate institutions to allow this participation to take place (and encourage it), and show citizens that their action has effects. In addition, the public service must be seen as committed to serve the people and responsive to citizens.

Current questions measuring public evaluations of institutions are:

- Q 49 Q50 Political parties as channels of participation, that differ enough from each other to make participation meaningful.
- Q 51 Referendums as decision making institutions
- Q 52 Q 53 Honesty and Fairness of last national election
- Q54 Q 55 Public service evaluation
- Q56 Degree of corruption in public service

Satisfaction with Democracy

Citizen orientations to their rights and responsibilities, their participation rates, their feelings of trust and empowerment, their evaluations of institutions, will affect their degree of satisfaction with democracy in their state. The three satisfaction questions used here take account of the developmental nature of democracy in many of the ISSP countries, and the feelings citizens may have about democracy in the future.

Q 57-9. Satisfaction with democracy today, judgement how well democracy worked 10 years ago and how well it will work 10 years from now.

By late 2011 and early 2012, in preparation for the ISSP meeting in Cavtat, Croatia, the drafting group had agreed to concentrate its efforts in the following areas:

1. Making adjustments to the three main batteries in the questionnaire—participation, citizen obligations, and citizen rights. The participation discussion revolved around the question of participation over the internet. There had only been one item in the 2004 questionnaire on this, worded as whether the respondent had “joined an internet political forum or discussion group.” There was general agreement that this wording was no longer adequate, but replacing it was a difficult task. The citizen obligations questions were generally regarded as satisfactory, except for one item, “to be willing to serve in the military at a time of need.” This item had not been proposed by the 2004 drafting group, and was introduced at the Obernoi meeting from the floor over the objections of the drafting group (and in violation of the ISSP rules.) The rights battery consistently loaded on a single factor, and the 2014 drafting group was determined to introduce some variation in this measure.
2. Creating better questions to measure global citizenship, trying to tap attitudes about citizen obligations, rights and possible participation beyond the boundaries of the nation state. The questions in 2004 about the United Nations were generally seen to have been inadequate in this regard.
3. Revisiting the questions measuring dimensions of empowerment, on the grounds that such basic feelings have an important role to play in the exercise of citizen action. Some analysis was pursued of the two ‘internal efficacy’ items in this regard, and also the questions measuring social and political trust.
4. Reevaluation of the questions on the domestic institutions through which citizen action often takes place, namely groups, political parties, direct participation and the institutions of government.

As the Cavtat meeting approached, the drafting group circulated a discussion document, reproduced below, which was based on the material above.

ISSP

CITIZENSHIP 2014 DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

PREPARED FOR ANNUAL MEETING, CAVTAT, CROATIA, APRIL 30-MAY2, 2012

DRAFTING GROUP:

CANADA

DENMARK

BELGIUM

CHILE

TAIWAN

(All question numbers in document refer to ISSP Citizenship module 2004)

A CONCEPTUAL GUIDE TO THE 2014 CITIZENSHIP MODULE OF THE ISSP

Citizenship denotes membership in a political community. There is both a legal and psychological (identity) dimension to the composition of the citizenry of any community. The community is usually associated with the state (often the nation-state) but may be conceived of in broader or narrower terms. A set of rights and privileges go along with citizen status, but citizens also have obligations to go along with those rights. Conceptions of the obligations of citizenship involve participation in its public activities. These participatory obligations may be broad (involving voting, service, community activities) or narrow (obeying the laws). The democratic citizen blends a certain degree of trust of fellow citizens and public officials with a sense of empowerment for personal action in a variety of circumstances. The democratic state creates political institutions which encourage and accommodate participation by the citizenry at large. The well functioning democratic state engenders satisfaction among the citizenry with its performance.

Citizenship Rights

Achieving citizenship status is associated with certain rights and privileges which go along with that status. These are often held (but of course not with all people or countries) to dominate obligations ("My citizen obligation to vote is trumped by my citizen right to decide whether to vote or not.")

The current rights battery (Q27-32) measures assessments of:

Q27 economic rights (adequate standard of living)

Q28 minority rights

Q29 equality rights (treat everybody equally)

Q30 citizen input rights

Q31 participation rights (people be given more opportunities to participate in d-m)

Q32 protest/opposition rights (acts of civil disobedience)

All of these rights questions have strong levels of agreement. In our review of this section, we have made the tentative decision to propose the amendment of this battery by removing Q29 and Q30 for reasons of duplication and overwhelming agreement. We propose to pretest a number of new items to replace them.

- a) One suggestion is to move Q60 to this format, in the form: "That governments respect democratic rights whatever the circumstances"
- b) People convicted of serious crimes should lose their citizen rights.

- c) Long-term residents of a country, who are not citizens, should have the right to vote in that country's national elections.

Citizen Obligations

All conceptions of citizenship involve some duties of those designated as citizens, in a sense in return for their rights. The “good citizen” is prepared to subscribe to a variety of principles which may include actual participation (Q1, Q5, Q7, Q8, Q9, Q10), adherence to laws (Q2, Q3), attentiveness (Q4), and tolerance (Q6).

This battery has been extensively used, and everyone we have consulted has urged that it be kept substantially as is. The exception has been Q10, which does not load with anything when factor analysis is employed, has a substantial amount of missing data and was not asked in all countries. We will be proposing to replace this item with a broader ‘service’ item. We will pretest at least two versions.

- a) To be willing to perform community or military service at a time of need.
- b) To be willing to serve the country at a time of need.

Participation

Participation is the key to the exercise of an active citizenship. It includes a wide variety of modes of activity in social and public life, although it is fair to say that political participation is emphasized in the citizenship survey because it most obviously transcends private activity which may or may not have a public interest component. Q14-21 comprises the most direct **participation** battery, but it can also be seen as encompassing the **Tolerance** questions (Q11-13) since these refer to public meetings. Also, the **Group Membership** questions (Q22-26) fall into the general participatory category.

The main question raised so far about the **participation** items has to do with “new media” of participation. Q21 asks about whether respondents have “joined an internet political forum or discussion group.” This is not an all-inclusive measure of internet use, particularly the use of “social media” to communicate informally with others. We have considered adding one or two items dealing with other aspects of internet use, such as for financial transactions, correspondence or social communication, but are not yet persuaded of their relevance to public participation.

One suggestion that has been made is that we move the (currently optional) media consumption items, Q61-64, into the obligatory section of the questionnaire. This battery contains the question [How often do you] “Use the Internet to obtain political news or information?”

Tolerance of those with opposing viewpoints is not only a potential obligation of citizenship (see earlier section) but involves the political actions of extreme groups, thereby affirming the centrality of participation to citizenship. At the moment, these questions refer to religious extremism, political insurrection and racial/ethnic prejudice (Q11-13).

Group membership is part of overall public activity, and is important for the investigation of social capital. Only one of the five questions at the moment is overtly political, namely belonging to a political party Q22. Q26, “Another voluntary association” is only useful for computing the number of groups of which someone could be a member. The drafting group is considering recommending that this question be removed.

Trust and Empowerment

An ideal conception of citizenship requires a certain degree of trust that citizens have in their public officials, and perhaps more importantly in each other. **Social trust** is one of the key concepts in the research on social capital. It involves expectations of the regularity and beneficial intent of random other people outside the friendship circle. Similarly, while citizens need not agree with the specific policies or actions of their public officials, it is important that those running the governments are seen as acting in general in the public interest. The social trust measures at the moment are Q42 and Q43, and the **political trust** measures are Q40 and 41. These two political trust items (Q40 Q41) are widely used, but they can be criticized for placing undue emphasis on “politicians” rather than institutions of government more generally. There is an alternative strategy for measuring political trust, by asking respondents how much they trust various political institutions or authorities, but this is a battery of questions which could expand the sequence beyond the space available (how much people trust legislature, courts, etc, etc.) . We intend to explore whether there are alternative political trust measures of this nature which can be compressed into two questions. If so, these will be pretested.

Empowerment is a term reflecting the subjective feeling that citizens can understand and influence (to some degree) the actions of public officials and the government. It is usually measured by **political efficacy** questions divided into “external political efficacy” (Q33, Q34) and “internal political efficacy” (Q35 Q36). In an empirical analysis of these questions, the weakest variables in terms of predicting participation are the two “internal efficacy” items (Q35, 36). They also correlate at a much lower level than “external efficacy” with discussing politics, political and social trust, and the evaluations of institutions. We are considering a recommendation to remove these two items.

In an additional effort to measure feelings of empowerment, the survey includes two questions asking about people’s potential actions to counteract an “**unjust law**” (Q37 Q38) Some suggestions have been made to remove these two items as a duplication of political efficacy (Q33,34). Empirical analysis shows, however, that they have an independent predictive effect on participation. The second item (Q34) is weaker than the first, however, and potentially this item alone could be removed.

Discussion of politics could easily be included under the **Participation** topic. The active citizen is one who is aware of public events and talks about them with others. Q44 and Q45 are designed to measure this idea. Frequency of political discussion (Q44) is to some degree a surrogate for political knowledge and attentiveness, not measured directly elsewhere in the questionnaire. Efforts to persuade others (Q45) is also a measure of political activity; none of the other participation items asks this kind of question, where people interact with others to try to influence their behaviour or opinion. Empirical analysis shows it has an independent predictive effect on participation.

Political interest (Q39) is a basic indicator of active citizenship, though it raises as many questions as it answers.

Evaluations of Institutions

Citizen orientations toward participation are essential for the democratic community, but the state which is the legal manifestation of that community must provide adequate institutions to allow this participation to take place (and encourage it), and show citizens that their action has effects. In addition, the public service must be seen as committed to serve the people and responsive to citizens.

Current questions measuring public evaluations of institutions are:

Q 49 Q50 Political parties as channels of participation, that differ enough from each other to make participation meaningful.

Q 51 Referendums as decision making institutions

Q 52 Q 53 Honesty and Fairness of last national election

Q54 Q 55 Public service evaluation

Q56 Degree of corruption in public service

Satisfaction with Democracy

Citizen orientations to their rights and responsibilities, their participation rates, their feelings of trust and empowerment, their evaluations of institutions, will affect their degree of satisfaction with democracy in their state. The three satisfaction questions used here take account of the developmental nature of democracy in many of the ISSP countries, and the feelings citizens may have about democracy in the future.

Q 57-9. Satisfaction with democracy today, judgement how well democracy worked 10 years ago and how well it will work 10 years from now. We feel asking these questions in 2014 will give an interesting time perspective on how feelings about democracy are evolving.

However, Q59, feeling about democracy 10 years in the future, has a substantially higher amount of missing data than the other two items. We are considering a recommendation that Q59 be removed.

Locations of Citizen Attachment (national/global)

Another dimension of the identity of citizens is currently included in the survey, namely the locations of citizen attachment. Citizenship involves the designation of a social/political community which not only controls membership but assures the rights and assigns the obligations. Most commonly, the state does so, because it has the sovereign power to enforce its decisions. However, people may think of other entities, no matter how nebulous, and feel personal connections to them. In particular, it is important to know if people think beyond the nation-state when they conceive of rights, obligations and participation. One of the most obvious failings of the 2004 survey relates to the inability of Q46-48 to adequately measure the global dimension. Q48 could be retained for continuity and the others replaced.

Two possibilities for replacements would be an overall individual choice of level at which citizen identifications are placed, and a choice of which level policies should be decided.

Self-assessment belonging to which level?

Suggestion

Source 1995 General Election Study Belgium (items c-g)

Which group do you consider yourself to be a member of in the first place and in the second place?

- o) World
- p) Continent
- q) Country
- r) Region within country
- s) Province
- t) Municipality or city

Source ESS2002

Policies can be decided at different levels. At which level do you think the following policies should mainly be decided?

International level
European level
National level
Regional or Local level

- q) protecting the environment
- r) fighting against organized crime
- s) agriculture
- t) defence
- u) social welfare
- v) aid to developing countries
- w) immigration and refugees
- x) interest rates

Social Network

We are considering a daily contact question which serves as a proxy measure of the social network dimension of social capital.

On average, about how many people do you have contact with in a typical day, including all those who you chat, talk, or discuss matters with, whether you do it face to face, by telephone, by mail, or on the internet (whether you personally know the person or not).

- 1) 0-4 persons
- 2) 5-9 persons
- 3) 10-19 persons
- 4) 20-49 persons
- 5) 50 persons or more.

Source: East Asian barometer. Other surveys.

At the end of the Cavtat meeting, there was the customary vote of the membership to give the drafting group guidance as to the priorities for featuring in the module. The following is an excerpt of the minutes of the meeting. The list includes two items, social citizenship and corporate citizenship, which were not featured in the drafting group presentation.

The GM was asked to vote for maximum five topics. The vote gave the following order of priority:

Priority	Topic	Votes
1	Rights and Obligations of Citizenship	28
2	Participation	25
2	Trust and Efficacy	25
3	Social Citizenship	17
4	Satisfaction with Democracy	16
5	Evaluation of Institutions	14
6	Media Consumption	10
7	Corporate Citizenship	8
8	Global Citizenship	7

The NDG presented an outline of their timetable.
Questions for pretest sent to DG convener
June 15th

DG circulates items to be pretested
August 1st

pretest results due to
DG convener
December 1st

DG convener circulates coordinated
pretest results to DG
January 15th

DG decides on final recommendations
February 1st

DG circulates final decisions to ISSP
March 1st

Annual meeting in Santiago, Chile
May 2013

In the course of considering its final recommendations, the drafting group asked for written comments from the membership.

Pretests were undertaken in three countries, and a focus group was held in a fourth. A final group meeting created the draft questionnaire for presentation at the meeting in Santiago in 2013. This document summarizes the questionnaire and the rationale for changes as well as the retention of previous items. In the end, only 10 changes were proposed from 2004.

ISSP MODULE 2014

CITIZENSHIP II

For presentation at Chile meeting

Drafting group:

Canada (convenor - Jon Pammett)

Denmark (Johannes Andersen)

Belgium (Ann Carton, Françoise Vanderkelen)

Chile (Carolina Segovia)

Taiwan (Eric Chen-hua Yu, Yang-chih Fu)

Topic	Items	N of replicated items	N of new items	Total	Dropped items
Citizenship obligations	Q1-Q10	9	0	9	Q10
Citizen rights	Q27-28, Q31-32, R_N2, R_N3, R_N4, R_N5, R_N7	4	5	9	Q29 Q30 Q60
Participation	Q11-Q13	3	0	3	Q21
Tolerance	Q14-Q20, N21, M_N1, S_N1	7	3	10	
Group membership	Q22-Q25	4	0	4	
Trust and empowerment	Q33-Q36	4	0	4	Q55
Political efficacy	Q37-Q38	2	0	2	
Unjust law	Q40-Q41	2	0	2	
Political trust	Q42-Q43	2	0	2	
Social trust	Q44-Q45	2	0	2	
Discussion of politics	Q39	1	0	1	
Political interest	LR_N1	0	1	1	
Left-right in politics	Q49-Q54 Q56	7	0	7	Q46 Q47 Q48
Evaluations of institutions	Q57-Q59	3	0	3	
Satisfaction with democracy	G_N1	0	1	1	10
Global citizenship		50	10	60	
Number of items					

Q refers to the question number in Citizenship 2004 questionnaire

New items

In last column question number of dropped items compared to Citizenship 2004 questionnaire

There are different opinions as to what it takes to be a good citizen. As far as you are concerned personally on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is very important, how important is it:

	Not at all Important						Very Important	Can't Choose
1. Always to vote in elections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Never to try to evade taxes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Always to obey laws and regulations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. To keep watch on the actions of government	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. To be active in social or political associations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. To try to understand the reasoning of people with other opinions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. To choose products for political, ethical or environmental reasons, even if they cost a bit more.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. To help people in (COUNTRY) who are worse off than yourself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. To help people in the rest of the world who are worse off than yourself	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

There are a number of groups in society.

11. Should religious extremists be allowed to hold public meetings?

Should definitely be allowed	1
Should probably be allowed	2
Should probably not be allowed	3
Should definitely not be allowed	4
Can't Choose	8

12. Should people who want to overthrow the government by force be allowed to hold public meetings?

Should definitely be allowed	1
Should probably be allowed	2
Should probably not be allowed	3
Should definitely not be allowed	4
Can't Choose	8

13. Should people prejudiced against any racial or ethnic group be allowed to hold public meetings?

Should definitely be allowed	1
Should probably be allowed	2
Should probably not be allowed	3
Should definitely not be allowed	4
Can't Choose	8

Here are some different forms of political and social action that people can take. Please indicate, for each one,

- whether you have done any of these things in the past year,
- whether you have done it in the more distant past,
- whether you have not done it but might do it
- or have not done it and would never, under any circumstances, do it.

	Have done it in the past year	Have done it in the more distant past	Have not done it but might do it	Have not done it and would never do it	Can't choose
14. Signed a petition	1	2	3	4	8
15. Boycotted, or deliberately bought, certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons	1	2	3	4	8
16. Took part in a demonstration	1	2	3	4	8
17. Attended a political meeting or rally	1	2	3	4	8
18. Contacted, or attempted to contact, a politician or a civil servant to express your views	1	2	3	4	8
19. Donated money or raised funds for a social or political activity	1	2	3	4	8
20. Contacted or appeared in the media to express your views	1	2	3	4	8
N21. Expressed political views on the internet	1	2	3	4	8

M_N1. How often do you use the media, including television, newspapers, radio and the internet, to obtain political news or information?

- 6) Several times a day
- 7) Once a day
- 8) 3-4 days a week
- 9) 1-2 days a week
- 10) Fewer than 1-2 days a week
- 11) Never

S_N1. On average, about how many people do you have contact with in a typical day, including all those whom you talk, chat, or correspond with?

- 1) 0-4 persons
- 2) 5-9 persons
- 3) 10-19 persons
- 4) 20-49 persons
- 5) 50 persons or more

People sometimes belong to different kinds of groups or associations. For each type of group, please indicate whether you,

- belong and actively participate,
- belong but don't actively participate,
- used to belong but do not any more,
- or have never belonged to it.

	Belong and actively participate	Belong but don't participate	Used to belong	Never belonged	Can't Choose
22. A political party	1	2	3	4	8
23. A trade union, business, or professional association	1	2	3	4	8
24. A church or other religious organization	1	2	3	4	8
25. A sports, leisure or cultural group	1	2	3	4	8

There are different opinions about people's rights in a democracy. On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is very important, how important is it:

	Not at all Important						Very Important	Can't Choose
27. That all citizens have an adequate standard of living	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
28. That government authorities respect and protect the rights of minorities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
31. That people be given more opportunities to participate in public decision-making	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
32. That citizens may engage in acts of civil disobedience when they oppose government actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
R_N2. That governments respect democratic rights whatever the circumstances	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
R_N3. That people convicted of serious crimes lose their citizen rights	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
R_N4. That long-term residents of a country, who are not citizens, have the right to vote in that country's national elections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
R_N5. That citizens have the right <u>not</u> to vote	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
R_N7. That health care be provided for everyone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't Choose
33. People like me don't have any say about what the government does	1	2	3	4	5	8
34. I don't think the government cares much what people like me think	1	2	3	4	5	8
35. I feel I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing (COUNTRY).	1	2	3	4	5	8
36. I think most people in (COUNTRY) are better informed about politics and government than I am.	1	2	3	4	5	8

Suppose a law were being considered by [appropriate national legislature] that you considered to be unjust or harmful.

37. If such a case arose, how likely is it that you, acting alone or together with others, would be able to try to do something about it?

Very likely 1
 Fairly likely 2
 Not very likely..... 3
 Not at all likely 4
 Can't choose 8

38. If you made such an effort, how likely is it that [appropriate national legislature] would give serious attention to your demands?

Very likely 1
 Fairly likely 2
 Not very likely..... 3
 Not at all likely 4
 Can't choose 8

39. How interested would you say you personally are in politics?

Very interested 1
 Fairly interested 2
 Not very interested 3
 Not at all interested 4
 Can't choose 8

LR_N1. In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?

Left Right Can't choose
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 98

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't Choose
40. Most of the time we can trust people in government to do what is right	1	2	3	4	5	8
41. Most politicians are in politics only for what they can get out of it personally	1	2	3	4	5	8

42. How often do you think that people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, and how often would they try to be fair?

Try to take advantage almost all of the time 1
 Try to take advantage most of the time 2
 Try to be fair most of the time 3
 Try to be fair almost all of the time 4
 Can't Choose 8

43. Generally speaking, would you say that people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

People can almost always be trusted 1
 People can usually be trusted 2
 You usually can't be too careful in dealing with people 3
 You almost always can't be too careful in dealing with people ... 4
 Can't Choose 8

44. When you get together with your friends, relatives or fellow workers, how often do you discuss politics?

Often 1
 Sometimes 2
 Rarely 3
 Never 4
 Can't choose 8

45. When you hold a strong opinion about politics, how often do you try to persuade your friends, relatives or fellow workers to share your views?

Often 1
 Sometimes 2
 Rarely 3
 Never 4
 Can't choose 8

Thinking now about politics in (COUNTRY), to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Can't Choose
49. Political parties encourage people to become active in politics	1	2	3	4	5	8
50. Political parties do not give voters real policy choices	1	2	3	4	5	8
51. Referendums are a good way to decide important political questions.	1	2	3	4	5	8

52. Thinking of the last national election in (COUNTRY), how honest was it regarding the counting and reporting of the votes?

Very honest 1
 Somewhat honest 2
 Neither honest or dishonest 3
 Somewhat dishonest 4
 Very dishonest 5
 Can't choose 8

53. Thinking of the last national election in (COUNTRY), how fair was it regarding the opportunities of the candidates and parties to campaign?

Very fair 1
 Somewhat fair 2
 Neither fair nor unfair 3
 Somewhat unfair 4
 Very unfair 5
 Can't choose 8

54. Thinking of the public service in (COUNTRY), how committed is it to serve the people?

Very committed 1
 Somewhat committed 2
 Not very committed 3
 Not at all committed 4
 Can't choose 8

56. How widespread do you think corruption is in the public service in (COUNTRY)?

Hardly anyone is involved 1
 A small number of people are involved 2
 A moderate number of people are involved 3
 A lot of people are involved 4
 Almost everyone is involved 5
 Can't choose 8

On the whole, on a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 is very poorly and 10 is very well.

	Very Poorly	Very Well	Can't Choose
57. How well does democracy work in (COUNTRY) today?	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		98
58. And what about 10 years ago? How well did democracy work in (COUNTRY) then?	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		98
59. And how about 10 years from now? How well do you think democracy will work in (COUNTRY) then?	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		98

G_N1. Do you agree or disagree that (COUNTRY) should give more power to international organizations?

Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Neither agree nor disagree	3
Disagree	4
Strongly disagree	5
Can't choose	8

OPTIONAL

On average, how often do you:

	Every day	3-4 days a week	1-2 days a week	Fewer than 1-2 days a week	Never	Can't choose
61. Read the political content of a newspaper	1	2	3	4	5	8
62. Watch political news on television	1	2	3	4	5	8
63. Listen to political news on the radio	1	2	3	4	5	8
64. Use the Internet to obtain political news or information	1	2	3	4	5	8

Now we have some questions about your relations with other people. On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is not at all important and 7 is very important, how important is it for you personally:

	Not at all Important	Very Important	Can't Choose
65. When you meet people for the first time, how important is it that you do or say something to show that you have respect for them?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		8
66. When you meet people you strongly disagree with, how important is it to do or say something to show you tolerate them?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		8

TRANSLATION NOTES

(Numbers refer to questions)

1. **Elections** refer to those held for public officials.
2. **Evade** has the connotation of illegality in not paying taxes owed, and does not mean “avoid”, since “tax avoidance” is not illegal.
3. **Regulations** refers to the operationalization of laws into specific provisions having direct applicability to everyday life.
4. **Keep watch** means exercise vigilance in observing government, with a view to pointing out unwarranted actions or ensuring that proper actions are conducted. **Government** refers to elected and non-elected state authorities. It is not specific to “The Government” in places where that refers to the party in power.

8 & 9. **Worse off** means having a lower standard of living.

11. **Religious extremists** means people who have religious beliefs far from the mainstream. The term usually means these people are not content to simply hold these beliefs, but try to impose them on others.

Preamble to 14-21. **Social action** means public activity intended to produce some kind of impact on the society at large, or a segment of it.

Coding for 14-21. If more than one response, code the more participative one (that is, the one closer to the left end of the scale.)

18. **Civil servant** should be translated with the appropriate term for the public service. Do not use the term “bureaucrat.”
28. **Government authorities** refers to public officials, both elected and non-elected (i.e. employees).
28. **Minorities** are those groups which, because of their lesser numbers in society, are often identified as needing special attention.

54-56. **Public service** should be translated with the appropriate term (see note on 18) for government officials. Do not use the term “bureaucracy.”

**ISSP CITIZENSHIP II MODULE
2014**

RATIONALE FOR DRAFTING GROUP PROPOSALS

The drafting group proposes a module incorporating 10 question changes from Citizenship I. This document explains the rationale for these proposals. Overall, the group considered:

1. Comments from outside experts and users of Citizenship I, as summarized in the previous document presented to the meeting in Croatia.
2. Comments and suggestions received from ISSP members prior to the Croatia meeting.
3. Comments raised in discussion at the Croatia meeting.
4. Results of voting on the priority areas for Citizenship II at the Croatia meeting.
5. Results of quantitative pretests undertaken in Chile, Belgium and Taiwan, which incorporated proposed new items and relevant sections of the previous Citizenship I questionnaire.

RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

This was the top rated section of the questionnaire in the voting on priorities, with 28 votes. It incorporates two of the key sections of the questionnaire, which are among the most used items in Citizenship I. A number of representations urged that the **Obligations** battery of “elements of the good citizen” be kept intact. The exception in the commentary was original item 10, “to be willing to serve in the military at a time of need,” which had a number of problems in 2004. This item had 13% missing data in 2004 and was not asked in all countries. It also had higher missing data in two of the current pretests (9 and 10% in Belgium and Chile). In the Belgian pretest, there was a poor factor loading with the other items, and the explained variance in the factor analysis rises when the item is dropped.

We initially considered ways to reword the military service item by either dropping the reference to ‘military’ or by combining it with other kinds of service ‘community or military service’, but the discussion at the Croatia meeting was skeptical that this would be meaningful. We therefore constructed another kind of item to support the obligations factor which measures service orientations (helping people in your own and other countries, choosing environmental products and being active in organizations.). This item, “to keep informed about international issues” did load with that factor in the Belgian and Chilean pretests, and in a slightly different construction of that factor in Taiwan. It did not, however, add to the explained variance in Belgium, and its addition was deemed in our meetings to be of a lower priority than some other items.

Our proposal is therefore to reduce the Obligations battery to 9 items, the original questions 1-9 in Citizenship I.

The **Rights** battery was one to which we gave a lot of attention. As mentioned in the Cavtat document, many of the old rights questions had highly skewed distributions (with the exception of Q32, civil disobedience). We particularly felt that old Q29 (“government authorities treat everybody equally regardless of their position in society”) and Q30 (“politicians take account the views of citizens before making citizens”) could be replaced because of the generality of their wording as well as the high levels of agreement.

Our proposal is to create a rights battery of 9 items, with 4 replicated items and 5 new questions; this will match the obligations battery in size and allow us to accommodate a number of different dimensions of citizenship rights.

We propose to move Q60 from Citizenship I to the rights section. This question, appearing at the very end of the previous questionnaire and out of a rights context, had a 20% nonresponse rate, possibly because of its stark wording. It asked for a choice between “under no circumstances should democratic rights be restricted by the government” and “when the government thinks it is necessary it should restrict democratic rights.” The wording of the revised question R_N2 “that governments respect democratic rights whatever the circumstances,” does not have unusual levels of nonresponse in the pretests.

We also propose to include new item R_N7 “that health care be provided for everyone”, even though this item has a high level of agreement. It will buttress Q27 “that all citizens have an adequate standard of living” to allow more measurement of **Social Citizenship**. This question area received 17 votes in the priority voting, and we feel that it best fits with the rights questions. In factor analyses from the pretests, this question loaded higher than the other social citizenship item pretested “that a job be ensured for everyone who wants one.” In qualitative evaluations of the questionnaire, the “right to a job” question was regarded as ambiguous, since it was unclear who would be providing these jobs.

We also propose to add three additional questions tapping other dimensions of citizenship rights. These are R_N3 (“that people convicted of serious crimes lose their citizen rights”); R_N4 (“that long term residents of a country, who are not citizens, have the right to vote in that country’s national elections”) and R_N5 (“that citizens have the right not to vote”). The last two of these questions measure political rights and N3 tests the circumstances under which rights can be removed.

With the addition of the new items, the rights battery goes from forming a single factor, to a three-factor battery in our pretests. In the three countries, Factor 1 contains 27, 28, N2, 31 and N7, whereas Factor 2 contains 31, 32 and N5 and Factor 3 contains N3 and N4. We have tentatively labeled these factors community/rights given from above; individualism/rights taken from below; and particularistic rights.

N4 and N5 in particular have much lower levels of agreement and therefore provide better variation than some other items. On N3, respondents in Belgium and Taiwan were more likely to agree than those from Chile that convicted criminals should lose their civil rights.

PARTICIPATION

The participation topic was tied for second place in the Cavtat voting on priorities, with 25 votes. Our proposal is to add 3 items to this section, and remove one. The item we propose to remove is the previous question at the end of the **group membership** section, which asks if the respondent has been a member of “another voluntary association.” We believe that this question, since it does not specify the

type of association, is only useful in creating an index of the number of associations belonged to. There are four other kinds of associations mentioned specifically (Q22-25) which can be used to investigate the kinds of groups to which the respondent belongs. We feel another kind of participation question would give more information than that one.

We propose to keep the main **participation** battery (Q14-20) intact, with the exception of the last question (old Q21) which previously asked whether the respondent had “joined an internet political forum or discussion group.” In order to better measure whether respondents participate on the internet, we pretested a new wording “Expressed political views on the internet.” In the Taiwanese and Belgian pretests, this item loads with Q20 (contacted or appeared in the media to express your views) and Q18 (contacted politicians or civil servants) and some other items. We therefore propose to substitute this new item to measure internet participation.

We consider the three items on **tolerance** in this general category (Q11-13) and propose to retain these items.

We propose two new items on participation. The first is M_N1, which measures media consumption to get political news or information. Our original hope in revising the questionnaire was that we could find the space to include the 4 media consumption items (Q61-64), which were asked as optional questions by 22 countries in 2004). However, this has proved difficult, especially in the light of the Cavtat priority voting, in which this area only received 10 votes. Our compromise was to write one new question, “How often do you use the media, including television, newspapers, radio and the internet, to obtain political news or information,” with a scale of frequency. This question was not pretested, but seems straightforward. We propose to keep the original four questions (Q61-64) as optional items.

The second new item we propose has to do with social participation. Question S_N1 asks “On average, about how many people do you have contact with in a typical day, including all those whom you talk, chat, or correspond with?” This is a simplified form of a question which was pretested, and which was asked in a longer form in East Asian Barometer Surveys, East Asian Social Surveys, and the ISSP 2006 module. Covering both the public and private realms of social interactions, this all-encompassing item helps reveal the extent to which an individual is engaged with others in everyday life, complementing other items focussing on groups. In particular, it helps identify those who are not group members but nonetheless socially active. A focus on “contact” also helps estimate the chances of meeting different kinds of people, a key step in learning about tolerance and political values. Results from previous surveys and the pretests show it has analytical value; for example, those who have contact with more people also have stronger normative perceptions about citizens' obligations, especially obligations toward the government.

TRUST AND EFFICACY

Trust and efficacy, as a group of questions, was tied for second place in the priority voting, also with 25 votes. As a result, we propose to retain all the 2004 questions (Q33-45). In the pretests, we tested a number of alternative measures of efficacy and trust, but the results indicated that the old items performed better.

We pretested alternative measures of **political trust** which measured the degree to which respondents said they trusted the country's parliament, legal system, political parties and politicians. When regressions were run of the predictive power of these variables, and the original political trust variables (Q40 and 41) we examined how many of the standardized regression coefficients were greater than .1. The two original political trust variables had 10 and 13 instances of coefficients over .1 out of a possible 24. The four 'trust in institutions' variables had 8, 9, 5 and 12 instances. Taking into consideration that we would need to use at least one extra question (3 or possibly all 4 instead of 2) to measure political trust, our conclusion is that the original items should be retained.

We also pretested two positively-worded external efficacy items. The two existing questions, while standard, are negatively worded: "People like me don't have any say about what the government does" and "I don't think the government cares much what people like me think." Although Clarke [(With Allan Kornberg and Thomas J. Scotto). "Accentuating the Negative? A Political Efficacy Question Wording Experiment." *Methodology: European Journal of Research Methods in the Behavioral and Social Sciences* 6 (2010: 107-17).] concludes that these negatively worded items are not less desirable, we did test two positively worded questions, "the average citizen has considerable influence on politics," and "People we elect as MPs try to keep the promises they have made during the election." We looked at the Taub correlations between the new and old efficacy items and all the participation questions. In most cases, the correlations with the original items were higher than those with the new questions. In addition, the correlations of participation with the "unjust law" questions (Q37, 38) were higher than either the old or new efficacy questions. Our conclusion is that the questions should not be changed.

There are therefore six 2-item batteries in the trust and efficacy section: external efficacy; internal efficacy; whether an unjust law could be changed; political trust; social trust; political discussion (which could also be considered political participation items.). All of these batteries have unique contributions to explained variance when participation is used as a dependent variable.

We have grouped one additional new item in this general category, that of **left-right identification**. This question, LR_N1, was suggested by several commentators on the 2004 questionnaire when we asked originally for suggestions, it is used in many surveys, and reads "In politics people sometimes talk of left and right. Where would you place yourself on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 means the left and 10 means the right." In the pretests, left-right self-placement does not have high missing data rates, and has correlations with the participation items in the .15 range, and sometimes higher. We conclude this will be a useful explanatory variable, and propose its inclusion.

SATISFACTION WITH DEMOCRACY

Q57-59 asking about satisfaction with democracy (“How well does democracy work in country today?” “and what about 10 years ago? How well did democracy work in country then?” “and how about 10 years from now? How well do you think democracy will work in country then?”) was the 4th-highest vote-getter in the priority voting from the previous meeting (16 votes). The third item, Q59, has higher rates of nonresponse than the other two, but from the expression of ISSP member interest in this topic as expressed in the voting, we propose to keep all three of these questions.

EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONS

This topic was fifth in the order of priority, with 14 votes. In 2004, this topic included evaluation of political parties (2 items Q 49 and 50); evaluation of referendums (1 item Q 51); evaluation of elections (2 items Q52 and 53) and evaluation of the public service (3 items Q 54-56). On examining the last set of questions, (original Q 54-56) we concluded that evaluation of the public service could be measured effectively with 2 items, and that original Q55 (“When the public service makes serious mistakes in country, how likely is it that they will be corrected?”) could be dropped without affecting the analytic utility of this sequence.

GLOBALIZATION

This topic received only 7 votes in the Cavtat priority voting. In accordance with our earlier thinking on this topic, we have proposed to drop Q46-48 from the 2004 questionnaire, which attempted to measure whether respondents wanted to give more power to the United Nations, put decisions in international organizations directly into the hands of citizens, and support United Nations intervention to rectify violations of human rights.

In order not to lose this idea altogether, we pretested a new question, G_N1, which asked whether respondents agreed or disagreed that “country should give more power to international organizations?” Qualitative testing produced some respondent questioning about which international organizations are meant. However, overall we felt the question does measure a feeling about the need for attention beyond the national state. In pretests it is related to political efficacy, and also to some political participation items. It is also related to the Left-Right self placement question, in that those who place themselves on the left are more likely to want to give power to international organizations. We therefore propose the substitution of G_N1 for the three globalization items being removed.

CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

This topic received 8 votes in the priority voting. It seemed to the drafting group that several questions would be needed to measure the concept satisfactorily, and that this could not be achieved without dropping items from the existing questionnaire which received higher priority scores. In addition, it seemed to us that other sectors of society than business should be reasonably investigated

as well, like interest groups, unions, etc. We therefore do not propose to include them in the Citizenship II main questionnaire, but remain open to a small battery being offered as optional items.

In the course of the Santiago meeting, in which the questions were voted on individually and in blocs, a few changes were made from the above proposed version of the questionnaire. The group's shortened version of question S_N1, people contacted in a typical day, was rejected in favour of the longer version of the question used previously in the ISSP. The group's proposal to drop the question relating to membership in "another voluntary association" was rejected in favour of retaining this item. Finally, the group's proposal to retain one item on globalization, "Do you agree or disagree that (country) should give more power to international organizations?" was rejected.