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ABSTRACT

Florian Stöckel: ‘Solidarity among Strangers’?
Citizenship, Identity, and Ambivalent Attitudes in Europe
(Under the direction of Liesbet Hooghe)

This dissertation contributes to our understanding of citizens’ attitudes towards European integration, focusing in particular on the causes and consequences of political identities. What generates a collective identity in a political community of different nations? What effects does a collective European identity have on relations among EU-citizens and their approval of authority transfers to supranational institutions? The first study examines the structure of citizens’ attitudes towards the EU. Based on an analysis of Eurobarometer data and the Chapel Hill expert survey I show that citizens are more ambivalent and less positive about the EU when elite division on European integration is more pronounced. Affective cues, such as an attachment to the EU, are powerful factors that explain both low levels of ambivalence and low levels of indifference towards the EU. In the second study I test Karl Deutsch’s argument on the role of social interactions for community building in Europe. I apply insights from social psychology to explain when and why contact between individuals from different national backgrounds can lead to a collective European identity. I conducted a panel survey with about 1500 students from 38 German universities. Individuals were surveyed before, during, and after their stay in another European country. My results show that contact with other international students rather than contact with students from the host country fosters a collective European identity most effectively. Also, transnational social interactions have a more profound impact on individuals
with a weak European identity to begin with. In the third study I use the same panel data to test implications of this identity change. A more pronounced European identity is related to viewing other Europeans as co-citizens with equal rights rather than as immigrants with limited rights. Individuals who develop a stronger European identity are more likely to support an equal access to jobs and local elections for citizens from other EU member states in Germany. Additionally, identity change motivates an endorsement for the transfer of political authority to the EU level. However, identity change affects left leaning citizens’ attitudes more directly than attitudes of their right leaning peers.
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INTRODUCTION

“If Europe is to be able to act on the basis of an integrated, multilevel policy then European citizens, who are initially characterized as such only by their common passports, will have to learn to mutually recognize one another as members of a common political existence beyond national borders...” (Habermas 2001: 99)

In Europe, political authority is exercised at the subnational and national level, but far-reaching decisions are also taken at a level above the nation state by institutions of the European Union (EU). While elites tend to support supranational decision making, large numbers of citizens in many European countries view giving up national sovereignty along with political authority skeptically (Hooghe 2003). This public discontent raises concerns regarding the conditions under which a political community can be created where authority is shifted to bodies outside the nation state. The Euro crisis highlights an even more sensitive topic by requiring member states to pool considerable financial resources. Against this background, the conditions under which citizens develop a sense of community and civic solidarity in the EU form the starting point of my project.

My perspective on the possibility of a democratic polity above the national state in Europe is influenced by work of Jürgen Habermas. Reminding us of the development of civic solidarity in national communities in the 19th and 20th century, Habermas argues that there is reason to believe that a comparable process is conceivable at the European level (Habermas
2001). However, as he notes, the critical issue is whether Europeans come to think of themselves as members of a shared community (Habermas 2012). Karl W. Deutsch’s work on social interactions among individuals from diverse backgrounds suggests a powerful mechanism with profound implications for European integration. His bottom-up perspective on community building guides this project.

The objective is to contribute to our understanding of public opinion on European integration in general and the role of citizens’ political identities in particular. I draw on political psychology to specify micro foundations and I use new data to test my conjectures. The subsequent papers are driven by the following research questions: First, what is the role of identity in structuring attitudes towards the EU? Second, can social interactions among individuals from different national backgrounds shape a sense of community among Europeans? And third, how do identity and ideology facilitate and constrain civic solidarity among Europeans?

*Theoretical Work that Motivates this Project*

This project is strongly influenced by the works of two scholars – Habermas and Deutsch – who have laid out the theoretical terrain for today’s empirical work on European identity. My point of departure is Habermas’ intriguing term of ‘solidarity among strangers.’ This seems a pertinent term to characterize the fragility of the solidaristic bonds in the current European Union. However, Habermas’ work draws attention to two basic historical developments that cast doubt on the presumed fragility of EU solidarity.

First, Habermas emphasizes that once national solidarity was fragile too. In fact, he used the notion of solidarity among strangers to describe the initial state of solidarity in national states
(Habermas 1996: 308, Habermas 2001: 64-65, Habermas 2006: 76). Originally, individuals had loyalties to their family members as well as to other individuals in the same town or village. Solidarity existed first and foremost among individuals who knew each other personally. Individuals might have been bound together legally, but there was no strong sense of community. A sense of unity among individuals who did not know each other and who did not previously think of each other as belonging together was only generated by political mobilization. A politically mobilized national consciousness created more abstract ties rooted in the idea of a shared history and language. Individuals from different social and religious groups came to think of each other as a community – despite being strangers to one another (Habermas 1996, 1998, 2001).¹ For Habermas (2001: 64-65), the “modern territorial state thus depends on the development of a national consciousness to provide it with the cultural substrate for a civil solidarity. […] While remaining strangers to one another, members of the same “nation” feel responsible enough for one another that they are prepared to make “sacrifices” – as in military service or the burden of redistributive taxation.”²

Habermas acknowledges that the political mobilization of a national consciousness (Habermas 2001: 103) involved violence, but he downplays the vast extent to which this process involved force in order to integrate territories and coercion to instill the notion of national unity in individuals (Gellner 2008, Marks 2012). Although it is the constructed nature of ‘solidarity among strangers’ on the national level that gives Habermas reason to envision similar ties on a

¹ Anderson (1991: 6) emphasizes a closely related and widely cited point in his definition of a nation as an imagined community: „It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nations will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives an image of their community.“

² Later, Habermas (2006: 77) added that civic solidarity is thin even within nation states: “Civic solidarity is in any case paid for in small change: income tax replaces the heroic duty to sacrifice one’s life for one’s country.” Nice.”
European scale, what it implies is that such ties can be created even without the coercion that characterized the mobilization of national identity.

Habermas offers a second argument for why Europe may be able to develop solidarity: the transformation of the basis of solidarity in national states from a rigid notion of ethnic patriotism to a more flexible understanding of constitutional patriotism. At least in postwar Europe, civic solidarity within nation states is based much less on ties that have their source in some form of national consciousness or imagined national ethnie (Habermas 2006). A shared legal framework and legal practices fuel civic solidarity rather than the belief in a fatherland. Habermas defines this devotion to the democratic process as constitutional patriotism (Habermas 2006: 78). Since civic solidarity today stems from constitutional patriotism rather than from a fatherland myth, citizens have shifted their emotional focus away from the nation. Hence, they should be well prepared to develop a sense of unity based on shared legal practices at the European level (Habermas 2006).

Few Europeans think of themselves primarily as Europeans and give up their national identity. Yet, at least a share of Europeans identify with Europe in addition to holding a national identity (Duchesne and Frognier 1995, Hooghe and Marks 2005, Risse 2010). Risse (2010: 61) calls this secondary identity a European identity “lite,” which does however raise a number of questions: Does a European identity lite have a psychological existence, how is it generated, and does it imply some type of solidarity among Europeans?

It is exactly the conditions under which individuals from diverse national backgrounds can come to think of themselves as a community in a meaningful way, where Deutsch’s path breaking studies prove particularly enlightening. His early work is primarily on nationalism, although the mechanism he describes is not bound to community formation within national
borders (Deutsch 1953, 1953a). The basic premise of his work is that the technological infrastructure and social communication channeled through it is constitutive for the emergence of a sense of community among subgroups of a nation. Deutsch (1953) shows how economic, social, and technological developments can mobilize individuals for intense communication among them. Once an infrastructure is in place, communication can create close ties between urban centers and peripheral areas. As communication intensifies, participating individuals come to think of themselves as a community. And because communication among individuals within a nation is so much more intense than across nations, the sense of belonging within these communities is constantly reinforced.

Deutsch pointed to implications of his work for supra-national integration processes (1953a). His main work on communities at an international level is on the conditions under which networks of interactions can contribute to a “security community” of different countries (Deutsch et al. 1957), which he relates specifically to European integration. Hence, Deutsch frames the background for a transactionalist approach to identity formation that transcends national boundaries. Yet, he was less concerned with the psychological underpinnings of identity formation at the individual level. Most importantly, the empirical evidence on the role of social interactions for community building in Europe is yet surprisingly inconclusive.

My contribution proposes an understanding of attitude and identity formation informed by social and political psychology. Using a pre-post test design with control group I can show the conditions that lead to a collective identity among individuals from diverse national backgrounds in Europe. I find this more pronounced European identity to have implications for how Europeans see their peers from other EU member states as well as for preferences on the political integration of Europe. Cross sectional analysis shows that a significant share of citizens
is ambivalent about the EU, that is to say they hold both positive and negative views on the EU simultaneously. An emotional attachment to the EU is however one of the strongest factors shaping outright support for the EU. In sum, I find tentative evidence for civic solidarity among Europeans. Future research needs to tackle what it implies for transnational redistribution in the EU, which is what I begin to discuss in a final paper.

Outline of the Four Papers of the Dissertation

The first paper addresses the basic structure of European citizens’ attitudes towards the EU.³ My point of departure is that citizens may not exhibit outright support or opposition to the EU, but could be ambivalent or indifferent. Therefore, I suggest a measure that differentiates ambivalence from indifference in public attitudes towards the EU. Based on an analysis of data from Eurobarometer 63.4 and the Chapel Hill expert survey I find a large share of Europeans to be ambivalent and only a small minority to be indifferent towards the EU. Moreover, my study reveals that the causes of indifference and ambivalence are fundamentally different. Multinomial multilevel regression analysis shows that cognitive cues – such as knowledge on the EU and media consumption – increase levels of ambivalence. Additionally, individuals are more ambivalent and less positive about the EU when elite division on European integration is more salient. In contrast, indifference is most prevalent when both cognitive and affective cues are absent. Affective cues, such as trust in EU institutions and affective involvement with the EU, are among the most powerful factors that explain low levels of ambivalence and low levels of indifference towards the EU, as well as a high level of outright support. In sum, an overwhelming majority of Europeans holds meaningful attitudes on European integration, and an

³ This paper is published in European Union Politics, 14.1 (2013): 23-45.
emotional involvement with the EU – like a European identity – seems to be a key predictor for support of the EU.

In the second paper, I apply Deutsch’s logic and examine if social interactions among Europeans contribute to a collective European identity (Deutsch 1953). Previous work on this issue presents surprisingly inconclusive results and suffers from endogeneity problems. My study entails two contributions to this literature. First, I employ insights from social psychology to describe the micro foundations of why social interactions can lead to a collective identity. Second, I use new panel data to probe causal effects. I surveyed about 1500 individuals at 38 German universities before they left to study one or two terms in another European country and shortly after they came back. A third survey wave took place five months after students returned. The panel study with control group allows me to analyze causal effects more reliably than research based on cross sectional data because the consequences of contact can be traced within individuals and over time. My findings indicate that transnational social interactions can help bring about a collective European identity. Precise data on the type of interactions students have while abroad make it possible to further examine the causal process. This analysis emphasizes that it is social interactions of German students with other international students that contribute to a collective European identity most effectively, while interactions between study abroad students and their hosts do not have a similar outcome. I also find that social interactions have a more intense impact on students with a weak European identity before going abroad. Finally, the panel data provide evidence for a recalibration of political identities that is stable many months after individuals have returned.

In the third paper, I examine Habermas’ proposition on the pivotal nature of a collective European identity for the social and a political integration of Europe. The change in students’
European identity after returning from an intra-European study abroad provides me with a unique opportunity to study implications of identity change for attitudes on European integration. I operationalize the social dimension of European integration along two lines: first, the extent to which Germans approve of equal opportunities for individuals from other EU member states on the German job market, and second, the extent to which these foreigners should be allowed to vote in German local elections. I examine support for the political dimension of European integration in the following ways: an individual’s interest in EU affairs, support for authority transfers to Brussels, and intention to vote in European parliamentary elections. I find that identity change has implications for both the social and political dimension of European integration. However, the strength of this link depends on ideological orientation. Left leaning individuals who deepen their European identity change more than right leaning individuals. That is to say, their views on non-German EU citizens in Germany and on the political integration of Europe become considerably more favorable, while the attitudes of right leaning individuals barely budge. Among right leaning individuals, only a very strong identity change seems to leave an imprint on other attitudes.

In my final paper, I put forth a research design to analyze constraints on public support for transnational redistribution in Europe. Based on the previous chapters and my other work (Kuhn and Stoeckel, 2014), I develop hypotheses on what may affect public support for transnational redistribution in Europe and I outline a way to test these. First, I expect citizens who hold a European identity rather than an exclusively national identity to support transnational redistribution. Second, I hypothesize that ideology mediates attitudes. An economically left ideology and a social libertarian ideology orientation are associated with higher support for transnational redistribution. Third, I posit that elite consensus increases support whereas salient
elite dissent decreases support for transnational redistribution. Finally, I expect citizens’ attitudes towards regional redistribution within a country to be a good predictor for their attitudes towards a similar process on the European scale. To test these hypotheses I outline a survey experiment which combines the features of a laboratory experiment with the advantages of a population based survey.
PAPER 1: AMBIVALENT OR INDIFFERENT? RECONSIDERING THE STRUCTURE OF EU PUBLIC OPINION

[Published in European Union Politics, 14.1 (2013): 23-45.]

Introduction

In studies of EU public opinion, the dependent variable is typically conceptualized as one-dimensional – i.e. as a continuum from low support to high support for the unification of Europe. This disguises a central aspect of belief systems, namely, that individual opinions are often simultaneously positive and negative. Rather than endorsing one side and refuting the other, many citizens embrace elements of both sides. In research on American public opinion, individuals with competing considerations relevant to one and the same object are considered ambivalent. This study has two goals. First, I suggest a measure that accounts for critical differences in attitudes towards the European Union. The measure distinguishes between indifference, ambivalence, and univalent views. Second, I propose and test a theoretical framework to explain ambivalence in public notions of the EU.⁴

Recent work has shown that ambivalence is not only distinct from indifference, but has nontrivial implications for the processing of political information and preference formation. Attitudes marked by ambivalence are held with less certainty, are retrieved from memory with more difficulty and, overall, tend to be less stable over time (Huckfeldt and Sprague 2000, Zaller

⁴ See Boomgaarden et al. 2011 for a notable exception that emphasizes the multidimensionality of citizens’ attitudes towards European integration. However, the authors focus on the distinctiveness of different dimensions of support instead of ambivalence as an attitude property. Van Ingelgom (2012), on the other hand, concentrates on indifference rather than ambivalence in attitudes towards European integration.
1992). Most notably, attitudes characterized by ambivalence are more vulnerable to persuasion than one-sided views (Bassili 1996) and they are more likely to be driven by whatever considerations are momentarily salient, so that context and cues become more relevant (Lavine et al. 1998, Tourangeau et al. 1989). Thus, the extent of ambivalence among Europeans is relevant in order to understand public opinion towards European integration, the success of extreme right- or left wing parties in European Parliament elections or EU referendum campaigns (Taggart, 1998, De Vries and Edwards 2009, Hobolt and Brouard 2011). Hobolt (2009), for instance, demonstrates in an elaborate framework how an individual’s level of support for European integration affects voting behavior in EU referendums. Consequently, better information on the structure of EU public opinion can extend our knowledge on other political processes. Evidence from the US would suggest that in contrast to individuals with univalent attitudes, EU citizens with ambivalent attitudes are more likely to be influenced by EU level events that garner high media attention or the arguments made by elites during EU related campaigns.

In the next section, I conceptualize ambivalent attitudes vis-à-vis un-ambivalent opinions. Then, I present a theoretical argument that links cue availability and cue competition to individual level ambivalence in views of the EU. Using Eurobarometer data, I show that the availability of cognitive cues on the EU increases ambivalence while decreasing indifference. Competing elite cues also intensify ambivalence and diminish levels of public indifference. On the contrary, affective cues reduce both levels of indifference and ambivalence among EU citizens. The results, for instance, elucidate a sharp difference between those who view the EU positively and those who are ambivalent, for it is the ambivalent that have a weak emotional involvement with the community. I conclude that the often-cited idea of a public dissensus on European integration is correct (Hooghe and Marks 2009), but needs revision. Rather than
describing only the aggregate level, a dissensus is what a significant share of Europeans experience on an individual level when forming their opinions about the EU. I address the theoretical implications of this finding and avenues for future research in a final section.

**Mapping Ambivalence and its Consequences**

There are two conceptualizations of ambivalence in the literature: First, ambivalence as a conflict of core beliefs, and, second, as a coexistence of positive and negative evaluations on a single object. According to the first understanding, citizens are only considered ambivalent when their answers on a policy question are instable due to a conflict of their core beliefs. Alvarez and Brehm (1995) give the example of a woman who exhibits ambivalence in her attitude towards abortion policies due to the strong beliefs she holds for both women’s rights as well as respect for human life.

Most research in political science employs a broader notion of ambivalence that is rooted in social psychology (Zaller 1992, Lavine 2001). According to this broader notion, ambivalence is the simultaneous endorsement of positive and negative evaluations with respect to an issue or object. Steenbergen and Brewer (2004) reconcile the two approaches and note that a conflict of core beliefs is a particular manifestation of ambivalence. I follow the broader notion of the concept, so that ambivalence is the presence of positive and negative considerations for the EU, while indifference is characterized by the absence of both kinds of considerations. A two-dimensional space clearly maps the viewpoint of ambivalent Europeans (Cacioppo, Gardner, and Bernston 1997) and shows their conceptual distinctiveness from individuals who are indifferent about the EU.
Table 1: Two dimensional representation of attitudes towards the EU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absence of favorable thoughts on EU</th>
<th>Presence of unfavorable thoughts on EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absence of unfavorable thoughts on EU</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of favorable thoughts on EU</td>
<td>positive about EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects of attitudinal ambivalence are well documented in the American context. However, in the European context little is known about ambivalence. Ambivalence, for instance, has repeatedly been found to decrease the predictability of political attitudes (for an overview, see Steenbergen and Brewer 2004). This is closely linked to an ambivalent respondent’s greater difficulty in making a political choice. Also, ambivalence increases an individual’s dependence on information that is salient at a specific point in time. Alvarez and Brehm examine these effects of ambivalence on US citizens’ positions towards abortion policies (1995) and the American Internal Revenue Service (2002). Rudolph (2005) explores an increase in response variability among ambivalent respondents in regard to US campaign financing, demonstrating how group attachment mutes this effect. Basinger and Lavine (2005) explain low predictability of voting behavior with ambivalence in party identification. They demonstrate that ambivalence affects the cues citizens use to make their choice in elections. Economic voting, for instance, becomes more central in the decision making process of citizens who have an ambivalent party affiliation, lack political knowledge, and see little campaign stimulus. Lavine et al. (1998) find experimental evidence for the greater importance of temporarily salient information for
ambivalent respondents. Since one’s immediate environment or context is usually most salient, they are able to demonstrate ambivalent individuals’ greater susceptibility to contextual effects.5

Sources of Ambivalence

The public opinion literature provides diverse and, at times, contradictory explanations of ambivalence. Addressing this literature, I develop a theoretical framework that explains ambivalence as a dimension of EU public opinion. At the center of my framework is a theory of cognitive and affective cues. Cognitive cues on the EU involve EU specific knowledge, political cues from the news media, and cues on the EU sent by parties. On the other hand, feelings of attachment to Europe and trust in EU institutions are treated as affective cues. These cues influence citizens’ views of the EU in a distinct but similar fashion to cognitive cues.

To develop my framework, I built on approaches proposed by Zaller (1992) as well as Steenbergen and De Vries (2012).6 However, these authors primarily focus on cognitive cues. Since it is a well-established observation in social psychology that attitudes are driven both by cognitive assessments as well as affect (Breckler and Wiggins 1989), I extend existing explanations of ambivalence to include affective sources. I present the cognitive cue centered approaches by Zaller (1992) as well as Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) in the next sections before addressing affective cues.

Zaller’s (1992) model on the relation between cognitive cues and political attitudes differentiates between three types of individuals: politically sophisticated citizens, politically

5 For a more thorough treatment of the human decision making process, see for example Lau (2003), Taber (2003), as well as Fiske and Taylor (2010).

6 The authors provide an advance copy of their manuscript online at http://catherinedevries.eu/content/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=13&Itemid=28
unsophisticated citizens, and citizens in between those poles, who make up the majority of the population. Political sophistication refers to the level of attention citizens pay to politics and the extent to which they comprehend political information. Thus, the concept of political sophistication is about the degree to which citizens absorb political cues. Zaller (1992) shows that individuals with low political sophistication are unlikely to be ambivalent about political issues due to their inattention to politics and lack of knowledge about competing political cues. Politically sophisticated citizens are also low in ambivalence, although for different reasons. Zaller (1992) notes that very politically sophisticated citizens are able to assess and reject counter attitudinal messages right away and are thus driven by a coherent set of considerations. He theorizes that all other citizens are expected to be ambivalent. That is because most citizens somewhat follow political news and have some political skills, but are not able to reject all political cues in opposition with their own views. These citizens accept and store numerous competing considerations on political issues, which makes ambivalence more likely to occur.

The account offered by Zaller (1992) is tailored to the political environment in the United States, especially its two party system. In most European countries, more than two political parties send cues on European integration. Except for cues from extreme right wing parties, political cues are often not aimed for or against the EU, but show more subtle differences. Like Zaller (1992), Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) conceptualize public opinion as a cueing process in which citizens rely on cues to form opinions. However, Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) factor in the specificities of European public opinion formation. For instance, they examine the effect of different cognitive cues separately, such as EU knowledge, news media cues on the EU, and party dissent on European integration. In contrast to Zaller (2012), the authors find that regardless of the level of political sophistication, competing cues always lead to ambivalence. By
the same token, they argue that “the clearer the cues are, the better able will the person be to form a coherent attitude and the less variable his or her expressed opinions will be” (Steenbergen and De Vries 2012: 6).

Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) thus do not find that politically sophisticated citizens – i.e. those with considerable knowledge about the EU – are less ambivalent because they are able to reject competing cues. On the contrary, there is evidence for a positive relationship between cognitive cue availability and ambivalence. Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) find that greater EU news media salience increases response variation, their indicator of ambivalence. This supports the notion that an increased emphasis on the EU by news media brings about a surge in the provision of competing cues, which, in turn, contributes to public ambivalence. Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) conclude that the salience of dissonant cognitive cues is an important trigger of ambivalence.

In contrast to Steenbergen and De Vries (2012), I argue that the lowest levels of political sophistication and a complete lack of cues on the EU cause indifference rather than ambivalence. An individual lacking any sort of cues is unlikely to be torn between two sides regarding the EU. Additionally, I hypothesize that cognitive cue availability decreases the prevalence of univalent views on the EU and increases ambivalence regarding the EU. On the one hand, I expect that cognitive cues make seeing the EU in a positive view less likely, and in turn, ambivalence more widespread. I expect this because acquiring cognitive cues causes citizens to hold an abundance of cues that might often be in opposition with each other. On the other hand, the literature provides much evidence that a better understanding of European integration makes a negative view of the EU less common (Inglehart 1970, Inglehart, Rabier, and Reif 1987, Janssen 1991). To summarize, I note the first hypothesis:
Another important source of cognitive cues regarding the EU are political parties since politics of European integration are often very technical in nature and the implications of many policies for an individual’s personal life can be difficult to assess (Franklin, Marsh, and McLaren 1994, Ray 2003). Elites provide cognitive cues that assist the public in making sense of European integration. If elites are divided over European integration, these cues are likely to be in competition with one another.

Steenbergen and de Vries (2012) theorize that both small and large levels of differentiation among party stances towards European integration lead to ambivalence. On the one hand, they argue that agreement translates into little need for debate and a lack of cues, which in turn intensifies ambivalence. On the other hand, large differences between parties regarding European integration also cause ambivalence because of the dissemination of competing cognitive cues.

In line with Steenbergen and De Vries (2012), I also expect elite division to translate into a salient political debate making competing cues on the EU available and leading to increased ambivalence. Along the same lines, I expect party dissent on European integration to decrease univalently positive views of EU. To date, party consent on European integration expresses an elite consent pro European integration, making positive views of the EU more likely. If there is dissent among parties, it reflects that one or more parties deviate from the elite consent in favor of the EU, which, in turn, makes positive views less likely to occur. In contrast to Steenbergen and De Vries (2012), I argue that a lack of contestation is not connected to higher levels of ambivalence. I expect elite consent to contribute to higher levels of indifference, rather than
ambivalence, since cue availability and cue competition is likely to be very low in the absence of a debate among parties over European integration.

*H 2: Greater party differentiation on European integration leads to higher levels of ambivalence and elite consent to higher levels of indifference.*

As mentioned before, social psychology highlights that attitudes are driven by cognitive assessments as well as affect. In fact, evidence even suggests a supremacy of affect over cognition, particularly when cognitive cues are unavailable or inconclusive (Lavine et al. 1998a). Affective reactions can often be accessed more easily and more quickly than cognitive information (Zajonc 1984). In many instances, affective responses to an object are perceived as more subjectively valid and linked more closely to one’s self than cognitive cues (Lavine et al. 1998a). Hence I extend the cognitive cue centered model to also include affective cues. I argue that the availability of affective cues is critical for citizens’ views of the EU. Among the different types of affect influencing public attitudes towards European integration, I focus on two key concepts, namely trust in EU institutions and attachment to Europe (McLaren 2004, McLaren 2007, Karp, Banducci, and Bowler 2003, Karp and Bowler 2006, Hooghe and Marks 2004, 2005). Both concepts express strong feelings and lead individuals to care about objects, which in turn decreases their level of indifference. Strong feelings are also likely to decrease the level of ambivalence, since affective cues can override a potential conflict of cognitive cues.

I hence expect trust in EU institutions to decrease indifference and ambivalence about the EU. For instance, while politically sophisticated individuals who lack trust in EU institutions are likely to be among the most ambivalent individuals, those who do trust EU institutions are likely
to be much less ambivalent. In fact, since trust can override competing cognitive cues among highly sophisticated individuals, it should make them univalently positive about the EU.

*H 3: Trust in EU institutions leads to less indifference, less ambivalence and more positive views of the EU.*

Another important affective cue that structures public opinion towards European integration are group attachments. Rudolph (2005) provides a detailed theoretical account and empirical support for the notion that group attachments decrease ambivalence. He argues that feelings of affiliation with a group help individuals to organize complex political issues. Studies that have applied this finding to EU public opinion include Hooghe and Marks (2004, 2005), who argue that individuals attached to Europe and their nation support European integration at much higher levels than exclusive nationalists. Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) also find that a dual national and European identity decreases ambivalence in support for European integration.

I expect a feeling of attachment to Europe to affect views of the EU in a similar way to trust in EU institutions. I expect attachment to Europe to decrease indifference and ambivalence. Since attachment to Europe is a positive affect, I expect attachment to decrease the likelihood for citizens to hold a negative view on the EU. Further, I hypothesize individuals at any level of political sophistication and cognitive cue availability to be less ambivalent about the EU. Subsequently, citizens who are knowledgeable about the EU and lack an affective attachment to Europe are expected to be ambivalent. Individuals who are knowledgeable about the EU and also have a strong affective attachment are expected to have a positive view of the EU.
**H 4:** Attachment to Europe decreases levels of indifference, negative views of the EU and ambivalence while making citizens more likely to hold a positive view on the EU.

**Data, Measurement, and Model**

The data for the empirical analysis and hypothesis tests come from Eurobarometer wave 63.4, for which the fieldwork took place between May and June 2005. It includes data from representative samples of around 1000 individuals from all countries that were EU member states at the time. This data set offers a unique combination of question items. It is one of the few survey waves that not only asks respondents about their position on the EU membership of their country, but also asks how attached respondents are to Europe, if they trust EU institutions, how much they know about them, and what meaning the EU has for them personally. The latter question provides the basis for my measurement of ambivalence and indifference.

**Dependent Variable**

For psychologists ambivalence is a well-known attitude dimension, which is typically accounted for by using two separate measures to gauge an individual’s relationship to an attitude object (Cacioppo, Garner, and Berntson 1997). By measuring how much someone likes an object independently from how much someone dislikes the same object, one can differentiate between indifference (neither liking, nor disliking), a positive attitude (liking, but no disliking), a negative attitude (disliking, but no liking), and ambivalence (simultaneous liking and disliking). Authors in American political science literature rely on items in the American National Election Study...
(ANES) that tap on the number of favorable and unfavorable things a respondent mentions about a particular candidate.

European surveys such as the Eurobarometer or European Election Study lack similar items. Steenbergen and de Vries (2012) circumvent this problem by considering the presence of heteroskedasticity in a regression model as an indication of ambivalence. Heteroskedasticity indicates unequal error variances, which can occur for reasons unrelated to ambivalence, such as an omitted variable or a model misspecification. Apart from that, heteroskedasticity refers only to a model as a whole, rather than to any observation individually. As a result, this measure neither allows an inference on the percentage of Europeans who are ambivalent, nor on which particular respondents are ambivalent.

I suggest a measure of ambivalence based on the meanings of the EU to respondents of a large-N survey. The Eurobarometer question “what does the European Union mean to you personally” provides information on whether a respondent views the EU in a positive way, a negative way or both positively and negatively. Each respondent is being offered thirteen meaning items that have a clearly positive or negative connotation. Seven items are positive (peace, economic prosperity, democracy, social protection, freedom to travel, cultural diversity, stronger say in the world) and six items are negative (unemployment, bureaucracy, waste of money, loss of cultural identity, more crime, not enough control at external frontiers). A respondent can answer that the EU means to her any one of these items or a combination of them, as there is no upper limit to how many items can be chosen. Only 5.7% of respondents

---

7 It would be preferable if the number of positive and negative items were the same. Since this cannot be changed, positive items have a greater probability of being chosen by a respondent. Thus, the figures for a positive view of the EU might be biased slightly upward, while those of a negative view can be biased downward. However, this is expected to have a negligible impact on the focus of the paper, which is ambivalence and indifference towards the EU.
mention none of these 13 options. The meaning selected most often is the freedom to travel, study, and work anywhere in the EU. It was selected by 53.5% of the participants of the survey. Among the negative meanings of the EU to respondents, the modal answer was bureaucracy, which was mentioned by 23.3% (more details on the pattern of the answers can be found in appendix B2).

Based on their answers, respondents fall into one of four clearly distinguishable groups: (1) persons who attach none of the 13 labels to the EU, (2) respondents who attach both negative and positive meanings to the EU, (3) individuals for whom the EU only has positive meanings and (4) a group for whom the EU only has negative meanings. I code the first group as indifferent towards the EU. Following the conceptualization of ambivalence as a simultaneous presence of positive and negative considerations on an attitude object, I code group two as ambivalent towards the EU. The respondents in group three are considered to have positive views about the EU and the respondents in group four are coded as negative about the EU.8

Based on this operationalization, the distribution of the dependent variable looks as follows. The EU has an exclusively positive connotation for 38.6% of the respondents and an exclusively negative meaning for 14.7%. The total share of indifferent respondents is 5.7%, while 41.0% are ambivalent. For the majority of ambivalent respondents (58.9%), the EU has three or less positive meanings as well as three or less negative meanings (appendix B1 provides more details on how conflicted ambivalent respondents are).

---

8 To counter the argument that ambivalence might only be present if a respondent is torn between more than a single positive and negative consideration, I tested another coding. In another model (online appendix, Table 18), I coded respondents only as ambivalent if the EU has at least two positive and two negative meanings for her. This does not change the main pattern of the effects of cognitive and affective cues on indifference and ambivalence towards the EU.
Table 2: Cross tabulation of EU membership support and attitude structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU Membership of [country] is ...</th>
<th>good thing</th>
<th>neither/nor</th>
<th>bad thing</th>
<th>don’t know</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(401)</td>
<td>(509)</td>
<td>(215)</td>
<td>(285)</td>
<td>(1410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>univalent negative</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(619)</td>
<td>(1408)</td>
<td>(1482)</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>(3656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>univalent positive</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6904)</td>
<td>(2057)</td>
<td>(414)</td>
<td>(202)</td>
<td>(9577)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambivalent</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5194)</td>
<td>(3485)</td>
<td>(1272)</td>
<td>(207)</td>
<td>(10,158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13,118)</td>
<td>(7459)</td>
<td>(3383)</td>
<td>(841)</td>
<td>(24,801)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are percentages; absolute numbers in parentheses.

Table 2 presents a cross tabulation of the popular EU membership question (“Do you support the EU membership of [your country]?”) and the four categories of my dependent variable. It reveals that the EU membership question would be an imprecise measure for differentiating between citizens with univalent and ambivalent views of the EU. There are respondents that associate the EU with positive and negative characteristics in each of the EU membership answer categories: i.e. among those saying EU membership is “a good thing”, “a bad thing”, “neither/nor”, or “don’t know”. For instance, 37.6 percent of respondents who find the EU membership of their country a bad thing are ambivalent, as well as almost 40 percent of those who find it a good thing. It is also noteworthy that nearly 50% of the respondents who selected the “neither/nor” category on the EU membership question actually have a one sided view on the EU (18.9% are negative and 27.6% are positive).
Independent Variables

Political sophistication is supposed to capture cognitive cue availability on the EU. It has a prominent role in explaining support for European integration and is operationalized in various ways in the literature. Inglehart’s early contribution emphasizes the focal point of the concept, namely an individual’s political skills (Inglehart 1970). He measures political skills using education and objective knowledge questions. American public opinion literature employs objective knowledge questions on political issues as a primary measurement instrument (Zaller 1992, Dancey and Goren 2010). I use objective knowledge to capture political sophistication. Objective knowledge is tapped by four EU related knowledge questions and has the highest value when a respondent answers all questions correctly. Additionally, cue availability on the EU and sophistication is higher among citizens who regularly consume news media (De Vreese and Boomgaard 2006). Hence, I include a variable for news media consumption. The variable is an index based on the frequency with which an individual attends to news on television, on the radio, and in newspapers.

The second hypothesis addresses the effect of party dissensus on European integration. Party dissensus is operationalized using a measure of dispersion. I calculate a mean EU orientation score for each country based on all parties in each member state and use the standard deviations on this mean for a regression analysis. The standard deviation sums up in one figure the dissimilarity of party positions on European integration within each EU country. The Chapel Hill expert survey (Hooghe et al. 2010) provides data on party positions, including party positioning on European integration. I use the survey version closest to Eurobarometer wave 63.4, i.e. the survey from 2006. In the expert survey data, each party is placed on a scale from one (strongly opposed to European integration) to seven (strongly in favor). The scores from
each party are used to calculate country means as well as a standard deviation for each EU member state. Smaller numbers of the standard deviation indicate relative consensus. This data is not available for Cyprus, Malta, or Luxembourg. These countries will be excluded from the analysis.

In my model, feelings of trust and attachment are treated as affective cues. I operationalize these affective measures using items from the Eurobarometer data set, which offers question items that measure trust in the European Parliament, the European Commission, the Council of the EU, and in the Court of Justice. The four items have been combined in an additive index. The data set does not offer a measure tapping identities, which would have allowed me to construct an exclusive/inclusive or dual identity variable as used in previous studies (Hooghe and Marks 2005, Steenbergen and De Vries 2012). To capture a person’s feelings of closeness to Europe, I use a question item that asks respondents how attached they are to Europe with the four response categories “not at all attached”, “not very attached”, “fairly attached”, and “very attached”.9

Control Variables

Isolating the effect of cognitive and affective cues on ambivalence in regard to someone’s views of the EU requires controlling for confounding factors. My model is concerned with

---

9 Affective cues are measured with items explicitly gauging a respondent’s feelings. The dependent variable is solely measured on the basis of cognitions, namely the meanings a respondent associates the EU with. This ensures that both instruments measure distinct concepts. Nevertheless, I cannot rule out the possibility that a citizens’ level of trust in EU institutions is in part driven by her attitude towards the EU. My conceptualization reflects the notion that feelings are more quickly accessible than cognitions (Zajonc 1984), from which it would follow that affective cues are causally prior to an attitudinal stance on the EU (based on cognitions). This mirrors the dominant understanding in the EU public opinion literature according to which trust in EU institutions as well as an attachment to Europe are predictors for a citizens’ attitude towards the EU rather than results of it (Carey 2002, Hooghe and Marks 2005, McLaren 2007).
ambivalence and indifference, but it also includes the response categories of a positive and negative notion of the EU. Therefore, I follow the suggestion of Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) regarding the selection of control variables. In their heteroskedastic regression model, they predict univalent and ambivalent attitudes towards the unification of Europe and apply controls derived from the rich literature of public support for European integration.

At the country level, I use net fiscal transfer and membership length (in decades) as control variables. Individuals who live in EU member states that receive funds from the EU budget have been found to be more positive about European integration than citizens in member states that are net-contributors (Anderson and Reichert 1995). Steenbergen and De Vries (2012) associate response variation in support for the unification of Europe with EU membership length.

Economic models of public opinion on European integration suggest that individuals for whom the EU entails more opportunities are more likely to be supporters of the integration process (Gabel and Palmer 1995, Gabel 1998). While the EU provides benefits like the free movement of labor and capital to managers, professionals, and wealthy citizens, it involves more risks for other citizens, such as low skilled workers. I control for occupational skills by using dummy variables and calculating an index of possessions as an instrument to capture wealth and income. Additionally, Hooghe and Marks (2005) emphasize that subjective economic prospects matter and they differentiate between prospects for oneself and for one’s country. I control for (subjective) national economic prospects and personal economic prospects.

Political orientations play a role for citizens’ attitudes towards European integration (Ray, 2003, Steenbergen, Edwards, and De Vries 2007). However, this link is not straight forward, especially in a model that pools countries from Western, Central, and Eastern Europe. Rather than an alignment of Euroskepticism with one political side, the evidence seems to suggest that it
is extreme political positions (on either side) that go along with anti-European positions among parties (Marks et al. 2006). Thus, I use dummies for political orientation, which could capture this kind of alignment. Besides, individuals with extreme left or extreme right political orientations could generally be less ambivalent about politics, which is controlled for through the use of dummies. Almost 20% of the respondents did not report a political orientation. To keep such observations in my analysis, I use a dummy for these individuals as well. I add standard controls from the literature on EU support, namely age, gender, frequency of political discussions, and education.
Table 3: Means of key independent variables in the four categories of the dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Indifferent</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU knowledge (1-4)</td>
<td>1.00 (1.11)</td>
<td>1.56 (1.14)</td>
<td>1.89 (1.17)</td>
<td>1.90 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (1-10)</td>
<td>3.74 (2.87)</td>
<td>4.36 (2.78)</td>
<td>5.73 (3.04)</td>
<td>5.82 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News media consumption (0-1)</td>
<td>.62 (.27)</td>
<td>.71 (.24)</td>
<td>.71 (.23)</td>
<td>.75 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in EU institutions (0-8)</td>
<td>3.96 (2.52)</td>
<td>2.94 (2.90)</td>
<td>6.10 (2.46)</td>
<td>4.96 (2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU attachment (1-4)</td>
<td>2.50 (.98)</td>
<td>2.42 (.95)</td>
<td>2.98 (.83)</td>
<td>2.82 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss politics (1-4)</td>
<td>3.10 (.97)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.59 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. left-right orientation (1-10)</td>
<td>5.17 (2.19)</td>
<td>5.29 (2.23)</td>
<td>5.36 (2.17)</td>
<td>5.36 (2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (15-97)</td>
<td>54.40 (20.03)</td>
<td>51.49 (17.76)</td>
<td>45.21 (18.54)</td>
<td>46.7 (17.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions (0-6)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.80)</td>
<td>3.25 (1.85)</td>
<td>3.77 (1.86)</td>
<td>4.15 (1.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary Statistics**

The statistics in Table 3 reveal the salient features of the individuals in the four different categories of the dependent variable. The Table demonstrates that ambivalent Europeans tend to be more similar to those holding a positive view of the EU than to any other group. Ambivalent respondents and those with a positive view of the EU are characterized, for instance, by a higher knowledge on the EU than individuals with negative views on the EU or those who are indifferent. However, ambivalent respondents are distinct from those with a positive view of the
EU in terms of affective measures. On average, ambivalent citizens are less attached to Europe and less trustful of EU institutions than their peers who have a positive view of the EU. Indifferent respondents are different from both ambivalent and positive respondents. Instead, indifferent respondents are closer to those with a negative view on the EU, but generally have less knowledge on the EU and consume less news.

Method

The data for this analysis is structured in two levels, with individuals being nested within countries. Respondents are likely to be more similar within countries than across countries, which can bias standard errors. Several independent variables vary only at the country level. I use a multilevel model in order to get correct standard errors for both individual and country level predictors. Because of the unordered character of the dependent variable, I estimate a multilevel multinomial logit regression model using Stata’s gllamm routine.

Results

The results reveal an important difference between indifference and ambivalence towards the EU. Cognitive cues decrease indifference, but increase ambivalence. The availability of cognitive cues makes a univalent view of the EU less likely. Affective cues decrease both levels of indifference and ambivalence. A strong positive affect towards the EU makes individuals more likely to be univalently positive about the EU. To examine these patterns in detail, I first comment on the raw coefficients of the multinomial logit model displayed in Table 4. Then, I

---

10 The VIF scores for all independent-level variables are below 2, indicating that multicollinearity is not a critical issue. The exact figures can be found in the appendix.
turn to predictive probabilities as a more accessible way to interpret the substantive meaning of the findings.

The estimated model explains a significant share of variance in the dependent variable.\textsuperscript{11} The coefficients in Table 4 refer to a change in the probability that a respondent is in one of the response categories rather than in the reference group, namely ambivalence towards the EU. All independent predictors except the dummy variables are standardized and hierarchically centered. Thus, the coefficients refer to the effect of a standard deviation increase of an independent variable while all other variables are held at their means. For instance, the negative coefficients for elite division indicate that an increase in elite division makes it less likely for a respondent to be negative, positive, or indifferent about the EU and more likely for a respondent to be ambivalent. Specifically, a one-unit increase in elite division on the EU significantly decreases the logistic probability of a respondent being positive about the EU rather than ambivalent by .16 (second column, Table 4) and by .38 for someone to be ambivalent rather than indifferent (third column, Table 4). Hence, this perspective shows whether the gap between an individual being in a respective rather than a reference category increases or decreases. It does not reveal how an increase in an independent variable affects a respondents’ (absolute) probability of being in a response category.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} This is confirmed by a likelihood ratio test. The deviance of an intercept only model is 46521.934, while the deviance of the full model is 42115.402.

\textsuperscript{12} The coefficients themselves do not show whether a variable makes an individual more or less likely to be in one of the four categories of the dependent variable. See Borooah (2002: 51) on this point: “…the direction of change in \( Pr (Y_i=m) \) the probability of observing outcome \( j=m \), for a small change in \( X_r \), cannot be inferred from the sign of \( \beta \). The reason is that in a multinomial a change in the value of a variable for a particular person affects for him or her the probability for every outcome (…). Therefore in effect it depends not just upon the sign of \( \beta \) but also upon the size of that coefficient relative to the size of the other coefficients attached to the variable…”.  
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Predicted probabilities show how an increase in an independent variable affects the probability for an individual to fall into one of the four categories of the dependent variable. This perspective puts the regression output on a more meaningful scale and therefore offers a more comprehensive evaluation of the effects. Table 5 presents the predicted probabilities that an individual will fall into each of the response categories based on the results from the model displayed in Table 4. For a more intuitive interpretation of the results, I show the marginal effect of a two standard deviation increase in each of the key independent variables. The figures in Table 5 reveal the change in the predicted probabilities resulting from an increase in an independent variable from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean when all other variables are held at their means or reference categories. Figures 1 and 2 provide a graphic representation of these effects. The lines on each dot in these figures represent a 95% confidence interval of the effects.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} The effects are statistically significant when the 95% confidence interval does not include zero.
Table 4: Results of multilevel multinomial logit model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Country level variables</th>
<th>Individual level variables</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ref.: ambivalent</td>
<td>p(negative)</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite division</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net fiscal transfer</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership length</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU knowledge</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration to Europe</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in EU institutions</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership length</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency discuss politics</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National econ. prospects</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal econ. prospects</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup1 (self empl)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup2 (managers)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup3 (other white collar)</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup4 (house person)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup5 (unemployed)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup6 (blue collar)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occup7 (students)</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polor1 (left)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polor2</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polor4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polor5 (right)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polor6 (NA)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2*Log Likelihood: 42,115.402
N level 2: 22
N level 1: 20,782

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001; independent var. ref.: women, retirees. Independent var. (exc. dummies) hierarchically standardized.
Table 5: The effect of five independent variables on predicted probabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p(indifferent)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p(ambivalent)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p(positive)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p(negative)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1sd</td>
<td>+1sd</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>-1sd</td>
<td>+1sd</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>-1sd</td>
<td>+1sd</td>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>-1sd</td>
<td>+1sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.027*</td>
<td>0.035*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.035*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News media consumption</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.010*</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
<td>-0.017*</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite division</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.021*</td>
<td>0.075*</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.075*</td>
<td>-0.058*</td>
<td>-15.2</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Trust</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-0.020*</td>
<td>-0.054*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.054*</td>
<td>0.221*</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.148*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU attachment</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.007*</td>
<td>-0.019*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.019*</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.061*</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< 0.05; -1sd and +1sd: figures refer to predicted probabilities for a respondent to be in the respective categories when independent variable of interest is set to 1 standard deviation below its mean or 1 standard deviation above its mean and when all other variables are held at their means or reference categories; Δ and (SE): change in percentage points and standard error on this change in parentheses; Δ %: change in the predicted probabilities in percent (these figures are also shown in the rope ladder plots).
Cognitive cues and the difference between ambivalence and indifference

The results from my analysis confirm hypothesis one. Cognitive cues significantly decrease levels of indifference and increase ambivalence about the EU. Figure 1 shows how the effects of EU knowledge, news media consumption, and elite division on indifference and ambivalence support this conclusion.

The figures in Table 5 reveal that the marginal effect of a two standard deviation increase in EU knowledge is a decrease in the predicted probability that a respondent is indifferent about the EU by 55.8%. In contrast, EU knowledge increases the probability that a respondent is ambivalent about the EU by 7.5%. Cognitive cues from the news media have an analogous effect. A two standard deviation increase in news media consumption results in a drop of the probability for someone to be indifferent by 24.3 percent. The effect on the probability for a respondent to be ambivalent is an increase by 6.7 percent. Additionally, news media consumption makes respondents less likely to be positive about the EU. The same increase in news media consumption decreases the predicted probability for someone to be positive about the EU by 4.5 percent.

The results suggest that cognitive cue availability makes it difficult for Europeans to be indifferent towards the EU. However, this opinion does not necessarily need to be one sided. Rather, EU knowledge and news media consumption seem to provide EU citizens with cues that allow them to view the supranational institution from two different perspectives, a positive and a negative one. The data does not support a curvilinear relationship between cue availability and ambivalence.14

---

14 In order to test for this possibility, I included squared terms of key independent variables in another version of the regression model (not displayed). This did not yield significant effects.
Figure 1: Predicted probabilities showing the effect of cognitive cues

Note: Effect of a change from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean of three independent variables of interest on the predicted probabilities that a respondent is in each of the categories when all other variables are held at their means. The lines indicate the 95% confidence interval.

The effect of elite division emphasizes the fundamental difference between indifference and ambivalence. Figure 1 reveals that party dissent over European integration significantly decreases levels of indifference and positive views of the EU, while augmenting levels of ambivalence. The predicted probability changes in Table 5 show that a two standard deviation increase in elite division decreases the probability that a respondent is indifferent about the EU by 45.8%. Elite division also increases the probability of an individual being ambivalent by 16.5%. In countries in which party positions on European integration are more differentiated, the probability of a respondent having a positive view of the EU decreases. The theoretical
expectation is that differences in party positions translate into a political debate. First, this is presumed to make it easier for citizens to form an opinion on the EU, making indifference less prevalent. Second, party dissent on European integration is assumed to provide individuals with competing cues and is therefore linked to higher levels of ambivalence and lower levels of univalent views on the EU. The analysis supports both explanations, although elite division is apparently more powerful in decreasing indifference than in increasing ambivalence.

In a nutshell, indifference results from a lack of cognitive cues on the EU. Ambivalence appears to result from an abundance of cognitive cues and their conflict with each other. The availability of cognitive cues also makes individuals significantly less likely to have univalent views of the EU. This analysis examined three sources of such cues, namely EU specific knowledge, the news media, and elites. News media consumption and elite division both lead to lower levels of univalently positive views on the EU. This is in line with my theoretical expectation because both the news media and elites, when divided, are likely to provide conflicting cues on the EU to citizens. These results also have an interesting implication for the role of party politicization of EU politics, as politicization apparently increases the involvement of citizens. At the same time, however, politicization might not necessarily increase the public approval of European integration but spread ambivalence instead.

**The effect of affective cues**

Affective cues, quite in contrast to cognitive cues, decrease not only levels of indifference but also levels of ambivalence. The affective cues I focus on measure the extent of
an individual’s positive affect towards the EU, namely trust in EU institutions and attachment to the EU. These types of positive affect also decrease negative views of the EU. Specifically, positive affect is the strongest predictor for a univalently positive view of the EU.

Hypothesis three states that trust in EU institutions decreases indifference and ambivalence, while it increases positive views of the EU. The results confirm this expectation. Figure 2 reveals that the marginal effect of a two standard deviation increase in trust in EU institutions decreases the probability for a respondent to be indifferent about the EU by 44.7 percent. Furthermore, the same increase in trust also significantly reduces the probability of a respondent to be ambivalent about the EU by 10.8 percent.

Trust in EU institutions also has a strong effect on univalent views of the EU. Specifically, it is a strong predictor for a positive view of the EU. A two standard deviation increase in trust results in a 69.4 percent reduction in the probability for an individual to hold a negative view of the EU and an almost 90 percent increase in the probability for a positive view. In a nutshell, trust in EU institutions makes individuals less negative about the EU, less indifferent, and also less ambivalent. In turn, high trust in EU institutions is what differentiates individuals with a positive view of the EU from all other respondents.
Figure 2: Predicted probabilities showing the effect of affective cues.

Note: Effect of a change from one standard deviation below the mean to one standard deviation above the mean of two independent variables on the predicted probabilities that a respondent is in each of the categories when all other variables are held at their means. The lines indicate the 95% confidence interval.

Attachment to Europe provides another affective cue that decreases levels of indifference and ambivalence. It also makes respondents less likely to have a negative view of the EU and much more likely to see the EU positively. Hypothesis four can be confirmed. Figure 2 reveals the similarity of the effect of attachment to Europe with that of trust in EU institutions. The marginal effect of a two standard deviation increase in EU attachment is a drop of the predicted probability for a respondent to be indifferent by 19 percent as well as a reduction of the probability for an individual to be ambivalent by almost four percent. Attachment to Europe measures a positive affect towards the EU. Parallel to the effect of trust, higher levels of attachment are associated with a lower probability for a respondent to view the EU negatively.
and a higher probability for a respondent to be positive about it.

The effect of both types of affective cues points to the same conclusion. In particular, attachment to the EU and trust in EU institutions helps to better understand the difference between ambivalent respondents and those with a positive view of the EU. Both of these groups of individuals know more about the EU than citizens who are indifferent or negative about it. However, these individuals differ substantively in their level of affect for the EU. In a nutshell, politically sophisticated citizens who trust EU institutions and are very much attached to Europe tend to have a positive view of the EU, while those who lack such an emotional involvement tend to be ambivalent.

**Conclusion**

A growing body of literature casts doubt on the assumption that citizens view political issues and objects in an exclusively positive or negative way. I suggest a measure that differentiates among indifference, univalent views, and ambivalence towards the EU using Eurobarometer data to catch a first glimpse of the extent of ambivalence present among Europeans. It shows that a sizeable number of Europeans are ambivalent. The analysis presents a framework that explains ambivalence on the basis of the availability and competition of cognitive and affective cues. The results reveal that cognitive cues, such as those stemming from EU knowledge and news media consumption intensify ambivalence towards the EU. In turn, cognitive cues decrease the probability for citizens to be positive or indifferent. Levels of indifference towards the EU are further diminished and levels of ambivalence are amplified when party positions on European integration differ greatly and competing cognitive cues become available to the public. Affective cues, by contrast, work in a different way. Trust in EU
institutions and an attachment to Europe reduce both indifference and ambivalence towards the EU.

This suggests a critical distinction between ambivalence and indifference. Ambivalent Europeans are highly informed by the news media and knowledgeable about the EU, while indifference results from low levels of knowledge and little understanding of EU politics. Additionally, indifference is at least in part related to low levels of party dissent on European integration, while a strong politicization of European integration and a debate among parties increases the probability for individuals to be ambivalent. The analysis also uncovered a difference between two groups of respondents who share a comparatively high level of political sophistication, namely those who are ambivalent and those who are positive about the EU. Ambivalence is more widespread and univalently positive views are less prevalent where elites are divided over European integration. Additionally, a lack of affective cues sets ambivalent Europeans apart from those with an exclusively positive view. A positive affect towards the EU in particular is one of the strongest catalysts for a univalently positive stance on the EU. Apparently, affect can motivate a firm position. A lack thereof can leave knowledgeable citizens puzzled where to stand in regard to the EU.

The results relate directly to theories of support for European integration. The notion that public opinion on the EU is characterized by a dissensus rather than a permissive consensus is apparently correct (Hooghe and Marks 2009). However, the constraining dissensus is not one that manifests itself only at the aggregate level. Rather, future theorizing on the opinions of Europeans should recognize that dissensus on European integration exists in many citizens’ minds.
The findings of this study have implications for future research on public attitudes towards European integration. In order to develop a precise understanding of the role of ambivalence, we first need better information. I employ a measure for ambivalence that provides only the first insight into the extent of individuals for whom the EU has a simultaneously positive and negative connotation. Research in psychology uses more elaborate tools to capture ambivalence (Kaplan 1972, Thompson, Zanna, and Griffin 1995, Cacioppo, Gardner, and Berntson 1997). The model presented in this paper can inform research analyzing how the Euro crisis affects EU public opinion. It underlines the importance of whether citizens perceive elites to be divided. Elite division over solutions to tackle the crisis could be a catalyst for rising levels of ambivalence towards the EU and a shrinking share of outright EU supporters. Given the significance of affective cues for attitudes towards the EU, it is also likely to be critical if the role of the EU in tackling the crisis contributes to higher or lower levels of trust in its institutions. A third route for future research is to analyze the behavioral consequences of ambivalence, for instance when it comes to national referendums on the EU or European Parliament elections. Ambivalent Europeans might be affected most by campaigns since they are more likely to change their opinions and use different heuristics when making voting decisions as compared to their unambivalent peers. It could well be ambivalent EU citizens who tip the scale, for instance, in referendums on EU related issues. Two research questions in this context can be identified at once, namely how ambivalence affects turnout and whether ambivalent Europeans are in fact, as theory suggests, more easily affected by elite cues and flashy arguments.
PAPER 2: CONTACT AND COMMUNITY: THE ROLE OF SOCIAL INTERACTIONS FOR A POLITICAL IDENTITY

Introduction

Can social interactions among individuals from different nations generate a sense of community that transcends national borders? For many citizens, their national identity is an important part of who they are. However, the role of nations is changing. Borders have become more permeable. Trade interdependence has increased, and social interactions now stretch beyond national borders. International integration has changed the role of national states in even more profound ways, particularly in Europe, where European countries have transferred considerable policy authority to a supranational organization. How do these processes affect citizens’ sense of community? This study tackles this issue by tracing the role of transnational social interactions in the formation of a new political community. The study applies a quasi-experimental approach to show the constituting role of social interactions for a supranational collective identity in Europe.

A rich literature in social psychology shows that interactions across group boundaries lessen prejudice, foster trust, and generate a collective identity among individuals from diverse ethnic or racial backgrounds. The role of social interactions in community building was central to Karl Deutsch’s thesis (Deutsch 1953, Deutsch et al. 1957). His early work inspired a recent debate on whether increased social interactions across borders facilitate a notion of political community among citizens of the EU. However, empirical tests have yielded inconclusive results. Research based on cross-sectional data suggests that social interactions generate a
collective political identity among Europeans (Fligstein 2008, Mitchell 2012, Rother and Nebe 2009, Van Mol 2013). Recent panel studies, which are arguably better equipped to examine causal processes, reject the same idea (Sigalas 2010, Wilson 2011). These contrasting results are puzzling, especially in light of a vast literature in social psychology on the effect of contact (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006).

My approach differs from previous studies in two ways. First, I apply insights from social psychology to theorize the microfoundations of the contact hypothesis. This enables me to specify the exact conditions under which social interactions lead (or do not lead) to identity building. Second, I use a unique three-wave panel data set to probe causal effects more robustly than previous studies. I surveyed almost 1500 students at 38 German universities before they left their home institutions to study one or two terms in another European country, shortly after they returned, and a third time after a time lag of five months. I use a refined measure to gauge identities that is superior to items in cross sectional surveys. Also, the length of my panel survey – 18 months – is unusual and enables me to probe more deeply into the stability of identity change. Thus, even though the set of respondents is not a random sample from the population, the panel study design with control group allows establishing causal effects more reliably than research based on cross sectional survey data, because the effect of social interactions can be observed within individuals and over time.

The paper is structured as follows. In the first part, I draw on Deutsch’s transactionalist framework, the contact hypothesis, and the common in-group identity model developed in social psychology to propose a more refined theory of the effect of social interactions. Next, I present evidence suggesting that transnational social interactions contribute to a sense of community among Europeans. Using data on participants’ interactions with other international students and
peers from their host country, I further analyze the underlying causal process. My findings suggest that it is contact with other international students that fosters a collective European identity, while interactions with hosts do not have a similar result. In a final step, I examine if a pronounced European identity among those who went abroad is only short-lived and tenuous, and find suggestive evidence for a stable recalibration of political identities.

**Contact and Collective Identities**

In political science, Karl Deutsch’s influential work first carved out the relevance of social interactions for political communities. The interaction hypothesis was devised in “Nationalism and Social Communication,” which deals with relations among individuals within a state (Deutsch 1953). The central theme is that social mobilization, mutual understanding, and effective communication are constitutive for the cohesion of a nation. Later, Deutsch and colleagues developed a similar idea in the realm of international politics (Deutsch et al. 1957), though geared towards the role of transactions for a “security community” made up of different nations. Deutsch’s work had major implications for the understanding of regional integration and sparked a vivid interest in the role of social interactions for the emergence of a collective identity among Europeans. However, his groundbreaking studies are not concerned with the underlying process at the individual level.

Research in social psychology focuses extensively on the effects and individual level underpinnings of social interactions. Contact theory, which has its roots in studies on racism in the United States, postulates that contact situations, which fulfill certain properties, foster positive attitudes of individuals from different groups towards one another. Allport (1954) argues that a successful reduction of intergroup biases necessitates the interactive situation to exhibit
four properties: equal status among those in contact, cooperative interdependence, common goals, and support of shared authorities, laws, or customs. Over time, the list of conditions defining an optimal contact situation has been extended, most importantly, by the advantageous role of opportunities to form friendships across group boundaries (Pettigrew et al. 2011). Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) review more than 500 studies on the effect of contact published within the last five decades. Their meta study reports remarkable empirical support for the contact hypothesis. What is more, the authors note that the effect of contact remains statistically observable as long as the intergroup contact situation is a positive rather than a negative experience.

Contact theory explains the effect of positive interactions on intergroup biases, but it does not link social interactions to collective identities. The common in-group identity model, an extension of contact theory formulated in the 1990s, points specifically to collective identities as one reason why contact reduces intergroup biases (Gaertner et al. 1993, Gaertner et al. 1996, Gaertner and Dovidio 2000). Hence, it provides a direct link between social interactions and identities. The common in-group identity model rests on the notion of a hierarchical structure of social identities. Individuals can think of themselves as members of smaller and more exclusive subgroups, or, alternatively, as members of larger and more encompassing higher level groups. If individuals think of themselves as members of a smaller group, their sub-group identity is salient, while thinking of themselves as member of a more encompassing group means a superordinate identity is salient. Summarizing the central tenet of the common in-group identity model, Gaertner et al. (1993: 6) make the point that “if members of different groups are induced to conceive of themselves as a single group rather than two completely separate groups, attitudes toward former out-group members will become more positive through processes involving pro-
ingroup bias”. However, a pronounced superordinate identity does not imply that individuals need to give up their subgroup identities, but that their membership in a common and superordinate group becomes more significant for themselves, a shared identity more salient and, in turn, more consequential for attitudes and behavior (Gaertner and Dovidio 2000: 48).

The common in-group identity model suggests that the conditions under which contact is associated with a reduction of intergroup biases are in fact also stimuli for individuals from different groups to see themselves as a more encompassing single group. Cooperative interactions and an equal status while interacting make it more likely for individuals to expand their in-group to individuals who were previously considered part of the out-group. An increase in the salience of existing superordinate identities and shared goals further facilitate the notion of a shared group affiliation (Gaertner and Dovidio 2012). Contact under these conditions sets a series of cognitive and affective processes in motion, which decrease the perceived distance between individuals from different groups. On the cognitive side, contact involves learning about the other group, which undermines prejudice and enhances intercultural understanding. On the affective side, social interactions across groups reduce anxiety, foster familiarity, and create empathy with the former out-group.

Evidence from everyday situations and political life supports the significant role that a more encompassing superordinate social identity can play. For instance, Nier et al. (2001) show that whites evaluate blacks who share a university identity more favorably. Levine et al. (2005) find that individuals are more likely to help a stranger in an emergency if they recognize a common social identity. Kane, Angote, and Levine (2005) discover that working groups are more likely to adopt a new idea from a newcomer who shares a superordinate identity. In political science, evidence from survey experiments shows that national identity in the US can
function as a common in-group for citizens who might otherwise be perceived as citizens of a
different ethnicity or race as out-group (Transue 2007, Wright and Citrin 2011). Transue’s work
(2007) also highlights significant implications for redistributive issues. He finds that a tax
increase for minority education finds much less support among whites when their racial identity
is primed, compared to when their national identity is salient. A racial prime makes whites see a
tax increase through their subgroup glasses. Hence, citizens interpret it as transfer from their own
racial group to another one, whereas a similar interpretation is much less salient in the national
identity condition.

**European Identity as Collective In-Group**

Applying the logic from social psychology to an international political context helps pin
down the precise mechanisms and conditions under which social interactions can contribute to a
supranational collective identity. In this realm, national identities rather than racial identities
create the most powerful divisions. The European context is particularly well suited for analysis.
Employing the terminology of the common in-group identity model, national identities could be
understood as subgroup identities, whereas a collective European identity is the corresponding
superordinate and supranational identity (Mols and Weber 2013). The formation of a collective
European identity has potentially profound political implications. A rich literature highlights a
collective European identity as an important normative condition for authority transfers from the
national to the supranational level and the legitimacy of the EU at large (Fuchs and Klingemann
2011, Lindberg and Scheingold 1970). Empirical studies find citizens’ identities to be a prime
factor that constrains European integration (Hooghe and Marks 2005, McLaren 2007). Holding
some type of European identity in addition to loyalty to the nation is associated with significantly higher support of European integration.

In short, Europeans can think of themselves just in terms of their national (subgroup) identity, in which case citizens in other countries are more likely to be perceived as out-group. Alternatively, individuals might think of themselves as individuals who are both citizens of the EU and their nation. In this case, Europeans in other countries are more likely to be seen as common in-group. This portrayal of the relationship between national and European identity resonates with a rich empirical literature. In fact, prominent studies conceptualize a collective European identity as a category akin to national identity albeit at a level above the nation state and referring to a community whose fuzzy boundaries coincide with the EU (Bruter 2009, Diez Medrano and Gutierrez 2001, Fligstein 2008). These authors apply Tajfel’s definition (1981: 255) of a social identity, as “that part of an individual’s self concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership”.¹⁵ In this sense, holding a European identity consists of a cognitive component, i.e. the self-identification as citizen of Europe rather than just as citizen of a particular country, as well as an affective part, namely an emotional attachment to the community of Europeans.

Despite the conceptual comparability of a collective European identity to national identities, authors recently emphasize important differences in its empirical manifestation (Castano 2004, Mols and Weber 2013, Risse 2010). The EU, just like a nation state, is an “imagined community” from the perspective of citizens (Anderson 1991). In order for it to be a relevant category for citizens to identify with it needs to be tangible. Quite in contrast to nations,

¹⁵ One should note, however, that much of the literature on a collective European identity does not test implications of Tajfel’s social identity theory in a strict sense, as Mols and Weber (2013) point out in a careful review.
however, the EU lacks a psychological existence for most citizens (Risse 2010: 56). For many individuals, it is an abstract entity and associated with a remote international organization rather than a community of people. Besides, it lacks reification mechanisms of a similar potency as those that socialize and link citizens of nation states to one another.

One might conceive of social interactions as an instrument for attaching a personal meaning to the abstract category of a collective European identity and turning it into a meaningful category. The question is whether it does. Cross-sectional research finds a consistent positive association between social interactions and European identity, but longitudinal analyses do not support this conclusion.

Using Eurobarometer public opinion data, Fligstein (2008) shows that citizens who have a strong European identity tend to travel more frequently to other European countries, are more educated than their peers, and often work as managers or professionals. Hence, these citizens are embedded in a network of transnational interactions, and Fligstein attributes their European identity to these interactions. Rother and Nebe (2009) corroborate his findings. They surveyed EU citizens who moved from their home country to another EU member state to live and work there. The share of respondents who are very much attached to Europe is much higher among movers than among citizens who did not leave their home country.16 Evidence based on ex-post surveys of intra-European exchange students also suggests that contact among Europeans prompts a European identity (King and Ruiz-Gelices 2003, Mitchell 2012, Van Mol 2013).

These studies share a common limitation. Due to the cross sectional nature of the data, they cannot reliably establish the direction of causality. In fact, it is as plausible to assume that individuals with a strong European identity in the first place are eager to interact with other

---

16 Kuhn (2011) adds a more nuanced test of the interaction hypothesis, though focusing on citizens’ levels of support for EU membership as the dependent variable. She finds three measures of transnationalism to increase support for European integration: a transnational background, transnational practices, and transnational human capital.
Europeans, as it is to argue that these citizens’ frequent interactions cause a strong attachment to Europe as suggested by Deutsch. Since correlational data cannot solve this puzzle, scholars have recently turned to panel surveys.

Studies employing a pre-post test design present ambiguous results, which cast doubt on the causal role of contact for a collective European identity. Wilson (2011) surveys students taking part in the European student exchange program “Erasmus” before and after embarking on their trip abroad. He does not find an increase in identification with Europe over the course of his panel. Sigalas (2010) also surveys students before and after going abroad. He shows that social interactions have a positive effect on identification with Europe (Sigalas 2010: 259.). Yet, when comparing data from before and after the study abroad, Sigalas registers no change in identification with Europe among British students who study abroad.

These null findings for the interaction hypothesis in a context that seems conducive for the emergence of a European identity are astonishing in light of the powerful evidence on the effects of contact from social psychology. Kuhn (2012) argues that educational exchange programs are ineffective because they are “preaching to the converted”. Compared with other citizens, students comprise a group that is already very attached to Europe. Consequently, they might not develop a stronger European identity: a ceiling effect. This has implications for the present study: individuals with a pronounced European identity already before engaging in intense social interactions with other Europeans might be affected less by contact than their peers with a weaker European identity to begin with.
Social Interactions and Identity Formation: Conditions and Expectations

My starting point is to conceive of Europe as an “imagined community”, which needs to be made tangible in order for it to be a relevant identification category (Anderson 1991, Castano 2004, Risse 2010). Without personal interactions among Europeans, the meaning of a collective European identity relies on elite cues and impersonal identity markers: symbols on passports and flags. Contact between individuals from diverse European countries is different: it gives tangible content to what it means to be “European.” This, in short, creates a cognitive representation of an otherwise abstract category. Furthermore, contact can also add a strong affective connotation to the concept of a shared European identity, when transnational social interactions are remembered as particularly positive and exciting experience, or led to friendships.

Based on this reasoning, I can formulate my first hypothesis. A context in which interacting individuals cooperate to solve problems collectively, in which they have an equal status, and in which they have the opportunity to form friendships across group boundaries should be favorable for the emergence of a collective identity. These features promote seeing similarities rather than differences even if individuals come from different countries. In those circumstances individuals are expected to consider each other increasingly as members of the common superordinate group rather than citizens of different nations. Hence, a shared European identity should become more perpetually accessible, which I hypothesize to manifest itself empirically in a more pronounced sense of identification with Europe.

I however do have sharply different expectations with regard to types of social interactions study abroad students engage in. On the one hand are individuals who interact
primarily with individuals of their host country when abroad. On the other hand are individuals who interact primarily with individuals from a diverse set of European countries. My second hypothesis is that contact with a diverse set of individuals from different European countries fosters a European identity more directly than interactions between study abroad students and hosts, because the contact situation more accurately mirrors the diversity of individuals making up the community of Europeans.

My third expectation focuses on the extent to which individuals already have a pronounced European identity before entering a contact situation. I hypothesize transnational social interactions to have a stronger effect on individuals for whom a European identity is a comparably less important part of their self before going abroad. Previous findings suggest that the effectiveness of contact depends not only on external conditions, but also on the configuration of the political identity with which individuals enter the contact situation. Sigalas (2010) and Kuhn (2012) expect a ceiling effect, whereby individuals who already have a strong European identity may not be affected by a study abroad. Transnational social interactions should be more formative for individuals who do not already have friends in other European countries and who lack intense contact with other Europeans. For them, the concept of a European identity – previously abstract or meaningless – may become a more relevant, tangible, and meaningful identity in the context of their new social interactions with individuals from other countries.

Finally, I expect transnational social interactions to generate a lasting identity change. In short, my expectation is that social interactions attach a personal meaning to the concept of a European identity that persists outside of the contact situation. Hence, identity change should also be stable for at least some time after students’ return.
Method: Research Design, Data, and Measurement

Research design and data

The data come from a three-wave panel survey of German students who went abroad to study in another European country. Most students participated in the EU program “Erasmus,” which facilitates student exchanges within Europe by waiving tuition fees and an easy transfer of credit points. I also collected data for a control group of students who did not participate in a study abroad program during the same period.\(^{17}\) Testing the effect of social interactions on identity formation with a sample of study abroad students seems adequate because their interactions should fulfill the conditions for positive contact. While studying abroad, students are likely to interact with a diverse set of individuals, including students from the host country as well as other international students. Given the shared status as students, there should be no particularly salient status differences in the contact situations. Also, contact situations in- and outside of the classroom should give study abroad students the chance to cooperate with other Europeans and the opportunity to form friendships across national boundaries.

The first wave took place in July and August 2010, before individuals in the study abroad group left their home institution for either one or two terms. Participants were contacted again in May 2011 for the second wave of the survey. At this point, two thirds of the study abroad group had returned, while one third of the participants continued for a second term. All students were contacted in November 2011, which is when almost all participants were back. The third wave took place a relatively short time after those who stayed abroad for 12 months came back, but it

\(^{17}\) Thirty-eight institutions of higher education forwarded my survey invitation to their students. I contacted professors of large lecture classes at several German universities to collect data for a similarly diverse group of control group participants.
followed after about half a year for the participants who went abroad for one term between wave one and two. This is important to test hypothesis three. Respondents went to 24 of the 27 member states of the EU. The largest shares of students went to France, Italy, and Spain (See Table 19 in the appendix for more details).

![Figure 3: Research design and timing of survey waves](image)

Measurement

According to Tajfel (1981) identity has a cognitive part – i.e. self-categorization as a European - as well as an affective part, namely a feeling of attachment. Most research based on large-N surveys relies on a crude measure of identification with Europe based on a single variable with four categories. In order to use a more reliable measurement instrument, I use an instrument inspired by Sigalas (2010). My European identity measure is based on five

---

18 The four categories offered to respondents of the Eurobarometer survey are typically: respondent identifies with her “nation only”/“nation and Europe”/“Europe and nation”/“Europe only”.

19 Other authors, such as Roccas et al. 2008 or Bruter 2009 developed more elaborate scales to measure political identities. However, I opt for a revised version of Sigalas’ 2010 measure for two reasons. First, his instrument
questions, two tapping cognitive issues and three gauging affective matters. The first element measures the frequency with which someone thinks of herself as a European citizen. This builds on Bruter’s important point that we are interested in Europe as a political community rather than Europe as a geographical or cultural entity (Bruter 2005). Another cognitive measure asks respondents to what extent they think they have something in common with other Europeans. The next three items capture affective dimensions of identity: attachment to Europe as general measure of affection, pride in being a European, and perceived closeness to other Europeans (see appendix for question wordings). All scales run from zero to six. The Cronbach’s alpha is high among the five variables (.79), which justifies an additive index. An additive index has the appeal that units are more intuitively meaningful than those of a factor solution. The choice for an additive index or factor solution does not affect the substantive results.

Students in the experimental and control group are broadly similar (see Table 20 in the appendix for descriptive statistics). All subjects are politically left leaning and closer to the green-liberal end of a “new politics” ideology dimension than to the traditionalist-authoritarian end. The mean age of respondents in the study abroad group is 23 and it is 24 in the control group. All participants speak at least one foreign language. Most panel participants are fairly mobile, travel frequently, and some lived abroad for a short time. The mean identification with Europe in the experimental group is slightly higher in the experimental than in the control group. I use logistic regression to analyze if any of these descriptive characteristics predict group membership, and find no statistically significant differences on most variables, including their

proved to be reliable in a student panel. Second, his questions are much shorter than the alternatives by Roccas et al. 2008 or Bruter 2009 and thus take less time for participants who are asked to answer the same survey multiple times, on their own, and online.
level of identification with Europe. Significant differences only exist with regard to three variables: students in the study abroad group traveled more frequently within the past 12 months, they have more language skills, and they are younger.

Panel attrition leads to a loss of participants over the course of the study. About 1500 students took part in the first wave. Out of those, 1206 students went abroad during the course of the panel and are thus the experimental group. 291 students stayed in Germany and make up the control group. Panel attrition in the study abroad group amounts to 39 percent between the first and second wave, and another 29 percent between the second and the third wave. While these figures reflect a non-negligible loss of participants, the rate is comparable to those presented by other authors with similar designs (Sigalas 2010, Wilson 2011). Panel attrition does not seem to induce a grave bias. I run a logistics regression where dropping out (=1) and staying (=0) are the outcomes and the characteristics shown in Table 20 (appendix) are the independent variables. None of these variables are significant and the model fit is very poor (Pseudo R2 = 0.01), indicating that panel attrition does not seriously impair the results (for the results, see Tables 22 and 23 in the appendix).

---

20 The dependent variable in this logistic regression is one for respondents in the control group and zero for those in the experimental group. Inserting all variables shown in Table 20 allows me to test if any of these characteristics predict group membership. See Table 21 in the appendix for the results.
### Results

The malleability of identities

The results reveal that studying in another European country leads to a significant increase in identification with Europe. Table 7 shows that among participants who study abroad for one term, identification with Europe increases from 3.77 to 3.91. This change is statistically significant at the p<.001 level (paired t-test). The increase in identification among students who study abroad for two terms is larger and also statistically significant. Identification with Europe among these students was already above the level exhibited by those in the one term study abroad group, but it still increases from 3.87 to 4.12. Apparently, prolonged contact seems to lead to a more profound effect on students’ political identity. During the same period, identification with Europe among students in the control group did not change over the course of the panel in a statistically significant way. These results are also robust when applying a different modeling strategy. I re-analyze the data using a repeated measures mixed model, which is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad group</td>
<td>N 1206</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attrition in percent</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>N 291</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attrition in percent</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>N 1497</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
commonly employed to analyze panel data in the medical sciences, psychology, and econometrics (Moskowitz and Hershberger 2002, Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal 2008). This estimation technique applies the logic of multilevel modeling to the study of panel data. It allows pooling respondents in the study abroad and control group and shows how both groups develop over time (see Tables 24-27 in the appendix). The analysis reveals again a statistically significant change in study abroad students’ identification with Europe and no significant change in the control group. The results are a first confirmation of hypothesis one, according to which contact among citizens from different EU member states contributes to identification with Europe.
### Table 7: Paired t-test on European identity change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test (SD)</th>
<th>Post-test (SD)</th>
<th>Δ (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 term</td>
<td>3.77 (.94)</td>
<td>3.91 (.94)</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad:</td>
<td>3.87 (.88)</td>
<td>4.12 (.86)</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.62 (.93)</td>
<td>3.52 (1.04)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>3.59 (.93)</td>
<td>3.64 (.92)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, two tailed significance test, scale: 0-6, standard errors in parentheses

The effect of contact with an international community

A comparison of means can attribute a change in students’ identities to the study abroad, but it does not offer direct evidence for the causal role of social interactions. I would like to further investigate if social interactions do indeed drive identity change. Hence, the key independent variables are participants’ interactions with individuals from other countries while abroad. I differentiate between participants’ interactions with other international students and interactions with students from the host country. I measure interactions with each group using three question items: socializing with the respective group generally, conversations involving personal problems, and discussing academic problems. The three items are merged into additive indices, namely one for contact with internationals and another one for contact with
hosts. Both indices exhibit high scale reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91 for the former index and 0.81 for the latter one.\(^{21}\)

I control for a number of confounding factors. I account for the fact that a respondents’ adjustment abroad could affect the dependent variable. For instance, an individual who finds it difficult to adapt abroad might not develop a stronger European identity for troubles experienced abroad. For similar reasons, I control for respondents’ level of homesickness as well as overall satisfaction with the study abroad program. Sigalas (2010) notes that a students’ multicultural background might also have an effect on the extent to which social interactions abroad leave an imprint on an individuals’ her identity. Therefore, I include variables measuring a respondents’ foreign language competence, frequency of traveling abroad, whether someone has previously lived abroad, and whether or not a students’ parents have the same nationality. I also control for age and gender and include a dummy for respondents who went abroad for two terms.

A plausible argument is that cultural openness accounts for part of why social interactions might lead to identity change. I address this issue by using data on the reasons students give for their interest in a study abroad. My survey offers ten motivations as well as an open field and respondents could select as much as three of these simultaneously (see Table 29 in the appendix). Most students go abroad for a combination of reasons. For instance, students go abroad to improve their language skills, to get a better understanding of a different country, and to gain an advantage on the job market. However, there is a smaller subset of students – about 14

\(^{21}\) Data on students’ amount of contact with internationals and hosts in the regression model comes from the survey they answered after their return. However, ex-post reports might be biased. Therefore I conduct a robustness check by analyzing if the results hold when data on contact comes from reports given by students while being abroad. The group of students who stays abroad for two terms (N= 124) provides me with this opportunity. They answer survey wave two while they are still abroad. I conduct all analyses again with this subset of students and the amount of social interactions they report while abroad (Table 30 in the appendix as well as Figures 11 and 12 in the appendix). This analysis yields similar results in all substantively important respects.
% – that does not pick any of three uniquely cosmopolitan reasons for their study abroad.\textsuperscript{22}

These students seem to be going abroad for job-related and other personal reasons, rather than because of their cultural openness. I use this difference to get a handle on whether cultural openness is a substantively meaningful driver for identity change. I include a dummy variable that equals one if respondents did not mention any cosmopolitan reason as motivation for their study abroad.

\textsuperscript{22} The three cosmopolitan motivations to study abroad are: (1) to get a better understanding of another country, (2) to see my own country from a different perspective, (3) to travel. See Table 29 in the appendix for all categories and the distribution of responses.
Table 8: Social interactions and European identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ international students</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ internationals*pre-EU ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ host country students</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ hosts*pre-EU ID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction w/ study abroad</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of adaption</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home sickness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-term dummy (ref.: 1 term)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lived abroad</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency of travelling</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language competence</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents nationality</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cosmopolitan</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity before going abroad (Y_{it})</td>
<td>0.66***</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 715, 704, 704

significance levels: $p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, $p < 0.001$, two tailed; Standard errors in parentheses
Table 8 shows the results of three regression models that allow me to evaluate the effect of social interactions on identity change. The results are estimates from a static score model with a lagged dependent variable. The dependent variable is respondents’ European identity score after their return. I include respondents’ European identity score before going abroad as

\[ \text{European identity before going abroad} \]

I pool all students who went abroad. Hence, data on students’ European identity after studying abroad comes from wave 2 for those who went abroad only for one term and it comes from wave 3 for those who went abroad for two terms.

\[ \text{European identity before going abroad} \]

---

\[ \text{European identity before going abroad} \]
independent variable. Therefore, coefficients of all other independent variables reflect their effect on identity change over time.\(^{24}\)

The results show a direct link between social interactions and identity change. Model 1 only includes two covariates in addition to European identity at the outset, namely social interactions with hosts and social interactions with other international students. Social interactions with other international students have a statistically significant effect on identity change, while interactions with students from the host country do not. Model 2 shows that contact with internationals remains a significant predictor for identity change when applying a wide range of controls. Among the control variables only the frequency of traveling has a significant effect on identity change. Importantly, the dummy variable for the small share of respondents for whom cultural motivations are not one of the specific reasons for their study abroad is not significant. Apparently, students who go abroad only for personal or professional reasons rather than their cultural openness are not less likely to develop a more pronounced European identity. In sum, the results provide additional and direct support for hypothesis one on the causal effect of contact across group boundaries for a collective identity. Yet, only interactions with a diverse group of internationals, which mirror more faithfully the diversity implied by a shared European identity, have a significant effect on identification with Europe. This supports my second hypothesis. Theoretically, Europe is also a shared in-group when study abroad students have contact with locals. However, these interactions seem to be perceived primarily as bi-directional and do not make a shared European identity salient.

\(^{24}\) There is a debate in various disciplines about whether using static scores with lagged dependent variable, change scores, or other alternatives are a most appropriate in a regression based on pretest-posttest data (Plewis 1985, Allison 1990, Liker, Augustyniak, and Duncan 1985, Finkel 1995). However, a static score model accounts more accurately for change that might be related to initial levels (Finkel 1995: 6), which is what I expect theoretically and find empirically. Moreover, only the static score model with initial European identity score allows me to test hypotheses 2, i.e. the conditional effect of contact at different levels of initial European identity.
In hypothesis three, I expect that social interactions have a greater effect on individuals with a weaker identification with Europe before going abroad, and test this through interacting initial European identity with both types of contact. Model 3 in Table 8 presents the results. Marginal effects plots visualize the substantive effect and support the notion of an interaction effect for social interactions with international students (Figures 4 and 5). Social interactions with other international students have a more pronounced effect the weaker an individuals’ identification with Europe before going abroad. Social interactions have no statistically significant effect when identification with Europe is high at the outset. These results confirm hypothesis two.

Stability of identity change

The findings indicate an important effect of social interactions in an international setting on the strengthening of a shared identity among Europeans. Is this a short-lived European identity spark due to the excitement of an adventurous journey? Or is it a durable recalibration of political identities? The data suggest that studying abroad leaves a lasting impression, which leads to a pronounced and durable European identity. A paired t-test comparing respondents’ level of identification with Europe at wave two and wave three shows support for this. Survey wave two took place shortly after respondents came back from their study abroad and wave three followed after another five months. As Table 9 shows, there is no drop or change in the European identity index between waves two and three of the panel (3.94 to 3.96, p=.63). These results support hypothesis three, which posits that a study abroad leaves a deep imprint on European identity, at least for the time covered by this survey. The stability of the identity
change is also remarkable given the context dependency of identities. The initial increase and proceeding stability in respondents’ European identity scores among study abroad students, highlights that my measure picks up a robust category with a particular meaning.

Table 9: European identity: change and stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Δw1-w2 (SE)</th>
<th>Δw2-w3 (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=69</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, two tailed significance test; based on respondents who went abroad between wave 1 and wave 2 and who answered all waves of the panel survey. Standard errors in parentheses

Conclusion

This article seeks to contribute to the scholarly debate on the connection between social interactions and political identities. On a theoretical level, this study extends Deutsch’s transactionalist framework by showing the conditions under which social interactions can be expected to shape a collective identity. My findings demonstrate that social interactions across groups with different national backgrounds help build a common identity, especially among individuals with an initially weak European identity.

Building on the contact hypothesis and its descendant, the common in-group identity model, I emphasize the need for contact to be a positive experience: those who interact need to perceive each other as hierarchically equal individuals involved in cooperative behaviors, or be in a position to form friendships across group boundaries. Additionally, for contact to be
effective it must occur among a set of individuals who are as diverse in their nationalities as Europe. Under these conditions, I argue that social interaction can attach a personal cognitive and affective meaning to a transnational collective identity, which would otherwise remain only an abstract category for an individual.

My research design has several advantages over previous empirical tests. I survey European exchange students before they go abroad, after their return, and again after a time lag. Additionally, I collect data on a control group. This pre-post test design with control group offers a better handle on how contact affects identity over time. The duration of the study provides new insights on the stability of identity change after the contact situation.

Like other panel studies on student interactions, my study cannot control for the self-selection of students into the study abroad program. It might be reasonable to expect that participants already see themselves as Europeans to begin with, which might be a reason for them to study abroad in the first place. If this were the case, this would bias the study against finding an effect of social interactions. In reality, there is considerable variation with regard to participants’ identification with Europe at the outset. And there are substantial differences in their reasons for going abroad. I do find that social interactions are less effective among individuals with a strong European identity to begin with. However, I can also show precisely that those with a weak European identity appear to be most affected by social interactions abroad.

My findings strongly support the effectiveness of social interactions across group boundaries. Participants who studied abroad display a significant increase in their identification with Europe. A longer study abroad is related to a more pronounced identity change. A closer examination of the underlying causal process in a regression analysis allows identifying social
interactions as the critical factor driving identity change. The unique three-wave panel design of
the study additionally provides a first glance into the stability of this identity change. The
recorded change is not just a short-lived spark due to the excitement about an exchange program.
It is stable even months after a students’ return. But perhaps the most surprising finding is that
type of interaction matters more than quantity: for students to embrace a European identity they
need to interact with a diverse set of people – not only with students from the host country. Only
interactions with other international students have an effect on students’ identification with
Europe.

The results also raise puzzles that deserve further investigation. First, we lack a precise
understanding of different types of European identity and their respective implications with
regard to public support of European integration, attitudes towards authority transfers to
Brussels, or situations in which citizens of affluent EU member states are asked to pool their
financial resources to help neighbors in economic distress. I claim that interactions as conceived
of by Deutsch (1953) can turn the abstract category of a collective European identity into a
meaningful and affectively charged one for Europeans. However, contact contributes to an
individuals’ ‘identification as a European’ based on horizontal ties among individuals from
different European countries. Therefore, the meaning and content of this European identity is
arguably starkly different from an identity created through other processes, such as Bruter’s
experiment on identity building based on the salience of EU news in media coverage (Bruter
2009). Insofar, my results underscore Cram’s point on the importance of different types of
European identity (Cram 2012). Future research should pay a special attention on the various
ways in which a collective identity is created in Europe and how these identities differ in their
implications for political attitudes.
Second, my theoretical framework puts much emphasis on the conditions needed in order for contact to translate into a European identity, but many social interactions among Europeans do not fulfill these conditions. Tourists only travel for short periods to other European countries, which might only rarely allow them to have sufficiently intense interactions. Blue collar might stay for longer periods abroad. Yet, those who hired them might treat these workers as inferior in status. This hierarchical difference and how it plays out in their daily interactions could be critical for how migrating workers experience an integrated Europe. Future research could examine if social interactions among a diverse set of individuals from different national backgrounds still contribute to a collective identity if the contact situation is less ideal than the one that exchange students face.
National identities provide a sense of community among people from different social classes and sometimes from diverse religious or ethnic backgrounds. Does a similar logical apply in a community of different nation states? An example is the case of the European Union (EU). A transfer of considerable powers away from national capitals to the EU in combination with majority ruling in some policy fields means that national sovereignty is seriously constrained. Profound decisions are taken in Brussels and Europeans have considerable rights even in the member states to which they relocate – but are no citizens of – in order to live and work. This raises the question of whether a collective European identity is needed to create a political community that consists of individuals from diverse national backgrounds.

Particularly influential in this context is work by Jürgen Habermas, who considers a collective European identity a critical ingredient for a European polity. He argues that citizens of the various member states of the EU need to think of themselves as Europeans and accept citizens of the other member states as members of same political community in order for a transnational will-formation to be possible in Europe (Habermas 2001, 2006). Habermas goes even further and claims that when a polity extends beyond national boundaries, the civic solidarity that exists among fellow citizens within nations needs to grow in a corresponding fashion in order to include citizens of other EU member states (Habermas 2012: 29). Only under
this condition, decisions taken in Brussels would be accepted as legitimate, especially if they have redistributive consequences (Laffan 1996, Habermas 2006).

This normative perspective raises empirical questions, most importantly, whether a collective European identity indeed plays the pivotal role that Habermas suggests. A broad literature shows that citizens who think of themselves as both citizens of their nation states and Europe view the EU much more positively than those who identify exclusively with their national community (Hooghe and Marks 2005). However, the relationship between holding a European identity and supporting the EU is only found in cross sectional research. Therefore, the relationship is only based on comparisons across individuals and could in fact be spurious. Evidence showing that individuals can develop a more pronounced European identity during their lifetime is lacking. What is more, Habermas suggests not only a close link between a collective European identity and views on the political integration of Europe. He also describes European identity and the extent to which Europeans think of each other as members of a shared community as two side of the same coin, i.e. for him they are inextricably linked (Habermas 2001: 99). I take both of these arguments as my starting point and evaluate them in light of empirical data.

To this end, I surveyed students before and after their study abroad in another EU country. I find a large share of these students to have a more pronounced European identity after their study abroad, and I detect a clear pattern in how identity change affects attitudes towards social and political integration. First, individuals who develop a stronger European identity are more likely to view Europeans from other EU member states as citizens with equal rights. Second, individuals with a more pronounced European identity are more interested in EU affairs, more approving of authority to be transferred to Brussels, and – to a smaller extent – they are
also more likely to turn out in European parliament elections. However, these implications are mediated by ideology. Identity change has more pronounced implications for left leaning respondents than right leaning respondents. Only a very strong identity change leaves an imprint on right leaning citizens’ views on European integration.

**European Identity as a Social Identity**

I understand a collective European identity as a social identity that is directed at a level above the nation but otherwise resembles national identity in many ways (Herrmann, Risse, Brewer 2004, Risse 2010, Bruter 2003, 2009, Fligstein 2008, Sanders and Bellucci 2012). Tajfel defines a social identity as “that part of an individual’s self concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (1981: 255). Hence, a European identity consists of two parts: a self-identification as European and an emotional attachment to the community of Europeans.  

Yet, to what extent does this European identity exist and what are its observable implications? Individuals living in one of the member states of the EU are, at least from a legal point of view, citizens of nation states as well as EU citizens, but do they think of themselves as European or are their national identities more salient? Even if they hold a European identity, to what extent is this identity “chronically accessible” (Conover 1995: 143)? And what are the

---

25 Bruter (2005, 2009) proposes a differentiation between a civic European identity and a cultural one. The civic identity refers to political dimensions of a community, such as citizenship and elections. The cultural identity denotes a common cultural heritage and history. Risse (2010) finds that the underlying dimension for the civic notion of Europe is shared values and an appreciation of such things as the freedom to travel. For a convergence of the values of a modern civic Europe and the EU, Risse (2010: 51) concludes, “the EU is modern Europe” [emphasis in the original]. Thus, identification with Europe can be seen as an identification with the community of people that makes up the EU despite the imprecision of the terminology.
consequences of this shared European identity for issues like the support for common citizenship rights or the transfer of political authority to institutions of the European Union?

Social identity theory and in particular its close relative, self-categorization theory (Turner et al. 1987) offers important insights to the nature and potential implications of a collective European identity. Self-categorization theory emphasizes that individuals can think of themselves as members of various groups (or categories), some of which are more exclusive, while others are higher-level categories that are more inclusive. An important consequence of the process of self-categorization is that individuals who perceive each other as members of the same category think of themselves as being more alike and as “interchangeable elements that share some representative common characteristic” (Van Lange, Kruglanski, Higgins 2012: 381). In comparative politics, Greenfeld and Eastwood emphasize the same point – national identity is “inseparably bound to the notion that all of one’s co-nationals are in some meaningful sense equal to oneself” (2007: 258).

From the perspective of the common in-group identity model (Gaertner and Dovidio 2000), a collective European identity is a higher-level identity when compared to national identities. The model highlights that higher-level social identities can create a sense of closeness among individuals who would be out-group if only more exclusive, lower level identities were salient to an individual. Hence, a self-categorization as European could create a sense of community with individuals in other countries with whom an individual shares this group membership. In short, whether and how much individuals identify both as Germans and EU citizens has important consequences for the extent to which individuals in other countries are seen as in-group or out-group. This directly applies the logic of a collective national identity to
the European level: Accordingly, a collective European identity creates bonds among Europeans in different EU member states.

Both, self-categorization theory and the common in-group identity model point to a number of implications of a shared European identity. First, an enhanced feeling of closeness and the fact that individuals with the same group identity think of themselves as equal should transfer to an increased willingness to grant equal citizenship rights in the domestic context. Second, both notions might also translate into an increased willingness to accept the transfer of political authority to a higher organizational level. The latter is also an important function of national identity. National identity fuels the notion that state authority, even when exercised from a remote capital, is not perceived as foreign rule but as self-rule. When this link is broken, for instance when regional identities are more important than national identity, state authority might indeed be perceived as foreign rule. Strong regional identities can shape the sense that self-rule is only realized when authority is exercised from within the region rather than a distant capital (Hooghe, Marks, and Schakel 2010, for Catalan identity in Spain, Hargreaves and Ferrando 1997). A strong European identity might therefore create the notion that authority in Brussels is perceived as self-rule rather than foreign rule.

A large body of empirical research examines whether a collective European identity translates into the support for a political institution, namely the European Union.26 Numerous studies based on cross sectional research have found a strong link between political identities and attitudes towards European integration. Carey (2002) shows that a strong national identity predicts opposition to European integration. McLaren emphasizes that citizens who see other

26 My use of the term on the European level is close to Conover’s (1995: 134) ‘citizen identity’ on the national level. She defines a citizen identity as one of two parts of an individual’s sense of citizenship. Accordingly, a “‘citizens identity’ is the affective significance that people give their membership in a particular political community.” Conover differentiates this from ‘understanding’ as a second element of an individual’s sense of citizenship, which refers to “the framework of beliefs that people develop about their relationship to the state and to other citizens”.
cultures as a threat and who are concerned about the loss of their national identity are more opposed to the EU membership of their country (McLaren 2004, 2007). However, many citizens integrate a national and European identity, as theory would predict. In fact, a majority of Europeans identify with their nation as well as Europe simultaneously and only a minority of Europeans identify exclusively with their nation (Duchesne and Frognier 1995, Risse 2010). Citizens with an exclusive national identity do not welcome European integration as much as those for whom the two identities are not mutually exclusive (Hooghe and Marks 2005).

These empirical studies do however have a number of limitations. Their findings derive from a controlled comparison of attitudes towards European integration between individuals. Yet, such comparisons cannot establish that this relationship exists as an individual’s identity changes. Some researchers question the plausibility of a link between identity and support on the grounds that political identities in Europe are almost frozen. Roose (2013) argues that identification with Europe has not changed over the last decades despite identity building efforts of the EU. Moreover, identification with one’s continent is in other parts of the world just as high as in Europe. He concludes that these findings cast doubt on a causal relationship between identity and support for European integration.

Recent studies analyzing change in identity and political attitudes of intra European study abroad students come to the conclusion that their sojourns neither affect their identities nor their support of European integration (Sigalas 2010, 2010a, Wilson 2011). These studies share some limitations. First, both authors only focus on group mean differences and conclude, based on the absence of a mean change, that studying abroad has been ineffective. However, Sigalas (2010: 259) does in fact document identity change based on a regression analysis. Hence, there is at least some variation in the sample and some students developed a more pronounced European
identity. This leads to the second limitation. Both authors collect information on students’ identities and their views on European integration before and after a study abroad. However, they do not connect these data and miss the opportunity to study whether an individual’s identity change is related to views on other issues. I argue in contrast to these studies that the extent to which a European identity is a persistently salient part of an individual’s self can change in the short term, with important implications for a social dimension as well as a political dimension of European integration.

**Hypotheses**

Based on the common in-group identity model (Gaertner and Dovidio 2000) I derive a number of hypotheses regarding the effect of European identity. Developing a higher-level identity creates a sense of closeness to individuals who would otherwise be considered out-group and leads to more positive attitudes towards these individuals. If individuals hold a strong European identity the same logic would apply. Developing a more pronounced European identity should be positively correlated with more favorable views towards citizens from other EU member states. This feeling of closeness has important implications. Shared social identities foster the notion among members of the group that they are similar to one another. Subsequently, individuals should be more likely to grant citizens from other EU member states equal citizenship rights similar to the ones that they would grant members of their national community, such as an equal access to domestic jobs or the right to participate in local elections.27

The effect of identity on individuals’ attitudes towards members of other groups has been extensively examined by the empirical literature on attitudes towards immigrants. The core

---

27 One should note, however, that even within nation states a fully “equal citizenship” for all individuals is often an ideal rather than a reality (Conover, Searing, and Crewe 2004).
finding is that political identities are central in explaining anti-immigrant sentiments. Sniderman, Hagendoorn, and Prior’s (2004) experimental work shows that identities are in fact more powerful than economic considerations in explaining anti-immigrant sentiments. Citrin and Sides (2007) corroborate this with data from 20 European countries. Anxieties based on culture and national identity account for much variation in preferences for lower levels of immigration.

In fact numerous studies show that a European identity is associated with more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Weldon (2006) reveals that Europeans who identify only with their nation instead of simultaneously identifying with their nation and Europe exhibit significantly lower levels of tolerance towards immigrants. Dejaeghere and Quintelier (2008) survey 6000 16-year-old Belgians. A self-categorization as European citizen is a significant predictor for tolerance towards immigrants.

Gerhards and Lengfeld (2013) test a link between European identity and attitudes of Europeans towards citizens from other EU member states. Based on cross sectional data from Germany, Spain, Poland, and Turkey, they report that holding a European identity as opposed to identifying only with a nation significantly increases citizens’ approval of foreign EU citizens on their national job market. Also, having stayed abroad, a post-materialistic value orientation, an ideological position on the right side, and education contribute to a more approving stance with regard to foreign EU citizens.

---

28 Since this paper focuses on the role of identity for attitudes towards EU citizens from other EU member states moving to Germany, I do not review the rich literature on the relationship between economic competition and anti-immigrant sentiments (Scheepers, Gijsberts, and Coenders 2002, Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky 2006).

29 In the absence of an item measuring respondents’ attachments to their nation, the authors construct a substitute that must be seen critically: Using data on the policy areas a respondent thinks should be decided at the EU rather than the national level, Citrin and Sides (2007) assign those respondents a stronger national identity which prefer more policy areas to be decided at the national rather than the EU level.

30 Gerhards and Lengfeld (2013a) focuses on the same topic, but does not include European identity as an independent variable.
**H 1:** A more pronounced European identity increases support for equal access to domestic jobs and local elections for EU citizens from other EU member states.

Identities are however not the only factor that affects citizens’ views on other EU citizens. A large literature finds that a right leaning ideological orientation is associated with more skeptical attitudes towards immigrants. Falling short of a strong causal link, most of these studies point toward the role of political elites in order to explain the relationship between ideological orientation and anti-immigrant attitudes. Based on a comprehensive analysis of Eurobarometer data from 1988 to 2000, Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky (2006) document the relation between ideology and anti-immigrant sentiment. The authors refer to the mobilizing effect of elite cues: “Right-wing parties that claim to protect the interests of the social groups under threat (i.e., socioeconomically weak native populations) have made the issue of immigration a central tenet of their political campaigns” (Semyonov, Raijman, and Gorodzeisky, 2006: 429). Pardos-Prado (2011) corroborates this with data from the 2002 European Social Survey. Lubbers, Gijsberts, and Scheepers (2002) point out that the causality might be running in the opposite direction, namely, that views on immigration determine citizens’ ideological orientations.

Social psychologists, by contrast, emphasize the causal role of personality characteristics to explain the link between ideological orientations and anti-immigrant attitudes. They point to right-wing authoritarianism as a personality characteristic that determines both why some citizens have a preference for right-wing parties as well an aversion towards diversity and

---

31 The authors acknowledge, however, that parties also follow public opinion, which is why the direction of causality is not entirely clear.
immigrants. Cohrs and Stelzl (2010) as well as Weldon (2006) integrate both personality characteristics and ideological orientations as sources for attitudes towards immigration in their analysis.\(^{32}\) Cohrs and Stelzl’s meta study emphasizes the role of right-wing authoritarianism and an individual’s social dominance orientation in predicting anti-immigrant attitudes.\(^{33}\) Weldon (2006: 339) links personality characteristics and (right-wing) party cues in mobilizing against immigrants when he notes that “although the working class may be less tolerant, the Left in general has been a stancher advocate of equality for ethnic minorities. This is especially true for Left-Libertarians and Green parties in Western Europe.”

In sum, both party cueing effects and personality characteristics might explain why individuals with a more left leaning political orientation exhibit greater openness towards foreigners than their more conservative peers. Therefore, a more right leaning orientation would run counter to the effect of a more pronounced European identity and should diminish its effect.

**H 2: A right leaning orientation decreases support of an equal access to domestic jobs and local elections for EU citizens from other EU member states.**

I test the relationship between European identity and an individual’s stance on the political integration of Europe by examining the following three dimensions: an individual’s interest in EU affairs, a preference for political authority to be at the EU rather than the national

---

\(^{32}\) There is a large literature on this issue in psychology. Prominent models are put forth by Altemeyer (1981), Esses et al. (2005) and Duckitt (2001).

\(^{33}\) Cohr and Stelz (2010: 674) define right wing authoritarianism as consisting of three elements: “conventionalism (agreement with traditional societal norms), authoritarian submission (tendency to obey authority figures who represent these norms), and authoritarian aggression (willingness to engage in authority-sanctioned aggression toward individuals or groups that violate traditional norms).” The authors define an individual’s social dominance orientation as “a preference for hierarchical relations among social groups in society, ideally resulting in one’s own group having a dominant status in relation to other groups.”
level, and an intention to participate in European parliament elections participation. One of the core elements of European integration is the creation of institutions above the level of nation state that are, by now, equipped with considerable powers, at least in certain areas. Yet, as Hooghe and Marks note (2009: 2) “citizens care – passionately – about who exercises authority over them.” Political identities are critical for whether the actors and institutions that exercise authority are seen as ‘one of them’ – that is, are viewed as a part of the community citizens identify with – or whether they perceive authority to be exercised by remote actors and institutions, which might feel to them as foreign rule. Hence, for citizens who do not think of themselves as Europeans, the transfer of authority from the national to the European level can easily be understood as merely a loss of power. In contrast, a sense of community among Europeans – expressed by citizens’ self-categorization as European – could imply a close relationship between identity and support for the political institutions of the EU.

However, one must note that this relationship could in fact be less tight than the link between European identity and attitudes towards other EU citizens. A social identity indicates who is out-group and who is in-group, that is, it tells individuals something about the relationship to other individuals. Therefore, it would be more likely to find a shared European identity to be related most closely to the social dimension of European integration and it would seem more difficult for an identity change to spill over to a political dimension. Interest in the EU is the least costly of my three measures and should be most easily be affected by identity change. A preference for political authority to be at the EU rather than the national level is more costly. It involves that an individual approves of a loss of political power at the national level and it should therefore be affected by an identity change less easily. Finally, EP election participation
involves that an individual changes her own behavioral intentions. I expect this to be the toughest test for the effect of an identity change.

**H 3:** *A stronger European identity is associated with greater interest in EU affairs, an approval of authority transfers to Brussels, and the intention to vote in European parliament elections.*

**Method**

I test my hypotheses using a panel data set, which I collected in 2010 and 2011. German participants of the Erasmus program of the EU answered the survey before they went abroad and again after their return. The first survey wave was carried out in July and August 2010, before students went abroad for one or two terms. Participants were surveyed again in May 2011, when students had returned who spent one term abroad (about two-thirds). All subjects were contacted again in November 2011, which is when all participants had returned. Students who stayed abroad were excluded from the analysis. This data set allows me to test the implication of identity change on preferences for the unification of Europe. However, one should note that this is an identity change generated by social interactions among Europeans with different national backgrounds. This sets it apart from a European identity as primed by EU symbols (Cram, Patrikios, and Mitchell 2011) or generated through the news media (Bruter 2009, Stoeckel 2011).

Methodologically, I am interested in the extent to which this identity change carries over into change in students’ preferences in regard to the social integration of Europe and the political integration of Europe. To examine this, I calculate change scores for the variables that tap these preferences and analyze how identity change explains variation in these change scores. In short, I test if identity change has a statistically significant effect on change in students’ preferences, when controlling for a number of confounding factors.
My European identity measure is inspired by Sigalas (2010) and employs five question items. Two measures tap cognitive issues and three variables tap affective matters. The first item is about the regularity with which someone thinks of herself as a European citizen. The second cognitive item probes the extent to which respondents think they have something in common with other Europeans. The next three items measure affective dimensions: attachment to Europe, pride in being a European, and perceived closeness to other Europeans (see appendix for question wordings). The range of each scale is zero to six. Cronbach’s alpha among the five variables is .79, which justifies an additive index. I opt for an additive index because its units are more intuitively meaningful than scores of a factor solution.

With regard to preferences on the social integration of Europe, I use two measures from the European Election Study 2004 (Schmitt et al. 2009). One item relates to foreign EU citizens on the German job market and the other item concerns their participation in German local elections. The first question asks about agreement with the following question: “When jobs are scarce, German companies should prioritize German workers over workers from other EU countries who want to work in Germany.” Strong agreement with this statement expresses a disapproval of an equal access to jobs in Germany for EU citizens from other countries. I recoded the answers in the analysis section so that higher values represent more positive attitudes towards foreigners. The second question asks respondents about whether they think citizens from other EU member states should be allowed to participate in German local elections.

I have three measures to tap the political integration of Europe. The first item measures a respondents’ interest in EU affairs. The second item is about the intention to participate in European parliament elections. Because of the norm to participate in elections, I approach this issue indirectly and ask respondents about their opinion on the following statement: “A lot of
people do not participate in European Parliament elections. Other people consider it a civic duty to participate in these elections. Do you consider it disregarding civic duties if one does not participate in European Parliament elections?” The answer categories are yes/rather yes/rather no/no. The third concept I am interested in has to do with preferences for political authority to be at the European rather than the national level. I combine the following three question items here, which are derived from an expert survey of EU Commission officials (Hooghe 2012). The three items are (1) whether the European Commission should become the true government of the EU, (2) if the European Parliament should be strengthened, and (3) whether the member states of the EU should remain the central actors of the EU. The last item was recoded so that higher scores indicate a preference for the EU to be stronger vis-à-vis the member states.

Results

Is there evidence for a relationship between identity change and the extent to which individuals are willing to grant citizens from other EU member states equal rights in Germany? I test if change over the course of the panel in European identity scores is associated with change in the two variables that tap preferences on the social integration of Europe – (1) disapproval of discrimination against EU citizens from other EU member states on the German job market and (2) approval of foreign EU citizens’ participation in German elections. I calculate change scores of all relevant variables (scores from after students’ return minus scores measured at the outset). Next, I regress change in the two dependent variables on identity change. I also include initial levels of the dependent variables as well as participants initial European identity scores as

---

I am grateful to Liesbet Hooghe for providing me with an advance copy of the questions used to measure these dimensions in the survey of EU Commission officials (for more information about the project, see also http://www.uea.ac.uk/political-social-international-studies/european-commission-in-question).
control variables, in order to account for the fact that change (or its absence) might in part be due to students’ scores before going abroad. This way, I can cope both with regression to the mean as well as ceiling effects.\footnote{The regression analysis is only based on the study abroad student sample.}

The results (Table 10) clearly indicate support for the first hypothesis. Students who develop a stronger European identity are more likely to treat non-German EU citizens like German citizens. First, change in students’ European identity is associated with a statistically significant change in their approval of citizens from other EU member states on the German job market. Second, individuals who developed a stronger European identity are also significantly more likely to approve of foreign EU citizens’ participation in German local elections. This pattern holds when controlling for ideological orientations, age, gender, and time spent abroad.

Ideology also has a substantively and statistically significant effect. Right leaning respondents are less likely to exhibit change on both measures for the social integration of Europe. This is consistent with hypothesis 2. Apparently, studying abroad has different implications for attitudes of right leaning individuals. However, the (positive) identity effect and the (negative) ideology effect are additive effects. Therefore, right leaning respondents change their attitudes when they develop a much stronger European identity while being abroad. I calculate predicted changes based on the models in Table 10 to make this more apparent.

Figures 6 and 7 show percentage change on the dependent variable when there is no identity change (light grey) and a maximum identity change (dark grey). I use percentage change in order for the effect sizes to be roughly comparable. The left bars reflect values for left leaning respondents (5\textsuperscript{th} percentile, a value of 1.9) and the right bars reflect values for right leaning respondents (95\textsuperscript{th} percentile, a value of 7). The error bar represents a 95 percent confidence
interval. Figure 6 shows that a maximum positive identity change is associated with an increase in an individuals’ approval of foreign EU citizens’ on the German job market by about ten percent. However, the same identity change does not imply a significant increase in positive attitudes towards foreign EU citizens on the job market among right leaning respondents. Identity change also implies that left leaning respondents become much more approving of foreign EU citizens’ election participation. Figure 7 also shows that right leaning respondents show a significantly more positive stance on foreign EU citizens’ voting rights when they experience the maximum possible identity change.

What are the implications of change in European identity for attitudes on the political integration of Europe? The dependent variables of each model in Table 11 are change scores and the modeling follows the procedure in the last section.

Table 11 shows support for hypothesis 3. A positive European identity change increases support for the political integration of Europe. Identity change has a significant effect on respondents’ interest in the EU, the extent to which political power should be in the hands of the EU rather than at the national level, and respondents’ intention to participate in European parliament elections. This effect holds when controlling for ideology, age, gender, and time spent abroad.

The effect of ideology is not consistent across the three indicators of political integration. Ideological orientations do not seem to matter for change in interest in EU affairs. However, right leaning respondents exhibit less change on the other two dimensions of political integration – authority shift and European election voting – than left leaning respondents.

I show predicted change in Figures 8 to 10 for all three variables. The Figures show again a comparison between predicted change in the dependent variable in case of no identity change
(light grey bars) and a maximum identity change (dark grey bars). This is repeated for left leaning and right leaning respondents. The top figure shows that the maximum positive identity change is associated with a change in respondents’ interest in EU affairs of about ten percent. This effect does not differ by ideological orientation. Developing a stronger European identity correlates also with an enhanced preference for authority to be at the EU level rather than the national level. This change is much stronger among left leaning than among right leaning respondents; among the latter only a very stronger identity change has substantive implications for preference for where authority should be located. The effect sizes are the smallest ones for the relationship between identity change and intention to participate in European parliament elections. A maximum identity change increases left leaning respondents’ turnover intention, but it has no statistically significant effect on right leaning respondents.
Table 10: European identity and the social integration of Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job market inclusion (change)</th>
<th>Election participation (change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coef</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity (change)</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity (pre-test)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right ideology (pre-test)</td>
<td>-0.07***</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-term dummy</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged DV (pre-test)</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.06**</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significance levels:  *p < 0.05,  **p < 0.01,  ***p < 0.001, two tailed test
Table 11: European identity and the political integration of Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interest in affairs of the EU (change)</th>
<th>European Parliament election participation (change)</th>
<th>Authority transfer to the EU (change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coef</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>coef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity (change)</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity (pre-test)</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right ideology (pre-test)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 term dummy</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagged DV (pretest)</td>
<td>-0.44***</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cons</td>
<td>1.96***</td>
<td>(0.46)</td>
<td>1.12***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adj. R² | .23 | .18 | .19 |
N       | 702 | 704 | 645 |

significance levels:  * p < 0.05,  ** p < 0.01,  *** p < 0.001, two tailed
Figure 6: Approval of foreign EU citizens on German job market (predicted change in percent)

Figure 7: Approval of foreign EU citizens' election participation (predicted change in percent)
Figure 8: Interest in EU affairs (predicted change in percent)

Figure 9: Approval of authority transfer to EU level (predicted change in percent)

Figure 10: Vote intention in European Parliament elections (predicted change in percent)
Conclusion

Do individuals who develop a more pronounced European identity also become more supportive of the social and political integration of Europe? We know that individuals can develop a stronger European identity in the short run, but does this actually matter for what one might call ‘solidarity among strangers’ in Europe? I use a unique opportunity to study the effect of identity change in Europe: identity change based on an individual’s participation in an intra-European study abroad program. And I find evidence that European identity change matters, but this effect is conditioned by ideology.

The participants of my panel went abroad and studied in another European country. The sojourn abroad led to a more pronounced European identity for many, and this is related to viewing other Europeans in Germany more as co-citizens with equal rights—and less as immigrants who should perhaps not have similar rights. More specifically, they are more likely to approve of equal rights on the job market and equal rights to participation in local elections. Ideology plays an important role as well. Citizens with a more right wing ideological orientation were less likely to develop more positive attitudes despite an identity change. A right leaning individual needs to experience a very strong identity transformation before she begins viewing individuals from other EU member states as co-citizens.

There is also empirical support for a relationship between an individual’s European identity and her views on the political integration of Europe. A more European identity leads to greater interest in the EU for left and right leaning individuals alike. It motivates stronger support for political authority at the EU level, but this effect is much stronger for people on the left than the right. Finally, I find limited support for a relationship between identity change and intention
to vote in European parliament elections. Only a strong identity change increases turnout intention among left leaning respondents, and there is no evidence for right leaning respondents.

In sum, the results provide empirical support for Habermas’ normative argument that more European identity is needed to sustain a political and social Europe. A relationship that was previously established in cross sectional comparison also manifests itself when citizens’ identities change over time. However, both normative and empirical studies tend to underplay the effect of ideology. Since mainstream parties of the left and right usually support European integration, it is often assumed that individuals support European integration almost as much as the parties they vote for. A closer look reveals this assumption may need to be revisited.

An individual’s sense of citizenship does not instantaneously translate into communal behavior on the national level either (Conover 1995: 149). Conover therefore emphasizes that it is the combination of citizen identities with other parts of the self that shape an individual’s relations to other citizens and the state. My results suggest that ideology is likely to be one of these other factors. Additionally, the results underline that citizens’ preferences for the nature of the EU might differ not just because of variation in their European identity. Hooghe’s (2012) research on EU Commission officials finds that left-libertarians prefer an EU with a strong role of the Commission, whereas right leaning officials prefer the member states to play a central role. Citizens’ attitudes might mirror these differences in the sense that some individuals might develop a stronger European identity without it implying a preference for a “United States of Europe.”
PAPER 4: IDENTITY AND ELITE CUES: A RESEARCH DESIGN TO ANALYZE INTERNATIONAL FISCAL SOLIDARITY IN EUROPE

Introduction

Perhaps one of the most far-reaching consequences of the Euro crisis is that resources of affluent EU member states are used to assist other member states in economic distress. This has led to a shift of scholarly attention from the study of support for European integration to the concrete issue of fiscal solidarity among EU citizens. The goal of this project is to make three contributions to this new line of inquiry.\footnote{I presented an earlier version of this project at the Kolleg-Forschergruppe (Research College) “The Transformative Power of Europe” at Freie Universität Berlin on December 9\textsuperscript{th}, 2013. Theresa Kuhn and I developed related ideas in greater detail in proposals for the SOEP-Innovation Sample of the DIW as well as for the EU funding program “Horizon 2020”.}

First, I want to uncover the role of political identities for citizens’ preferences on transnational redistribution in the EU. A large body of research is concerned with the role of a mass European identity (Bruter 2003, 2009, Fligstein 2008, Habermas 2006, Risse 2010). Theoretical accounts posit that a shared European identity is the base for solidarity with citizens’ in neighboring EU member states (Habermas 2006, Jones 2012). However, there is little empirical research that substantiates this claim. What is more, current research does have little evidence on whether political identities have a causal effect on attitudes in the context of European integration at all. Using an experimental research design embedded in a survey – i.e. a survey experiment – I want to disentangle cause and effect in the relationship between citizens’ identity and preferences for redistribution in Europe. To this end, I assign respondents randomly
to different conditions: one condition that primes citizens’ European identity and another condition that primes national identity. This allows me to test whether it makes a difference whether citizens form opinions when European identity rather than a national identity is salient.

Second, I want to contribute to the new literature by analyzing the leverage of elites on citizens’ preferences. Against the background of the considerable costs involved in the creation of the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), elite cues can be critical to garner public support for or shape opposition to redistributive policies in the EU.37 Elite cueing has been studied extensively in the US as well as in Europe and are an important heuristic for citizens’ when evaluating European integration (Ray 2003, Steenbergen, Edwards, and De Vries 2007, Stoeckel 2013). However, what leverage do elites have over citizens’ preferences in the realm of transnational redistribution in Europe? I analyze this issue in Germany, which is not only a large contributor to European rescue mechanisms. Since very recently, Germany also has a new anti-Euro party, which is likely to gain seats in the 2014 European Parliament elections. Thus, Germans no longer only receive pro-European cues. This allows me to study both the effect of elite leverage and party dissent on public opinion on European integration. In order to examine the causal effect of elite cues, respondents are assigned to two different treatment conditions, namely either an elite consensus condition, or an elite dissent condition. I expect that elite dissent decreases support for transnational redistribution.

Third, I want to broaden our understanding of public opinion on transnational redistribution by relating it to citizens’ views on domestic redistribution. In short, this involves testing to what extent and under which conditions citizens’ support for territorial redistribution

---

37 Strictly speaking, the ESM does not redistribute fiscal resources in a similar way as the EU budget. However, the ESM is financed by EU member states and it is critical for the economic well being of struggling Euro zone members. Therefore I see it as a redistribution scheme of the EU.
within countries is a good predictor for their approval of transnational redistribution. Present studies on the topic lack this critical comparison.

Finally, I want to test if and in what way ideological orientations play a role for public opinion on transnational redistribution. Previous research comes to surprisingly inconclusive results. For instance, Kuhn and Stoeckel (2014) find that ideological orientations on the left/right dimension do not explain citizens’ attitudes on European economic governance. Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit (forthcoming) find that citizens who support extreme parties support bailouts less than citizens who support mainstream parties. This would imply that preferences towards transnational redistribution are structured quite differently than preferences towards domestic redistribution where left/right ideology is the decisive dimension. Hence, citizens’ orientation on the libertarian/authoritarian dimension might be more important than left/right ideology.

In what follows, I firstly provide a theoretical background by reviewing the literature on public support for European integration and how it is connected to the new debate on citizens’ preferences for transnational redistribution in the EU. Then, I discuss the role of identities, elite cues, domestic redistribution, and ideology, and how I hypothesize each concept to explain variation in citizens’ preferences. Finally, present the survey and the embedded experiment with which I plan on testing my hypotheses.

**Theorizing Public Opinion on Transnational Redistribution**

I use the term transnational redistribution in order to refer to a variety of policies that involve the use of one EU member state’s tax revenue to the economic benefit of other EU member states via the EU budget (e.g. structural funds), the European Stability Mechanism, or bailouts.
Redistribution of fiscal resources between affluent and less affluent EU member states took place already before the Euro crisis as part of the EU cohesion policy, which seeks to counteract disparities within the EU. Therefore, about a third of the EU budget – whose resources come mainly from the member states – are transferred to economically weak regions. However, to tackle the Euro crisis, an unprecedented amount of money needed to be pooled by Eurozone members, firstly, to fund the EFSF and, secondly, to fund the ESM. Both institutions lend money and do not redistribute it directly. Nonetheless, each participating country still has to contribute actual cash – e.g. in the case of Germany about 22 billion Euro – which raises the question under which conditions Europeans’ approve of this use of their taxes.

Attitudes on redistribution at the European level could be structured in a similar way as attitudes towards European integration. For instance, when citizens use their view on European integration as a heuristic to form preferences on fiscal solidarity between EU member states. The literature on public support for European integration suggests three major sets of explanations that account for variation in citizens’ attitudes towards the EU (for an overview, see Hobolt, 2012). First, utilitarianism plays an important role, i.e. citizens who benefit from European integration – such as managers and professionals – tend to be more supportive of the process than citizens with less skills (Gabel and Palmer 1995, Gabel 1998). Second, political identities matter in the sense that individuals who see themselves both as citizens of their country and the EU (inclusive nationalists) are more supportive of European integration than citizens for whom the two identities are in opposition to each other (exclusive nationalists) (Hooghe and Marks 2005). Third, party cues matter in a distinct way: extreme parties on the left and right are often Euroskeptical, which seems to have an effect on their followers, whereas mainstream parties are usually supporting European integration (Ray 2003, De Vries and Edwards 2009).
A new literature rejects the notion that public support for transnational redistribution in Europe is structured in a similar way as support for European integration. Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit (forthcoming) use data from Germany and find that socioeconomic status and occupation explain little when it comes to support for transnational redistribution. Also, ideological orientations on the left-right dimension matter little. Instead, altruism and cosmopolitanism explain who supports transnational redistribution and who opposed it. Yet, overall the model explains only a small amount of variation. Based on another survey experiment conducted in Germany, Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit (2012) find that the conditions of bailout packages determine whether a majority of respondents supports or opposes it. Public support is at a maximum for a bailout package whose recipient is Ireland, which involves spending cuts but no firing of public employees, which involves only a small German contribution and which comes with an endorsement by the European Central Bank. Based on Eurobarometer data from 2011, Kuhn and Stoeckel (2014) further support the notion that preferences on economic cooperation in the EU are different from mere support for European integration. They find that citizens holding some type of European identity have high hopes for European economic governance – i.e. a strong role of the EU and a close cooperation of EU member states to tackle the crisis. In line with Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit’s (forthcoming) findings, socio economic status or left/right ideology matter little.

This literature has important shortcomings. First, the role of political identities for transnational redistribution is in fact unclear. Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit (forthcoming) include a distant measure for identities – namely citizens’ interest in international affairs. Kuhn and Stoeckel (2014) include citizens’ identities, but their dependent variable is European economic governance rather than support for transnational redistribution. Both studies cannot
disentangle the direction of causality for they rely on cross sectional data: Citizens might not identity with Europe and therefore oppose fiscal transfers between EU member states. Yet, it is also plausible that individuals reject transnational redistribution in Europe and that is why they are less likely to think of themselves as Europeans.

Second, even though elite cueing has been identified as an important process shaping public opinion when it comes to European integration, elite leverage has not been studied in relation to transnational redistribution in Europe. The existing research is heavily based on data from Germany at a time when no publicly visible party openly and directly opposed Germany’s contributions. This changed since the recent national elections in the fall of 2013 when the new anti-Euro party ‘Alternative for Germany’ almost won seats in the Bundestag. Hence, the situation before the European parliament elections (with a lower threshold to win seats) is different, since all mainstream parties support transnational redistribution and only one salient party rejects it. Against this background, I will develop theoretical expectations on how I hypothesize that identity, elite cues, preferences on domestic redistribution and ideology shape citizens’ preferences over transnational redistribution.

Political identities and their mobilization

Political identities are constructed in the long run, but more difficult to change in the short run (Huddy 2001, 2002). However, citizens usually hold multiple identities. Elites can mobilize identities so that one identity becomes more salient than another. In Europe, many citizens identify both as citizens of their national community and as citizens of Europe. The critical question is which identity is most consequential when they form preferences on transnational redistribution in Europe.
Recent evidence shows that even subtle differences in the way citizens see themselves has consequences on how they evaluate policy proposals. Examples are the studies by Transue (2007) and Sniderman, Hagendoorn, and Prior (2004). In order to make the American (national) identity versus a racial subgroup identity salient, Transue (2007) asked one group of respondents “How close do you feel to your ethnic or racial group? and the other group “How close do you feel to other Americans?.” Priming a racial (subgroup) identity rather than American national identity decreased support for a tax increase that would benefit less affluent citizens from a different racial group most. Sniderman and colleagues (2004) conduct an experiment in which they prime the Dutch national identity in one treatment condition and citizens’ identity as ‘individuals’ in another condition. Priming respondents’ national identity rather than their identity as an individual led to a substantial increase in their opposition to immigration.

Few studies examine the extent to which a European identity can be shaped or primed. Notable exceptions are Bruter’s (2009) long-term panel study, as well as the survey experiment conducted by Cram and colleagues (2011). Bruter (2009) sent 1200 participants in six EU countries a bi-weekly newsletter on the EU for two years. Positive news on the EU led to an increase in participants’ civic European identity, while negative news led to a decrease. Surprisingly, the effect sizes are modest at the end of the 24-month period in which respondents received the newsletter, but were massive after an additional time lag of six months.

Cram, Patrikios and Mitchell (2011) conduct an online survey experiment with Irish and British respondents. Respondents were exposed either to functional triggers involving the EU (photo of EU flag at an airport immigration zone) or symbolic primes (EU flag in front of EU parliament). Only functional triggers have an effect on EU support. Respondents with a high attachment to the EU became more pro-European when they saw the functional EU trigger.
Subjects with a weak European identity were less approving of the EU when seeing the same prime.

I build on this work to study the effect of elite mobilization of national identity versus mobilization of a shared European identity. Priming one identity rather than another makes it salient and presumably more consequential for citizens’ preferences. When thinking about transnational redistribution in Europe, a salient subgroup identity would imply that citizens in other EU member states are more likely to be seen as an out-group. Therefore, transnational redistribution in Europe would be a transfer of funds to ‘others’ or an ‘out-group’. When citizens consider transnational redistribution while they think of themselves as EU citizens rather than just as Germans, they should be more likely to perceive it as redistribution within their community, i.e. within their ‘in-group’. In this way, transnational redistribution would be more similar to territorial redistribution schemes that also exist between richer and poorer territories within nation states.

This does not imply European identity is a sufficient ingredient for public approval of transnational redistribution in Europe. Rather, mobilizing citizens’ European identity is likely to be a necessary condition for the approval of transnational redistribution. That is, all else equal, mobilizing national identity causes support for transnational redistribution to be lower than when citizens’ European identity is mobilized.

\( H1: \) Priming citizens’ European identity increases support for transnational redistribution when compared to a mobilization of national identity.
**Elite dissent**

Zaller’s (1992) model on the relationship between elite messages and public opinion is based on three key processes: the reception, acceptance, and sampling of information. The basic notion is that citizens receive political information mainly from elites and this information might either be a one sided stream of messages or a stream with opposing views. Predispositions and attention to politics determine which information citizens attend to, accept, and store in their memory. When thinking about politics or answering survey questions, citizens sample from whatever information is accessible to form their opinions. Hence, it matters whether citizens receive one-sided information on a topic – for instance, because there is no elite dissent– or whether citizens receive different views on an issue, because elites are divided. Predispositions play a role when left leaning citizens reject cues from right leaning sources and vice versa. Citizens are more likely to accept and memorize cues from their party, which, in turn, determines the kinds of considerations that will be available to form an opinion. It follows from Zaller’s model (1992) that public opinion is more likely to be polarized on an issue when different parties send opposing messages on an issue.

Research on public support for European integration finds powerful elite cueing effects, but most studies rely on cross sectional data. Ray (2003) as well as Steenbergen, Edwards, and De Vries (2007) show how citizens follow their trusted party on European integration. Supporters of mainstream parties tend to be more approving of European integration than supporters of extreme left- or right wing parties. Additionally, the extent to which national elites are united or divided on EU politics leaves traces on public opinion as well. Elite conflict over
European integration has been found to decrease support for European integration and to increase ambivalence among the public (Steenbergen and De Vries 2012, Stoeckel 2013). To date, only Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit (forthcoming) show an association between elite positions and public opinion on transnational redistribution in Germany. They find that supporters of mainstream parties – i.e. the parties that approved past bailout packages – view transnational redistribution more favorably than supporters of an extreme left or right wing party.

Recent survey experiments demonstrate how elite cues affect citizens’ preferences also in most direct ways. For instance, Bullock (2011) finds that policy information affects citizens’ opinions, but only in the absence of party labels. When a party cue was given, Democrats and Republicans were driven towards the position of their party. In contrast, Nicholson (2012) finds that support for a policy was not higher among Democrats when they saw Obama would support it. However, when Democrats learn that then presidential candidate McCain supports the same policy, they support it much less than when not seeing the Republican cue.

Recent experimental work in the context of Europe’s multiparty systems shows similar cueing effects. For instance, Aaroe (2012) conducts laboratory experiments in Denmark’s multiparty system. Using different source cues – e.g. an extreme right wing party leader or the prime minister – and various policy issues Aaroe finds ‘contrast effects.’ That is, respondents who dislike the party or the party leader are less likely to take his position when the source cue is present. Brader, Tucker, and Duell (2013) use a survey experiment to examine whether parties can pull their supports in Great Britain, Hungary, and Poland on various issues. They find citizens to generally follow their party’s position. The party cue effect is stronger the older a party is, when the party is an opposition party, and when the party has a more ideologically coherent image. Hobolt’s (2009) experiment involves a random assignment of respondents to a
condition in which they are asked about whether they would like Britain to join the Euro, either while seeing that the British (Labour) government supports it (treatment condition) or while not seeing any elite cue (control condition). Respondents in the treatment condition were significantly more likely to approve joining the Euro than respondents in the control condition, who did not receive this cue. Additionally, the elite cue decreases the share of undecided respondents.

Based on this discussion, I expect elite cues to shape public opinion. In particular, I assume that a salient elite consensus increases public support for transnational redistribution relative to a situation with no cues (control condition). When elite dissent is salient, I expect voters’ prior attachments to condition the extent to which party cues are effective. Strong party-identifiers follow the position of their party regardless of whether there is a salient elite dissent or not. This view is supported by research on biased information processing (Taber 2003). Accordingly, citizens do not attend all information equally, put an emphasis on information from a trusted source, and disregard all other information. Hence, in a situation with elite dissent, I expect citizens with a strong attachment to any one of the parties in the German Bundestag to exhibit high support for transnational redistribution when compared to a situation with no cues (control condition). I do not expect elite cues to be effective for citizens without strong party attachments when elite dissent is salient – that is, I do not expect their support for transnational redistribution to be different from the control condition. In contrast, supporters of the “Alternative für Deutschland” (AfD), which opposes transnational redistribution, should exhibit particularly low support for transnational redistribution in the presence of a cue from their party.

H 2a: Salient elite consensus increases support for transnational redistribution.
H 2b: In a situation with salient elite dissent, only strong party identifiers follow the cues of their party. Hence, (strong) supporters of parties with seats in the German Bundestag exhibit high support for transnational redistribution when receiving a party cue. Supporters of the AfD exhibit particularly low support for transnational redistribution.

Left/Right and Gal/Tan Ideology

When it comes to citizens’ ideological orientations, one must note that both the (economic) left/right dimension and the “new politics” dimension or gal/tan dimension could structure attitudes on transnational redistribution. If public opinion towards transnational redistribution is more similar to preferences on domestic redistribution, one can expect left/right orientations to have some bearing. However, if an individuals’ support for European integration is more relevant, attitudes on transnational redistribution are likely to be structured by the gal/tan dimension.

Public opinion on redistribution between social classes is in fact a particularly well researched topic. A broad literature discusses two main mechanisms that complement each: self-interest and ideological beliefs. Individuals in lower social classes, with less income, or less education consistently support higher levels of redistribution than their peers with more income or education (Svallfors 1997, Corneo and Grüner 2002, Blekesaune and Quadagno 2003, Finseraas 2008). In short, citizens who are likely to be recipients of redistribution are more likely to support it than citizens who are likely contributors. It is difficult to evaluate what this
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38 Analyses using data from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) rely on respondents’ approval of the following statement „It is the responsibility of the government to reduce the differences in income between people with high incomes and those with low incomes” (ISSP Research Group 2008).
implies for transnational redistribution in Europe and in the context of a ‘net-contributor’ country in the EU. Following the self-interest logic, all citizens in a net-contributor country would oppose transnational transfers, because it might run against their interests in a narrow sense. Hence, there should be little variation between preferences of rich and poor individuals.

A second strand of literature posits that ideological considerations have an effect on citizens’ preferences for redistribution over and above self-interest. However, the direction of causality here is not entirely clear. Citizens might be left leaning because of their stance on redistribution (Finseraas 2008). In any case, there is ample evidence for a relationship between beliefs about the reasons for inequality, egalitarian values, reciprocity considerations on one side and attitudes towards redistribution on the other side (Corneo and Grüner 2002, Bénabou and Tirole 2005, Blekesaune and Quadagno 2003, Kangas 1997, Alesina and Angeletos 2005, Fong 2001). In sum, left leaning citizens are more supportive of redistribution even when controlling for education, occupation, and income. Thus, if values and beliefs imply that left leaning citizens find redistribution between rich and poor more important than right leaning respondents irrespective of self-interests, left/right orientations should also predict support for transnational redistribution in Europe. Moreover, a new party that opposes transnational redistribution in Europe should be more successful among right leaning respondents. Therefore, elite cues against transnational redistribution in Europe should have a stronger effect on right leaning citizens than on left leaning citizens.

However, ideological orientations on the left-right dimension say little about citizens’ views on European integration. In fact, supporters of social democratic parties and supporters of conservative parties often have broadly similar attitudes towards the EU. Yet, it is supporters of extreme parties on the left and right who disapprove of European integration. In short, public for
European integration maps onto a second ideological divide: that is, a dimension with individuals holding an authoritarian view on one end and citizens with a libertarian orientation on the other end (Hooghe and Marks 2009, Kriesi et al. 2012). Citizens with an authoritarian orientation care passionately about issues such as immigration or a homogenous culture. For these individuals, European integration poses a threat and is therefore opposed by them, whereas it is much more easily reconcilable with a libertarian orientation. These differences might be important also for attitudes on transnational redistribution. Citizens could see redistribution on the European scale as yet another step of European integration, which would spark most strongly the opposition of individuals with an authoritarian ideological orientation.

**H 3:** Citizens holding a left leaning ideological orientation are more supportive of transnational redistribution than right leaning citizens; an anti-Euro party cue decreases support for transnational redistribution more among right leaning respondents than among left leaning respondents.

**H 4:** Citizens holding a libertarian orientation rather than an authoritarian are more supportive of transnational redistribution.

*Attitudes towards domestic redistribution*

Transnational redistribution differs from redistribution between rich and poor citizens, for it is about territory rather than class. It refers to transfers between rich and poor regions or countries. Therefore, citizens’ attitudes towards inter-regional redistribution within a country might be a particularly good predictor for their views on transnational redistribution. European countries
differ in the legal provisions for and extent to which they redistribute between rich and poor regions. For instance, Germany has both a fiscal equalization mechanism between its states, as well as a so-called solidarity tax on incomes that channels funds to regions that once were in Eastern Germany. I argue that citizens who approve of territorial domestic redistribution are also more likely to approve of transnational redistribution. First, these citizens have an awareness for territorial inequality. They seem to regard markedly different living conditions within different parts of a single community as something that needs to be counteracted. Second, these citizens approve of a transfer of tax resources between richer regions to poorer regions as an appropriate means to confront territorial inequalities. Thus, holding wealth of a region constant, citizens who support domestic redistribution should be more supportive of transnational redistribution. I expect this relationship to be stronger among individuals who think of themselves as Europeans rather than exclusively as Germans, because they are more likely to think of Europe as a community within which inequalities need to be addresses in a similar fashion as in domestic communities.

$H5$: Citizens who support interregional redistribution domestically are more supportive of transnational redistribution. This relationship is stronger among citizens who hold a more pronounced European identity.

**Methodology**

The centerpiece of this project is an original online survey of a probability sample of about 1000 German citizens. I focus on Germany because it is the largest contributor to the different redistributive schemes of the EU (e.g. Structural Funds and the ESM). Besides, all parties that have seats in the German parliament support the Euro and a willing to support future
fiscal transfers in Europe, albeit under different conditions. Additionally, there is a new party – ‘Alternative for Germany’ – that runs a campaign against the Euro and that opposes transnational redistribution in Europe. This party is likely to win seats in the European Parliament elections in May 2014 and hence Germany allows me to study the effects of elite cueing in the context of a campaign that is actually unfolding.

Although online surveys are less representative of the population than telephone surveys, a growing number of studies in political science relies on this cost efficient data source (Cram, Patrikios, and Mitchell 2011, Brader, Tucker, and Duell 2013, Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit forthcoming). Bechtel and colleagues show that socio economic biases are limited in nature and can be dealt with by employing survey weights (Bechtel, Hainmueller, and Margalit forthcoming). Following the literature on elite and identity cueing effects, I want to employ a survey experiment to test hypotheses two and three (on survey experiments, see Barabas and Jerit 2010). Survey experiments combine the advantages of an experiment, such as the random assignment of treatment and control conditions, with the benefits of a large-N sample of the population. I plan on randomly assigning respondents to one of two identity priming conditions and to one of two elite cueing condition. Hence, there are four different treatment conditions as well as a pure control condition.

(1) Identity Priming:

In the identity priming condition respondents are randomly assigned to one of two treatment conditions: a European identity condition or a national identity condition. The identity priming consist of both a ‘question-as-treatment’ design as well as visual cues. Respondents are asked three questions about their European identity. In the background of the screen are EU
symbols such as the EU flag and a ballot box with the ‘EU stars’ on it. In the national identity condition respondents see questions about the extent to which they identify as Germans. Additionally, respondents see soccer fans dressed in black-red-yellow, German flags, and the German Bundestag.

(2) Elite Cueing:

There are two different treatment conditions with which I test the effect of elite cues (hypothesis 2). The first treatment makes elite consent salient. After asking the respondent which party she supported in the last national elections, the next site displays a statement which says that this party along with all other parties in the Bundestag support the Euro as well as future transnational redistribution. The second treatment makes elite dissent salient. The respondent first reads the same statement about her “trusted party’s” support for the Euro and transnational redistribution. What follows is another statement about a new party. It reminds the respondent that there is a party campaigning for seats in the European parliament elections, which is against the Euro and which opposes future fiscal transfers between Germany and other countries in the EU.

Table 12 presents the five conditions of the survey experiment. Subjects are randomly assigned to one of these conditions before answering the same items on transnational redistribution in the EU. Condition one includes the priming of national identity and further contains an elite consensus frame, i.e. subjects get questions on the extent to which they identify with their country and see information on the fact that all parties in the German parliament
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39 All parties currently in the Bundestag support the Euro and future transnational redistribution, so this site only be inapplicable for those respondents who did not vote or who voted for a party that did not make it into the Bundestag. These respondents only see the statement ‘All parties currently in the German Bundestag support the Euro and future transnational redistribution in Europe’.
support EU wide redistribution. In condition two respondents’ European identity is primed by using respective question items, before they see information about the party consensus on EU wide redistribution in the German parliament. Condition three primes respondents’ national identity before exposing them to information about party dissent: respondents learn that all parties in the German parliament support transnational redistribution in Europe, while a new party – the “AfD” – opposes it. Condition four primes respondents’ European identity before exposing them to the party dissent between the parties in parliament and the new party “AfD”. Condition five is a control condition without any identity priming or elite cueing.

Table 12: Overview of the five conditions of the survey experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parties agree</th>
<th>Parties disagree</th>
<th>No party cue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Identity</strong></td>
<td>Condition 1: National identity + Elite consensus</td>
<td>Condition 3: National identity + Elite dissent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Identity</strong></td>
<td>Condition 2: European identity + Elite consensus</td>
<td>Condition 4: European identity + Elite dissent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No identity priming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition 5: Pure Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement**

**Dependent variable**

I use three different questions in order to tap support for transnational redistribution in Europe. The first item relates to redistribution in a crisis situation (taken from Special Eurobarometer 74.1). It reads as follows: “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In times of crisis, it is desirable for Germany to give financial help to
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40 I am very grateful to Theresa Kuhn and the discussions we had about these measures in Berlin in 2013. She pointed out that a question measuring a respondent’s willingness to make a personal sacrifice to help an EU member state in economic difficulties was already used in a Eurobarometer from 1981. We developed a proposal for the German ‘SOEP-Innovation Sample’ using the measures for transnational redistribution that are presented here.
another EU Member State facing severe economic and financial difficulties.” The second question is about citizens’ attitudes towards transnational redistribution on the European level also outside of crisis situations. EU wide redistribution is portrayed as something that is akin to redistribution between rich and poor regions within a country. The question is “Germany’s contributions to the EU budget are also used to provide financial assistance to economically weak countries. Do you agree with this policy?” Both of the aforementioned questions refer to redistribution in an abstract way, because they do not make personal costs salient. The third item directly asks respondents about their willingness to contribute to transnational redistribution personally. It is adapted from a question that was used in Eurobarometer 15 in 1981: “Are you, personally, prepared or not to make some personal sacrifice, for example, paying a little more taxes to help another country in the European Union experiencing economic difficulties?” (Source: adapted from Eurobarometer 15, Spring 1981).

Independent variables

In order to measure identities, I use questions for European and national identity based on items suggested by Bruter (2003). Additionally, I ask the standard Eurobarometer question that allows measuring if a respondent holds an exclusive and inclusive national identity (Hooghe and Marks 2005). The European identity measurement includes the following three items from Bruter (2003):

(1) “On a scale of one to seven, one meaning that you do not identify with Europe at all, and seven meaning that you identify very strongly with Europe, would you say that you...?”

(2) “Would you say that you feel closer to fellow Europeans than, say, to Chinese, Australian, or American people?”
(3) “In the near future, do you see yourself ... ? As a) only German, b) German and European, c) European and German, d) European only”

The national identity measurement tries to be as similar as possible to the aforementioned questions, using the following wordings that are adapted from Bruter (2003):

(1) “On a scale of one to seven, one meaning that you do not identify with Germany at all, and seven meaning that you identify very strongly with Germany, would you say that you...?”

(2) “Would you say that you feel closer to fellow Germans than, say, to British, Spanish, or Italian people?”

In order to measure support for territorial redistribution within German, I use an item from the German Politbarometer survey 2011 West (Jung, Schroth, and Wolf 2013). It reads: “Because of the German fiscal equalization mechanism, economically poorer regions receive financial resources from richer region. Do you agree with this policy?”

Left/right ideology is measured with a standard question text commonly used (e.g. Eurobarometer 63.4) and I employ a scale running from 0 to 10: “In politics, people sometimes talk about left and right. On a left-right scale where [0] means left and [10] means right, where would you place yourself?”. Measuring gal/tan ideology is more complicated, for it refers to a dimension about party competition that is not easily salient to citizens. Therefore, I want to measure citizens location on a libertarian-authoritarian scale inspired by Evans, Heath, and Lalljee (1996) and adjusted to the German context: “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: a) Young people today don’t have enough respect for traditional German values. And b) Homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children.”
APPENDIX 1: Supplementary Statistics for Paper 1

Table 13: Question wording (Eurobarometer 63.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Construction and Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards the EU</td>
<td>Based on answers to the following question: What does the European Union mean to you personally? [Answer options read out to respondent; rotation from top to bottom/bottom to top, 7 positive items: peace, economic prosperity, democracy, social protection, freedom to travel, cultural diversity, stronger say in the world. 6 negative items: unemployment, bureaucracy, waste of money, loss of cultural identity, more crime, not enough control at external frontiers] (Source: EB 63.4 QA 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indifferent = EU has no meaning to respondent at all positive = EU has only positive meanings to respondent negative = EU has only positive meanings to respondent Ambivalent = EU has positive and negative meanings to respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country level variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite division</td>
<td>For each country, I calculate the standard deviation of the overall orientations of parties towards European integration. Then, I rescaled this variable to have a range from zero to one. (Source: Chapel Hill party expert survey 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership length</td>
<td>EU membership length in decades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU knowledge</td>
<td>For each of the following statements about the European Union could you please tell me whether you think it is true or false? (Source: EB 63.4 QA24) _1: The European Union currently consists of fifteen member states _2: The members of the European Parliament are directly elected by the citizens of the European Union _3: The European Union has its own anthem _4: The last European elections took place in June 2002 0= if no question was answered correctly, 5= if all questions were answered correctly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Education                    | How old were you when you stopped full-time education? (Source: EB 63.4 D8) }
Recoded: 1= 14 years, 9 = 22 years and older, 10= still studying

| News media consumption | Additive index based on the following three items: About how often do you...? [every day, several times a week, once or twice a week, less often, never, DK] (Source: EB 63.4 QA 17) | 1: Watch television news programs  
2: Read the news in daily newspapers  
3: Listen to radio news programs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Europe</td>
<td>People may feel different degrees of attachment to their town or village, to their region, to their country or to Europe. Please tell me how attached you feel to Europe. (Source: EB 63.4 QA 35)</td>
<td>Very attached, fairly attached, not very attached, not at all attached, DK (excluded)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Trust in EU institutions | Additive index based on the following three items: And, for each of them, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust it? [tend to trust=2, tend not to trust=0, DK=1] (Source: EB 63.4 QA23) | 1: The European Parliament  
2: The European Commission  
3: The Council of the European Union  
4: The Court of Justice of the European Communities |
| Frequency discuss politics | When you get together with friends, would you say you convince friends often, from time to time, rarely or never? (Source: EB 63.4 QA1) |
| Possessions | Which of the following goods do you have? (TV; DVD player; CD player; Computer; Internet access; a car; an apartment/house which you have finished paying for; an apartment/house which you are paying for; DK) (Source: EB 63.4 D46) |
| National econ. prospects | What are your expectations for the next twelve months: will the next twelve months be better, worse or the same, when it comes to the economic situation in (COUNTRY) ? [better=2, worse=0, the same=1] (Source: EB 63.4 QA4_2) |
| Personal prospects | What are your expectations for the next twelve months: will the next twelve months be better, worse or the same, when it comes to the financial situation of your household? [better=2, worse=0, the same=1] (Source: EB 63.4 QA4_1) |
| Age | Age in years (Source: EB 63.4 D41) |
| Gender | Male = 0, Female = 1 (Source: EB 63.4 D10) |
| Occupation | Did you do any paid work in the past? What was your last occupation? (Self employed, managers, other white collar, house person, manual worker, unemployed, retired, students) (Source: EB 63.4 D15) |
| Political Orientation | In political matters people talk of "the left" and "the right". How would you place your views on this scale? 1=left, 10=right (Source EB 63.4 D1) |
Table 14: Summary statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards the EU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical variable, see Table 2 for distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country level variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite division</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net fiscal transfer</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU membership length</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level variables:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News media consumption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>24708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Europe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>24297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in EU institutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency discuss politics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>24665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National econ. prospects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>23373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal prospects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>24192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47.27</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>24791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: self employed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: managers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: other white coll.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: manual worker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: house person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: unemployed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation: students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Orientation (very left)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Orientation (left)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Orientation (middle)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Orientation (right)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Orientation (very right)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol. Orientation (No Answer)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>24801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table shows the range and summary statistics of the variables before they were hierarchically centered and standardized.
Table 15: Meanings of the EU for respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of positive meanings of EU to respondents</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1410)</td>
<td>(1253)</td>
<td>(1108)</td>
<td>(748)</td>
<td>(314)</td>
<td>(146)</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2588)</td>
<td>(1460)</td>
<td>(980)</td>
<td>(469)</td>
<td>(204)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>(5815)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2682)</td>
<td>(1491)</td>
<td>(709)</td>
<td>(330)</td>
<td>(157)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(5465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2230)</td>
<td>(879)</td>
<td>(433)</td>
<td>(221)</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>(66)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(3956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1055)</td>
<td>(504)</td>
<td>(291)</td>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(2120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(574)</td>
<td>(271)</td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>(129)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(1284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(246)</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(602)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(202)</td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10987)</td>
<td>(6098)</td>
<td>(3880)</td>
<td>(2136)</td>
<td>(996)</td>
<td>(486)</td>
<td>(218)</td>
<td>(24801)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Distribution of respondents for meaning items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning item</th>
<th>Mentioned by (total N= 24801)</th>
<th>in percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive meanings:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to travel, study and work anywhere in the European Union</td>
<td>13,275</td>
<td>53.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>8789</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger say in the world</td>
<td>6779</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural diversity</td>
<td>6540</td>
<td>26.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Prosperity</td>
<td>5983</td>
<td>24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>5731</td>
<td>23.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social protection</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>14.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative meanings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>5772</td>
<td>23.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money</td>
<td>4975</td>
<td>20.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>4899</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>4590</td>
<td>18.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough control at external frontiers</td>
<td>4537</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of our cultural identity</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents were free to choose as many meanings as they wanted. Presentation: most often mentioned meaning to least often mentioned one. Order was rotated for respondents during the telephone surveys.

Table 17: Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU knowledge</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News media consumption</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Europe</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in EU institutions</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency discuss politics</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessions</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National econ. prospects</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal prospects</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Results of multinomial model with alternative coding

Respondents are coded as ambivalent only when they mention at least 2 positive and negative evaluations on the EU. Respondents who mention nothing or only one evaluation from each side are considered indifferent in this robustness check. All other respondents are coded as either positive about the EU or negative about the EU. The Table shows the effect of five independent variables on predicted probabilities as in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p(indifferent)</th>
<th>p(ambivalent)</th>
<th>p(positive)</th>
<th>p(negative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1sd</td>
<td>+1sd</td>
<td>( \Delta ) (SE)</td>
<td>-1sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cog-( \text{-})nitive Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.042* (.005)</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News media consumption</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>-0.017* (.005)</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite division</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.043* (.006)</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Cues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Trust</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.052* (.005)</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU attachment</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.020* (.005)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < 0.05 \); -1sd and +1sd: figures refer to predicted probabilities for a respondent to be in the respective categories when independent variable of interest is set to 1 standard deviation below its mean or 1 standard deviation above its mean and when all other variables are held at their means or reference categories; \( \Delta \) and (SE): change in percentage points and standard error on this change in parentheses; \( \Delta \% \): change in the predicted probabilities in percent (these figures are also shown in the rope ladder plots).
## APPENDIX 2: Supplementary Statistics for Paper 2

Table 19: Countries visited by participants of the panel study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1 term abroad</th>
<th>2 terms abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>566</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: Study abroad and control group descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study abroad group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>66.5 %</td>
<td>61.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>33.5 %</td>
<td>38.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multicultural background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents nationality:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same:</td>
<td>93 %</td>
<td>98.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different:</td>
<td>7.0 %</td>
<td>2.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.1 %</td>
<td>44.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.3 %</td>
<td>39.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt;</td>
<td>27.6 %</td>
<td>15.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of travelling abroad in past 12 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0.6 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>5.0 %</td>
<td>18.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 times</td>
<td>18.0 %</td>
<td>30.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 times</td>
<td>25.7 %</td>
<td>21.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 times or more</td>
<td>50.8 %</td>
<td>26.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No:</td>
<td>54.3 %</td>
<td>59.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>45.7 %</td>
<td>40.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL-TAN ideology</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right ideology</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity index (low to high)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 724, 148

Note: Data is based only on respondents that are included in the subsequent analyses.
Table 21: Analysis of differences between study abroad and control group (logistic regression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.12 **</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multicultural background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents nationality (1=different)</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages Spoken</td>
<td>-0.36 **</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency travelling abroad</td>
<td>-0.59 ***</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived abroad</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAL-TAN ideology</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right ideology</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity index</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| constant                             | -1.59       | 1.10           |

**N** 825  Pseudo-R2 0.11

Note: 1= control group, 0=study abroad group;  * p < 0.05,  ** p < 0.01,  *** p < 0.001
### Table 22: Analysis of drop-outs in study abroad group (logistic regression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multicultural background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents nationality (1=different)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages Spoken</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency travelling abroad</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived abroad</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL-TAN ideology</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right ideology</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity index</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-2.62 **</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>1126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-R2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1= dropped out, 0=stayed in panel; *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

### Table 23: Analysis of drop-outs in control group (logistic regression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multicultural background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents nationality (1=different)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages Spoken</td>
<td>-0.40 **</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency travelling abroad</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived abroad (1=yes)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL-TAN ideology</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right ideology</td>
<td>0.33 **</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity index</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-R2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1= dropped out, 0=stayed in panel; *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001
Table 24: Repeated measures mixed model (1 term abroad group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group effect</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time effect</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time by Group</td>
<td>0.23 **</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>3.62 ***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Random effects parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var (constant)</td>
<td>0.62 ***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var (residual)</td>
<td>0.28 ***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N (observations)   | 1410        |
| N (groups)         | 705         |
| Log-likelihood     | -1706.1527  |

Multilevel model with time points nested within individuals; DV= European identity index; ‘time effect’ refers to European identity change between wave 1 and wave 2, ‘group effect’ compares study abroad and control group, ‘time by group’ tests the statistical difference of the change in the two groups over time.

Table 25: Post hoc estimation following repeated measures mixed model (1 term abroad group)

test for significance of change between wave 1 and 2 by group based on mixed model shown above (‘delta method’; 1 term abroad students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 vs. 1</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Study abroad group  |             |                |
| Wave 2 vs. 1        | 0.14 ***    | 0.03           |
Table 26: Repeated measures mixed model (2 term abroad students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group effect</td>
<td>0.29 *</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time effect</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time by Group</td>
<td>0.19 *</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>3.59 ***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random effects parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var (constant)</td>
<td>0.52 ***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Var (residual)</td>
<td>0.28 ***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (observations) 534
N (groups) 267
Log-likelihood -627.80519

Multilevel model with time points nested within individuals; DV= European identity index; ‘time effect’ refers to European identity change between wave 1 and wave 3, ‘group effect’ compares study abroad and control group, ‘time by group’ tests the statistical difference of the change in the two groups over time.

Table 27: Post hoc estimation following repeated measure mixed model (2 term abroad group)

test for significance of change between wave 1 and 3 by group based on mixed model shown above (“delta method”; 2 term abroad students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 vs. 1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 vs. 1</td>
<td>0.25 ***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28: Question wording I (panel data set)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Question wording</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU citizenship</td>
<td>How frequently do you think of yourself as an EU citizen?</td>
<td>0 (not at all) to 6 (very often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU attachment</td>
<td>People may feel different levels of attachment towards different geographical areas. How attached do you feel to Europe?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>How close do you feel to other Europeans?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Are you proud of being European?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonalities</td>
<td>To what extent do you think you have something in common with other Europeans?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU identity index</td>
<td>Additive index based on the five items above Cronach’s alpha is 0.79 at wave 1, 0.81 at wave 2, and 0.79 at wave 3</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact with internationals (socializing)</td>
<td>How frequently do you interact with international students in general?</td>
<td>0 (not at all) to 6 (very often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with internationals (personal)</td>
<td>How often do you discuss personal problems with international students?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with internationals (academic)</td>
<td>How often do you discuss academic affairs with international students?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with hosts (socializing)</td>
<td>This part is about your interaction with students who are at home in the country where you are spending your study abroad period. Students from other countries or other Erasmus students should not play a role here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How frequently do you interact with students who are at home in your host country in general?</td>
<td>0 (not at all) to 6 (very often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with hosts (personal)</td>
<td>How often do you talk about personal problems with students who are at home in your host country?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with hosts (academic)</td>
<td>How often do you talk about academic affairs with students who are at home in you host country?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction w/ study abroad</td>
<td>All things considered, how satisfied are you with your study abroad?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of adaption</td>
<td>Did you find it difficult to get used to your new environment?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home sickness</td>
<td>Did you feel home sick during your time abroad?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lived abroad</td>
<td>Did you ever live abroad before your study abroad?</td>
<td>0=no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1=2-6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often did you travel to another country within the past 12 months?

- 0 = not
- 1 = 1-2 times
- 2 = 3-4 times
- 3 = 5-6 times
- 4 = 7 or more

How many other languages do you speak besides your mother tongue, i.e. in how many other languages can you take part in a conversation?

[Number]

Do your parents have the same nationality?

- 0 = same
- 1 = different

On a scale from 0 to 10, where would you see yourself? 0 means progressive or liberal views and 10 conservative views.

In politics, people sometimes talk about left and right. On a left-right scale where 0 means left and 10 means right, where would you place yourself?

To what extent do you consider the following considerations part of your motivation to study abroad. See all answer categories in Table 29. You can select up to three reasons.

Note: The survey was administered in German; tenses were adjusted to situation/location of respondent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mentioned by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional advancement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain an advantage on the job market</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn a specific skill</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire a specific certificate abroad</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cosmopolitan reasons</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a better understanding of another country</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To travel</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see my own country from a different perspective</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ambiguous/other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve my foreign language competence</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find out what I want to do with my life</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a compulsory part of my curriculum</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open field remark</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because a friend also participates in a study abroad</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Participants could select up to three reasons simultaneously.
Table 30: Robustness check: social interactions and European identity (while abroad)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ international students</td>
<td>0.11**</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ internationals*pre-EU ID</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ host country students</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact w/ hosts*pre-EU ID</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lived abroad</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td>(0.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequency of travelling</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language competence</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents nationality</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cosmopolitan</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European identity before going abroad (Y_{t-1})</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.76***</td>
<td>0.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R^2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001; Standard errors in parentheses
Figure 11: Marginal effect of contact with international students (alternative operationalization)

Figure 12: Marginal effect of contact with students from host country (alternative operationalization)
Table 31: Question wording II (panel data set)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>European identity index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU citizenship</td>
<td>Do you ever think yourself as citizen of Europe?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU attachment</td>
<td>People may feel different levels of attachment towards different geographical areas. How attached do you feel to Europe?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>How close do you feel to Europeans?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Are you proud of being European?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonalities</td>
<td>How many things do you feel you have in common with other Europeans?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign EU citizens: jobs</td>
<td>When jobs are scarce, German companies should prioritize German workers over workers from other EU countries who want to work in Germany. (Agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly) RECODED: higher values mean higher approval of EU migrants</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign EU citizens: elections</td>
<td>Citizens of other EU member states who live in Germany should be allowed to participate in local elections in Germany</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power EU Com.</td>
<td>The European Commission ought to become the true government of the European Union (Agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power EP</td>
<td>The powers of the European Parliament ought to be strengthened.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power member states</td>
<td>The member states out to remain the central actors of the European Union. (Agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly) → recoded so that higher values indicate a preference for the EU to be more powerful</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the EU</td>
<td>Are you generally interested in EU affairs?</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP election voting</td>
<td>A lot of people do not participate in European Parliament elections. Other people consider a civic duty to participate in these elections. Do you consider it disregarding civic duties if one does not participate in European Parliament elections? (yes/rather yes/rather no/no)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: Supplementary Materials for Paper 4

Figure 13: European identity priming

European Parliament Election Survey

- On a scale of one to seven, one meaning that you do not identify with Europe at all, and seven meaning that you identify very strongly with Europe, would you say that you...? [1-7]

- Would you say that you feel closer to fellow Europeans than, say, to Chinese, Australian, or American people? (Please, choose ONE ONLY) [Yes, strongly / Yes, to some extent / I don’t know / No, not really / No, not at all]

- In the near future, do you see yourself...? As a) only German, b) German and European, c) European and German, d) European only

Figure 14: National identity priming

German Attitude Survey 2014

- On a scale of one to seven, one meaning that you do not identify with Germany at all, and seven meaning that you identify very strongly with Germany, would you say that you...? [1-7]

- Would you say that you feel closer to fellow Germans than, say, to British, Spanish, or Italian people? (Please, choose ONE ONLY) [Yes, strongly / Yes, to some extent / I don’t know / No, not really / No, not at all]

- In the near future, do you see yourself...? As a) only German, b) German and European, c) European and German, d) European only
Despite difference with regard to the way the EU needs to be reformed, the << preferred party >>, along with all other parties in the German Bundestag supports the following two positions:

- Germany should keep the Euro as a currency
- Under certain conditions Germany should use additional funds to assist economically vulnerable Euro zone members.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In times of crisis, it is desirable for Germany to give financial help to another EU Member State facing severe economic and financial difficulties.

- Totally agree, agree, disagree, totally disagree, and don’t know

Figure 15: Elite cueing (consensus condition)

Despite difference with regard to the way the EU needs to be reformed, the << preferred party >>, along with all other parties in the German Bundestag supports the following two positions:

- Germany should keep the Euro as a currency
- Under certain conditions Germany should use additional funds to assist economically vulnerable Euro zone members.

During this election campaign a new party – the Alternative für Deutschland (‘AfD’) – campaigns for seats in the European Parliament. This party’s positions diverge from the parties mentioned above. In particular, its manifesto mentions the following goals:

- Germany should get rid off the Euro as a currency
- Germany should not get involved in any additional fiscal transfers within the EU.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In times of crisis, it is desirable for Germany to give financial help to another EU Member State facing severe economic and financial difficulties.

- Totally agree, agree, disagree, totally disagree, and don’t know

Figure 16: Elite cueing (dissent condition)
REFERENCES


