

Chapter 10

Questions about National , Subnational and Ethnic Identity

Suggested by

Jaak Billiet
K.U. Leuven

Contents

10.1.	(Sub)-national and ethnic identity by Jaak Billiet	386
	<i>10.1.1 Problems in the measurement of ethnic identity</i>	<i>388</i>
	<i>10.1.2 Proposal for the ESS-core questions on ethnic identity</i>	<i>396</i>
	<i>10.1.3 Problems in the measurement of citizenship and (sub)-national identity ..</i>	<i>399</i>
	<i>10.1.4 Proposal for (sub)-national identity questions in ESS core</i>	<i>409</i>
10.2	Comments of the CCT	413

10.1. (Sub)-national and ethnic identity by Jaak Billiet

Introduction

As was the case for religious identification in previous session, (sub)-national and ethnic identities are in the core of social identifications (Erikson & Johnsson, 1999). A 'social identity' is "the individual's knowledge that he belongs to certain groups. These identities result social groups together with some emotional and value significance to hem of the group membership" (Tajfel, 1978: 63). These identities therefore result from inter-group relations as do cognitive and affective representations of its dimensional constituents. More specifically, social identity theory (SIT) proposes that individuals seek a positive social identity, a positive self-concept based on their membership through social comparisons between their own and other groups. They try to achieve 'positive distinctiveness for their own group in order to protect and maintain their self-esteem as group member (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner & Giles, 1981). Individuals self-conceptions of who they are, and how they relate to others, is greatly influenced by the interpersonal and intergroup context in which they evolve and in which social comparisons are made (Kessler, et al., 2000: 96-97). (Sub)-national and ethnic identities are therefore the results of contacts with others, primarily characterised by their real or perceived affiliation to a more or less valued group defined along (sub)-national and ethnic lines (Leets, Clément & Giles, sd: 13).

For these reasons, although these identities refer to 'objective' political, geographic (regions) or physical realities, the measurement of (sub)-national or ethnic 'belonging' or identification is always subjective. It depends as much on self-conceptions, affective feelings as on social definitions of others in the relevant environment. Moreover, the diversity in sub-national and ethnic groups is overwhelming, and specific for nearly every country in the ESS. Therefore, it will be even more difficult to find a small set of questions as this was the case in the measurement of religious identification that had a least common features over different countries. We should keep in mind that it is not intended to make a special module. We just want to select a limited number of questions for the ESS core.

A source for the measurement of (sub)-national identity was J.J. Linz's paper that was prepared for the ESS core. I took the conclusions of that paper and I completed these with information derived from my own experience and research on (sub)-national identities in Belgium (Maddens et al., 1998; Maddens et al., 2000; De Winter et al., 1998; Billiet et al., 2000). Because Belgium is a typical and complex multi-national society with different official languages, most problems that are discussed in Linz's paper are present in our research.

The main source of the measurement of ethnicity is an excellent but unpublished paper by Leets, Clément and Giles (s.d.). Although, the paper is not dated, I assume that is prepared in the eighties (see Leets, Giles & Clément, 1986).¹ It is an excellent overview of the theories and

¹ This paper was presented for publication in a Tarki book (Budapest) in which social measurements should be presented for east European countries. My paper on the measurement of religion that I used as a source for the previous section, was also prepared for that occasion. Most of the idea's that are developed in that paper

of all problems met by the measurement of ethnicity. The conclusions will learn us that the measurement of ethnic identity by means of a standardised instrument is not that evident in a cross-cultural situation (with surveys in many countries) because “ethnic identification is seen as the self-assignment to an evaluatively-loaded social category, with societal, situational and relational characteristics” (Leets et al., 22). Let us start with the most difficult, ethnic identity.

← Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

appeared in an earlier article of the same authors (1986), but the paper seemed to be completed in 1992 of 1993.

10.1.1 Problems in the measurement of ethnic identity

“Ethnicity has proven to be a very difficult concept to define with much precision. Indeed those who have approached the task have not been able to achieve a consensus. Most usages are both vague and ambiguous in their applications to empirical research. What some scholars consider to be examples of ethnicity, other would consider to be cases of such other variables as regionalism, religious-sectarianism, class conflict, and even sheer opportunism” (Ross, 1979: 3)

Leets, Giles and Clément explored the the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups* (Thernstrom, 1980), which records information on 101 ethnic groups, and found that ethnicity is treated as an aggregate characterised by some combination of at least 14 features. These features are: (1) common geographical origin; (2) migration status; (3) race; (4) language or dialect; (5) religious faith; (5) ties that transcend kinship, neighbourhood and community boundaries; (7) shared traditions, values, and symbols; (8) literature, folklore, and music; (9) food preferences; (10) settlement and employment patterns; (11) special interest in regard to politics in the homeland and the US; (12) institutions that specifically secure and maintain the group; (13) an internal sense of distinctiveness; (14) an external perception of distinctiveness (Leets et al., 2). Going that direction would suggest a set of complex multiple indicators, and some kind of cluster analysis afterwards in order to construct the ethnic groups at hoc by means of closeness and distance. Such a measure should then be combined with a subjective self-definition. It is impossible to do this in a core questionnaire if many features are included, because such an approach would require a very large questionnaire on the topic of ethnicity.

Theories of ethnicity

In the work of Thompson (1989), ethnicity has been viewed as a biological, cultural, political, psychological and social organisation phenomenon, with a number of contrasting paradigmatic consequences. There is certainly not a unifying framework to study ethnicity over all disciplines. Even within the social sciences, there are different theories of ethnicity, each with their own assumptions and consequences for the measurement. According to Leets et al. the *‘primordialism-instrumentalism’* dichotomy is fundamental in the perspectives from which ethnicity has been studied. Some authors are working from a *‘primordialist’* principle in which ethnicity is viewed as an innate or instinctive (genetic) predisposition (Leets et al., 5; Shils, 1957). Human, by nature, are seen to have a primordial need for group affiliation that is best satisfied by the maintenance of an ethnic identity (Leets et al., p. 6). In this perspective, objective measurements of ethnic belonging must be possible. In contrast, *‘instrumentalism’* claims that ethnicity is defined by social (not genetic) forces. Ethnic groups are thus made in social processes (Leets et al., 6). The social identity theory (SIT) is clearly grounded in this perspective. *Postmodernism* goes even a step further in this direction: ethnicity is not only man-made, it is constantly re-constructed in interaction. In the latter perspective, the measurement of ethnic identity in surveys by means of standardised instruments seems impossible.

One may assume that this situation results in large numbers of measurements that are different depending of the theoretical views and assumptions. However, after an exploration

of a large number of empirical articles that appeared between 1974 and 1992 in social science journals, Leets, Clément and Giles (p. 16) concluded that 82% of the instruments were not derived from a conceptualisation. About 43% of the measures are geopolitical, 9% are subjective, 5% behavioural and 22% multiple measures (no information: 21%). More recently, ISSP 1995 is an example of such an a-theoretical and geopolitical approach. Ethnicity is measured there by questions about country and region where the respondent is living, the country where the ancestors come from, and by the self-placement at a list of ethnic groups. The categories in which the respondents are classified are evidently largely country specific.

What are the most important accents in the sociological theories? In *socio-biology*, ethnicity is considered deeply rooted in the individual but ethnic boundaries are also perceived as fuzzy and ethnicity is seen as situational, depending on ecological conditions. Both the primordialist and the instrumentalist perspectives are present there as two complementary sides of the evolutionary coin (Leets et.al., 6).

According to Leets, Clément and Giles (pp 9-10), two strains of Marxist thought seem relevant to studies of ethnocentrism: post-modern and dependency theories. *Postmodernism* views ethnicity as contextualised by its historical and cultural nature. In this view, conceptions such as nations and ethnicity are historically made and unmade. They may arise and disappear under different historical conditions. Anderson (1983) proposes that ethnicity ultimately depends upon points of shared references held by members of an ethnic community or nation. These common points of reference result in national or ethnic collective memories or '*imagined communities*'. The term 'imagined' is used because the members of these 'communities' will never know, meet or hear of most of their fellow-members (Anderson, 1983). The *dependency theory* denies any real substance to ethnicity since this is completely reduced to the class struggle. In this approach, the analysis of inequality is basic to understand ethnicity.

In the framework of the theories of *assimilation* and *pluralism*, ethnic groups are perceived as folk groups from a former era that are now under transformation as a result of the individual freedom offered to individuals in a modern society. *Pluralists* stress the continuing viability of ethnic groups and they promote the idea of pluralistic and multi-cultural societies. Contrary to that, *assimilation* theory asserts that with individual freedom and opportunity, ethnic groups become obsolete. In this view, the distinction and usefulness of the ethnic group will be absorbed in the social structure of society (see Thompson, 1989). According to this theory, the ethnic groups will gradually lose their distinctiveness and become part of larger societies (Leets et al., 10-11). Needless to say how wrong these 'predictions' are for the minority groups and the immigrants.

1. rfshlagf
2. rejh
- 3.

What do we learn from the theories of ethnicity?

1. The measurement of ethnic identity is not possible with only *objective* criteria, the *subjective* self-definition of belong is also important, but it is presumably not evident to ask questions about one's "ethnic identity".

2. Measuring ethnic identity by means of a large set of objective indicators derived from the different features (e.g. *primordialism linked to multiple objective indicators*) is impossible within the context of the ESS core since it requires too many questions about too many different aspects.
3. The opposite way of measuring ethnic identity in which the focus is only on ongoing identity construction and subjective contextual definitions (e.g. *instrumentalism linked to neomodernism and constructivism*) is completely excluded in the context of surveys since in that case, we cannot use standardised instruments (survey questions).
4. The ideas of 'imagined community' and 'common references' are related to the concept of '*social representations*' (see Moscovici, 1984). It is, in principle possible, to ask questions about the social representations that are shared (collective) among members of groupings.
5. So far as the *assimilation theory* is correct, there will be hardly traces of ethnic identity feelings among the citizens of Western European societies (in the majority groups) and it has no sense to ask these respondents about the ethnic groups to which they belong. It is very likely that a large number of respondents do not identify with an ethnic group but with a nation or sub-nation (region) or language group. It is therefore to know what kind of identification is most salient for the respondent.
6. Language is in many cases closely related to ethnic origin (see Erikson & Johnsson, 1999).

Theories of identity

Thus far the theories on ethnicity of which we could derive some ideas about the measurement of ethnic identity. What can we learn from the theories of identity? It is possible to distinguish between psychoanalytic theories, social identity theories, social interaction theories of identities, and social constructivism.

In the psychoanalytic theory of which Erikson (1959) is an exponent, ego identity is "the awareness of the fact that there is a self sameness and continuity to the ego's synthesising methods and that these methods are effective in safe guarding the sameness and continuity of one's meaning for others" (Erikson, 1959; 23; Leets et al., 12).

The *social identity theory* links Erikson's ideas of individual identity with society (groupings). The individual's identity depends on the social interactions within groups. The knowledge that one belongs to certain groups, and the value attached to those memberships, is based on the subjective perception of the individual (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Ethnic identity is the result of contact with others, primarily characterised by their *real* or *perceived* affiliation to a *more or less valued group* defined along ethnic lines (Leets et al., 13).

In *social interactionism*, the focus is at the actively involved actor in the process of ethnic identification. An individual does not have one identity, but *multiple identities* which are negotiated with others through interaction (Blumer, 1969). An individual's ego identity, individual identity, and social identity, are viewed as interdependent and inseparable, and are different aspects of the same social process. An individual's social identity is not always stable and equally salient. Individuals actively engage in different identity stages according

to the social context and the interaction. Ethnic identity emerges when an individual's social context underscores aspects that are related to the categorisation of individuals along ethnic lines (Leets et al., 14).

Social constructivism (Gergen, 1985) embraces the notion of a subjective and historically-constructed identity, challenging the objective basis of conventional knowledge. The social constructivists have no interest in the appearance of ethnic (or other) identities as such, they are interested in the social processes in which the identities are constructed.

What do we learn from the theories of identity?

1. Social constructivism does not fit with our interest for survey measurements. This was already concluded from previous theoretical perspectives of ethnicity.
2. We should keep in mind that there may be multiple (ethnic) identities that are not mutually exclusive and that include each other (e.g. Western European -> Flemish). We will meet this idea again in the section of (sub)-national identity.
3. Membership is more or less positively (or negatively) evaluated. It is not a matter of yes or no, but of intensity of feelings (gradation).
4. The saliency of an ethnic identity is not stable but depends of situations and contexts. Non existing identities (non-attitudes) can be induced by the questions in a survey.

The measurement of ethnicity in surveys

In a large number of studies, ethnicity is not the focal point, but it is included in the questionnaires as a social-background variable. We have already pointed to the fact that, according to a survey of Leets et al. of about 10,000 citations in the 1974-1992 period, at least 43% of the measures were *geopolitical*. The questions that are asked are about the place of birth of the respondent, the place of birth of the parents' and even the grandparents'. *The subjective approach* simply asks the respondent what ethnicity she or he considers herself or himself. The behavioural approach tries to measure ethnic identity by asking about a number of activities in which the respondent is involved (ritual happenings, the use of food, language, religious practice...). In about 22% of the cases that report the measurement of ethnicity, multiple measures are used (e.g. language + country or region of birth + nationality + emotional attachment). It is claimed that multiple indicators (objective and subjective) are indispensable to capture the essence of ethnicity, but this is seldom implemented in practice (Leets et al., 17-18).

In studies in which ethnicity is the focal point, the following dimensions of ethnic identity are included in the questionnaires: ethnic awareness, ethnic self-identification, ethnic attitudes, and ethnic behaviours (behaviour patterns that are specific for an ethnic group).

If we think about these measures, a large number of categories must be present in closed questions or one should use open questions. Each of these is problematic. The risk of *open questions* is that the respondent does not understand what is meant by the question. Sometimes, the term '*race*' is used instead of ethnic group, but a study argues that asking for

the '*origins*' is closer to the popular understanding of ethnic diversity than 'race' (Hirschman et al., 2000). In *closed questions*, it is nearly impossible to include all relevant categories that are valid in all European countries. In that case, one should ask each National Co-ordinator to *prepare functional equivalent questions that are country specific* and that are comparable for all the countries (see also Erikson & Johnsson, 1999).

There are other measures, e.g. evaluative reactions to ethnic group membership. This is problematic because an evaluative reaction does not reflect a person's sense of belonging to an ethnic group. It is possible that one is classified as a member by objective criteria, but that one has very negative feelings towards that group. Ethnic identity measured in terms of language, friendship, social organisation, religion, cultural traditions, and politics may be the poorest of the measures (Leets et al., 20). Erikson and Johnsson's paper (1999) stated that registration of ethnic status is a very sensitive issue and will probably lead to differing results in different countries. According to them, one may well get a rather substantial non-response on such a question and it is probably not possible to use the same categories in all participating nations. However, what in this situation seems to be possible, is to ask for country of birth for the respondent and for the parents and likewise, the nationality, mother tongue, and denomination of the respondent.

The use of mutually exclusively categories (Black vs. White, French vs. English) is not advised because this does not allow identities that are simultaneously endorsed (complementary identities). It is better to rate each of the identities in separate questions because this allows for positive correlations.

According to Leets, Clément, and Giles, one should keep in mind the following principles that are derived from the theoretical exploration: "Ethnicity and ethnic identification, whether *stable* or *transient*, *fundamental* or *peripheral* to the individual's concerns include a *measure of self-assignment* to a socially-derived category, which only exists *by opposition to other social categories*. Furthermore, such self-assignment is per force *affectively-loaded*. Both the categorical assignment and its valence are, therefore, necessary elements of ethnicity and its measurement" (Leets et al., 21).

Some empirical findings about ethnic identification

In the *Belgian General Election survey* of 1995, in the *Belgian European Value* study of 1999 (specific questions in Belgian), and in ISSP 1995 we find information about the saliency of different identifications. The EVS 1999 is interesting since, in Belgium, an *open question* was asked first (before the questions of geopolitical identities): "*Looking at the groups to which you belong, which one is of most significance*".

Many different answers were given by the respondents. After coding into meaningful categories, we found the distribution in Table 1. During the coding and the analysis, we learned the following: (1) The open question was not easy to respond since it was not explained what was meant by "groups". People could have all kinds of thing in their heads. However, only 2% of the respondents had no opinion. One of the reasons for that is that interviewers had helped the respondents. We discovered in the file of open answers

response sets for several interviewers (some interviewers had systematically more the same terms as others); (2) About 29% of the respondents reported no significant groups; (3) The reference to *ethnic groups was quasi zero* in this population of 89% Belgians and 11% non-Belgians; (4) Geo-political affiliation (Belgium, Flanders, Wallonia, the World as a whole...) was not a significant identification, but in subsequent closest questions with response scales about frequency of feelings, intensity of feelings and value of feeling, one could have the impression that geo-political attachment was really significant. This impression however has to be questioned in view of the open questions where the groups were spontaneously endorsed by the respondents. This is an empirical argument in favour of the assimilation hypothesis saying that many citizens of Western-European countries do not endorse ethnical identification because other identifications are more significant.

Exhibit 2.1. Categories of groupings with highest significance in EVS 1999 (Belgium) (Billiet et al., 2000).

Grouping	Flanders	Wallonia	French speaking Brussels	Total Belgium
None	26,0	31,1	43,2	29,1
Primary groups	32,2	46,0	23,7	36,1
Religious groups	22,0	4,7	11,8	15,3
Social organisations	11,1	7,0	11,0	9,8
Geo-political	4,3	5,4	7,8	5,0
Generation	2,3	1,0	0,6	1,7
Work, company	0,8	2,3	1,5	1,2
Social categories	1,1	1,7	0,0	1,3
Other	0,4	0,9	0,5	0,6
Total	805	588	480	1.873

In the Belgium General Election Survey of 1995 (ISPO, 1998) the following question was asked before the questions on (sub)-national identity and consciousness. *"People sometimes consider themselves as being part of a certain group of people. Could you tell me, for each of these groups, to what extent it is important to you to belong to this group? You can answer with Card nr. X"*.

The response distributions for two regions (Flanders = Dutch speaking, Wallonia = French speaking) are in Exhibit 2.2. The following observation can be made: (1) We did not ask questions about the ethnic identification, but this might be possible; (2) The most important groups to belong to are the nation, the language, and the territory. The other groups seem not so important; (3) There are differences between the region in importance of the three most important groups. An additional problem in this sample is the possibility that 'nation' is different for the two regions (is it Belgium, Flanders, or Wallonia?). We should discuss this difficulty for all (sub)-national entities in next session about national identity.

Exhibit 2.2. Response to the question about the importance of groups (ISPO, 1998: 181-183) (horizontal percentages).

Groups	Very important	Important	Not much important	Not important	Do not know
People who belong to one nation					
Flanders	9.9	51.2	28.6	8.1	2.2
Wallonia	30.8	37.5	19.4	101	2.3
People who live in the same territory					
Flanders	6.5	50.4	32.6	8.8	1.7
Wallonia	27.4	36.2	23.4	11.7	1.3
People who share the same language					
Flanders	14.0	52.4	25.0	8.1	0.6
Wallonia	34.7	39.0	17.6	7.9	0.9
People who have the same age					
Flanders	2.3	16.4	51.1	29.3	0.8
Wallonia	9.2	24.1	36.0	29.6	1.0
People who have the same belief					
Flanders	3.2	23.7	46.2	26.0	0.8
Wallonia	8.6	21.8	34.5	33.7	1.4
People who have the same occupation					
Flanders	1.3	15.2	43.8	39.0	0.6
Wallonia	7.1	17.9	33.7	39.5	1.7
People of the same gender					
Flanders	0.9	6.1	41.3	50.6	1.1
Wallonia	2.3	11.0	33.0	52.1	1.6
People who belong to the same social class					
Flanders	1.7	17.0	49.4	30.5	1.4
Wallonia	6.4	23.7	33.0	35.7	1.2

Another observations deals with the measurement of ethnic identity in ISSP 1995. In Q18a about the racial/ethnic group of the respondent, the following two strategies are suggested if the information in the demographic part of the questionnaire does not provide the information about the ethnic group (notice: the question wording in the demographic part is country specific): a) the investigator should develop a list of the major ethnic groups of the country and ask respondent to place herself/himself on the list; b) ask the question "From what country/countries or part(s) of countries of the world did your ancestors come?". A subsequent question about the closeness of feelings (very close, close, not very close, not close at all, can't choose) is optional. In the reporting of the response distributions, it is apparent that these questions were used in different ways. Germany has simply asked about the nationality and has avoided the terms "race of ethnic". Great Britain was offered a list of major ethnic groups and asked "To which of these groups do you consider to belong". The Netherlands and Japan asked "To which group do you belong". The coded list of ethnic (national) groups contained 95 main categories.

In the Netherlands, 97.2% of the respondents refer to "Netherlands, Flemish or Dutch". In Normay, 97.6% refer to Norway. About 93.2% of the Swedish sample refer to Swedish. 84.1% of the Bulgarian refer to "Bulgarian". The respondents of the latvia refer to "Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian" (59.2%) and "Russian, Russia" (30.4%). Quasi none of the inhabitants of European countries refer to "European" as an ethnic group, but 75.5% of the respondents in New Zealand refer to "European, Europe, White/European, other Europe, other European, White" (15.2 refer to "Maori"). A better illustration of the context dependence of ethnic identity can hardly be given. The countries with most ethnic diversity in the responses are Canada and the Philippines. In Canada, 36% refer to "France Canada or French Canada", and 25.7% to "English, British, England, England & Wales". 29.8% of the Philipinne respondents refer to "Visayan/Cebuano, Hoholano, Leyteno/leyte" and 27.8% refer to "Philippino/Filippino, Tagalo, Phillipines" (ISSP 1995: 136-148).

The "closeness questions" has been asked in 14 countries. The distributions are rather skewed with only a few number of respondents in the "not close at all" category.

We may conclude that "ethnic identity" is no equally "real" in each country. The majority group in Western societies does not use the term "ethnic group" and refers mostly to geopolitical realities such as the nation, or a sub-nation or region (e.g. the open EVS question and ISSP). It seems to be more salient for immigrants who refer to their origin (e.g. in New Zealand "Europeans", but this is presumably a precoded category). The same category that has the quality of an "ethnic identity" in one context (e.g. European in New Zealand) may have none in another context ("European" in Europe). The group identification is, as was found in the theoretical discussion, comparative and contrastive (e.g. "English" or "French" in Canada, not "European"). We may expect that even among those who do not use the term in everyday life, will indicate the "ethnic group" important in a question with rating scales. It is possible to avoid this by including a category "without meaning" (or something like this).

10.1.2 Proposal for the ESS-core questions on ethnic identity

After all this, the measurement of ethnic identity in a common core seems problematic. If one takes the previous observations seriously, there are ideally three steps in the construction of questions about ethnicity. (1) In view of the elaboration of a taxonomy of ethnic group, one should try to elicit through an open methodology, ethnic labels, corresponding valences, and contextual aspects. (2) The second step consists in using the taxonomy in order to formulate closed questions regarding the endorsement of various labels and their perceived valence in a representative sample of situations. The respondents should be presented simultaneously with a variety of labels and invited to view their own ethnic membership. (3) The final step consists in the derivation of indices of ethnic salience since it is apparent that the assignment of labels alone is not adequate. These are the final recommendations in the study of Leets, Clement and Giles (p. 22-23). The country-specificity is also stressed in the paper of Erikson and Johnsson (1999).

Is this possible in the context of the ESS core? I think it is not. What to do then? Can we ask each National Co-ordinator to construct a closed questions in which every significant ethnic group in his or her country is listed, and in which the intensity of attachment or distance is measured? ISSP 1995 has used this strategy. However, the response distributions show that different terms are mixed. What is the experience of the participants of ISSP (Zuma, Natcen)? What is the alternative within context of a very limited number of questions? Is a two-step open question an alternative? Even after this exploration I admit that I do not know, and that I am even more in doubt then before this study. Therefore I will give some suggestions that made it possible to take a decision in the group about which questions can be included in the core.

According to Erikson and Johnsson, (1999) measuring country of origin, nationality, mother tongue and denomination together should make it possible to construct a highly precise indicator of ethnicity. It will not only be possible to distinguish between immigrants from different nations but also between immigrants of different nationality but having their origin in the same country. Therefore, these variables should be present anyway within the core and they can be used for several purposes (religious identity, ethnic origin, sub-national identity)

Religious identification: see previous part of this paper.

Language (Mother tongue): see **Q33** of ESS core questionnaire. Suggestions for Demographic and Socio-economic variables (Annotated version 20.09.01), p. 11

Country of origin and citizenship. See also the section on national identity. Take **Q31** (citizenship) and **Q32** (country of birth) of ESS core questionnaire. Suggestions for Demographic and Socio-economic variables (Annotated version 20.09.01), p. 10.

Ethnic origin:

QE1. "Are you or any of your parents an immigrant to [country]?"
--

	YES	NO
RESP: HIM/HERSELF IS AN IMMIGRANT	1	2
RESP: FATHER IS AN IMMIGRANT	1	2
RESP: MOTHER IS AN IMMAGRANT	1	2

Ethnic identification

QE2. Do you consider yourself as belonging to an ethnic group? (YES/NO)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO -> QE3

QE3. Which group? _____

Alternative: the ISSP strategy: ask the National Co-ordinators to list the relevant ethnic groups in the country and ask a closed question (for an example see: British Social Attitudes, 14th report, 1997: 273)

QE2b. "To which of these groups do you consider yourself to belong?"
(*Country specific list*)

Closeness

QE4. "How would you describe your feelings towards this group?"

1. very close
2. close
3. not very close
4. not close at all
7. I have no idea on that

Importance of ethnic (and other) identifications

QE5. "People sometimes consider themselves as being part of a certain group of people. Could you tell me, for each of these groups, to what extent it is important to you to belong to this group? You can answer with Card n°. X".

	Very important	Important	Not much important	Not important	I have never reflected on this
People who belong to one nation	1	2	3	4	7
People who live in the same territory	1	2	3	4	7

People who have the same religious beliefs	1	2	3	4	7
People who belong to the same ethnic group	1	2	3	4	7
People who share the same language	1	2	3	4	7

I have only listed the most important groups of the ISPO question and I have added the "ethnic group".

Other question that belong also to "national identity" (see next section). The category "not reflected on this" is included in order to distinguish between opinions and non-opinions. I think that this is necessary here, given the nature of the issue.

Apart from these questions, it is recommended to ask about the citizenship of the respondent(nation) and about his own origin and the origin of his ancestors (or parents and grandparents), and about the language he or she is using in everyday life. I will discuss these questions in next section 4.

10.1.3 *Problems in the measurement of citizenship and (sub)-national identity*

Most problems that were encountered in previous section come back in the measurement of national identity. However, there are some new aspects, and the measurement of national identity is more extensively documented in comparative and cross-cultural research. This section is mainly based on the paper that J.J. Linz has prepared for ESS (concepts, problems, some suggestions for questions, on the paper of Erikson and Johnsson (1999), and on my own experiences and empirical analysis in this domain (Maddens et al., 2000; ISPO data-sets). I will also utilise the ISSP 1995 survey on national identity, and some of the studies that are using these data (Blank, Schmidt & Westle, 2001; de Figueiredao & Elkins, 2001; Smith, 2001), and the 1997/98 *Report on British Social Attitudes* (Jowell et al., 1997).

Internal complexity of the nation-state

J. Linz started his note with the observation that nation-states are often multinational (the 'sub-nations'), multilingual, multicultural, multiethnic and multi-religious (pp. 1-3). According to J. Linz, it is very important to collect reasonably adequate data on the different dimensions (p. 4). The ethnic and religious dimensions have been discussed in previous sections. We can now pay attention mainly to the aspects of multiple nationalities and multiple linguistic groups into one nation-state. Both aspects are often mixed. The idea of 'multicultural' is more complex since it covers all kinds of cultural differences. It is impossible to include some measurements of this within the core module.

To a certain extent, the problem of linguistic diversity will be solved because in the ESS instructions to the National Co-ordinators. Translations should be made for all languages that exceed 5% of the population within each nation-state. However, it is possible that the language that will be used in the questionnaire does not correspond with the language the respondent speaks in his every-day life situation (e.g. at home). This can be solved by asking the open ISSP question "What language(s) do you speak at home?" (Q16a in the 1995 ISSP module) or by Q33 (core questionnaire: annotated version 20.09.01). This question is followed by another question "What languages do you speak well?" (Q16b). This is presumably a measure of integration into the broader cultural unit (the nation-state, Europe? the world?). I know from research in complex multi-lingual environments, such as Brussels, where it is difficult to answer the first question one often asked: "In what language do you count when you are shopping?" We will pick this up in the proposal for questions. Some of the participating nation-states that are confronted with this problem are Spain, Belgium, Italy (province of Bolzano-Bosen, not 5%?), Finland, Bulgaria (Turkish minorities), Latvia (Russian), Slovakia (Hungarian), etc...

An explicit assumption of a lot of research on nationalism is that national identities are exclusive. But this is not the case in many situations in which sub-nationalities are more or less institutionalized (Linz, pp. 5-6).

The problem of sub-national identities

In some countries citizens do not have a single and evident national identity, but can choose between different more or less competing national identities: on the one hand the official (e.g. Spanish, Belgian, or British) nationality, on the other the sub-national or peripheral (e.g. Catalanian, Flemish, or Scottish) identity. The political autonomy that quite a few sub-national entities have acquired during the past decades tends to intensify this antagonism, as it encourages the sub-national authorities to start a nation-building project of their own. Even if citizens do not care about the political issues involved in this process, they still have to come to terms somehow with this double nationality. Previous research indicates that they need not consider those nationalities as contradictory but can develop multiple national identities (e.g. Melich, 1986; Maddens, 1989). All the same, a choice between the two nationalities is often unavoidable. As Billig (1995: 105-111) points out, the concept of 'the' nation is pervasive in the 'deixis' of everyday public and private discourse, to the extent that national identity can be considered as a routine way of talking and listening. Catalonians are thus constantly confronted with the choice between using either 'Spain' or 'Catalonia' as the frame of reference of their discourse; between speaking and thinking in terms of 'we, Catalonians', or 'we, Spaniards', for instance when they have to identify themselves abroad, or when they refer to famous compatriots (Maddens et al., 2000).

In this context, *national identity* can be conceptualised as the choice which citizens have to make between the national and the sub-national identity. We assume that citizens generally do not consistently adopt either the national or the sub-national point of view, and hence cannot categorically be divided into two different groups. Rather, the average citizen will constantly oscillate between the two nationalities, though the odds of taking the national or the 'sub'-national point of view will probably vary: some citizens will tend to take the national position more frequently, while others will be more inclined towards the sub-national position. Only a minority will consistently prefer one nationality over the other (Maddens et al., 2000). For that reason, it will be necessary to measure the (sub)-national identity not only by a categorical 'identity' question but also by questions that measure the degree of involvement (importance) of each identity.

The paper of J. Linz also paid attention to the problem of the *relative importance* of several identities (p. 7), but it mentioned another aspect. In the previous paragraph the importance of one (sub)-national identity over another one is discussed. The paper of Linz stressed the importance of one identity over another (class based versus nation based, ethnic based versus nation based, etc...). We have tried to solve already that problem in previous section (see: Importance of ethnic (and other) identifications).

The problem of levels of identity

In our brief discussion about sub-national and national identities, the possibility of complementary identities is recognised, but the eventuality of conflict and mutual exclusiveness cannot be omitted in the measurements. This is different for identities that are layered and that can be conceived completely complementary. This problem is discussed at pages 8-9 of Linz' paper. Reference is made to the identification with geo-political units as the local community, the province, and not to forget in the ESS core, with Europe.

The identification with the levels (the nation and sub-nation included) is often measured by the question “*With which of these entities do you identify in the first place?*” However, there is strong evidence that the responses are strongly effected by a primacy effect (see further). Because this kind of questioning assumes exclusivity, even when it is followed by a question about the second important identity (of a complete ordering), other questions are suggested. Some researcher distinguish between the *frequency*, the *importance*, and the *value* of identification (Billiet et al., 2000). Each of these aspects is measured by ordinal response scales (see further) for each of the identities. Because the response scales are common within each aspect and different between each aspect (*frequency, importance, and value*) there is empirical evidence that there are three method factors in the measurement models (Billiet et al., 2000). More substantially, this kind of approach tends to find complementary identities (strong positive correlations between the levels in each dimension).

Related concepts: nationalism, national proud, patriotism

Thus far, (sub)-national identity has been used in a rather limited scope as *simply national self-identification* (and the importance attached to it), but the concept of national identity is much complex in the literature. In the national identity module of ISSP 1995, related concepts like national proud and patriotism are measured. There are already lots of studies on these (Haas, 1986; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; see also: <http://www.issp.org/paper.htm>; Smith & Jarkko, 2001). These concepts are measured by questions (and statements) about *feeling proud* about a number of country’s achievements (social security, technology achievements, arts, literature, equal treatment of groups, political influence, achievements in sports, armed forces, history), general questions on feelings about the country (liking, ashamed, worried, frustrated, enthusiastic, angry, hopeful, upset), attitudes towards citizenship, unity of the country). In the empirical studies, all these items are combined in different subsets and there is a lot of confusion about the names. Sometimes the ‘proud’ items are together with the feelings split into patriotism (the ‘post materialistic’ characteristics) and nationalism (the ‘materialistic’ characteristics) with a different relationship of these concepts to the attitude towards immigrants as a consequence (Figueiredo & Elkins, 2001). At other occasions, several sub-dimensions are found in the set of ‘proud’ items. Sometimes, patriotism has a positive connotation as opposed to nationalism that has negative connotations and is negatively correlated with ethnic prejudice and feelings of threat (Blank et al., 2001).

According to Smith and Jarkko (2001) who analysed the measures of national proud of ISSP 1995 for all participating countries, *national pride* is related to feelings of patriotism and nationalism. “*Patriotism* is love of one’s country or dedicated allegiance to same, while nationalism is a strong national devotion that places one’s own country above all others. National pride co-exists with patriotism and is a prerequisite of nationalism, but nationalism extends beyond national pride and feeling national pride is not equivalent to being nationalistic. Likewise, national pride is not incompatible with cosmopolitanism (literally being a “world citizen”), but nationalism (or at least a strong degree of it) is antithetical to a transnational perspective” (Smith & Jarkko, 2001: 1). In ISSP 1995 specific national pride is measured by a set of questions about ten domains (Smith & Jarkko, 2001: 2).

These concepts, national identity, national pride, patriotism, and nationalism are extensively discussed in the paper of Blank, Smith, and Westle (20001). According to them, '*national identity*' covers a quite different aspects and facets of the individual's relationship towards its nations (what this may be in the light of sub-nations). The following aspects are included (Tajfel, 1982; Westle, 1999). I quote Blank et al. (2001: 6-7):

- a subjective conviction of formally and subjective belonging (the previous discussed aspect);
- a nation related emotion that can vary between a negative and a positive pole (see previous discussion). This aspect is linked with the ideas of identification and contra-identification (Tajfel & Turner, 1979);
- the relevance of the national identification for the overall identity of the individual (the proposed question about relative importance of different kinds of affiliation is an operationalisation of this);
- subjective beliefs regarding the current aims and problems of the nation;
- subjective beliefs regarding opportunities and constraints for individual action, arising from national affiliation
- a principal willingness to internalise the national culture;
- a community-ideology consisting of convictions about the ideal values, aims and character of the nation.

National identity is thus a very broad and diffuse concept that is used to cover *the intensity and the type of relationship* towards the nation (or sub-nation). Blank et al. propose to use the term "*national identification*" to describe the *intensity of feelings* towards one's nation (intensity of closeness), regardless of the qualitative content of these feelings. They also propose to use the terms '*nationalism*' and '*patriotism*' for questions of *content or type* of national identity. In what respect is nationalism different from patriotism in their definition.

Nationalism is characterised by: (I quote again Blank et al., 2001 with some comments between brackets, see also Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989)

- overemphasis of the national affiliation in the individual's self concept;
- inclination to define one's own group by criteria of descent, race or cultural affiliation (others would call this an '*ethnic representation of the nation*' as opposed to a '*republican representation*'; see Maddens et al., 2000; Fennema & Tillie, 1994);
- idealisation of the nation and it's history and suppression of ambivalent attitudes towards the nation (or again "sub"-nation).
- Feelings of national superiority;
- Uncritical acceptance of national, state and political authorities;
- High relevance of socially derogating comparisons with groups not considered to be part of the nation (or sub-nation).

Patriotism is then defined as the counter concept of nationalism. Some authors would call this a '*republican representation of the nation*' (Fennema & Tillie, 1994; Maddens et al., 2000). Again quoting Blank et al. (1999: 8) '*patriotism* is characterised by:

- the national affiliation in the individual's self-concept is not overemphasised;
- the nation is not primarily defined in ethnic terms, but rests on a democratic definition;
- at the centre of the national self-definition are humanist and democratic values;
- support to the nation is refused in case the nation's aim are not in accordance with these values;

- the nation is not idealised, but evaluated on the basis of critical conscience;
- a reconstruction of group history allowing different views;
- temporal comparisons bear a high relevance; incase of patriotism it is more relevant to compare the status quo of the ingroup today with its prior conditions of the ingroup history.

It is clear this kind of operationalisation in its nationalist (ethnic) or patriotic (republican) variant² requires a large number of measurements. One can find a large set of indicators in the ISSP 1995 module on national identity. Some questions remain open: how define national consciousness? Is this an aspect of national identity? We should not care so much with these concepts and measurements in the context of the ESS core module since we have only room for a small number of questions, and not complete sets of questions on proud, patriotism, or nationalism. The complete operationalisation requires a special module. Moreover, the set of national pride questions are rather difficult to ask in situations where there are different sub-national groups with rather negative or neutral feelings towards the national level. For that reason, we will now confine ourselves to a more limited set of question about '(sub)-national identification' in the much smaller sense as outlined by Blank et al. (2001). This means that the focus here is on the *identification* of the national or sub-national group to which one thinks to belong, to the *intensity of this relationship*, and to the *strength (importance)* if it in comparison to other group identifications. The latter aspect is already discussed in the proposal of questions on ethnic identity: see *importance* in section 2).

Questions on (sub)-national identification: empirical evidence

In this section, some of our experiences with measures of national identity are documented. The first measurement is the closed question about one's persons first (and second) geopolitical identity. The wording of the question is the following (ISPO, 1995):

First_id and second_id (ISPO)

"Which group do you consider yourself to be a member in the first place, and in the second place? Use Card x to answer".				
	First place		Second place	
1. Belgium	1		1	
2. Flemish community/region		2		2
3. Province	3		3	
4. Municipality or city		4		4
5. Other: which	5		5	

Since Europe is not mentioned in this list, subsequent questions on Europe are asked:

² One should be careful with this kind of operationalisation because it is not value-free: patriotism is here by definition what is *good*; nationalism is *bad*.

Europe

“Do you fee that you are not only a Belgian, but a European citizen as well? Does this happen never, sometimes or often?”

1. Never	(43.1% Flemish, 32.0% Walloon, 18.0% Brussels)		
2. Sometimes	(39.2%	46.2%	42.8%
3. Often	(14.4%	19.9%	37.3%)
(Do not know)	(3.3%	1.0%	1.9%)

In the 1999 EVS questionnaire, Europe is included in the first and second identity questions (Halman, 2001: 223-224).

First_id and second_id (EVS)

Show card X. “Which of these geographic groups you say you belong to first of all? And the next? And which do you belong the least of all?”

	First	Next	Least
A. Locality or town where you live	1	1	1
B. Region or county where you live		1	2
	2		
C. Your country as a whole	3	3	3
D. Europe	4	4	4
E. The world as a whole	5	5	5
(Do not know)		7	7
	7		

In the EVS wording, there is presumably a strong accent on “geographical” unit, but more important, a primacy effect is striking. The percentages of respondents choosing “locality or town” (first category) at first place is the highest and varies between 32.1% (Belgium) and 66% Belarus). One should observe that in Belgium, in the second category “Flemish, Walloon, Brussels” was between brackets at the response card, and in the third category “Belgium” (27.0%) was offered (20.3%). We can compare this with ISPO 1999 (same wording as in 1995). In Flanders, 56.2% of the respondents choose “Belgium” (on top of list) at first place, 27.5% choose the Flemish community and only 13.4% choose the commune or city (bottom position of card). The differences with EVS are striking: 22.4% Belgium (-34 points), 23.6% Flanders (-4 points) and 39.3% local community or town (+26 points).

In next Table, the response distributions on the first_id questions asked in different orders (but also in different time periods) are compared. It is evident that this question cannot be used without randomisation of the response categories. The effect of question order on the category on top of the list is at least 10 percent points. Randomisation is a solution if one wants univariate estimations for the population of the responses on that questions, but it is useless if we want to use it in the construction of a national identity variable.

Exhibit 2.3. Response on the question about group identity in four national surveys in Flanders (percentages)*

<i>Response categories</i>	<i>1991 Election survey</i>	<i>1995 Election survey</i>	<i>1999 Election survey</i>	<i>Survey on political knowledge 1995</i>	<i>Survey on political knowledge 1996</i>
Flemish community/Region	39.6 (2)	24.4 (2)	24.7 (2)	22.4 (3)	23.1 (3)
Belgium	42.1 (6)	50.9 (1)	51.6 (1)	35.8 (4)	36.2 (4)
Province	3.0 (3)	3.3 (3)	3.1 (3)	2.7 (2)	3.9 (2)
Community/city	13.0 (4)	16.9 (4)	17.1 (4)	31.6 (1)	29.2 (1)
Europe	-	-	-	5.7 (5)	5.9 (5)
other	1.6 (5)	1.9 (5)	2.6 (5)	1.9 (6)	1.8 (6)
N	2,449	2,099	2,179	710	987

* The order of the questions is between brackets

An alternative for the first_id question, also mentioned in the paper of J. Linz, is the *exclusive identification question*.

Exclusive national identification (ISPO 1995 and 1999)

<i>“Which of the following statements apply most to you? You can use Card X to answer”</i>	
	<i>(% in Flanders)</i>
1. I consider myself only as a Flemish	(3.5%)
2. I feel more Flemish than Belgian	(22.8%)
3. I feel as much Flemish as Belgian	(44.6%)
4. I feel more Belgian than Flemish	(17.0%)
5. I consider myself only as a Belgian	(10.6%)

This way of questioning reveals a number of respondents with more or less exclusive identities, however, the number of respondents in the middle of the scale is high. This may be partly due to a response effect, however, according to other ways of questioning, the mix of sub-national and national feelings seems the common position (see further). It is clear that the categories of these questions are country specific.

There are certainly other ways of asking the question about identification with a nation or sub-nation. In the *British Social Attitudes questionnaires*, (BSA) a multiple response question is used. Since the respondent can choose more than one answer, the order effect (primacy in face-to-face or response card) is likely to disappear. However, if more than one response is chosen, it is necessary to order the responses afterwards (but equal ordering should be possible), or to force the respondent to choose one group in a subsequent question. The BSA questions are the following:

Q475. "Please say which, if any, of the words on this card describes the way you think of yourself" (*please choose as many or few as apply*) (**probe:** any other?) (*multicoded*)

1. British
2. English
3. European
4. Irish
5. Northern Irish
6. Scottish
7. Welsh
8. Other (*write in*).....
9. None

If more than one answer

Q477. "And if you had to choose, which one best describes the way you think of yourself?" (*choose one*)

10. British
 11. English
 12. European
 13. Irish
 14. Northern Irish
 15. Scottish
 16. Welsh
 17. Other (*write in*).....
- None

Another way of avoiding the order effect in the first_id question is asking about the *frequency* and *intensity* of feelings of each (sub)-national group. In ISPO 1995 these questions are asked for the national group and a sub-national group; depending on the geographical (and political) are in which the respondent lives. This is rather easy when the sub-national groups are living in delimited geographical areas or when the number of sub-nationalities is well institutionalised and limited.

Frequency and intensity questions

"Some people consider themselves Flemings (= *subnation*) while other people do not. How frequently do you feel yourself a Flemish?"

- | | |
|------------------|---------|
| 1. Never | (5.8%) |
| 2. Seldom | (13.4%) |
| 3. Sometimes | (32.5%) |
| 4. Often | (25%) |
| 5. almost always | (22.4%) |
| (do not know) | (0.9%) |

"Some people consider themselves Belgian (= *nation*) while other people do not. How frequently do you feel yourself a Belgian?"

6. Never	(2.5%)
7. Seldom	(11.6%)
8. Sometimes	(33.7%)
9. Often	(25.5%)
10. almost always	(26.2%)
(do not know)	(0.5)

In EVS 1999, frequency, intensity and value questions are asked for the different geo-political levels (Billiet et al., 2000). We have already indicated that there is a large difference between the scores given to each of the levels by these questions, compared with the very few choices of geo-political entities in an open question.

Frequency of feeling as...

"How often do you feel...?" (Card nr X)							
	Never	Seldom	Some- times	often	Very often	always	DK
Belgian	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Flemish	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
European	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Citizen of Y	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(X)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Y = locality or town of respondent

X = group mentioned in an open question about most significant group

Intensity of feelings

"If you feel..... is this feeling weak, moderate or strong?" (Card nr Y)				
	Weak	Moderate	Strong	DK
Belgian	1	2	3	7
Flemish	1	2	3	7
European	1	2	3	7
Citizen of Y	1	2	3	7
(X)	1	2	3	7

Value of feelings

"How valuable is for you feeling a...?" (Card nr Z)						
	Absolutely not	not	neutral	valuable	Very valuable	DK
Belgian	1	2	3	4	5	7
Flemish	1	2	3	4	5	7
European	1	2	3	4	5	7
Citizen of Y	1	2	3	4	5	7
(X)	1	2	3	4	5	7

What are the experiences with these questions in Flanders and Wallonia. First, it is impossible to fit a model with only five content factors. Only with three additional method factors (6, 3 and 5 point scales), one can obtain a nice measurement model. This is a structure comparable with the modeling of an acquiescence factor (Billiet & McClendon, 2000), however, the loadings on the method factors are rather high and not all equal. Second, the correlations between the latent variables (nation, sub-nation, Europe, Citizen, most significant, are all rather strong and positive. This is an indication of the complementarity of the levels. With this method, it is very hard to detect those with rather exclusive feelings towards one level and negative feelings towards another level, although there exists a small group of such respondents in Flanders (about 10% according to other measures).

We can conclude this empirical section with a more general observation about all these measures of (sub)-national identity. Each of these questions are easy to include in a questionnaire if there are several sub-national groups each living in clearly delimited geographical region, or if there are only a few sub-national groups. It is rather difficult to use these questions if none of these conditions is met if none of these conditions is met, because then longer lists of groups must be included and offered to all respondents.

10.1.4 Proposal for (sub)-national identity questions in ESS core

We are working in the hypothesis that only a few questions on (sub)-national identity are asked. In that case we propose only to ask questions about the (sub)-national identification. These are general questions about the closeness to a (sub)-national or geo-political reality. Europe should be included. We propose a question that is free of order effects, and some kind of ordering should be possible.

Language (see previous section)

Citizenship (see previous section)

Following the question of citizenship, it is possible to ask a general question about national pride:

General pride (proposal of Linz)

QN1. "How proud are you to be [nationality = previous response on citizenship]"

1. Very proud
 2. Quite proud
 3. Not very proud
 4. Not at all proud
- (D.K.)

(Sub)-national identification: country specific wording of the BSA questions (BSA, 1997: 272-273: Q475 and Q477)

The preceding question does not contain the possibility of an identification with the local community or with the world as a whole. Therefore we propose to ask also the EVS question:

QN2. Show card X. "Which of these geographic groups you say you belong to first of all? And the next? And which do you belong the least of all?"

	First	Next	Least
A. Locality or town where you live	1	1	1
B. Region or county where you live		1	2
		2	
C. Your country as a whole	3	3	3
D. Europe	4	4	4
E. The world as a whole	5	5	5
(Do not know)		7	7
		7	

Alternative: the closeness question of ISSP 1995.

QN2b. "How close do you feel to..." (please tick one box on each line)

	<i>very close</i>	<i>close</i>	<i>not very close</i>	<i>not close at all</i>	<i>can' choose</i>
A. your neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	7
B. your town or city	1	2	3	4	7

C. your [county]	1	2	3	4	7
D. X [country]	1	2	3	4	7
E. Europe	1	2	3	4	7

OptionalPatriotism, chauvinism, nationalism

The set of national pride items of ISSP 1995

References: (sub)-national and ethnic identity

- ANDERSON, B. (1983), *Imagined communities*. Londn: Verso.
- BLANK, TH.; P. SCHMIDT & B. WESTLE (2001), "Patriotims" – A contradiction, a possibility or an empirical reality? Paper prepared for presentation ot the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops. ECPR Workshop 26. National Identity in Europa, 6-11 April, Grenoble. 32 pp.
- BILLIET, J. & J. MCKEE MCCLENDON (2000), "Modeling acquiescence in maesurement models for two balanced sets of items". *Structural Equation Modeling. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 7 (4), pp. 608-629.
- BILLIET, J., DOUTRELEPONT, R. & VANDEKEERE, M. (2000), "Types van sociale identiteiten inBelgië: convergenties en divergenties". Pp. 17-53 in: DOBBELAERE, K. , ELCHARDUS, M. KERKHOF, J. VOYÉ, L. & BAWIN-LEGROS, B. (Eds.), *Verloren zekerheid. De Belgen en hun waarden, overtuigingen en houdingen*. Tiel: Lannoo.
- BILLIG, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*, London: Sage.
- BLUMER, H. (1969), *Symbolic interactionism: Perspectives and method*. Princeton, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- de FIGUEIREDO, RUI J.P. & ELKINS, Z. (2001), *Are Patriots Bigots? An Inquiry into the Vices of In-group Pride*. Paper presented at an International Workshop on Ethnic Prejudice, Trento, 19-20 Oct. 2001, pp. 29.
- DE WINTER, L., A. FROGNIER & J. BILLIET (1998), "Y a-t-il encore des Belges? Vingt ans d'enquêtes sur les identités politiques territoriales. Pp. 123-136 in: M. Martiniello & M. Swyngedouw (Eds.), *Où va la Belgique. Les soubresauts d'une petite démocratie européenne*. Paris: L'Harmattan
- ERIKSON, E. (1959), "Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers by Erik H. Erikson". *Psychological Issues, 1*. New York: International Universities Press.
- ERIKSON, R & J. O. JONSSON (1999), *How to ascertain the socio-structural position of the individual in society. Suggestions for the core ESS questions*. 25 pp + Annex (2 pp.)
- GERGEN, K.J. (1985), The social constructionist movement in modern psychology". *American Psychologist*, Vol. 40: 266-275.
- FENNEMA, M. AND TILLIE, J. (1994) *The extreme Right as perverse Cargo Cult. Ethnic Nationalism, Social Efficacy and the Extreme right in the Netherlands*. Paper prepared for the workshop 'electoral research', Politicologenetmaal: Soesterberg, 26/27-5-1994
- HAAS, E. (1986), "What is Nationalism and Why Should We Study it?" *International Organization*, vol. 40: 704-744.
- HIRSCHMAN, CH., R. ALBA & R. FARLEY (2000), "The meaning and measurement of race in the U.S. census: glimpses into the future". *Demography*, Vol. 37 (3), pp. 381-391.
- ISPO (1998), *1995 General Election Study Belgium. Codebook and Questionnaire*. Leuven/Louvain La Neuve: ISPO/PIOP.
- ISSP (sd), *National Identity. ISSP 1995 Codebook*. ZA Study 2880.
- JOWELL, R., J. CURTICE, A. PARK, L. BROOK, K. THOMSON & C. BRYSON (1997), *British Social Attitudes. The 14th Report*. London: Ashgate.

- KESSLER, TH., A. MUMMENDEY & U-K, LEISSE (2000), "The Personal-Group Discrepancy: Is There a Common Information Basis for Personal and Group Judgement?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 79 (1), 95-109.
- LEETS, L., G. HOWARD & T. CLEMENT (1986), "Explicating Ethnicity in Theory and Communication Research". *Multilingua*, Vol. 15 (2): 115-147.
- LEETS, L., R. CLÈMENT & H. GILES (s.d.), *The ethnicity quandary: conceptual and measurement issues*. Unpublished paper.
- LINZ, J.J. (s.d.), *The Question of Identity. Suggestions for the Core European Social Survey*. Yale university: Unpublished paper, 15 pp.
- KOSTERMAN, R. & F. FESBACH (1989), "Towards a Measure of Patriotic and Nationalistic Attitudes". *Political Psychology*, Vol. 10: 257-247.
- MADDENS, B. (1989), Een vaderland om te beminnen? Het nationale bewustzijn van laatstejaarscholieren, *Res Publica*, 31, p. 49-73.
- MADDENS, B., R. BEERTEN & J. BILLIET (1998), "The National Consciousness of the Flemings and the Walloons. An Empirical Investigation". Pp. 199- 208 in: K. Deprez & L. Vos (Eds.), *Nationalism in Belgium. Shifting Identities, 1750-1995*. London: McMillan Press Ltd.
- MADDENS, B., J. BILLIET & R. BEERTEN (2000), "National Identity and the attitude towards foreigners in multi-national states: the case of Belgium", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. Vol. 26 (1), 45-60.
- MELICH, A. (1986), The Nature of Regional and National Identity in Catalonia. Problems of Measuring Multiple Identities, *European Journal of Political Research*, 14, p. 149-169.
- MOSCOVICI, S. (1984), The Phenomenon of Social Representations, in: R.M. Farr and S. Moscovici (eds.), *Social Representations*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-69.
- MUELDERS, M. ()
- ROSS, J .A. (1979), "Language and the mobilization of ethnic identity". Pp. 1-5 in H. Giles & B. Saint-Jacques (Eds.), *Language and ethnic relations*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- (2001), *National Pride in Cross-National Perspective*. Chicago: NORC/University of Chicago (paper on web: <http://www.issp.org/paper.htm>)
- TAJFEL, H. (Ed.) (1978), *Differentiation between social groups*. London: Academic Press.
- TAJFEL, H., & TURNER, I. (1979), ""An integrative theory of intergroup conflict". Pp. 33-47 In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Books.Cole.
- TAJFEL, H. (1982), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. New York: Cambridge Univesity Press.
- THERNSTROM, S. (Ed.) (1980), *Harvard Encyclopedia of American ethnic Groups*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press at Harvard University Press.
- THOMPSON, R. (1989), *Theories of ethnicity: A critical appraisal*. New Vork: Greenwood Press.
- Turner, J.C., & Giles, H. (Eds). (1981). *Intergroup behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Westle, B. (1999), *Kollektive Identität im vereinten Deutschland – Nation und Demokratie in der Wahrnehmung der Deutschen*. Opladen: leske & Budrich.

10.2 Comments of the CCT

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The following questions have been suggested for ethnic identity and national identity:

QE1. "Are you or any of your parents an immigrant to [country]?"

	YES	NO
RESP: HIM/HERSELF IS AN IMMIGRANT	1	2
RESP: FATHER IS AN IMMIGRANT	1	2
RESP: MOTHER IS AN IMMIGRANT	1	2

The CCT comments: A problem with this question and other objective criteria is that there are always groups whose status as immigrants is ambiguous - for example white immigrants from Indonesia who have returned to their country after independence.

Deleted: ich are seen as immigrants which are not seen as seen and do not think of themselves as immigrants.

Deleted: F

Deleted: ich

An alternative introduced by the CCT was the following set of two questions:

Would you describe yourself as being a member of a minority group that is discriminated against in this country?

Yes 1 ASK H2 563
No 2

(Don't know) 8

H2 *On what grounds is your minority group discriminated against? PROMPT 'What other grounds?'*

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

Colour or race	01	564-573
Nationality	02	
Religion	03	
Language	04	
Age	05	
Gender	06	
Sexuality	07	
Disability	08	
Other (WRITE IN) _____	09	
(Don't know)	88	

Ethnic identification

QE2. Do you consider yourself as belonging to an ethnic group? (YES/NO)

- 1 YES
- 2 NO -> QE3

QE3. Which group? _____

Alternative: the ISSP strategy: ask the National Co-ordinators to list the relevant ethnic groups in the country and ask a closed question (for an example see: British Social Attitudes, 14th report, 1997: 273)

QE2b. "To which of these groups do you consider yourself to belong?"
(Country specific list)

The one step procedure seems to be better than each of the two questions of the two steps procedure as can be seen from the quality predictions with SQP.

item	reliability	validity	method effect	total quality
E2	.54	.70	.30	.38
E3	.49	.73	.27	.36
E2b	.66	.65	.37	.42

On the basis of these results there is an argument to prefer the second procedure using only one question above the procedure using two steps. However, on further analysis, it became clear that the task of drawing up exhaustive country-specific lists and devising a generic code frame into which these could be post-coded would have proved too difficult in the context of the ESS. It was felt that the primary use of ethnicity as a variable in this context would be in order to analyse on the basis of majority versus minority groups. A pragmatic approach was therefore selected, which asked respondents' subjective assessments of whether they belong to a minority ethnic group or not, along with an additional question on whether respondents feel discriminated against for any reason (see final list of questions).

Closeness

QE4. "How would you describe your feelings towards this group?"

1. very close
2. close
3. not very close
4. not close at all
7. I have no idea on that

reliability = .74 validity = .81 method effect .19 total quality = .60

Technically there is no problem with this question but it is advisable to avoid the combination of very close and not very close with close in between.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Other questions suggested by Jaak Billiet were omitted both because of lack of space and because the immigration module at Round 1 would duplicate efforts at this stage.

Deleted: had to be

Final Choice

Some of the following questions come from the initial demographic chapter. Others are new, based on Linz and Billiet, but many are re-formulated to accommodate cross-national needs. As noted, however, since one of the Round 1 rotating modules selected was on immigration, much of the material covered in the original proposals in this chapter was covered in the rotating module on immigration. Rather than repeat topics within the questionnaire, the core items on ethnic identity and immigration were thus pared down. A new set of decisions as to what should be included in the core for round 2 and beyond will be made in the light of analysis of the round 1 data.

Deleted: Moreover,

Deleted: to a minimum.

Deleted: D

Deleted: after

The items included in the final questionnaire were as follows:

ASK ALL

C16 Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country?

Yes	1	ASK C17
No	2	GO TO C18
(Don't know)	8	

C17 On what grounds is your group discriminated against? **PROBE:** 'What other grounds?'

CODE ALL THAT APPLY

Colour or race	01
Nationality	02
Religion	03
Language	04
Ethnic group	05
Age	06
Gender	07
Sexuality	08
Disability	09
Other (WRITE IN) _____	10
(Don't know)	88

ASK ALL

C18 Are you a citizen of [country]?

Yes	1	GO TO C20
No	2	ASK C19
(Don't know)	8	

C19 What citizenship do you hold?

WRITE IN _____

(Don't know) 88

ASK ALL

C20 Were you born in [country]?

Yes	1	GO TO C23
No	2	ASK C21
(Don't know)	8	GO TO C23

C21 In which country were you born?

WRITE IN _____

(Don't know) 888

C22CARD 22 How long ago did you first come to live in [country]? Please use this card.

Within the last year	1
1-5 years ago	2
6-10 years ago	3
11-20 years ago	4
More than 20 years ago	5
(Don't know)	8

ASK ALL

C23 What language or languages do you speak most often at home? [to be coded into ISO693-2]	
WRITE IN UP TO 2 LANGUAGES _____ _____	
(Don't know)	888

C24 Do you belong³ to a minority ethnic group in [country]?

Yes	1
No	2
(Don't know)	8

C25 Was your father born in [country]?

Yes	1	GO TO C27
No	2	ASK C26
(Don't know)	8	GO TO C27

C26 **CARD 23** From which of these continents does your father originally come⁴? Please use this card.

Europe	01
Africa	02
Asia	03
North America	04
South America and the Caribbean	05
Australasia	06
(Don't know)	88

³ "Belong" refers to attachment or identification.

⁴ Father's country of birth is intended. Same applies for mother in C28.

ASK ALL

C27 Was your mother born in [country]?

Yes	1	GO TO D1
No	2	ASK C28
(Don't know)	8	GO TO D1

C28 CARD 23 AGAIN: From which of these continents does your mother originally come? Please use this card.

Europe	01
Africa	02
Asia	03
North America	04
South America and the Caribbean	05
Australasia	06
(Don't know)	88