Tilburg University

Beyond the civic-ethnic dichotomy. Investigating the structure of citizenship concepts across thirty-three countries

Reeskens, T.; Hooghe, M.

Published in:
Nations and Nationalism

Publication date:
2010

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Reeskens, T., & Hooghe, M. (2010). Beyond the civic-ethnic dichotomy. Investigating the structure of citizenship concepts across thirty-three countries. *Nations and Nationalism*, 16(4), 579-597.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Nations and Nationalism **16** (4), 2010, 579–597.

Beyond the civic–ethnic dichotomy: investigating the structure of citizenship concepts across thirty-three countries

TIM REESKENS* and MARC HOOGHE**

**Department of Sociology, Tilburg University, the Netherlands*

***Department of Political Science, University of Leuven, Belgium*

ABSTRACT. The traditional distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship continues to dominate the study of citizenship concepts. In recent years, various authors have questioned the dichotomous character of these concepts. In this article, we empirically investigate the applicability of this dichotomy based on an analysis of International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) survey data across thirty-three societies. The analysis demonstrates that this dichotomous structure can indeed be detected and therefore the theoretical dichotomy can be considered as empirically valid. While ethnic citizenship refers most strongly to having national ancestry, for civic citizenship the most important criterion seems to be to obey national laws. However, the ethnic concept of citizenship can also be defined in a negative manner: for ethnic citizenship, obeying the national laws is clearly not a sufficient condition. Further analysis also reveals that the measurement of both concepts is not equivalent cross-nationally, so that findings on civic and ethnic citizenship are difficult to compare across societies.

KEYWORDS: citizenship concepts, civic citizenship, comparative research, ethnic citizenship

Introduction

Conventional wisdom holds that citizenship concepts fall into two broad and distinct categories. Civic citizenship is considered as open and inherently political: adherence to legal norms is the main criterion to distinguish citizens from non-citizens. Ethnic citizenship, on the other hand, implies that ethnic status or ancestry determine who is accepted as a full member of the community. This distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship is now more than six decades old (Kohn 1944), and it continues to be one of the most influential theoretical frameworks for the study of nationalism, national identity and citizenship politics (Brubaker 1992; Shulman 2002).

While in the original study Kohn identified Western Europe as civic and Eastern Europe as ethnic, in subsequent research various authors also applied the distinction to Western Europe itself. For instance, Brubaker (1992) famously claimed that French citizenship responds to a civic logic: adherence to the French law, culture and values are seen as essential to define citizenship. These political and cultural requisites imply that one's descent is less relevant to acquire full citizenship. In fact, it has to be remembered that the current French president, Nicolas Sarkozy, was born in a family of Hungarian refugees. In contrast, Brubaker claims that Germany can be identified as ethnic: having German ancestors (even when this ancestry has to be dated back several centuries) is an important criterion for acquiring German citizenship. While the French concept of citizenship is descriptive and open to choice (one can always immerse oneself in French culture), the German concept of citizenship status is ascriptive and closed (one cannot choose to descend from German settlers). As such, civic citizenship is often portrayed as much more open and egalitarian than the closed ethnic conception.

Self-evidently, this crude dichotomy between ethnic and civic citizenship only allows for a quite general understanding of national identity. While currently the distinction between these two forms of citizenship is still being accepted as a heuristic device to study identity and citizenship, various authors have put forward the claim that the distinction needs to be further qualified (Yack 1996; Smith 2000; Kuzio 2002). It has also been claimed that not all Western European societies adhere to a civic conception of citizenship: historical evidence suggests that Western countries have started with ethnic notions of citizenship, gradually evolving toward more open civic concepts (Kaufman 2000). Furthermore, in recent years, scholars of Eastern European societies have questioned the stereotyping of all Eastern European identities as inherently ethnic, and thus prone to exclusion, ethnic violence and even civil war (Zubrzycki 2001; Shulman 2002; Björklund 2006; Janmaat 2006). Therefore, Kuzio (2002: 20) arrives at the conclusion: 'pure civic or ethnic states only exist in theory'.

Thus far, the study of civic and ethnic citizenship concepts has been concentrated mainly on government policy. However, it can be questioned whether government policy is an ideal indicator to classify societies. Partly because of European integration, citizenship policies are converging in Europe, and therefore policies no longer reflect national cultures unequivocally. For instance, in recent years Germany has largely abandoned its traditional policy of *jus sanguinis* with regard to acquiring German citizenship (Minkenberg 2003; Joppke 2007). Therefore, we can assume that official German policy no longer reflects the traditional citizenship values of the German population because of diverse legal, political and institutional external pressures. As Björklund (2006: 95) argued: 'attention to public opinion is largely absent in the literature on nation-building, although anchorage in public opinion is, arguably, essential to the validity of the model of the ethnic versus the civic nation'. At least we can argue that the currently available studies on citizenship concepts in government

policy should be supplemented with studies on the occurrence of these concepts in public opinion.

In this article, we introduce two major innovations in the study of civic vs. ethnic citizenship concepts. Firstly, we will investigate the empirical validity of this dichotomy: what exactly are the defining characteristics of both citizenship concepts, and can they be considered as mutually exclusive? Secondly, in order to conduct this inquiry, we will rely on public opinion data, gathered in the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). More specifically, we will use the 2003 National Identity wave of this comparative survey project (ISSP 2003). By means of data reduction, we will ascertain the empirical validity of the civic–ethnic distinction and the precise delineation of both concepts. Multiple group confirmatory factor analysis (MGCFA) is used to assess the cross-national validity of both concepts in order to test whether the civic–ethnic structure is measured equivalently across all countries in the sample.

We briefly review the literature on civic and ethnic citizenship and then summarise the discussion therein with regard to the universal applicability of the civic–ethnic dichotomy. Subsequently, we introduce data and methods, in order to analyse the empirical validity of the distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship. In the final section, we critically reflect on the results of the analysis.

Civic and ethnic citizenship conceptions

The distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship can be traced back to Meinecke's (1970 [1907]) typology of nationalisms, distinguishing the *Staatsnation* from the *Kulturnation*. Meinecke (1970) argued that there is a difference between nations that are based primarily on some joint experience of cultural heritage and nations that are based primarily on the unifying force of a common political history and constitution. Therefore, the *Staatsnation* is based on a form of social contract that in principle is open to all who wish to adhere to it. In the literature, the Swiss Federation and the USA are usually portrayed as typical examples of such a *Staatsnation*. On the other hand, the *Kulturnation* is described as an ethnic community in which inclusion is based on descent. The textbook examples of the ethnic nation are Germany, Japan and Israel. These two ideas are seen as mutually exclusive: if a society stresses its political character, it cannot simultaneously refer to a shared ethnic identity and an alleged glorious past as its founding myth. In the earlier work of Meinecke, states were seen as balancing between those two extremes. In fact, it can be argued that the political history of Germany during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was mainly a struggle between ideas of Germany as a *Kulturnation* or a *Staatsnation* (Giesen 1991).

While Kohn (1944) also uses the distinction between civic and ethnic nationalism, in his work these concepts are rather seen as fixed and stable characteristics of nation-states. Famously, he portrayed Eastern European societies as primordially ethnic, while the liberal regimes of Western Europe

were seen as civic. More recently, in the work of Brubaker (1992), the same distinction is being applied, but this time with regard to Germany and France: 'for the distinctive and deeply rooted French and German understandings of nationhood have remained surprisingly robust. Nowhere is this more striking than in the policies and politics of citizenship *vis-à-vis* immigrants' (Brubaker 1992: 3).

It is important to note here that Brubaker does not assume that this distinction could only be applied to the study of legal systems: in his work, the distinction between civic and ethnic identities is seen as a social and historic characteristic of nation-states. These characteristics express themselves in acts of legislation, but they should be seen as enduring and comprehensive elements of national identity. Therefore, his assumption is that at least the majority of French or German citizens actually apply these arguments in their self-identification, or in their reasoning about community and citizenship (Brubaker 1996: 170).

In recent years, various authors have expressed their concern about the empirical validity of civic and ethnic citizenship. Based on quantitative data, Shulman (2002) argues that ethnic concepts are just as prevalent in Western European societies, while in Eastern Europe notions of civic identity can also be found. Shulman summarises his results as follows:

Imperial and communist rule have not pushed Eastern European nationhood in a strongly cultural direction while greatly weakening civicness. And whereas most of the West has a long tradition of democracy and relatively strong and stable political institutions, cultural conceptions of nationhood are alive and well, and support for multiculturalism is relatively weak. (Shulman 2002: 583)

Moreover, based on survey data from Latvia, Poland and Lithuania, Björklund (2006: 112) claims that Eastern Europe is not a civic desert area: 'the results of the Baltic survey do not support the idea of a uniform and specifically East European 'ethnic' concept of nationality'.

In an attempt to counter this point of critique, Brubaker admits that the concept of civic and ethnic nationhood suffers from two major weaknesses (Brubaker 2004). Firstly, there are analytical ambiguities associated with the civic-ethnic distinction. Within the literature, there is no agreement on the question of which elements refer specifically to civic or ethnic concepts of citizenship (Brubaker 2004: 137). It has to be noted here that while Brubaker acknowledges doubt about the operationalisation of the concepts, he does not question the fact that both concepts can be used as ideal types. The second problem is associated with the normative implications of the distinction. Civic nationalism is portrayed as liberal, universalistic and inclusive while the ethnic form of nationality concepts is regarded as illiberal, particularistic and exclusive. Especially in Eastern Europe and the Balkans, where ethnic divisions do not necessarily coincide with state borders, ethnic and civic conceptualisations of group identity do not necessarily overlap. Therefore, Brubaker introduces a further distinction between state-framed and counter-state understandings of nationalism.

Problems with current theories and research

Despite the criticism expressed toward the dichotomous character of the civic–ethnic distinction, it is quite telling that this theoretical framework still dominates the literature on citizenship and nationhood. Nevertheless, various authors have identified important conceptual and theoretical reservations against the civic–ethnic dichotomy.

Firstly, it had been stated that a simple dichotomy is not sufficient to fully understand the varieties of citizenship concepts. Kymlicka (2001: 244) claims that ‘membership’ is not just a question of law or ethnic heritage, but also of culture. This cultural factor is usually neglected in the literature on nationalism and identity. Kymlicka uses the examples of Quebec and Catalonia to make his claim: Québécois and Catalans are concerned with the survival of their culture and they do accept immigrants as long as they respect the cultural tradition of these regions. As such, citizenship concepts are not just two-dimensional, but incorporate various elements of community, society and politics. Kymlicka proposes that instead of a dichotomy, at least three dimensions of citizenship should be distinguished: ethnic, civic and cultural.

Secondly, the question of whether civic and ethnic citizenship concepts should be considered as mutually exclusive has led to an intensive debate. Miller (2000: 131) argues that the two concepts cannot be combined. In his view, societies hold on to either a civic or an ethnic citizenship concept, while it is almost inconceivable to simply take a middle position on that continuum. Brubaker (2004: 139) strongly opposes this view and argues that all these various considerations are being used simultaneously. Citizenship concepts within a society are based on ethnic, civic and cultural considerations, and all these elements are used simultaneously in order to reach a decision on who is considered as a full member of the political community, and who is not.

Technically, this distinction translates into a debate about the structure of citizenship beliefs. In the Miller view, there are two completely different concepts of citizenship that have little or nothing in common. If, for example, the criterion of having ethnic ancestry is being stressed, this automatically implies that the criterion of residing within the territory of a country is not considered as important. According to the Brubaker argument, on the other hand, there are various interrelated ways to think about citizenship and all of them relate to one latent concept, without being mutually exclusive.

Thirdly, it remains to be ascertained how specific criteria relate to theoretical concepts; or, to put it differently, how the concepts could be operationalised. There is some consensus on the question that obeying the law, respecting political institutions, ethnic descent, speaking the language, adhering to a majority religion etc. at various stages are all being used as admission criteria. How exactly these criteria relate to the theoretical concepts is seldom addressed explicitly. Shulman (2002) circumvents this problem by *a priori* assigning specific items to a theoretical concept, which is hardly in line with accepted practices in survey research or in data reduction. In his study he

Table 1. *Operationalisation of civic, cultural and ethnic identity in Shulman (2002: 559)*

<i>Content of national identity</i>	<i>Key indicators</i>
Civic	Live on the territory Have legal citizenship status Express will to join political community Adhere to basic state ideology
Cultural	Adhere to political institutions and rights Believe in dominant religion Speak national language Share national traditions
Ethnic	Ancestry, descent Belong to the dominant ethnic/racial group

does not investigate the empirical validity of this assignment. In Table 1, we list Shulman's operationalisation of the concepts of civic, ethnic and cultural identity. Our argument would be that before we accept this operationalisation, at least it should be tested whether these criteria are indeed related so strictly and one-dimensionally to the specific theoretical concepts.

Fourthly, Shulman (2002) implicitly assumes that his operationalisation is cross-nationally equivalent: in all of the nations that were included in his survey, the same structure and relations between items and concepts are thought to be found. For example, this would mean that citizens across all nations consider speaking the national language as a part of the concept of cultural citizenship. However, this too is an assumption that can only be accepted once it has been tested empirically. Therefore, we need to investigate the cross-national equivalence of the distinction between the various concepts (Harkness, Van de Vijver and Mohler 2003). Only if cross-national measurement equivalence is met is it possible to compare countries with respect to their levels of civic or ethnic citizenship. If not, we can only conclude that the two concepts have different meanings in the societies we want to study.

In this article, self-evidently we cannot address all of the problems associated with these concepts. We want to concentrate on four specific questions:

1. Do citizenship requirements form two (ethnic–civic) or three (ethnic–civic–culture) latent factors?
2. Can these factors be represented as mutually exclusive?
3. If so, which items offer valid operationalisations of this latent structure?
4. Can these concepts be measured in a cross-nationally equivalent manner across societies?

Validity of typologies in cross-national research

Before we try to formulate an answer to these four research questions, we first need to explain clearly the methodological challenges that are inherent in this

kind of cross-national research. The empirical study of broad concepts like civic or ethnic citizenship requires operationalisation into distinct survey items. Because it is not possible to ask respondents whether they believe in ethnic or civic citizenship, survey items need to be developed that tap these dimensions and can be considered as a reliable and valid measurement of these theoretical concepts (Churchill 1979; Gerbing and Anderson 1988; Spector 1992; Miller and Mitamura 2003). Thus far, the assignment of these items to theoretical concepts (Shulman 2002) relied purely on theoretical considerations. This violates the rule that before investigating a theoretical concept with empirical measurements, at least the empirical validity of these concepts should be investigated. By means of exploratory factor analysis, we can detect (1) the underlying dimensional structure of the citizenship items and (2) the correct assignment of specific items to a latent concept.

While this kind of data reduction technique might be considered as adequate for survey research conducted in a single society, this analysis does not contain sufficient information about cross-national validity. This implies that in the different societies under investigation one should achieve measurement equivalence. To be more specific, measurement equivalence is achieved when the relation between indicators and latent variables is invariant across countries.

In the effort to achieve the highest level of cross-national measurement equivalence, meaning that the latent means of the civic and ethnic citizenship concepts may be compared across countries, three tests will be applied (Steenkamp and Baumgartner 1998: 80–1). The first and lowest level of measurement equivalence is configural invariance, referring to the fact that the measurement instrument shows the same pattern of salient and non-salient loadings across nations. The second level of invariance is the metric one, meaning that the different factor loadings are equivalent across all groups of countries. Scalar equivalence is the third level. While configural and metric equivalence do not lead to the comparison of latent means across nations, scalar equivalence is the necessary prerequisite to compare means cross-nationally. Therefore, only if scalar equivalence is met can countries be compared in a valid manner on their level of civic or ethnic citizenship. Scalar equivalence is tested when, on top of the metric invariance (keeping the factor loadings invariant across groups), the intercepts are constrained across groups (Steenkamp and Baumgartner 1998).

Data and methods

The data used in this article are the recent ‘National Identity’ wave of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP), which was carried out in 2003. The purpose of this cross-national survey project is to build ‘a continuing annual program of cross-national collaboration on surveys covering topics important for social science research’ (ISSP 2003: 6). The 2003

'National Identity' wave was carried out in thirty-five countries across the globe. Because two countries (Bulgaria and Latvia) did not use the full battery for this question, they had to be excluded from the analysis, leaving us data from thirty-three countries with over 41,000 respondents. These countries are Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, East and West Germany,¹ the UK, Hungary, Ireland, Israel and the Palestine territory, Japan, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Uruguay, the USA and Venezuela.²

In the ISSP survey, respondents were questioned about the criteria they considered as important to be accepted as a citizen of their country. More specifically, they could rate eight different criteria: being born in the country, having legal citizenship status, having lived in the country for most of one's life, speaking the dominant language, adhering to the dominant religion, respecting the laws, 'feeling' a member of the community and having national ancestry. It is clear that these items were developed and included in the ISSP survey in order to test the distinction between ethnic and civic concepts of nationality, but in the literature thus far we do not find any test of the cross-national validity and measurement equivalence of these concepts. Respondents could rate the importance of these criteria on a four-point ordinal scale, ranging from not important at all (1) to very important (4) (Table 2).

Table 2. *Citizenship requirement items in ISSP (2003)*

<i>Item</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Not</i>			
		<i>important</i>	<i>Not very</i>	<i>Fairly</i>	<i>Very</i>
		<i>at all</i>	<i>important</i>	<i>important</i>	<i>important</i>
To have been born in [country]	41,034	7.84	17.00	30.86	44.30
To have [country nationality]	41,068	3.01	9.28	32.99	54.72
citizenship					
To have lived in [country]	40,941	4.78	17.36	36.01	41.85
for most of one's life					
To be able to speak					
[country's language]	41,179	3.27	8.62	29.57	58.54
To be a [religion]	40,323	30.51	23.68	20.55	25.26
To respect [country nationality]	40,758	3.46	8.97	37.88	49.69
political institutions and laws					
To feel [country nationality]	40,887	2.82	7.75	32.40	57.03
To have [country nationality]	40,720	13.36	22.88	29.45	34.31
ancestry					

Note: Entries are row percentages. Each item is presented in a matrix questionnaire design. The items are preceded by the phrase: 'Some people say that the following things are important for being truly [nationality]. Others say they are not important. How important do you think each of the following is ...' Cases are weighted by the ISSP design weight factor.

The distribution of the responses on these eight citizenship requirements, as reported in Table 2, makes clear that respondents tend to consider a lot of these criteria as very important. The feeling of national identity, speaking the language, having citizenship status and respecting the law are clearly of tantamount importance, while place of birth, religion, length of stay and ancestry receive lower ratings. However, the distribution of these eight items does not reveal which items empirically belong together.

Therefore, in the remainder of this article we will first investigate the latent structure of the civic–ethnic dichotomy with exploratory factor analysis; we will then check the stability of this extracted solution using confirmatory factor analysis for categorical data. With regard to the factor analysis, we have opted for an oblique rotation (Promax) over an orthogonal rotation (Varimax) because we want to obtain information about the correlation between the factors that may arise from the analysis (Sharma 1996). When using an orthogonal rotation, the assumption is that the factor axes are uncorrelated, and therefore the variables of interest are modelled in such a manner that they load on only one factor. An oblique rotation, on the other hand, is not based on this assumption. If the extracted factors are mutually exclusive, this would nevertheless lead to a factor–axes correlation that would be fairly low. The oblique rotation allows for a better testing of the relation between the two concepts that we distinguished earlier.

In a second step, the stability of this factor solution will be tested using confirmatory factor analysis. Given the categorical measurement level of the data – the response categories are ordered from 1 to 4 with a skewed distribution, as Table 2 shows – we will use the appropriate method for categorical data.

The result of these two data reduction steps will be the basis for the test of cross-national measurement equivalence of the citizenship concepts, using MGCFA (Byrne, Shavelson and Muthén 1989; Rensvold and Cheung 1998; Billiet 2003; Reeskens and Hooghe 2008). The analysis software used in this article is Mplus (Muthén and Muthén 2006). To test the fit of this MGCFA, different fit indices are evaluated (Bollen 1989; Bollen and Long 1992). The first considered test statistic is the chi-square test. However, the chi-square statistic is known to be sensitive to sample size. Because cross-national survey research uses very large samples (the final sample size is 38,311), the chi-square test statistic is not sufficiently sensitive as an indication for the model fit. In structural equation modelling, there are two types of fit indices. The first is the ‘comparative indices’, which compare the fit of the estimated model with the fit of a baseline model. As a comparative index, we will use the Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) and the comparative fit index (CFI) to test the fit of the model. The second type is the ‘absolute indices’, which examine the closeness of fit. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) will be used to test the fit of the model based on an absolute index. To consider a model as fairly stable, we apply the rule of thumb that the comparative indices need to be larger than 0.95 and that the RMSEA must be smaller than 0.05.

Exploratory factor analysis

The first question that we will address is whether the distinction between ethnic and civic citizenship is empirically valid, and whether the various items in the ISSP citizenship concepts module indeed relate to these citizenship concepts as is routinely assumed. Before investigating the dimensional structure, the question arises of how many factors are extracted from the eight items. The Eigenvalues of the factors have been plotted in the scree plot in Figure 1, and they clearly show that a two-factor solution is to be preferred: the Eigenvalue of the first two factors exceed the threshold of 1.00, meaning that these two factors are distinct from each other and are both able to subtract a significant level of variance in the variables. Therefore, the three-factor solution, as suggested by Kymlicka (2001), is not presented in these data.

In line with prior research and based on the content of the items, we label these factors as ethnic and civic concepts of citizenship. For the first factor, 'having national ancestry', which clearly refers to ethnic citizenship, receives a strong factor load and therefore can be labelled as ethnic citizenship. 'Respecting the political institutions and laws' receives the strongest factor loading for the second factor. Because this adherence to dominant norms is claimed to be a typical characteristic of civic citizenship, this second factor is labelled as civic citizenship.

Table 3 displays the results of the exploratory factor analysis.³ At first sight, the items indeed respond to a dichotomous latent structure. Place of birth, length of residence, religion and national ancestry clearly load on the 'ethnic' factor. Speaking the national language, respect for laws and institutions and the feeling of identity load just as clearly on the second (civic) factor. However, the question of citizenship status loads equally on both factors; because of this strong cross-loading, it needs to be discarded in further analyses. It is also interesting to note that we find three negative factor loadings: having been born in the country and having national ancestry show a weak negative relation with

Figure 1. Scree plot of the Eigenvalues as a result of an exploratory factor analysis for categorical data with Promax as rotation method (source: ISSP 2003).

Table 3. *Exploratory factor analysis of citizenship concepts*

<i>Item</i>	<i>I Ethnic factor</i>	<i>II Civic factor</i>
To have been born in [country]	0.871	– 0.031
To have [country nationality] citizenship	0.470	0.397
To have lived in [country] for most of one's life	0.621	0.244
To be able to speak [country language]	0.167	0.554
To be a [religion]	0.563	0.031
To respect [country nationality] political institutions and laws	– 0.207	0.778
To feel [country nationality]	0.226	0.580
To have [country nationality] ancestry	0.834	– 0.036
Factor axes correlation	0.578	

Note: Entries represent factor loadings, resulting from an exploratory factor analysis for categorical data (in Mplus 4.0) with Promax as rotation method and ULS as estimator. The axis correlations coefficient indicates the correlation between the two extracted factors. The figures in bold represent membership of the specific citizenship item to their respective ethnic or civic latent factor.

civic citizenship, while respecting the law has a negative relation with the ethnic factor. A further interesting result obtained by the exploratory factor analysis is the factor–axes correlation of 0.58. This implies that there is a strong correlation between the two: those respondents who are more in favour of ethnic citizenship requirements tend to adhere to a civic logic.

This exploratory factor analysis leads to clear results: we can distinguish ethnic and civic citizenship concepts, and various items relate unambiguously to one of these two ideas. However, a more appropriate and rigorous test of the distinction involves confirmatory factor analysis to ascertain the stability of the factor solutions.

Confirmatory factor analysis

Turning to a formal assessment of the stability of the retained factor structure, we test the dichotomous factor solution as it was found in the exploratory factor analysis. Thus, we ascribe the place of birth, length of residence, religious membership and national ancestry items to an ethnic factor while speaking the national language, respecting the political institutions and feeling indicators are assigned to the civic factor. Because the more formal ‘having national citizenship’ item showed strong loadings on both factors, this item has been left out the confirmatory factor analysis.

However, the results of this confirmatory factor analysis proved to be unstable: an RMSEA of 0.091, a TLI of 0.964 and a CFI of 0.961 cannot be

Figure 2. Confirmatory factor analysis for categorical data (item response categories: 1–4) with weighted least squares. CFI, comparative fit index; TLI, Tucker-Lewis index; RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation. $n = 38,311$.

considered as acceptable. Therefore, it seems clear that a simple and unequivocal two-factor solution is not sufficiently stable in cross-national research. In order to arrive at a more stable model, two adjustments to the original model had to be introduced. Firstly, we had to allow a relation between the item on 'respect for institutions and the law' and the ethnic latent factor. Even though this relation is highly negative (-0.50), it proved to be essential for the stability of the model. Secondly, the 'to have lived in the country for most of one's life' item had to be removed from the analysis because it showed strong cross-loadings with a negative impact on the stability of the model. These two adjustments led to an appropriately stable model, with an RMSEA of 0.038, a TLI of 0.992 and a CFI of 0.994 (Figure 2). This model is fully acceptable and demonstrates the validity of a two-factor solution for the citizenship concepts module in ISSP.

At this point in our analysis, some preliminary conclusions are in order. Firstly, we do indeed observe the occurrence of a stable two-factor solution, which implies that with the current limited list of items that the ISSP has provided in its survey, there is no need to construct a third, cultural form of citizenship in the way Kymlicka (2001) has suggested. Elements like religion or language can easily and in a valid manner be assigned to ethnic or civic

citizenship and there is no third factor to be detected, contrary to theoretical assumptions.

Secondly, we can observe that the items used to operationalise both concepts are not always in coherence with previous theoretical assumptions. To elaborate on the clearest example, Shulman (2002) claims that speaking the language of the country is an element of cultural citizenship. Also, according to descriptions of the *Kulturation* (Brown 1996), it was expected that speaking the national language would load on the ethnic dimension. Empirically, however, this assumption is unwarranted. The criterion of speaking the language clearly relates to a civic conceptualisation of citizenship and therefore, at least with regard to public opinion data, the assumption of Shulman is unwarranted. Therefore, the six criteria that are listed in the stable model in Figure 2 are clearly sufficient to test the civic and ethnic concepts of citizenship.

Thirdly, the confirmatory analysis reveals that at first sight the supposed dichotomy is indeed present. Being born in the country, adhering to the dominant religion and having national ancestry clearly refer to an ethnic concept of citizenship, with national ancestry being the most characteristic and most powerful item. Respecting the law, speaking the language and feeling a citizen are equally strong expressions of a civic concept of citizenship. Here, the item on respecting the institutions and the laws is the most characteristic and statistically the most powerful.

Fourthly, it is important to note that the two components are not mutually exclusive: they even show a strong correlation of 0.80 in the stable confirmatory factor analysis model. This finding adds to the debate about whether civic and ethnic citizenship should be regarded as mutually exclusive and therefore competing concepts, or as related concepts. The analysis clearly demonstrates that there is a positive correlation: respondents who adhere to an ethnic logic are also more likely to consider civic citizenship as important.

Fifthly, it is quite remarkable that the model only becomes stable if we allow one negative relation in the model, which is rather uncommon in this kind of empirical testing of theoretical constructs. However, it must be remembered that we try to capture a logic of exclusion. Citizenship is always internally inclusive and externally exclusive, as Brubaker (1992) reminded us. If one adheres to an ethnic logic, it is clear that if one is not born in the country, does not share the main religion and has no national ancestry, one does not qualify as a full member. The entrance test is made even stricter because there is a negative criterion in addition to these three ‘positive’ criteria. Within the ethnic concept of citizenship, newcomers should not entertain any illusory aspirations: it is not because they respect the institutions and the law of the country that they will ever be considered as full members of society. To put it differently, one of the defining elements of ethnic citizenship concepts is exactly that it rejects an important element of the civic logic. The back door of acquiring full citizenship by accepting the law and the institutions of a new country is firmly locked in this citizenship concept.

Cross-national validity

Because we have now arrived at a valid measurement of civic and ethnic citizenship, it is tempting to compare countries with regard to civic and ethnic citizenship. In order to compare countries on their level of civic and ethnic citizenship, it is crucial that the concepts being measured are cross-nationally equivalent, as we have mentioned already. Only if the latent structures are comparable across nations can one compare the scores of these countries directly. Because we want to ascertain whether countries can be compared directly in their scores on this latent variable, we will limit ourselves to a test of the scalar equivalence model, meaning that both factor loadings and intercepts (i.e. of the threshold model, because of the categorical nature of our data) need to be equal across all countries under investigation. In Table 4 we summarise the results of these tests, showing both the relevant fit indices and the model modification indices (likelihood ratio test). The modification indices list the country-specific relations that are most harmful for the stability of the model.

The results of this multiple group test are listed in Table 4, in which we have only summarised deviant factor loadings with a modification index higher than 100. The scalar equivalence test makes clear that the civic–ethnic typology that proved to be stable for the overall sample is certainly not

Table 4. *Cross-national scalar equivalence test on the civic – ethnic typology*

<i>Model</i>	<i>Chi-squared</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>TLI</i>	<i>Country highest contrib.</i>	<i>Modif. index</i>
Scalar invariance	14,295.4	711	0.128	0.879	Israel	523.910
+ λ IL-J (ethnic $\rightarrow$ religion)	13,576.5	710	0.125	0.885	USA	226.778
+ λ US (civic $\rightarrow$ ancestry)	13,331.7	709	0.123	0.887	Poland	216.966
+ λ PL (ethnic $\rightarrow$ religion)	13,101.6	708	0.122	0.889	Ireland	178.459
+ λ IE (ethnic $\rightarrow$ speak)	12,753.2	707	0.121	0.892	Portugal	160.701
+ λ PT (ethnic $\rightarrow$ religion)	12,592.9	706	0.120	0.893	South Africa	142.668
+ λ SA (ethnic $\rightarrow$ religion)	12,445.8	705	0.119	0.894	Philippines	149.128
+ λ PH (ethnic $\rightarrow$ religion)	12,296.4	704	0.119	0.896	Uruguay	125.628
+ λ UY (ethnic $\rightarrow$ born)	12,166.0	703	0.118	0.897	West Germany	123.040
+ λ GE-W (civic $\rightarrow$ feel)	12,012.7	702	0.117	0.898	Hungary	111.278
+ λ HU (ethnic $\rightarrow$ born)	11,901.6	701	0.117	0.899	Ireland	108.225

RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation; TLI, TuckerLewis index

Note: Results are the test statistics after testing the factorial invariance in an MGSEM for categorical data (item response categories 1–4) with weighted least squares adjusted for means and variances as estimator. Estimator WLS. The ten factor loadings with highest chi-squared contribution are highlighted. The λ refers to factor loadings from factor (ethnic or civic) to the corresponding item.

equivalent for each and every country in our sample. The RMSEA of 0.13 and TLI of 0.879 indicate that the measurement equivalence test does not hold. Even though we have found a theoretically convincing model on the pooled data, this test reveals that civic and ethnic citizenship concepts are defined in different ways across societies.

The most deviant factor loadings can be observed by checking the likelihood ratio tests (the modification indices). In line with Poortinga (1989), some of the deviances can in fact be interpreted as meaningful. The strongest deviation is the meaning of the religious item in the Israeli sample.⁴ Within Israel, adhering to the dominant religion loads much more strongly on the ethnic dimension of citizenship than in all other countries; this can be related to the special status of Israel as a Jewish state. We can observe that religion is also problematic in Poland, Portugal, South Africa and the Philippines. For most of these countries this loading is stronger than the average estimation, which leads to the conclusion that religious membership is indeed an essential element of ethnic citizenship considerations, yet the importance of this component is highly variable from country to country.

In the USA sample, the relation between the ancestry item and the civic component had to be freed. The new estimated parameter in the USA was negative. The traditional ‘melting pot’ concept is apparently still present in American public opinion: it is clear that there is no requirement at all for having had ancestry in American society if one adheres to a civic notion of citizenship. Furthermore, in Ireland we observe a negative relation between speaking the national language and the ethnic factor. Clearly, speaking English is not sufficient if one is to be considered as a full Irish citizen according to the ethnic norm.

Without elaborating too much on this analysis (for reasons of clarity, we have only listed the deviant factor loadings and not the problematic thresholds), the MGCFA models of the 2003 National Identity wave of the ISSP provides strong evidence that the civic and ethnic typology are not being measured cross-nationally equivalent across nations. While some deviant factor loadings seem to have a solid explanation, the analysis still shows that the model is far from stable. Therefore, countries should not be ranked based on their ‘scores’ on these two dimensions, contrary to what has become practice in current comparative research. Country-specific measurements are called for, and the deviant factor loadings listed in Table 4 might serve as a first indication of how this could be pursued.

Conclusion

The distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship concepts dominates the study of citizenship and nationhood. The main aim of this article was to assess whether both concepts can be measured in a valid manner at the individual level, and whether this measurement is cross-nationally equivalent. While we do find a

clear two-factor solution, it is apparent that scores on these factors cannot be compared easily across the various countries participating in the ISSP.

The validity of the two-factor solution implies that there is no empirical reason to assume the existence of a third, cultural factor, as has been put forward in the work of Will Kymlicka. Being born in the country is shown to be the clearest expression of ethnic citizenship, while adhering to the laws of the country is the main criterion for civic citizenship. However, it is important to note that ethnic citizenship can also be measured in a negative manner. For respondents adhering to an ethnic conception of citizenship it is clear that obeying the laws is not sufficient to become a full member of the community. Although various authors have already criticised the normative assumptions underlying the distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship, one cannot escape the conclusion that this finding is quite revealing for the 'ugly face' of ethnic nationalism. There are various criteria that one should uphold to be regarded as citizen; one even closes the idea of a civic form of integration by asking newcomers to obey to the laws of the country. To put it differently: one actually denies all access to newcomers, because one not only lists various criteria that are impossible to fulfill (one cannot wish to have been born in the country), but one even explicitly raises the counter-argument that it will not be sufficient to obey the laws of the country. In effect, this amounts to a 'damned if you do, damned if you don't' logic.

One can safely assume that the negative relation between ethnic concepts of citizenship and the 'obey the law' criterion does not imply that non-citizens do not have the duty to obey the law of the country in which they reside. We can further assume that respondents who adhere to the ethnic citizenship concept will also be concerned about maintaining the state of law in their country. Therefore, the structure of the concept of ethnic citizenship contradicts the 'law of the excluded middle' in formal logic (Priest 1983). In this case, obeying the law is seen as a relevant criterion, but in both cases the outcome is the same. If non-citizens do not obey the law, they do not qualify as full citizens; but if they do obey the law, they do not qualify either. Two different propositions lead to the same outcome: the non-citizens are not accepted as full citizens, which contradicts the rule of *tertio non datur*. The concept of ethnic citizenship seems to suffer from a logical inconsistency. This inconsistency implies that ethnic concepts of citizenship almost automatically lead to exclusion and segregation. Given the fact that, worldwide, societies are becoming more diverse, and that we have every reason to assume that migration flows will continue to intensify in the decades ahead, this renders the concept of ethnic citizenship all the more problematical.

For comparative research, the main implication of our finding is that it is virtually impossible to rank countries on a civic-ethnic continuum based on a composite measure that includes several indicators, as is the standard in cross-national research strategies (Smith 1988). This is because various items have different meanings in various national contexts. Predominantly with regard to religion as an indicator of ethnic citizenship, there is a varying degree of

importance over the different countries. The criteria for deciding on who is to be considered a full citizen are apparently quite idiosyncratic for various societies.

Although at first sight these cross-national measurement considerations might seem to be purely methodological, they do imply that, unfortunately for those of us who like easy dichotomies, in reality it is not straightforward to simply rank states and political systems on a scale between the opposing ideal types of civic and ethnic citizenship. In order to deal with the cross-national inequivalence of the civic–ethnic dichotomy, four strategies are available (Poortinga 1989). First of all, one might simply refrain from ranking countries on their levels of ‘civicness’ and ‘ethnicness’ because the analysis reveals that the concepts simply have a different meaning in different countries. Secondly, one can ignore the inequivalence of the concepts and compare the latent means anyway. Thirdly, one can interpret the inequivalence. The fact that, for instance, the religious membership item is a very powerful indicator for ethnic citizenship in the state of Israel is a meaningful finding by itself that needs to be taken into account. Fourthly, it is possible to reduce the bias by removing those items that pose most cross-national bias. In fact, this would mean that the comparison of countries on their civicness and ethnicness would be based on a single-item measurement, namely those items that have been shown to receive the strongest factor loading, i.e. respecting the national institutions and laws and having national ancestry, respectively. Both items have also been proven to show no major cross-national deviances; the distinction between, on the one hand, upholding the national laws and, on the other, having national ancestry seems to capture the distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship remarkably well.

Notes

1 To make historical comparisons possible, the former Eastern and Western Germany are still being considered as two distinct societies in the ISSP sample.

2 For all analyses in this article, we used the ISSP design weights to ensure representativeness within the country. We do not wish to make any statements about all the inhabitants of the countries that participated in the ISSP survey. On the contrary, we are interested in differences between countries; countries are considered here as cases to be investigated, and relevant cultural contexts. Therefore, there is no need to use population weights in the analysis because the theoretical relevance of a country is not related to its population size.

3 For the exploratory phase in this research, we decided that a factor loading of at least 0.40 was preferred and that no cross-loadings larger than 0.10 were tolerated. It has to be noted that this criterion could not be upheld for the confirmatory research.

4 In the ISSP, a distinction was made between the Jewish sample within the state of Israel and the Arab sample.

References

- Billiet, J. 2003. ‘Cross-cultural equivalence with structural equation modeling’, in J. A. Harkness, F. J. R. Van de Vijver and P. P. Mohler (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Survey Methods*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

- Björklund, F. 2006. 'The East European "ethnic nation" – myth or reality?', *European Journal of Political Research* 45, 1: 93–121.
- Bollen, K. A. 1989. *Structural Equations with Latent Variables*. New York: Wiley.
- Bollen, K. A. and Long, J. S. 1992. 'Tests for structural equation models', *Sociological Methods and Research* 21, 2: 123–31.
- Brown, D. 1996. *The State and Ethnic Politics in Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Brubaker, R. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, R. 1996. 'Civic and ethnic nations in France and Germany', in J. Hutchinson and A. D. Smith (eds.), *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brubaker, R. 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Byrne, B. M., Shavelson, R. J. and Muthén, B. O. 1989. 'Testing for the equivalence of factor covariance and mean structures: the issue of partial measurement invariance', *Psychological Bulletin* 105, 3: 456–66.
- Churchill, G. A. Jr 1979. 'A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs', *Journal of Marketing Research* 16, 1: 64–73.
- Gerbing, D. W. and Anderson, J. C. 1988. 'An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment', *Journal of Marketing Research* 25, 2: 186–92.
- Giesen, B. (ed.). 1991. *Nationale und kulturelle Identität. Studien zur Entwicklung des kollektiven Bewußtseins in der Neuzeit*. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.
- Harkness, J. A., Van de Vijver, F. J. R. and Mohler, P. P. 2003. *Cross-cultural Survey Methods*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- International Social Survey Programme (ISSP). 2003. *National Identity II*. Köln: Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung.
- Janmaat, J. G. 2006. 'Popular conceptions of nationhood in old and new European member states. Partial support for the ethnic–civic framework', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, 1: 50–78.
- Joppke, C. 2007. 'Transformation of citizenship: status, rights, identity', *Citizenship Studies* 11, 1: 37–48.
- Kaufman, E. 2000. 'Ethnic or civic nation? Theorizing the American case', *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 27, 1–2: 133–55.
- Kohn, H. 1944. *The Idea of Nationalism. A Study in Its Origin and Background*. London: Macmillan.
- Kuzio, T. 2002. 'The myth of the civic state. A critical survey of Hans Kohn's framework for understanding nationalism', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25, 1: 20–39.
- Kymlicka, W. 2001. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meinecke, F. 1970 [1907]. *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Miller, A. S. and Mitamura, T. 2003. 'Are surveys on trust trustworthy?', *Social Psychological Quarterly* 66, 1: 62–70.
- Miller, D. 2000. *Citizenship and National Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Minkenberg, M. 2003. 'The politics of citizenship in the new republic', *West European Politics* 26, 4: 219–40.
- Muthén, L. K. and Muthén, B. O. 2006. *Mplus User's Guide* (4th edn). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén and Muthén.
- Poortinga, Y. H. 1989. 'Equivalence of cross-cultural data: an overview of basic issues', *International Journal of Psychology* 24, 2: 737–56.
- Priest, G. 1983. 'The logical paradoxes and the law of excluded middle', *Philosophical Quarterly* 33, 131: 160–5.
- Reeskens, T. and Hooghe, M. 2008. 'Cross-cultural measurement equivalence of generalized trust. Evidence from the European social survey', *Social Indicators Research* 85, 3: 515–32.
- Rensvold, R. B. and Cheung, G. W. 1998. 'Testing measurement models for factorial invariance: a systematic approach', *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 58, 6: 1017–34.

- Sharma, S. 1996. *Applied Multivariate Techniques*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Shulman, S. 2002. 'Challenging the civic/ethnic and West/East dichotomies in the study of nationalism', *Comparative Political Studies* 35, 5: 554–85.
- Smith, A. D. 2000. *The Nation in History. Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, T. W. 1988. *The Ups and Downs of Cross-national Survey Research. GSS Cross-National Report No. 8*. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.
- Spector, P. E. 1992. *Summated Rating Scale Construction: an Introduction*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. and Baumgartner, H. 1998. 'Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research', *Journal of Consumer Research* 25, 1: 78–90.
- Yack, B. 1996. 'The myth of the civic nation', *Critical Review* 10, 2: 193–211.
- Zubrzycki, G. 2001. "'We, the Polish nation": ethnic and civic visions of nationhood in post-communist constitutional debates', *Theory and Society* 30, 5: 629–68.