Transnational status and cosmopolitanism: are dual citizens and foreign residents cosmopolitan vanguards?

ANDREA SCHLENKER

University of Lucerne, Frohburgstr. 3,
6002 Lucerne, Switzerland
andrea.schlenker@unilu.ch

Abstract *Empirically growing transnationalism and normatively demanded cosmopolitanism may be closely connected when considered as different elements of new forms of citizenship beyond the single nation-state. Do individuals with either full (dual citizenship) or partial (foreign resident) transnational status exhibit more cosmopolitanism than mono citizens? This article decodes the multidimensional character of cosmopolitanism using major democratic theories – liberalism, republicanism, and communitarianism. Multivariate regression analyses of data from a survey among mono citizens, dual citizens and foreign residents in Switzerland reveal that a transnational status is associated with cosmopolitanism in a differentiated way. Dual citizens and especially foreign residents are more likely than mono citizens to exhibit liberal cosmopolitanism; but only dual citizens having full political rights and opportunities in two countries are more likely to exhibit republican cosmopolitanism and only foreign residents excluded from the political community of residence are more likely to exhibit communitarian cosmopolitanism. Each of them can thus be considered as vanguards in specific ways. Our study furthermore demonstrates the added value of disaggregating both cosmopolitanism and transnationalism.*

Keywords COMMUNITARIANISM, COSMOPOLITANISM, DUAL CITIZENSHIP, FOREIGN RESIDENTS, LIBERALISM, REPUBLICANISM, TRANSNATIONALISM

Fuelled by high levels of international migration, a growing number of people worldwide have formal ties across national borders and a legal status that is different from that of the majority population. More and more countries are accepting dual citizenship (Brøndsted Sejersen 2008) and increasing numbers of individuals are using the opportunity to formalize their multiple belonging (Bloemraad 2004). There are also a growing number of long-term residents without citizenship but with far-reaching civil and social rights (Soysal 1994). What dual citizenship and so-called denizenship have in common is their transnational character (Bauböck 1994). These two forms of

transnational status are normatively contested since they add to the growing incongruence between the citizenry of a nation-state and its inhabitants. In addition, many fear that, in the long term, they will have a negative impact on integration into the country of residence or produce divided loyalties (Renshon 2005).

However, beyond the national realm, dual citizens or foreign residents can also be regarded as vanguards of cosmopolitan citizenship (Blatter 2011; Schlenker and Blatter 2014). Transnational legal status may reduce the significance of national boundaries and foster the emergence of individual dispositions necessary for new, cosmopolitan forms of citizenship. The ancient idea of cosmopolitanism was recently revived as a normative goal of particular relevance in these times of growing transnational interdependencies and global problems (Beck 2000; Held 2003; Nussbaum 1996). However, its empirical assessment is not yet well established (for a recent overview see Delanty 2012). Assuming a potential pattern of 'globalization from below' (Portes 2000), we analyse the question of whether a formal transnational status is associated with higher levels of cosmopolitanism. Do individuals with either full (dual citizenship) or partial (foreign resident) transnational status exhibit more cosmopolitanism than mono citizens? Repeatedly criticized as an elite phenomenon (Calhoun 2002), a focus on migrants and transnational communities may enrich our understanding of rooted cosmopolitanism (Appiah 1998). In contrast to Beck (2000), we do not consider transnationalism and herein a transnational status *per se* to be an indicator of cosmopolitanization (Kuhn 2011; Mau et al. 2008). A transnational legal status confers a special combination of membership, rights and opportunities in two countries. This may make transnational citizens more likely to exhibit cosmopolitanism than mono citizens, but this is not necessarily the case.

To analyse this hypothesis, we have to clarify what we mean by cosmopolitanism, due to the imprecise nature of the term. Analysing cosmopolitanism on the individual level involves multiple dimensions (Pichler 2009, 2012; Skrbis and Woodward 2007; Vertovec 2009). Since we want to assess the relationship between transnational status and new forms of citizenship and democracy beyond the nation-state, we will link the empirical analysis to normative democratic theories. We will develop and analyse three dimensions of cosmopolitan citizenship at the individual level, inspired by liberalism, republicanism and communitarianism. Our empirical analysis will be based on a survey in Switzerland from 2013, comparing dual citizens, foreign residents and Swiss mono citizens. Controlling for important alternative factors, our analysis will demonstrate how transnational status is associated with individual differences in these dimensions of cosmopolitanism.

This article addresses three major research fields: conceptually, it contributes to the reflective debate on cosmopolitanism and how to analyse its existence empirically; its empirical findings contribute on the one hand to the debate on the consequences of dual citizenship and a foreign resident status, and on the other hand to the discussion of what influences the emergence of cosmopolitanism. It thus resonates with the broader debate on the relationship between cosmopolitanism and transnationalism, which has so far been inconclusive (Roudometof 2005: 121). While other studies found a positive relationship between transnationalism, understood as transnational

practices, and cosmopolitanism (Gustafson 2009; Helbling and Teney 2015; Mau et al. 2008), the impact of different variants of a transnational status has not yet been analysed.[1] A formal status that derives from the default status of a (single) national citizen is usually discussed in respect to national integration. Our analysis will shed light on its consequences for citizenship practices and identities beyond the national realm.

The remainder of this article is structured in three parts. The first clarifies our understanding of transnational status and of cosmopolitanism before formulating hypotheses on the relationship between them. The second part describes the operationalization, data, methods and control variables. The third part presents the empirical analysis and discusses the findings.

Conceptual clarifications: transnational status and cosmopolitanism

Forms of transnational status and purported consequences

In this article, we focus on legal transnational status in the sense of trans-state or involving two states. Two forms prevail: first, dual (or multiple) citizens who enjoy a transnational status 'grounded both in enforceable rights and in clearly bounded membership(s)' (Fox 2005: 194). In an increasing number of countries worldwide, migrants who successfully apply for citizenship are allowed to keep their former nationality (Brøndsted Sejersen 2008). Children of multinational couples and children born to foreign parents on the territory of a country with birthright citizenship are also eligible for dual citizenship.

There is, second, a less encompassing form of transnational status: foreign residents who have external citizenship in their country of descent, mostly encompassing political rights, and quasi-citizenship in their country of residence, usually restricted to civil and social rights (Bauböck 2010a; Soysal 1994).[2] In addition to the lack of political rights in the country of residence, even a long-term residence permit neither protects against expulsion (in the case of crimes or war, for example), nor secures the right to diplomatic protection abroad or a right to return (Hansen 2009). Therefore, many scholars call this status denizenship (Hammar 1990). Irrespective of any normative evaluation, the package of rights foreign residents enjoy is partial, while dual citizens enjoy full sets of rights in two countries.

The increasing number of people with dual or foreign citizenship in many countries generates fears and hopes alike. Most fears concern the impact of the incongruence between inhabitants and citizens on national integration and democracy (Bauböck 1994). With respect to foreign residents, there is a widespread consensus that they should, in the long run, be included in the citizenry, either through naturalization or through the granting of political rights (Joppke 2010). With respect to dual citizens, long-established fears of legal conflicts and divided loyalties have retreated. Instead, many perceive in dual citizenship a potent means to promote the political integration of immigrants. However, this trend should not gloss over the fact that fears still exist (Renshon 2005) and that in many countries dual citizenship is still forbidden and contested. Only recently, various studies analysed the empirical consequences of dual

citizenship for national integration and democracy, but with inconclusive results (Mügge 2012; Schlenker 2015; Staton et al. 2007).

The proliferation of people with a transnational status may also trigger consequences beyond the national realm. Fears arise especially wherever national boundaries are contested and transborder minorities exist (Bauböck 2010b). The recent conflict in Ukraine and the hesitance of the Baltic states to accept dual citizenship illustrate this point. However, those interested in transnational or cosmopolitan democracy tend to place hope in transnational status (Blatter 2011; Schlenker and Blatter 2014). It might be precisely the incongruence between inhabitants and citizens that allows national boundaries to be overcome and cosmopolitanism thus to develop. Delanty (2000: 63), for example, emphasizes that 'today the cosmopolitan is not the émigré intellectual or the free-floating expatriate, but one of the millions of uprooted people who have had to leave their homeland not out of choice but out of economic or political necessity.' He is convinced that diasporas, immigrants and transnational communities embody a cosmopolitanism that is different from 'the Enlightenment notion of cosmopolitanism or that of bourgeois detachment' (Delanty 2000: 140). Since cosmopolitanism is a very imprecise term, we will first develop a differentiated understanding of this concept based on democratic theories, before clarifying the mechanisms that might connect the two forms of transnational status to cosmopolitanism.

Dimensions of cosmopolitanism from a perspective of democratic theories

Despite the diversity of conceptions of cosmopolitanism, Holton (2009) identifies 144 different types of cosmopolitanism), one consensus remains: cosmopolitanism is a multidimensional concept. Many scholars differentiate between three fundamental dimensions: an ethical or philosophical dimension (often referring to Kant), a political dimension concerning global governance structures, forms of international intervention or an emerging global civil society, and a sociological or cultural dimension (Delanty 2000: 52; Vertovec 2009: 5). The latter concerns cosmopolitan attitudes, practices and abilities, often conceived as attitudinal, behavioural, cognitive, or emotional subdimensions (Pichler 2009, 2012). The breadth of this concept means that it is frequently found in many disciplines. Our research question has its roots in political science and maintains that perspective with a focus on democracy and citizenship. We therefore refer to established democratic theories to define the various dimensions of cosmopolitanism that are relevant for our purpose.

Cosmopolitanism, understood as a political programme, builds upon the ideal of democracy, which can no longer be guaranteed within the territorial limits of nation-states but should 'assert itself on a global level' (Archibugi 2000: 144; see also Archibugi and Held 1995). Although the concept of citizenship has been developed within the framework of the nation-state, it is not restricted to the national level (Delanty 2000).[3] Different dimensions of cosmopolitan citizenship can be determined from the general concept of democratic citizenship, which is broadly understood to contain four elements – (a) status as a citizen through formal membership of a political community; (b) civil, political and social rights; (c) participatory practices; and (d)

belonging/collective identity (Delanty 2000). Theories of democracy put different emphasis on these dimensions. Below, we will discuss liberal, republican and, perhaps surprisingly, communitarian approaches to cosmopolitanism and its individual manifestation.

From its origins, 'the cosmopolitan spirit was the expression of a globally oriented *liberalism*' (Delanty 2000: 54; italics added). The basic idea involves universal individual rights and the notion that each person is 'a citizen of the world' (Nussbaum 1996: 4). The ultimate units of concern are human beings; boundaries between nations, states or cultures are morally irrelevant (Held 2002: 310–11; Pogge 2002: 169).[4] This should become manifest in specific attitudes: eager to engage with and to learn about other cultures and able to move between them (Skrbis and Woodward 2007: 738; Waldron 1992: 782), cosmopolitans share an open and tolerant worldview 'that is not bound by national categories' (Mau et al. 2008: 5). Recognizing the increasing interconnectedness of political communities, cosmopolitans also approve of political responsibility at the trans- and supranational levels (Mau et al. 2008: 2). They ultimately desire 'to remove all borders and boundaries and unreservedly embrace otherness' (Skrbis and Woodward 2007: 738). However, the critique is often presented that 'most versions of cosmopolitan theory share with traditional liberalism a thin conception of social life, commitment and belonging' (Calhoun 2002: 95). Communitarian and republican approaches try to offer solutions for this deficit.

Cosmopolitan ideas are usually contrasted with republican and, even more so, with *communitarian* theories. Most scholars see a fundamental opposition between communitarianism and cosmopolitanism (Held 2002; Teney et al. 2014; Zürn 2014). With Thompson (1998: 182), however, one can argue that 'communitarianism should not be treated as a philosophical enemy of cosmopolitanism'. The latter is certainly not compatible with parochialism or sovereignty, but communitarianism primarily inspires a rethinking of the foundations of liberal democracy with a view to strengthening democracy itself (Walzer 1990); in this sense, the communitarian critique can also be applied to the predominantly liberal versions of cosmopolitan citizenship.

Communitarians point to the background condition of an underlying community as the motivational basis for a sense of justice that is the primary virtue of a liberal citizen. From this perspective, and this is also true at a global level, without community, rights and justice lack an overriding authority (Thompson 1998: 186). Many accuse cosmopolitanism of being unable to take particular identities and traditions into account (Calhoun 2002). However, collective identities and solidarities are not necessarily confined by traditional or national boundaries; they are amorphous, multifaceted and multilayered phenomena. Consequently, Delanty (2000: 137) argues that 'cosmopolitan citizenship can succeed only if it re-establishes a relationship to community.' A common bond based on shared values between all human beings (Thompson 1998: 188) could ideally fill the motivational vacuum for mutual obligations and global solidarity at the heart of cosmopolitanism (Morrice 2000: 248). Certainly, most communitarians insist that 'humanity' is too thin and too broad a concept to motivate identification or solidarity on its own behalf (see MacDonald 2003). However, although there might be strong empirical challenges to global identity and solidarity, it is not beyond the realms

of possibility (Abizadeh 2005). Whether and to what extent such a community is present in the minds and hearts of individuals is an open empirical question (Pichler 2009; Skrbis and Woodward 2007).

Although *republicanism* also is often understood as being in opposition to cosmopolitanism, it is 'neither inherently anti-cosmopolitan nor inseparable from the romance of the nation-state' (Bohman 2004: 336). On the contrary, republican scholars, such as Bohman, argue that republicanism provides the best interpretation of cosmopolitanism. Political ideals of democracy, community and participation should be extended to the global level to ensure freedom from tyranny and domination under conditions of globalization (Bohman 2007: 352). Instead of (solely) building on global rights and institutions as liberal versions of cosmopolitan democracy, this translates into a stronger emphasis on various forms of participation. Citizens' active involvement in the legislative and deliberative process has a constitutive function as well as providing public judgement and contestation (Pettit 1997). Citizens should be able not only to vote but also to voice grievances, to protest against constraints, to demand accountability and to draw attention to issues that are judged important for the common good (Chung 2003: 149–50). From this perspective, democracy is ensured by citizens' effective power to contest authority.

The intention of this necessarily selective overview was to draw out key propositions of the various strands of democratic theory in order to define relevant dimensions of cosmopolitanism; it reduces the complexity of these old and diversified traditions to a large extent. This may be excusable as we are aiming for an empirical assessment of these dimensions through a comparative analysis. In summary, liberal cosmopolitanism focuses on individual autonomy as characterized by cultural openness and the prevalence of individual freedoms and rights, irrespective of national borders; republican cosmopolitanism focuses mainly on the idea of the active citizen who is informed, interested and active in supranational politics for the common good; finally, communitarian cosmopolitanism emphasizes a global community and identity as a fundamental source for democracy beyond the state.

Theoretical mechanisms connecting transnational status to cosmopolitanism

The nation-state remains an important structure in framing individual dispositions and actions (Vertovec 2009: 8). A legal status of state membership carries rights and opportunities, but also special meanings, relations and structures. We will adopt the formal status of a mono citizen of the country of residence as the baseline against which dual citizens and foreign residents are compared. We will elaborate, in the following, the potential impacts a transnational status may have on liberal, communitarian, and republican cosmopolitanism, whether mediated through other patterns of a transnational life or directly.

With respect to *liberal cosmopolitanism*, it is important to emphasize that a transnational status is supposedly associated with increased transnational connectivity and social networks, with more contact with diverse people and a heightened awareness of cultural differences (Hannerz 1990: 241; Kuhn 2011: 814; Mau et al. 2008: 5). The

increase in tourism and global media are also relevant here but the experience of migration to another country, whether voluntary or not, certainly has a deeper impact than short-term physical or mental travel. Migrants are confronted with a new social, cultural and political environment and with the challenge of integrating into their new country of residence. Many therefore expect them to be more inclined to accept difference and cultural diversity (Scheffler 1999: 258) and thus to display liberal cosmopolitan attitudes.

Also, from a more rationalistic perspective, there is reason to expect that transnational status matters because interdependences between countries affect individuals more personally, either directly, by taxation or social security policies, for example, or at least via personal ties, such as family abroad. This may increase the willingness to consider opposing national interests and/or to solve transnational issues through a supranational settlement or institution. The extent of affectedness of native mono citizens is highly contingent on residence location or specific combinations of interests or experiences. The twin belonging of dual citizens increases the likelihood of their being affected. For foreign residents, such interdependences can even reach existential levels if, for example, in the case of conflict between the countries involved, political actors are tempted to attack their residence rights. In less extreme cases of discrimination, too, invoking supranational rights or appealing to supranational institutions is often the last resort. In general, transnational individuals might have a stronger awareness of opportunities beyond national confines (Kuhn 2011: 816). We therefore anticipate that dual citizens and foreign residents are more likely than mono citizens to exhibit *liberal cosmopolitanism (Hypothesis 1)*.

When assessing the potential impact of status on *communitarian cosmopolitanism*, social constructivist and social psychological approaches have much to contribute. Social identity theory (Abrams and Hogg 1999) emphasizes the importance of processes of self- and other-categorization. Nation-states influence such categorization processes since citizenship has become 'the primary category by which people are classified' (Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer 2001: 1) and official labels are strongly entrenched in the perceptions of actors and reproduced in social relations. The status of being a mono citizen enables unproblematic self-categorization as a member of the national community in which one resides. Single membership provides a clear belonging, embedded in one frame of national identity, as diverse and contested as it may be (Kriesi et al. 1999). This is different for people with a transnational status. Migrants in general are expected to articulate complex affiliations, more negotiable identities and multiple loyalties that lie beyond the boundaries of their resident country (Vertovec and Cohen 2002: 2), often enabled by multi-linguistic abilities (Delanty 2000: 64). Schattle (2008: 10) also emphasizes that themes of immigration 'figure as powerful formative experiences in the lives of many self-identifying global citizens'. However, not all migrants are necessarily more inclined to think of themselves as global citizens. As an alternative reaction to political exclusion, the fact of difference and ambiguity might also strengthen the (foreign) national identity and encourage a retreat into extremist versions of the old, possibly religious traditions, leading to more parochial identities.

Although we assume that this is not an attractive option for the majority, this is an open empirical question.

Dual citizens have two frames of national identity at their disposal, since two states fully recognize their membership. This horizontal doubling of belonging may also lead to vertical pluralization in the sense of embedding the multiple identities within the broader category of humanity (Schlenker and Blatter 2014: 1106). However, being a full and recognized citizen in the country of residence there is little incentive to do so. In addition, two passports are often (also) a matter of convenience with potentially little impact on deeper seated feelings of belonging. Foreign residents, by contrast, are formally excluded from the national political community in which they reside; as far as their formal status is concerned, they are outsiders. Their status is laden with ambiguity because immigration is a highly politicized issue in most receiving countries. Exclusion from the political community in which they live and categorization as 'other' may hinder attachment. The push towards more universal categories of belonging might therefore be much stronger for them. We thus assume that foreign residents are more likely than mono citizens to exhibit *communitarian cosmopolitanism (Hypothesis 2)*.

With respect to *republican cosmopolitanism*, differences between the two forms of transnational status again become apparent. Dual citizens have twice the political opportunity structures, irrespective of whether these opportunities are used to the same degree. They have the opportunity to accumulate a repertoire of political competences from two countries and to use selected elements of the acquired knowledge and practice as they see fit and circumstances require; this is similar to what Vertovec (2009: 7) understands as a cosmopolitan competence in the sense of code-switching. The multiplication of options and potential experiences might increase political empowerment in general and raise the awareness of even more opportunities on a supranational level and the competence to seize them. In this sense, the duplication of opportunities eventually 'spills over' to cosmopolitan engagement.

In contrast, foreign residents do not have the same multiplication of political rights and opportunities to acquire cross-political competences. On the contrary, without formal membership in the country of residence, it is more difficult to influence the political issues that immediately concern them. To be sure, a politically active non-citizen could well have more influence than a passive, non-voting citizen, but the former would have to make more efforts. In addition, even a long-term residence permit ultimately grants a precarious status that is, to a certain extent, subject to political volatility. Many therefore assume that foreign residents are less motivated to participate politically in their country of residence (Joppke 2010: 146). One could argue that, as a compensation, they may be especially interested in supranational forms of governance. However, the lack of political opportunities in their immediate context more likely undermines interest in politics in general, the habituation to become active and the experience of political efficiency. In contrast, such opportunities are doubled for dual citizens which might spill-over to vertical involvement and foster a republican (self-) image of an active citizen also on supranational levels. We therefore anticipate that dual citizens are more likely than mono citizens to exhibit *republican cosmopolitanism (Hypothesis 3).*

Operationalization, data and methods

To operationalize cosmopolitanism, we have various survey items at our disposal that capture the key features of each dimension. The liberal dimension, focusing on transnational individual freedoms and rights, irrespective of national borders, is operationalized by orientations that are marked by openness towards cultural diversity, immigration, and naturalization. Two further items are included that ask whether external affected interests should also be considered in political decision making, or whether these external nationals should even be allowed to participate in these decisions. Assessing transnational political rights, the latter two items add a particularly liberal aspect to the other indicators commonly used to measure cosmopolitan attitudes (Mau et al. 2008; Pichler 2009, 2012).

Communitarian cosmopolitanism mainly emphasizes the community, which we operationalize by indicators of cognitive self-description in supranational categories, emotional attachment and feelings of solidarity to Europeans or humanity at large. This corresponds to a large extent to assessments in other studies of cosmopolitan identities (Pichler 2009; Sinnott 2005) and adds solidarity as an additionally central aspect of communitarianism, what Helbling and Teney (2015) call moral cosmopolitanism. Our questions are worded to allow various degrees of simultaneous identification. Thus, an individual can describe herself as 100 per cent national and as 100 per cent a world citizen. The same applies to the assessment of attachment and feelings of solidarity towards various groups of people. We consider items concerning any level above the state, including the European and global level. Switzerland is not a member of the European Union, but it is located in the middle of Europe, has close ties to its European neighbours and is associated with the EU through far-reaching bilateral agreements. The items we use do not refer to the EU as a political community, but to Europe as a geographical entity and indeed load on the same dimension as items referring to the world.

Finally, to operationalize the republican idea of the active citizen on a global level, we use indicators that capture reported political participation in a broad sense, including information, interest, activities, and loyalties. We assess knowledge of the United Nations and interest in global politics. Since there are no voting rights on a global level, we assess the republican emphasis on contestation and communication by various forms of political activities, including signing a petition, participating in a demonstration, donating money to a political cause, contacting the media or a politician, discussing politics and taking part in online political fora concerning global political matters. In addition, we include membership of an international NGO. Finally, one further item asks whether political participation is motivated by the perceived common good or interest of Europe or humanity as a whole. To our knowledge, a comparable dimension has not been included in analyses before.

Thus, in searching for 'actually existing cosmopolitanism' (Calhoun 2002), we assess cosmopolitanism not only as an empirically measurable attitudinal stance (Mau et al. 2008) but also as an emotional and behavioural disposition that transcends the nation-state without prescribing whether one or the other is more important for global democracy. Table 1 gives an overview of the indicators used (for wording of the questions, see Appendix).

Table 1: Operationalization of cosmopolitanism

Dimension	*Indicators*
Liberal dimension	Openness toward cultural diversity Openness toward immigration/ naturalization Consideration of transnational interests Support for transnational political rights
Communitarian dimension	Self-description as a European Self-description as a world citizen Attachment to Europe/ the world Solidarity with all Europeans/ all human beings
Republican dimension	Knowledge of the UN Interest in global politics Political activities concerning global matters Participation in the interest of Europe/ humanity

Our analysis is based on quantitative, cross-sectional data from a survey among dual, mono and foreign citizens in Switzerland, financed by the Swiss National Science Foundation and conducted by a professional survey institute. Switzerland has been a frontrunner in Europe in accepting dual citizenship since 1992. Dual citizens now make up a significant percentage of the Swiss population. The 2000 census revealed that more than 10 per cent of the seven million Swiss citizens living in Switzerland have a second passport (BFS 2011). In addition, there is a large population of foreign nationals (23 per cent in 2013). This situation, and the fact that every third marriage in 2009 was bi-national, ensure that the number of dual citizens in Switzerland will continue to grow steadily.

Many surveys include indicators of political identification and involvement on different levels but not dual or foreign nationality. We used many of the established questions from these surveys to develop the questionnaire for our own survey, making it comparable to existing findings, and simultaneously assessing all elements of citizenship on national and supranational levels.

Our sampling procedure was designed to have sufficient numbers of immigrants from one national background as common in surveys of immigrants (Lipps et al. 2013). We selected three countries with very different migratory ties to Switzerland – Germany as the current major source of new and mostly highly qualified migrants; Italy as the most important country of origin of former, less qualified 'Gastarbeiter'; and Kosovo as one of the main sources of refugees and newer, less qualified labour migrants. These different nationalities make up the largest proportion of immigrants into Switzerland and are often the focus of considerable media interest; in selecting them, we hope to capture the full range of possibilities while simultaneously enabling comparative analyses. This selection also allows us to control for EU membership, which is potentially relevant for cosmopolitanism.

As in many other countries, dual citizenship is not documented in any official register in Switzerland. Our sample was possible thanks to the generous support from two Swiss authorities. Among the specified (former) nationalities, a sample of naturalized citizens and foreign residents with permanent residence permission (Permit C) was randomly selected from the official register of the Swiss Federal Office for Migration. As a control group, a sample of (autochthonous) Swiss was randomly chosen from the sampling register of the Federal Office for Statistics. The sampling took both gender (equally distributed) and age (minimum 18) into account. The overall sample comprises 929 dual citizens, 412 foreign citizens and 423 Swiss mono citizens (Table 2).[5] Field work was undertaken between April and July 2013 and was carried out in German, French, Italian and Albanian.[6]

Table 2: Sample of the survey

Categories	Second/foreign nationality			N
a. Dual citizens	German	Italian	Kosovar	*929*
c. Foreign residents	382	349	198	*412*
d. Swiss mono citizens	183	118	111	*423*
Total N by Random Quota				*1764*

Our research design is factor-centric. Our aim is not to explain cosmopolitanism extensively but to elucidate primarily the impact of a transnational legal status while controlling for relevant alternative explanations. We take the individual as the level of analysis. To assess whether there is a systematic relationship between transnational status and cosmopolitanism, we will consider two groups of potential alternative influences. The first group concerns possible confounding factors that may be present with dual or foreign status. These are factors related to the personal migration background and other transnational experiences. Since many mono citizens also have a migration background, we control for having naturalized. In addition, we control for nationality to capture the variation caused by different countries of origin; being an EU citizen, for example, may have a positive influence on cosmopolitanism. We also include generation and length of residence in Switzerland, both of which may reduce the assumed impact of a dual or foreign status. Two other variables are, in contrast, likely to enhance its impact, namely ongoing social relations and mobility across national borders (Kuhn 2011; Mau et al. 2008). We therefore also include international travel and professional and private contacts as controls.

The second group of control factors concerns alternative explanations such as demographic, socio-economic and ideological factors. We will include gender, age, education, income, place of residence (degree of urbanization) and political orientation, which have repeatedly been found to be important predictors of cosmopolitanism (Pichler 2009, 2012). By including these covariates in the linear regression models, we hope to isolate the relationship between a dual or foreign status and cosmopolitanism in its various dimensions. The causal direction may also be reversed, namely that

cosmopolitanism increases the willingness and probability of migrating in the first place and having and/or keeping dual citizenship later on. We therefore do not claim to establish unidirectional causal relationships that run from transnational status to cosmopolitanism, but aim to discover systematic differences between dual, foreign, and mono citizens in their cosmopolitanism while controlling for other relevant factors.

Empirical analysis: cosmopolitanism of transnational citizens – a comparison

Dimensions and extent of cosmopolitanism

To test the empirical validity of our conceptualization, we submitted the various indicators of cosmopolitanism introduced above to a principal component analysis. Based on our theoretical discussion differentiating between three dimensions of cosmopolitanism, we retained three factors as extraction criteria. The resulting components fit well into our operationalization (Table 3). One component includes indicators of self-description, attachment, and solidarity on a supranational level and thus captures the communitarian dimension of cosmopolitanism. The second component includes the various attitudes towards immigration, naturalization, and cultural diversity as well as towards transnational interests and rights, capturing the liberal cosmopolitan dimension. The third component includes knowledge, interest, political activities, and participation for the common good and thus corresponds to what we call republican cosmopolitanism. The component analysis thus justifies the use of these items to construct a scale for each dimension of cosmopolitanism, with 0 representing no cosmopolitanism and 10 a high level of cosmopolitanism. For further analyses, we use scales instead of the factor scores since the former can be interpreted more easily. The three scales slightly correlate with each other.[7] This is in line with Pichler's (2009: 722) finding that cosmopolitan 'attitudes and identity coincide to a considerable extent'. Nevertheless, they are sufficiently independent to analyse them separately.

Regarding the overall extent of the various dimensions of cosmopolitanism (Table 4), we have a classic case of a glass being considered half full or half empty. On a 10 point scale, the extent of cosmopolitanism is on average at the half way point in all three dimensions, with communitarian cosmopolitanism, surprisingly, scoring highest (with a mean of 5.87), followed by republican cosmopolitanism (with a mean of 5.35) and liberal cosmopolitanism (with a mean of 5.12). In the light of the low levels of empirical evidence, particularly on cosmopolitan identification and participation (Jung 2008; Norris 2000), the small differences between the different dimensions and the overall extent are remarkable. In spite of them being contested theoretically, communitarian and republican cosmopolitanism indeed seem to be practical concepts that can be found among individuals.

With respect to the question of whether there are differences between different status groups, the descriptive results confirm our expectations: dual citizens and foreign residents exhibit significantly more liberal cosmopolitanism than mono citizens, and foreign residents even more than dual citizens. Both groups with a transnational status also display, on average, slightly more communitarian cosmopolitanism. Finally, dual citizens seem more cosmopolitan in a republican sense than both other groups, while foreign residents do not differ from mono citizens in this respect.

Table 3: Dimensions of cosmopolitanism: component loadings

	Component 1	*Component 2*	*Component 3*
Openness toward cultural diversity	.127	.632	.275
Openness toward immigration	.024	.851	.021
Openness toward naturalization	.031	.857	.011
Consideration of transnational interests	.233	.548	.227
Support for transnational rights	.195	.519	-.044
Self-description as a European	.688	.100	.107
Self-description as a world citizen	.666	.052	.141
Attachment to Europe	.734	.133	.007
Attachment to the world	.741	.050	.021
Solidarity with all Europeans	.583	.140	.142
Solidarity with all human beings	.520	.180	.218
Knowledge of the UN	-.075	.072	.503
Interest in global politics	.180	.010	.730
Political activities concerning global matters	.027	.086	.481
Participation in the interest of Europe	.310	.091	.636
Participation in the interest of humanity	.249	.028	.707
Variance explained (cumulative)	25.9%	38.0%	47.5%
Cronbach's alpha	.76	.72	.68

Method: Principal component analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization; fixed number of factors; rotation converged in 5 iterations; loadings lower than 0.40 in blue; $N = 1694$.

Table 4: Extent of cosmopolitanism by status

Dimensions of cosmopolitanism	*Status*	*Mean*	*SD*	*N*
Liberal	Mono citizens	4.33	1.99	342
	Dual citizens	5.24***	1.80	777
	Foreign residents	5.75***	1.62	298
	All	5.12	1.88	1417
Communitarian	Mono citizens	5.64	1.97	338
	Dual citizens	5.93*	2.00	772
	Foreign residents	5.96**	1.91	310
	All	5.87	1.98	1420
Republican	Mono citizens	4.98	1.74	317
	Dual citizens	5.65***	1.68	709
	Foreign residents	4.99	2.04	275
	All	5.35	1.80	1301

Significance of differences in the means between groups (T-test values) ***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05.
Note: Scales of liberal, communitarian and republican cosmopolitanism run from 0 to 10.

Multivariate analysis

The *descriptive* results suggest that dual citizens and foreign residents are indeed more likely to manifest liberal cosmopolitanism, as our first hypothesis expected. This result is also robust when we introduce control variables (Table 5; for blockwise analyses of each dimension see Tables A1–A3 in Appendix). Dual citizens are significantly more likely to manifest liberal cosmopolitanism, but the effect of being a non-citizen is much stronger. This is in line with Pichler's (2009) finding that non-citizens manifest more cosmopolitan attitudes. An interesting result is that being of Kosovar descent increases the probability of liberal cosmopolitanism almost to the same extent. As with other migrants from former Yugoslavia, this group of mostly Muslim immigrants clearly experiences most exclusion or even discrimination in Switzerland (Hainmueller and Hangartner 2013). In addition, their country of origin only recently experienced a bloody civil war based on ethnic conflicts, which might further strengthen post-national attitudes. A further element of the personal migration experience is significant here, namely being a first generation migrant. The impact of residence duration is significant but minimal. Among the other control variables, personal transnational relations also have a robust and significant impact. As far as the socio-demographic profile is concerned, the results are in line with previous findings on similar topics: women clearly exhibit more liberal cosmopolitanism than men; education and living in an urban area have significant positive, although lesser effects. Not surprisingly, a conservative political orientation has a strong negative effect on liberal cosmopolitanism.

With respect to communitarian cosmopolitanism, the effect of dual citizenship disappears in multivariate analyses. Controlling for migration-related and socio-demographic/economic factors, only foreign residents are more likely to manifest communitarian cosmopolitanism. In this respect, whether respondents are (mono or dual) citizens by naturalization also has a strong impact. Some of the control variables are equally important for liberal cosmopolitanism: again, personal transnational relations have a robust and positive effect, women are also more likely to exhibit this kind of cosmopolitanism, and a political orientation to the right again has a strong negative impact. Overall, however, this dimension is least explained by our model, socio-economic variables seem especially irrelevant for this kind of cosmopolitanism, which, in contrast to the other two, mainly consists of affective orientations. As with other forms of collective identities, cosmopolitan identification seems to be influenced by factors that are difficult to capture. The large body of literature aiming to understand what drives European identity is telling in this respect (Herrmann et al. 2004).

Finally, there is also supporting evidence for our third hypothesis. In contrast to the results for communitarian cosmopolitanism, we find that dual citizenship has a significant and robust impact on republican cosmopolitanism and no impact on being a foreign resident. Respondents with an Italian background are significantly less likely to manifest this kind of cosmopolitanism, which might be due to bad experiences with the political system in their country of origin. Among the control variables, again transnational social relations increase the propensity for this dimension. Furthermore, socio-economic factors, such as education, income and degree of urbanization, are also

significant. In line with the results from research on political participation in general (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993), the better educated, higher income, city dwellers who consider themselves on the left are more likely to be involved in supranational politics.[8]

Table 5: Multivariate analysis of cosmopolitanism

	Liberal		Communitarian		Republican	
Status (ref: mono citizens)						
Dual citizens	.579**	(.217)	.028	(.433)	.823***	(.210)
Foreign residents	1.326***	(.290)	.876*	(.262)	.332	(.282)
Naturalized	.150	(.178)	.608**	(.345)	.150	(.177)
Second/foreign nationality (ref: Swiss nationality)						
German	-.035	(.309)	-.259	(.211)	-.321	(.306)
Italian	-.129	(.288)	-.292	(.372)	-.844**	(.282)
Kosovar	1.088**	(.312)	-.317	(.345)	-.439	(.303)
First generation	.349*	(.169)	-.173	(.370)	-.147	(.167)
Residence duration	.007*	(.003)	.003	(.201)	.001	(.003)
International travel	-.027	(.084)	-.033	(.004)	.133	(.084)
Intern. business contacts	.241*	(.107)	.394**	(.100)	.328**	(.106)
Intern. private contacts	.352**	(.134)	.422**	(.128)	.289*	(.134)
Male	-.228*	(.107)	-.296*	(.159)	.242*	(.107)
Age	.008	(.005)	.007	(.127)	.011*	(.005)
Education	.041**	(.015)	.004	(.006)	.060***	(.015)
Income	-.005	(.032)	.005	(.018)	.096**	(.031)
Urbanization	.057*	(.023)	.020	(.038)	.042	(.023)
Right political orientation	-.345***	(.025)	-.250***	(.028)	-.155***	(.025)
Constant	4.363***	(.362)	6.099***	(.433)	3.501***	(.366)
Adj. R2	.284		.093		.191	
Number N	1091		1086		1006	

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; all others are not significant.
Method: Linear regression, listwise deletion. For blockwise analyses see Tables A1–A3 in Appendix.
Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients are stated, along with the corresponding standard errors (in brackets).

Discussion

In the light of these results, our hypotheses seem largely confirmed: while both groups of transnationals are more likely to manifest liberal cosmopolitanism, only foreign residents are more inclined to exhibit communitarian cosmopolitanism and only dual citizens are more inclined to manifest republican cosmopolitanism. For both dual citizens and foreign residents an increased propensity to be aware of cultural diversity and to be affected by transnational interdependences seems to prompt more liberal attitudes. However, the impact of being a foreign resident is more than double the impact of being a dual citizen. Foreign residents are often targets of discrimination and often existentially affected by transnational interdependences. They might therefore be more inclined to support cultural diversity and transnational rights (Pichler 2009: 724).

The lack of formal recognition as a member of the 'in-group' in the country of residence seems to play out even more with respect to communitarian cosmopolitanism. Foreign residents seem inclined to compensate for their outsider status with a broader collective identity formation. What also matters in this respect is the question of whether one is a (mono or dual) citizen by naturalization or not. All individuals with a migration background seem more likely to manifest supranational identities and solidarities, while a dual status as such seems irrelevant.[9] Being a national and also an 'other', having two national frames of reference for identity formation does not, apparently, encourage individuals to transcend those national frames in favour of a supranational level. This might partly be caused by the fact that two passports are often simply of practical value with little impact on identities. In the light of this, the impact on liberal and especially republican cosmopolitanism is even more remarkable.[10] The formal tie to more than one political community appears to be especially relevant for being an informed, interested and active citizen in supranational arenas. Full membership of two political communities and, with it, the secured right to political participation and the full set of political opportunities in two countries seem to have a positive impact on political participation at the supranational level; there seems to be a spill-over effect to cosmopolitan involvement.

It is interesting that, among the control variables, a German or Italian background and, thus, either a former or an additional EU citizenship, had almost no effect on any dimension of cosmopolitanism, although being an EU citizen brings several benefits in Switzerland.[11] Overall, given the diversity of former or second nationality in our sample, the little influence of nationality is remarkable. The selected immigrant groups differ, on average, in respect to migration background and conditions of reception in Swiss society. While (longstanding) immigrant workers from Italy are in general well received by Swiss society today, the culturally similar and highly skilled Germans tend to suffer from Germanophobia, especially in the Swiss-German part of Switzerland (Helbling 2011) and Kosovars, like all ex-Yogoslav immigrants, are often subject to widespread prejudices (Hainmueller and Hangartner 2013). In spite of these differences, national background did not influence the different dimensions of cosmopolitanism in any consistent way.

Those control variables that increased all dimensions of cosmopolitanism are associated with personal contacts across national boundaries, irrespective of whether they are for business or private purposes. Interestingly, transnational mobility had no significant effect on cosmopolitanism in any dimension. Transnational relations to people seem clearly more important than transnational experiences of physical mobility. Mau et al. (2008) constructed a transnationality index, including private transnational relations as well as travel and visits abroad. Their index consistently influences cosmopolitan attitudes, but being of a composite nature it does not capture any differentiated impact from transnational travel and transnational social contacts. The same applies to Kuhn's (2011) three-dimensional index of transnationalism, including transnational background, practices, and human capital where transnational contacts and mobility are subsumed under practices (Delhey et al. 2015). Our results, however, underline that it is worthwhile to disaggregate transnationalism, to differentiate between transnational

mobility, contacts, and personal background such as status if we are to understand their differentiated impacts on cosmopolitanism. Analysing supranational attitudes, feelings and behaviour as different dimensions of cosmopolitan citizenship, the importance of transnational contacts strengthens the perspective on citizenship as a fundamentally relational concept (Donati 1995).

The other control variables have a differentiated impact. Not surprisingly, political ideology is particularly relevant for cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, there is a clear, also not surprising, gender bias: women are more likely to exhibit liberal and communitarian cosmopolitanism, while men are more likely to become active in the sense of republican cosmopolitanism. Finally, being educated increases liberal and republican cosmopolitanism. This is in line with results on cosmopolitan attitudes (Jung 2008; Pichler 2009, 2012). It is, however, remarkable that income, age and education do not impact on all dimensions of cosmopolitanism because cosmopolitanism is often portrayed as an elite-project (Calhoun 2002), as a rich literature on the European Union also suggests (Fligstein 2008; Haller 2008). Fligstein (2008: 156), for example, argues that 'Europe so far has been a class project, a project that favours the educated, owners of business, managers, and professionals, and the young.' Our study shows that controlling for transnational status and practices, income only seems to influence republican cosmopolitanism that is tied to more resource-based activism. Class may affect the degree of transnationalism, which in turn affects cosmopolitanism, but there seems to be no direct link between class and liberal and communitarian cosmopolitanism. Delhey et al. (2015: 272, 282) argue that not only is vertical stratification, in the sense of income inequality, important for transnational practices, but so also is horizontal stratification in the sense of heterogeneities, including migration background. Our results take this argument a step further and underline the importance of the latter for cosmopolitanism, even when controlling for transnational practices.

Overall, our analysis of data from Switzerland shows that foreign residents are frontrunners of cosmopolitanism with respect to the liberal and communitarian dimensions; they think and feel clearly more cosmopolitan than citizens, but they are not more active in this sense. In addition, dual citizens can be regarded as vanguards of cosmopolitanism in a potentially important way: they are especially more likely to act in a republican cosmopolitan sense.

These results may be specific to the Swiss case. At 23 per cent, Switzerland has by far the highest level of foreign population among all Western countries except Luxembourg. At the same time, based on a primarily ethnic definition and the very selective nature of the naturalization process (Giugni and Passy 2004), it has one of the most exclusive citizenship regimes.[12] Since citizenship is seen as a reward for successful integration, being a citizen can be interpreted as a sign of having a similar set of attitudes and identification as the majority population.[13] There is thus a strong (self-) selection of naturalized or dual citizens, who are considered more integrated than non-naturalized foreign residents. In addition, recent initiatives such as banning the construction of minarets in 2010 and limiting immigration in 2014 further heightened the salience of immigration issues. This context may increase the relevance of any status that departs from the default one of a (single) national. We therefore cannot claim

broad generalizability of our results. Nevertheless, they shed light on potential unintended side effects of factors that are not, in the first instance, intended to promote cosmopolitanism in a normative sense. Our analysis shows that both partial and full transnational status may have the unintended side effect of increasing specific dimensions of cosmopolitanism.

Conclusion

The results of our analysis suggest that the growing number of dual citizens and foreign residents has a differentiated potential for cosmopolitanism, which is widely assumed a promising answer to increasing transnational interdependences. This demonstrates the benefit of disaggregating both cosmopolitanism and transnationalism. Based on data from Switzerland, we analysed whether a transnational status, independently of transnational practices, increases the propensity of individuals to exhibit liberal, communitarian or republican cosmopolitanism, to the extent that they think, feel, and act as world citizens in order ultimately to legitimize new political formations on a supranational level. Formal or partial membership of two national communities is less abstract than membership of continental or global communities. Both forms of transnational status overcome the monism of national citizenship without losing its concreteness; we therefore expected a positive impact on cosmopolitanism, in line with Delanty (2000) and others who see in transnationalism a first step towards cosmopolitanism.

However, important differences exist between a partial and a full transnational status that also became manifest in a differentiated impact on various dimensions of cosmopolitanism. Dual citizens and foreign residents can each be considered vanguards of cosmopolitanism in a specific way. The result that dual citizenship seems especially relevant for supranational forms of citizenship practices stands out. In contrast to Joppke's analysis of dual citizenship as a form of 'citizenship light', there is potential that on supranational levels it promotes less 'the Roman citizenship of passive rights-holding than the Athenian citizenship of active participation in the political community' (Joppke 2010: 147). The finding that dual citizens are more likely to exhibit republican cosmopolitanism, but not the communitarian dimension fits with the proposition of cosmopolitan republicans to enhance supranational cooperation, communication, and contestation without necessarily overcoming national frames of identity formation (Bohman 2004). In contrast, those formally excluded from the political community in which they reside are more likely to overcome national forms of identity and interest formation, but national borders confine their political involvement. In other words, the partially transnational status of foreign residents fosters openness, tolerance, and identification with humanity at large but not supranational political engagement. The latter is more common among dual citizens with a privileged and secure status. Dual citizens and foreign residents thus each contribute in a specific way to grounding cosmopolitan democracy. It is possible to speculate that the more individuals live in countries without being full members, the more widespread liberal and communitarian aspects of cosmopolitanism might become. Those in search of active global citizens, however, should especially take the increasing number of dual citizens into account.

To evaluate whether our results are due to Swiss particularities, we would need country comparisons. As Pichler's (2012) multilevel analysis showed, both individual and contextual factors have an influence on cosmopolitan attitudes and identities. We propose going beyond GDP and the socio-political culture he analysed. The meaning of a legal status varies enormously by country; the level of politicization of immigration issues is certainly relevant here. In addition, with respect to a transnational status, we have to consider the constellation of countries involved (Bauböck 2010a). Our study included three different constellations but many more exist. The specific circumstances of departure and reception may be relevant for the development of cosmopolitanism among individuals with a transnational status. We therefore propose looking more closely at national integration and the citizenship regimes of sending and receiving countries as the relevant opportunity structures that frame the meaning attached to different forms of transnational status.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Joachim Blatter for his valuable comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript and Samuel Schmid and Eva Granwehr for dedicated research assistance. I am also grateful for inspiring discussions at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (2014) in Washington, especially with Elizabeth Cohen and Linda Bosniak. My thanks also go to the anonymous reviewers of *Global Networks* for their helpful comments. I could not have written the article without generous support from the Swiss National Science Foundation. The quality of the data also owes a lot to the support of the Swiss Federal Office for Migration and the Federal Statistical Office.

Notes

1. Previous research focused on the relationship between (intra-European) migration and European identity or support for European integration (Kuhn 2011; Recchi and Favell 2009). Our focus, however, goes beyond the European Union.
2. Several countries confer political rights at the local (or regional) level to long-term foreign residents, but only a few at the national level (Pedroza 2013).
3. Habermas (1996: 515) is even convinced that 'state citizenship and world citizenship form a continuum whose contours, at least, are already becoming visible.'
4. The dominance of this individualistic perspective often leads to the critique that cosmopolitanism is portrayed from a Western European perspective only (Appiah 2004).
5. To increase the number of dual citizens by birth and thus the number of second-generation immigrants, an additional 151 respondents with dual citizenship were interviewed via the LINK Internet-Panel. The 423 Swiss mono citizens include 138 naturalized citizens. Some 1764 interviews were conducted out of 4963 contacts; the overall response rate was thus approximately 35.5 per cent, which is not an unusually low rate among individuals with migration backgrounds (Lipps et al. 2013).
6. Some 1307 interviews were conducted online and 457 as written interviews, at the participants' request. The interviews were on average 32 minutes long; the median was 28 minutes; 66 per cent were conducted in German, 11.5 per cent in French, 12.4 per cent in Italian and 10.1 per cent in Albanian.

7. Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between liberal and republican cosmopolitanism amounts to .238, between liberal and communitarian cosmopolitanism to .331, and between republican and communitarian cosmopolitanism to .355, all highly significant ($p < .001$).
8. Income is a sensitive question to ask in Switzerland. Running the same regressions without this factor increased the N by almost 150 respondents; the substantial results, however, did not change.
9. Regression analyses of every single indicator of this dimension (not shown here) also did not reveal a significant influence of dual citizenship.
10. Since we control for first generation, this different impact of the two forms of transnational status cannot be explained by the assumption that foreigners have themselves migrated and dual citizens are more likely to be second generation immigrants. Nor is this effect eliminated by residence duration. One might further assume that other transnational factors intervene, such as political interest and participation in the country of descent or identification, attachment, solidarity and loyalty to it. However, there are no differences between dual citizens and foreign residents in this respect (not shown here) that systematically vary with their differentiated relationship to the various dimensions of cosmopolitanism. For example, foreign residents are more attached to their country of descent and exhibit more cosmopolitan identity, but they are also more interested in the politics of their country of descent without this interest spilling over to the supranational level.
11. Running the regressions with interaction terms between country of descent and formal status (not shown here) did not reveal additional insights.
12. The regular naturalization process is decided on three levels of administration – the local, the cantonal and the national level – each with its own criteria. Among other criteria, one of the longest residence duration worldwide is demanded: while applicants have to live in Switzerland for at least 12 years, some municipalities demand 12 years of residence within their community. Besides, the fees can be considerable (Helbling 2010).
13. Also after abolishing direct democratic decision-making on naturalization requests (Hainmueller and Hangartner 2013), patterns of discrimination in naturalization processes might still exist, not to mention potential discrimination that may deter immigrants from applying for citizenship in the first place.
14. For summary statistics of the independent variables 'status' and 'foreign or second nationality', see Table 2. For summary statistics of the dependent variables see Table 4.

References

Abizadeh, A. (2005) 'Does collective identity presuppose an other? On the alleged incoherence of global solidarity', *American Political Science Review*, 99 (1), 45–60, doi: 10.1017.S0003055405051488.

Abrams, D. and M. Hogg (eds) (1999) *Social identity and social cognition*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Aleinikoff, T. A. and D. B. Klusmeyer (eds) (2001) *Citizenship today: global perspectives and practices*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Appiah, K. A. (1998) 'Cosmopolitan patriots', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: thinking and feeling beyond the nation*, Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 91–114.

Appiah, K. A. (2004) 'The limits of being liberal', *Global Agenda* (magazine of the World Economic Forum), January, available at: www.somalinet.com/forums/viewtopic.php?t=42199.

Archibugi, D. (2000) 'Cosmopolitan democracy', *New Left Review*, 4 (July/August), 137–50, available at: https://newleftreview.org/II/4/daniele-archibugi-cosmopolitical-democracy.

Archibugi, D. and D. Held (1995) *Cosmopolitan democracy: an agenda for a new world order*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauböck, R. (1994) *Transnational citizenship: membership and rights in international migration*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Bauböck, R. (2010a) 'Studying citizenship constellations', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (5), 847–59, doi: 10.1080/13691831003764375.

Bauböck, R. (ed.) (2010b) 'Dual citizenship for transborder minorities? How to respond to the Hungarian–Slovak tit-for-tat', EUI working paper RSCAS 2010/75, available at: http://hdl.handle.net/1814/14625.

Beck, U. (2000) 'The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity', *British Journal of Sociology*, 51 (1), 79–105, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2000.00079.x.

BFS (Bundesamt für Statistik) (2011) *Eidgenössische Volkszählung 2000*, Neuchâtel.

Blatter, J. (2011) 'Dual citizenship and theories of democracy', *Citizenship Studies*, 15 (6–7), 769–98, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2011.600090.

Bloemraad, I. (2004) 'Who claims dual citizenship? The limits of postnationalism, the possibilities of transnationalism, and the persistence of traditional citizenship', *International Migration Review*, 38 (2), 389–426, doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00203.x.

Bohman, J. (2004) 'Republican cosmopolitanism', *Journal of Political Philosophy* 12 (3), 336–52, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9760.2004.00203.x.

Bohman, J. (2007) **[REFERENCE MISSING. PLEASE SUPPLY OR CHANGE DATE TO 2004]**

Brøndsted Sejersen, T. (2008) '"I vow thee my countries" – the expansion of dual citizenship in the 21st century', *International Migration Review*, 42 (3), 523–49, doi: 10.1111/j.1747-7379.2008.00136.x.

Calhoun, C. (2002) 'The class consciousness of frequent travellers: towards a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism', in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 86–109.

Chung, R. (2003) 'The cosmopolitan scope of republican citizenship', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 6 (1), 135–54, doi: 10.1080/13698230510001702713.

Delanty, G. (2000) *Citizenship in a global age: society, culture, politics*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Delanty, G. (ed.) (2012) *Routledge handbook of cosmopolitan studies*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Delhey, J., E. Deutschmann and K. Cirlanaru (2015) 'Between "class project" and individualization: the stratification of Europeans' transnational activities', *International Sociology*, 30 (3), 269–93, doi: 10.1177/0268580915578744.

Donati, P. (1995) 'Identity and solidarity in the complex of citizenship: the relational approach', *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 8 (2), 155–73. doi: 10.1080/13511610.1995.9968441.

Fligstein, N. (2008) *Euroclash: towards a sociology of the European Union*, Oxford: OUP.

Fox, J. (2005) 'Unpacking "transnational citizenship"', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8 (1), 171–201, doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104851.

Giugni, M. and F. Passy (2004) 'Migrant mobilization between political institutions and citizenship regimes, a comparison of France and Switzerland', *European Journal of Political Research*, 43 (1), 51–82, doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2004.00145.x.

Gustafson, P. (2009) 'More cosmopolitan, no less local', *European Societies*, 11 (1), 25–47, doi: 10.1080/14616690802209689.

Habermas, Jürgen (1996) *Between facts and norms: contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hainmueller J. and D. Hangartner (2013) 'Who gets a Swiss passport? A natural experiment in immigrant discrimination', *American Political Science Review*, 107 (1), 159–87, doi: 10.1017/S0003055412000494.

Haller (2008) **[REFERENCE MISSING. PLEASE SUPPLY]**

Hammar, T. (1990) *Democracy and the nation state: aliens, denizens, and citizens in a world of international migration*, Aldershot: Gower Publishing.

Hannerz, U. (1990) 'Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7 (2), 237–51, doi: 10.1177/026327690007002014.

Hansen, R. (2009) 'The poverty of postnationalism: citizenship, immigration, and the new Europe', *Theory and Society*, 38 (1), 1–24, doi: 10.1007/s11186-008-9074-0.

Helbling, M. (2010) 'Switzerland: contentious citizenship attribution in a federal state', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (5), 793–809, doi: 10.1080/13691831003764334.

Helbling, M. (2011) 'Why Swiss-Germans dislike Germans: opposition to culturally similar and highly skilled immigrants', *European Societies*, 13 (1), 5–27, doi: 10.1080/14616696.20 10.533784.

Helbling, M. and C. Teney (2015) 'The cosmopoiltan elite in Germany: transnationalism and postmaterialism', *Global Networks* 15 (4), 446–68, doi:10.1111/glob.12073.

Held, D. (2002) 'Culture and political community: national, global, and cosmopolitan', in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 48–58.

Held, D. (2003) *Cosmopolitanism: a defence*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Herrmann, R. K., T. Risse and M. B. Brewer (eds) (2004) *Transnational identities: becoming European in the EU*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Holton, R. J. (2009) *Cosmopolitanisms: new thinking and new directions*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Joppke, C. (2010) *Citizenship and immigration*, Cambridge: Polity.

Jung, J. K. (2008) 'Growing supranational identities in a globalising world? A multilevel analysis of the World Values Surveys', *European Journal of Political Research*, 47 (5), 578–609, doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2008.00779.x.

Kriesi, H.-P., K. Armingeon, H. Siegrist and A. Wimmer (eds) (1999) *Nation and national identity: the European experience in perspective*, Chur: Verlag Rüegger.

Kuhn, T. (2011) 'Individual transnationalism, globalisation and euroscepticism: an empirical test of Deutsch's transactionalist theory', *European Journal of Political Research*, 50 (6), 811–37, doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2011.01987.x.

Lipps, O., F. Laganà, A. Pollien and L. Gianettoni (2013) 'Under-representation of foreign minorities in cross-sectional and longitudinal surveys in Switzerland', in J. Font and M. Mendez (eds) *Surveying ethnic minorities and immigrant populations: methodological challenges and research strategies*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 241–67.

MacDonald, T. (2003) 'Boundaries beyond borders: delineating democratic "peoples" in a globalizing world', *Democratization*, 10 (3), 173–94, doi: 10.1080/13510340312331293977.

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

Morrice, D. (2000) 'The liberal–communitarian debate in contemporary political philosophy and its significance for international relations', *Review of International Studies*, 26 (2), 233–51, doi: 10.1017/S0260210500002333.

Mügge, L. (2012) 'Dual nationality and transnational politics', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38 (1), 1–19, doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2012.640003.

Norris, P. (2000) 'Global governance and cosmopolitan citizens', in J. S. Nye and J. D. Donahue (eds) *Governance in a globalizing world*, Cambridge: Brookings Institution Press, 155–77.

Nussbaum, M. (1996) 'Patriotism and cosmopolitanism', in J. Cohen (ed.) *For love of country: debating the limits of patriotism*, Boston: Beacon Press, 3–17.

Pedroza, L. (2013) 'Policy framing and denizen enfranchisement in Portugal: why some migrant voters are more equal than others', *Citizenship Studies*, 17 (6–7), 852–72, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2013.834140.

Pettit, P. (1997) *Republicanism: a theory of freedom and government*, Oxford: OUP.

Pichler, F. (2009) 'Down-to-earth' cosmopolitanism: subjective and objective measurements of cosmopolitanism in survey research', *Current Sociology*, 57 (5), 704–32, doi: 10.1177/ 0011392109337653.

Pichler, F. (2012) 'Cosmopolitanism in a global perspective: an international comparison of open-minded orientations and identity in relation to globalization', *International Sociology*, 27 (1), 21–50, doi: 10.1177/0268580911422980.

Pogge, T. (2002) *World poverty and human rights*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Portes, A. (2000) 'Globalization from below: the rise of transnational communities', in D. Kalb, M. van der Land, R. Staring, B. van Steenbergen and N. Wilterdink (eds) *The ends of globalization: bringing society back in*, Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield, 253–70.

Recchi, E. and A. Favell (2009) *Pioneers of European integration: citizenship and mobility in the EU*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Renshon, S. A. (2005) *The 50% American: immigration and national identity in an age of terror*, Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Rosenstone, S. and J. M. Hansen (1993) *Mobilization, participation, and democracy in America*, New York: Macmillan.

Roudometof, V. (2005) 'Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and globalization', *Current Sociology*, 53 (1), 113–35, doi: 10.1177/0011392105048291.

Schattle, H. (2008) *The practices of global citizenship*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Scheffler, S. (1999) 'Conceptions of cosmopolitanism', *Utilitas*, 11 (3), 255–76, doi: 10.1017/S0953820800002508.

Schlenker, A. (2015) 'Divided loyalty? Identification and political participation of dual citizens in Switzerland', *European Political Science Review*, online version published before inclusion in an issue, doi: 10.1017/S1755773915000168.

Schlenker, A. and J. Blatter (2014) 'Conceptualizing and evaluating (new) forms of citizenship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism', *Democratization*, 21 (6), 1091–116, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2013.783820.

Sinnott, R. (2005) 'An evaluation of the measurement of national, subnational and supranational identity in crossnational surveys', *Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 18 (2), 211–23, doi: 10.1093/ijpor/edh116.

Skrbis, Z. and I. Woodward (2007) 'The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness', *Sociological Review*, 55 (4), 730–47, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2007.00750.x.

Soysal, Y. N. (1994) *Limits of citizenship: migrants and postnational membership in Europe*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Staton, J. K., R. A. Jackson and D. Canache (2007) Dual nationality among Latinos: what are the implications for political connectedness? *The Journal of Politics*, 69 (2), 470–82, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2508.2007.00544.x.

Teney, C., O. Lacewell and P. de Wilde (2014) 'Winners and losers of globalization in Europe: attitudes and ideologies', *European Political Science Review*, 6 (4), 575–95, doi: 10.1017/S1755773913000246.

Thompson, J. (1998) 'Community identity and world citizenship', in D. Archibugi, D. Held and M. Köhler (eds) *Re-imagining political community: studies in cosmopolitan democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 179–97.

Vertovec, S. (2009) *Cosmopolitanism in attitude, practice and competence*, MMG working paper 09–08, available at: http://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-001M-0000-0012-1E2B-9.

Vertovec, S. and R. Cohen (eds) (2002) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and practice*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Waldron, J. (1992) 'Minority cultures and the cosmopolitan alternative', *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 25 (3), 751–93, available at: http://goo.gl/HUfHMd.

Walzer, M. (1990) 'The communitarian critique of liberalism', *Political Theory*, 18 (1), 6–23, doi: 10.1177/0090591790018001002.

Zürn, M. (2014) 'The politicization of world politics and its effects: eight propositions', *European Political Science Review*, 6 (1), 47–71, doi:10.1017/S1755773912000276.

Appendix

Items and wording of questions

DEPENDENT VARIABLES (SCALE ITEMS)

Liberal cosmopolitanism

Openness toward cultural diversity	'Would you say that Switzerland's cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries?' Minimum: 0 = undermined; maximum: 10 = enriched.
Openness toward immigration/ naturalization	'Should immigration to/naturalization in Switzerland generally be made easier or more difficult?' Minimum: 0 = more difficult; maximum: 10 = easier.
Consideration of transnational interests	'Some political decisions today can have an impact beyond the borders of countries. Would you agree that in such cases the interests of people affected by such decisions in other countries should be considered?' Minimum: 0 = do not agree at all; maximum: 3 = agree strongly. The values were rescaled to a range of 0–10 before aggregation with the other items.
Support for transnational political rights	'Some political decisions today can have an impact beyond the borders of countries. Would you agree that in such cases the people affected by such decisions in other countries should be able to participate in these decisions in some way?' Minimum: 0 = do not agree at all; maximum: 3 = agree strongly. The values were rescaled to a range of 0–10 before aggregation with the other items.

Communitarian cosmopolitanism

Self-description as a European/world citizen	'How much does the following statement apply to you? I am a European. /I am a world citizen.' Minimum: 0 = applies not at all; maximum 10 = applies fully.
Attachment to Europe/the world	'How attached do you feel to Europe/the world?' Minimum: 0 = not at all attached; maximum: 3 = very attached. The values were rescaled to a range of 0–10 before aggregation with the other items.
Solidarity with all Europeans/human beings	'How strongly do you feel obliged towards the following groups of people? All Europeans/all human beings.' Minimum: 0 = not at all; maximum: 3 = strongly. The values were rescaled to a range of 0–10 before aggregation with the other items.

Republican cosmopolitanism

Knowledge of the UN	Number of right answers to the question: 'Which five countries of the following are permanent members of the UN Security Council?' Minimum: 0; maximum: 5. Countries included as options: China, Germany, Australia, France, Russia, Brazil, Canada, Spain, India, USA, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Turkey. The resulting summative scale was rescaled to a range of 0–10 before aggregation with the other items.

Interest in global politics	'How interested are you in international politics?' Minimum: 0 = not at all; maximum: 10 = very strongly.
Political activities concerning global matters	Summative scale constructed from answers to the following questions. 'Have you participated in one of the following forms of political activity concerning global matters during the last two years; signed a petition/ participated in a demonstration/donated money for a political cause/ contacted media/contacted a politician/Di££scussed politics with family or friends/taken part in online political forum.' 'Are you a member of an international NGO?' Minimum: 0 = none of the above; maximum: 8 = all of the above. The summative scales were rescaled to a range of 0–10 before aggregation with the other items.
Participation in the interest of Europe/ humanity	'To what extent do you take into account the following interests when you participate politically?' The interests of Europe/of humanity Minimum: 0 = not at all; maximum: 10 = very much.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Status	Dummy variables with mono citizens as the reference category.
Foreign/second nationality	Dummy variables with Swiss nationality as the reference category.
Naturalized	Dummy variable with autochthonous citizens/foreigners as the reference category.
First generation	Dummy variable with second generation/no immigration background as reference category.
Residence duration	'Approximately how many years have you lived in Switzerland?'
International travel	'On average, how often do you travel to Germany/Italy/Kosovo or other countries for business or private purposes?' Minimum: 0 = never; maximum: 3 very often.
International business contacts	Dummy measuring whether someone has work-related contacts with people in other countries.
International private contacts	Dummy measuring whether someone has friends in other countries.
Male	1= male, 0 = female.
Age	Age in years.
Education	Years of full-time education completed.
Income	'If you count your income from all sources, what is your monthly net income?' 1 = no income at all; 8 = CHF 12 001 or more.
Urbanization	0= 9–999 inhabitants, 8 = 200 000 + inhabitants; standardized coding by means of geographical meta-data according to where respondents live.
Political orientation	'In politics, political orientations can be categorized as left or right. Where would you place yourself on the following scale?' Minimum: 0 = very much on the left; maximum: 10 = very much on the right.

Table A1: Blockwise analysis of liberal cosmopolitanism

	Model I		*Model II*		*Model III*	
Status (ref: mono citizens)						
Dual citizens	.850***	(.133)	.499*	(.239)	.579**	(.217)
Foreign residents	1.479***	(.166)	1.107***	(.313)	1.326***	(.290)
Naturalized			.090	(.189)	.150	(.178)
Foreign/second nationality (ref: Swiss nationality)						
German			.464	(.329)	-.035	(.309)
Italian			.133	(.307)	-.129	(.288)
Kosovar			1.247***	(.317)	1.088**	(.312)
First generation			.358*	(.157)	.349*	(.169)
Residence duration			.008**	(.003)	.007*	(.003)
International travel			-.012	(.092)	-.027	(.084)
Int. business contacts			.183	(.114)	.241*	(.107)
Int. private contacts			.465**	(.147)	.352**	(.134)
Male					-.228*	(.107)
Age					.008	(.005)
Education					.041**	(.015)
Income					-.005	(.032)
Urbanization					.057*	(.023)
Right political orientation					-.345***	(.025)
Constant	4.384***	(.112)	3.338***	(.252)	4.363***	(.362)
Adj. R2	.068		.130		.284	
Number N	1091		1091		1091	

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; all others are not significant.

Method: Linear regression, listwise deletion.

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients are stated, along with the corresponding standard errors (in brackets).

Table A2: Blockwise analysis of communitarian cosmopolitanism

	Model I		*Model II*		*Model III*	
Status (ref: mono citizens)						
Dual citizens	.125	(.146)	-.073	(.271)	.028	(.433)
Foreign residents	.453*	(.181)	.678	(.351)	.876*	(.262)
Naturalized			.549*	(.211)	.608**	(.345)
Foreign/second nationality (ref: Swiss nationality)						
German			.107	(.371)	-.259	(.211)
Italian			-.082	(.346)	-.292	(.372)
Kosovar			-.091	(.356)	-.317	(.345)
First generation			-.160	(.175)	-.173	(.370)
Residence duration			.005	(.003)	.003	(.201)
International travel			-.008	(.104)	-.033	(.004)
Int. business contacts			.322*	(.129)	.394**	(.100)
Int. private contacts			.458**	(.164)	.422**	(.128)
Male					-.296*	(.159)
Age					.007	(.127)
Education					.004	(.006)
Income					.005	(.018)
Urbanization					.020	(.038)
Right political orientation					-.250***	(.029)
Constant	5.717***	(.122)	4.936***	(.283)	6.099***	(.433)
Adj. R2	.004		.023		.093	
Number N	1086		1086		1086	

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; all others are not significant.

Method: Linear regression, listwise deletion.

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients are stated, along with the corresponding standard errors (in brackets).

Table A3: Blockwise analysis of republican cosmopolitanism

	Model I		*Model II*		*Model III*	
Status (ref: mono citizens)						
Dual citizens	.614***	(.127)	.893***	(.219)	.823***	(.210)
Foreign residents	.112	(.157)	.497	(.289)	.332	(.282)
Naturalized			.275	(.180)	.150	(.177)
Foreign/second nationality (ref: Swiss nationality)						
German			-.262	(.310)	-.321	(.306)
Italian			-.931**	(.285)	-.844**	(.282)
Kosovar			-.779**	(.294)	-.439	(.303)
First generation			.102	(.147)	-.147	(.167)
Residence duration			.006*	(.003)	.001	(.003)
International travel			.218*	(.087)	.133	(.084)
Int. business contacts			.464***	(.108)	.328**	(.106)
Int. private contacts			.301*	(.139)	.289*	(.134)
Male					.242*	(.107)
Age					.011*	(.005)
Education					.060***	(.015)
Income					.096**	(.031)
Urbanization					.042	(.023)
Right political orientation					-.155***	(.025)
Constant	5.162***	(.106)	4.194***	(.243)	3.501***	(.366)
Adj. R2	.027		.117		.191	
Number N	1006		1006		1006	

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05; all others are not significant.

Method: Linear regression, listwise deletion

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients are stated, along with the corresponding standard errors (in brackets).

Table A4: Summary statistics of independent variables[14]

Variable	Mean	SD	Min-Max	N
Naturalized	0.49	0.50	0/1	1764
First generation	0.43	0.49	0/1	1680
Residence duration	28.7	17.7	0-83	1590
International travel	1.93	0.61	0/3	1734
International business contacts	0.34	0.48	0/1	1686
International private contacts	0.80	0.40	0/1	1728
Male	0.51	0.50	0/1	1764
Age	44.7	15.3	19-83	1764
Education	13.7	3.71	1-27	1677
Income	4.00	1.81	1-8	1476
Urbanization	3.65	2.06	0-8	1764
Right political orientation	5.01	2.10	0-10	1531

