

MEASURING (SUB)NATIONAL IDENTITIES IN SURVEYS

SOME LESSONS FROM BELGIUM

Kris Deschouwer, Lieven De Winter, Jérémy Dodeigne,
Min Reuchamps & Dave Sinardet*

Paper presented at the conference *The State of the Federation 2015*

18 December 2015 – Université de Liège

* The names of the authors are in alphabetical order

1. Introduction: surveying national identities

In political science the concept of identity has been used quite widely. Abdelal et.al. (2001) identify “an obvious increase in the attention to identity” (p. 4) since the 1990s. That includes the study of international relations in which the identity of states is being used as an independent variable explaining the choices and mutual perceptions of states. In the area of comparative federalism and regionalism, the attention for identities has increased as a consequence of the ‘new politics of nationalism’ (Keating 1996) at the subnational level. The territorial politics in countries like the UK, Canada or Belgium have been analyzed – among others – through the lens of substate identities. That does not mean however that the concept has been neatly defined. “The term is richly – indeed for an analytical concept – hopelessly – ambiguous” (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000: 6). It does refer (be it vaguely) to a social category, to characteristics shared by members of a group. A group of people marked by the same label can however refer to many different boundaries between them. It can for instance be about race, gender, age, class, religion or ethnicity. For each of these there is a large stream of literature about all thinkable aspects. National identities do however not play a very prominent role in that literature (McCrone & Bechofer 2015). While identities like class or gender can have important and direct effects on behavior and attitudes, national identity is of a different nature. It is a so-called ‘banal’ identity (Billig, 1995). That means that it is very much taken for granted. It is not that often explicitly mentioned and it is not often explicitly spelled out what its meaning and content is. Most people most of the time do not pay much attention to their national identity (Miller, 1995).

Yet when national identities are challenged or activated, they do become more visible and awareness of them becomes more important. Their meaning and content are then explicitly discussed. And that is exactly what has happened in several places in the course of the past few decades. Claims made by substate nationalist movements and parties in Quebec, Corsica, northern Italy, Catalonia, Flanders or Scotland – to cite the most prominent examples – have activated a debate about national and subnational identities. And as a consequence political science has paid attention to these debates and has tried to map the evolutions and varieties in national identities. The strength of national identities (subnational identities in particular) is seen as one of the possible drivers of the demands for the territorial reorganization or breaking up of national states. Regional political entrepreneurs have crafted narratives in which specific regional economic strength and cultural traditions are combined to mobilize for territorial autonomy (Keating et.al. 2003).

Measuring both the content and the strength of these shared feelings of belonging to national communities has then obviously become an important focus in the research on territorial reorganization. A clear difference has however developed between the research focusing on the elite and the research focusing on the population. Although recently some survey research was done on MP’s in Belgium (Reuchamps, Sinardet, Dodeigne & Caluwaerts, 2015), the dominant approach at the elite level has been qualitative. The way in which elites define the political community, how they stress some of its aspects and underplay others or how they contest the importance of other identity claims was largely measured by using elite interviews or discourse analysis (e.g. Van Dam 1996; Keating et.al 2003). These methods allow for a fine-

grained measurement of the *content* of the national identities, of the different ways in which how being a Scot or a Quebecois is represented and interpreted. It allows for describing the way in which membership of the group is defined, how history is interpreted and how the relation with other groups is defined.

When analyzing national identities at the level of the population, a different method is generally used. Here the dominant technique is survey analysis. Individual respondents are asked questions about how they relate to different national identities. The Linz-Moreno question or the hierarchical question (see below) are all attempts to measure the *salience* and the *intensity* of the feelings of belonging to a group. They measure individual characteristics of the citizens, the degree in which citizens identify with certain categories. In this contribution we will look in particular at the way in which the Linz-Moreno question has travelled (well) to Belgium. Before entering the heart of the matter, we must however be aware of the assumptions made when measuring national identities in survey research.

While in the literature on nationalism the tradition is very much one that assumes that identities are constructed and are therefore also malleable and subject to change depending on the time, the context and the actors referring to it (e.g. Anderson 1983, Gellner 1983, Hobsbawm 1991), the tradition of measuring national identities in surveys is deeply rooted in a behaviourist approach. This is actually the very consequence of the technique itself. It assumes the existence of categories that are stable and that do not vary between context, and that can therefore be captured by asking questions to individual respondents. Irrespective of the exact way in which the respondents are asked to indicate the salience or importance of identities for them, we assume in the first place that there is a *homogenous meaning* of each of the suggested identities. Surveys of this type do not measure the content of national identities but define them as a stable category. If a survey question asks whether and to what degree somebody feels Scottish or British, we do not offer them the possibility to say what exactly being Scottish or British means for them. The only way in which responses can be interpreted is by summing the answers and by assuming that the words have the same meaning for all respondents. This is of course an assumption made for all questions asked in survey research, but it is of particular relevance for the measurement of national identities. The homogeneity is taken for granted, just as if being a Scot or a Brit has the same degree of homogeneity across the population as being male or female or being under or over 55. Especially when identities are contested and when they are the object of (sometimes heated) political debates – which is less the case for belonging to gender or age groups – the assumption of a homogenous meaning of the identities is problematic and should at least be explicitly recognized, because it is the meaning given by the researchers that is attributed to the respondents.

A second assumption that is being made is that the feelings of belonging are independent from the context. One is being asked to what extent one feels Walloon or Belgian, but not how this may vary between places and contexts. One might feel more Belgian when abroad, or more Walloon when listening to a statement of a Flemish nationalist. In a survey question only one single and stable answer is however possible. Stability over time is however not assumed.

By repeating the same questions in consecutive surveys, we are able to assess the degree in which the intensity of identities evolve over time within a population.

Yet another assumption that is (always) made by survey research is that the categories offered to the respondents are meaningful. The respondents are supposed to have a clear opinion, to be informed and to have reflected about what is being asked. Survey research is thus trying to measure a complex, varied and moving characteristic of individuals by confronting them with (sometimes hard and exclusive – see below) choices between national identities. The choices offered are also quite obviously tailored to the specific situation in which identities are being measured. It is indeed quite interesting to note that the Linz-Moreno question in which respondents are asked to make a choice between one subnational and the statewide nation identity has been developed in a context where this dual choice does make sense.

So the specific questions and categories used to measure identities in surveys also contain assumptions about those identities. This why we can hypothesize that using different questions can also amount to different results. While in the past, different questions have been used to measure identities – even though the Moreno question is clearly dominant in research up until now – this was generally also in different surveys, not making it possible to attribute variation to the question used. To be able to assess the impact of the tool on the measurement of identities we have used three different questions measuring national and subnational identities in Belgium in a 2014 electoral survey. We will compare the responses given to these questions in the empirical part of this paper. First, however, we will go into the way identities have been measured in the past in different so-called ‘multi-national’ states, specifically concentrating on the ‘Linz-Moreno’ question, and the way in which it has travelled to other places where researchers want to measure national and subnational identities. After that we give an overview of the way identities have been measured in Belgium in the past.

2. Measuring identities in ‘multi-national’ contexts: the Linz-Moreno Question

As mentioned, the methodological dimension of research on sub-national identities is crucial to understand and analyze the results. Among the questions seeking to grasp the nature of identities in plurinational contexts, the so-called Linz-Moreno question stands out because of both its design and its comparative fashion.

As Coller (2006) stated, the development and first uses of the “Moreno question” is wrongly attributed to the Spanish scholar, Luis Moreno. In a very good history of the question, Peres (2007) showed that the first use of this question was in fact in a publication by Gunther, Sani and Shabad (1986) based on empirical work that took place between 1978 and 1984. The questionnaire used for the study “was developed by the authors in consultation with DATA and was pretested in 1978” (Gunther, Sani & Shabad, 1986: 437). This research was thus held under the patronage of DATA SA which was a survey research company. Juan Linz, who already was a specialist of the study of multiple identities, supervised the research of the three authors and introduced them to the multiple identities question as they acknowledged in their introduction (Gunther, Sani & Shabad, 1986: XIX). Thus the so-called “Moreno question” has to be attributed to Juan Linz.

As a matter of fact, we should note that the “Moreno question” does not only follow the logic and method initiated by Linz, it has been formulated by Linz himself. He was working on peripheral nationalism in Spain (Linz, 1973) when his observations led him to provide a conceptual framework for the scaling of five categories of territorial self-identification. The conception of the question was part of a scientific project to collect and analyze quantitative data on subjective identities embedded in a context of strong nationalist mobilizations which Linz was in favor of (Peres, 2007). He even actively took part as an elected regional councilor in the quest for autonomy for the Madrid region within the general process of Spanish devolution after 1978 (Moreno, 2006 & 2007).

The starting point of Linz’ puzzle is the political context of Spain which is “a state for all Spaniards, a nation-state for a large part of the population, and only a state but not a nation for important minorities” (Linz, 1975: 423). Subsequently Linz highlighted that if the linguistic difference is one of the essential drivers for regionalist/nationalist demands, it only becomes politically and socially prominent when it coincides with other cleavages and/or conflicting interests (Peres, 2007: 518).

Following Dupoirier (2007), there are three underlying assumptions to Linz’s approach. The first hypothesis, which had already partially been confirmed by various studies on the Basques, the Catalans, the Valencians and the Scots before the first use of the question, assumes the existence of a dual identity in plurinational states. The second posits that these identities may be hierarchized, while the third assumes that the stronger the regional identity is, the louder the claims for more autonomy are. With his colleagues at DATA, Linz first used five dual categories in surveys carried out in 1978-79 (Linz, Gómez-Reino y Carnota, Andrés Orizo & Vila Carro, 1981: 519-548). Dismissing nationalist injunctions towards selecting a unique identity, Linz built a questioning model allowing individuals to position themselves vis-à-vis two conflicting allegiances: these identities can not only be accepted or abandoned, but also combined and the intensity of this combination could be specified (Peres, 2007: 522).

Nevertheless, if the questionnaire was developed by Linz, it was popularized by Luis Moreno. As Moreno himself acknowledges, Linz was the first scholar to use the five dual categories in public opinions surveys carried out at the end of the 1970s and so doing he “provided a conceptual base for the scaling of 5 categories of self-identification” (Moreno, 2006: 4). Linz’ studies served indeed as a source of inspiration for Moreno’s own work.

Coming from Madrid, Moreno went to Scotland in 1983 and “engaged in comparative research on home rule between Scotland and Catalonia as the theme of [his] PhD dissertation” (Moreno, 2005: 3) which he passed in 1986. Henry Drucker, a pioneer researcher on Scottish devolution, supervised Moreno’s doctoral thesis and introduced him to works of Mackintosh (1968). The latter worked on dual identities in Scotland and Moreno, drawing a parallel between Scotland and Catalonia, felt that the comparison had to be further analyzed (Moreno, 1986). The objective was to corroborate the findings of Mackintosh about the dual identity of Scotland and those of Giner concerning the dual identity of Catalonia with new data coming from Scotland. At that time, the only identity question administrated in the same wording in Scotland was the ‘Forced Choice National Identity’ developed in the Scottish Election Study and used in 1974 and 1979. For that question, respondents were asked to choose one identity

between 'being Scottish' and 'being British' for which an overwhelming majority of Scots responded 'being Scottish' (respectively 65 and 56 percent) (Curtis 2013).

With the help of Drucker's connections, Moreno asked the *Glasgow Herald* newspaper to add a question to one of their regular opinion surveys. The Moreno question was eventually submitted for the first time to the Scottish population at the end of June 1986, eight years after Linz. The following question was asked to the readers: "We would like to know how people living in Scotland considers itself in terms of nationality. Which of the following best describes your vision for yourself?". Five response options were offered to respondents: (1) Scottish, not British; (2) More Scottish than British; (3) As far Scottish as British; (4) More British than Scottish; (5) British, not Scottish. These findings confirmed the preeminence of a Scottish dual identity, as in Catalonia (Moreno, 2006 & 2007)[†]. They shed new light on the understanding of the political dynamics, in particular in Scotland. As Moreno put it the "political significance of the manner in which Scots identify themselves appears to be more complex than assumed beforehand. Other than acknowledging the high level of legitimacy in the setting up of Scottish democratic institutions within the framework of the British state, Scottish 'dual identity' and a strong sense of Scottishness cut across other functional dimensions of social life, such as gender, class or religion, with variable political effects" (2006: 11). Since the 1997 general elections, the Moreno question has been regularly used in England, Wales and Scotland (but not in Northern Ireland) via the Scottish Election Study /Scottish Social Attitudes/, Welsh Election Study/ Welsh Referendum Study and British Election Study/ British Social Attitudes (see all data sources in Curtice 2013)

Noteworthy, there was initially no difference between the questionnaire built by Linz and the Moreno question used by Moreno and subsequent scholars. This explains why some authors speak about "Linz-Moreno" question (Keating, 2009a, 2009b, 2014; Guinjoan & Rodon, 2015; Antón Merino, 2015). However, a significant discrepancy, which Linz regretted, was increasingly introduced in the two extreme options (Peres, 2007: 522). While the initial wording was "I feel X", it is nowadays often administered as "I *only* feel" or 'I *exclusively* feel" which contravenes the original idea of the Linz question. But still, even with this proposition, the use of the Moreno question highlights a much more nuanced identity allegiance than previously observed with exclusive questions. In that sense, the "use of Linz questionnaire is thus not in itself politically innocuous. It leads to a soothing distancing compared to a monistic conception of nationality, in the sense that it plays down the identity choices" (Peres, 2007: 523).

Traveling of the Moreno question

After its export from Spain to the United Kingdom, the use of the Linz-Moreno question has been repeatedly introduced by various scholars in other political systems. Before presenting them, it is quite remarkably to observe that, aside Martínez-Herrera's (2005) PhD thesis, there

[†] The results were: (1) Scottish, not British 39%; (2) More Scottish than British 30%; (3) As far Scottish as British 19%; (4) More British than Scottish 4%; (5) British, not Scottish 6%. There were also 2% of "don't know" answers.

is no comparative perspective using the Linz-Moreno question[‡]. The overwhelming majority of studies are case-oriented.

Among the first scholars to adopt the methodological choice of the Linz-Moreno question we firstly encounter scholars in European studies. The Moreno question has been included as a standard question in the Eurobarometer since 1992, replacing the previous ‘complementary identity question’[§] (see history of the Moreno question at the European level in Duchesne 2008; Bruter, 2008). The formulation of the Linz-Moreno question in the Eurobarometer is: *‘Do you in the near future see yourself as (nationality) only, (nationality) and European, European and (nationality), European only?’*. This is however a ‘partial’ Moreno question since the mixed identity option is not present (as much ‘national identity’ as European). Besides, the hierarchy between identities is unclear in this formulation. Indeed, is it clear for the respondents that ‘(national identities) and European’ indicates a superiority of the national identity over the European identity while ‘European and (national identities)’ indicates primacy of European identity over the national identity?

A second country where (some) scholars rapidly adopted the Linz-Moreno question is Canada, and most particularly in Quebec. Because of its (strong) independentist claims, the study of Quebecker’s identity is well established in this region since the 1960s. During almost three decades, Quebeckers were asked whether they feel ‘Québécois’, ‘Canadiens français’, ‘Canadiens anglais’ or ‘Canadien’ (Pinard, 1997), i.e. a type of ‘forced choice territorial identity’. In 1997, a survey conducted in the context of the adoption of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) included for the first time the Linz-Moreno question. Guy Lachapelle (2007) who was part of the survey team discussed at length the context and reasons behind the inclusion of this question. In particular, he cited two factors explaining how the Linz-Moreno question became increasingly known in Canada: on the one hand, there was a rich debate animating European scholars in the early 1990s due to the inclusion of the Linz-Moreno question in Eurobarometers (see above); on the other hand, he was convinced by other colleagues studying comparable regions in Europe (David McCrone and John Curtice in the UK as well as Luis Moreno himself in Spain).

France is the third country where surveys administered this question. From 1995 to 2007, in addition to Eurobarometers, it has been used in four French surveys (conducted by the company TNS Sofres) in order to compare French and European identities (Dupoirier, 2007). More recently, Alistair (2006) also tested the Moreno question using Brittany as a case study to test the links between nested territorial identities and claims for regional institution-building. Although he does not acknowledge it explicitly in his work, his education and research background in the UK is likely to have contributed to its exportation to France. At that moment, the Linz-Moreno question was repeatedly implemented in English, Scottish and Welsh electoral surveys. In France, the recourse to the Linz-Moreno question constituted a distinctive rupture vis-à-vis the initial ‘forced choice territorial identity’ used by the

[‡] She compared five regions from three different countries (Basque Country, Catalonia, Galicia, Quebec and Scotland).

[§] It asked respondents *‘Do you sometimes think of yourself not only as a (nationality) citizen but also as a European citizen? Does it happen often, sometimes or never?’*

Observatoire Interregional du Politique from 1985 to 1992 (plus once in 2000). French respondents had to choose between 'city/county where they live', their 'Département', their 'Région', 'France' or "none). Later on, from 1992 to 2001, the *Observatoire Interregional du Politique* developed a multiple identity metric measure (respondents could express several territorial attachment), in which the intensity of respondents' territorial attachments can be assessed (Dupoirier, 2007: 535).

Despite the growing subnational autonomy throughout the world (Marks et al. 2008), which (partially) reflects the increase of subnational identities, the rest of the scholarly community has not really used that question in their research. Nevertheless, **there is a strong qualitative tradition analyzing the construction and development of nested identities.**

Methodological assessment

Of course this type of questioning method is far from being perfect and following the methodological analysis formulated by De Winter (2007), five weaknesses can be identified. It is important to note that these weaknesses also apply for two other questions (intensity and frequency question and hierarchical question). A first problem is that the number of possible choices influences the frequency of the responses: the more items by category, the more likely this category will be chosen frequently. A second difficulty is linked to the emotional connotations problem with the identification items. The formulation of the propositions can induce rejection or adhesion. Therefore scholars and researchers have to pay great attention in the wording of the alternatives which must be neutral. Thirdly, findings on *recency effect*, which implies that the latter category on the list is more often chosen, and *primacy effect*, which implies that the category on the top of the list is more often chosen (Billiet, Loosveldt & Waterplas, 1984), indicate that the order of the proposition has a great influence on the results. Those *recency effect* and *primary effect* provoke the fourth weakness: the logical contradictions observed in the responses obtained through Moreno question and hierarchical question. Finally, it is difficult to apply the Linz-Moreno questioning to situations of multiple (i.e. more than two) identities. The Moreno question does not determine the prevalence of identity on its multiple alternative identities unless it is multiplied until every binary combination possible is obtained.

Because it is composed of only two levels of identity, the Moreno question thus is less rich than the hierarchical question.

Consequently regarding the respective strengths and weaknesses of the three questioning, the balance provided by the Moreno question and its benefit in terms of simplicity and ordinariness that makes it easily applicable in research designs, imply that it is the most favored option by scholars. Its success is thus more a matter of nuance and pragmatism than the result of empirical adequacy. But still, quite paradoxically its simplicity gives the Moreno question a methodological acuity: It can be "interpreted as an ordinal variable of the degree of regional identity or conversely national identity, which allows for more detailed analyses" (De Winter 2007: 592).

A significant weakness of the question and it has been used, explaining that some scholars do not use it, is that the question does not allow for 'neither national nor regional' as an answer. Besides, the question only permits dual territorial comparison (NAT/EU or EU/NAT or NAT/REG...). This doesn't fit with the complexity in a polity like the European Union where a person can feel, for instance, Basque, Spanish and European. Moreover, from an epistemological perspective, results obtained with the Moreno question are not beyond reproaches. For a good discussion of data availability about Moreno question see Fitjar (2010: 35-40).

3. Measuring identities in Belgium

Similar to other states characterised by a devolution process, a research tradition of measuring identities has developed in Belgium during the past four decades, the period largely coinciding with the Belgian federalisation process. Most often, these 'ethno-territorial' identities, as they have often been labelled in Belgium, were measured within the framework of larger quantitative surveys. Particularly since the 1990s this was done as a part of (post-)electoral surveys, resulting in measurements at least every four years. Next to this, there have also been irregular polls on identities in Belgium, mostly carried out by media organisations, but in this contribution we will limit ourselves to scientific surveys.

It is to our knowledge from 1975 onwards that identities as such started to be measured. There had already been a number of public opinion studies conducted on the linguistic conflict in Belgium between 1966 and 1975, focusing on people's perceptions of the most important problems and solutions of which some parts are related to the identity debate, but without actual measurement of identity feelings (for an overview see Verdoodt, 1976). In the first part of the 1980s, research on identification was part of a panel survey focusing specifically on the community conflicts (called Régioscope), afterwards in (post-)electoral surveys (mostly ISPO-PIOP and Partirep). In these different studies, different types of survey questions have been used.

The hierarchical question

The most often and consistently used way to measure identities in Belgium is through the hierarchical question, asking respondents to which of a list of given identities they feel most closely related in the first and in the second place. To our knowledge, this question first appears in an inter-university survey in 1975. It is still used in the two electoral surveys organised in 2014. Therefore, the hierarchical question also seems best suited to analyse evolutions of ethno-territorial identities in Belgium over a long period of time, covering about the entire federalisation process.

Table 1: Ethno-territorial identities in Flemish region, based on hierarchical question (1975-2014)

1 st	75	79	80	81	82	86	91	95i p	95i	96	99	03	04	07	09	10	14i	14p
Bel	19	34	40	37	35	44	42	52	36	37	56	54	42	52	43	45	56	56
Fla	17	45	44	47	48	33	40	25	23	23	27	30	39	34	27	29	28	21
Pro	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	4	6	3	5	9	3	7
Co m	61	19	14	13	14	20	13	17	32	30	13	12	12	10	15	13	13	15
Eur									?	?					9			
Oth							2	3			0	0		1	1	4	0	1
N		100 4	690	492	418		237 9	206 6			249 7	124 7		112 4	153 1	190 0	113 1	925

Table 2: Ethno-territorial identities in Walloon region, based on hierarchical question (1975-2014)

1 st choice	75	79	80	81	82	86	91	95	99	03	04	07	09	10	14p
Bel	27	54	59	61	57	58	68	65	72	68	56	75	57	70	69
Wal	22	18	17	15	18	16	11	10	11	10	12	8	9	5	11
FrC	4	16	16	17	16	11	11	8	5	6	8	6	5	7	5
Prov	4	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	2	5	1	3	2	4
Com	44	9	6	6	8	12	7	10	10	10	15	8	9	14	10
Eur													16		
Oth							3	7	0	4		2		2	1
N		944	619	457	381		139 1	124 1	129 4	742		662	800	337	911

Data from: AGLOP - GLOPO: 1975 (inter-university); Régioscope (ULB-UCL): 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1986; ISPO/PIOP: 1991, 1995, 1999, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2014; ISPO (only FI): 1995, 1996; Partirep: 2009, 2014

These evolutions can be found in tables 1 and 2. Particularly striking is the much higher importance attached to the commune/city in the surveys where this was proposed first (1975, 1995i and 1996). However, some of the differences that can be seen in the tables can probably be (at least in part) explained by methodological differences. Indeed, the way the hierarchical question has been put to respondents has differed. Most important differences include the wording of the question, the wording of the proposed identities, the number of proposed identities, the number of references to one identity and also the order of the proposed identities (De Winter, 1999).

Let's first focus on the wording of the question. Between 1979 and 1986 (in the Régioscope studies) the question was asked as follows: 'To which group do you consider to belong above

all?**. From 1995 this became: 'Of which unity do you consider yourself part in the first and the second place?' for Flanders while in the French version the wording was less precise.^{††} The first questions refer more to an actual group of people, while the second one refers more to an institutional reality.

The wording of the identities also differed: the Régioscope studies referred to 'l'ensemble des belges' (to make the distinction with the other proposed identities), while later studies just used Belgium. Two non-electoral ISPO studies conducted in 1995 and 1996 (only for Flanders) on the contrary used 'Belgian' and 'Flemish'.

Also, Régioscope included all the different institutional identities, making a distinction between the 'Dutch language community' and the 'Flemish region' (which was dropped in ISPO-PIOP) and also proposing the Brussels region as well as the German-speaking language community (Delruelle-Vosswinkel et al, 1983: 15). In the Partirep surveys (2009 and 2014) Europe was added as an option, which was also the case in the 1995 and 1996 ISPO-studies.

In some cases, some type of identities were further specified and divided. This is for instance the case in the 1975 study, where the local level - which in other surveys was generally proposed once as 'your commune or city' - was divided into three options: your commune, the entity of which your commune and its surroundings is part of and your city.

The order in which the different identity options are presented to respondents also shows variation. Research showed that this indeed has an effect on the results due to a primacy effect: options that are presented first tend to get more support, at least among respondents without strong opinions on the matter (Billiet, 1996). Because most surveys use a decreasing order going from the highest to the lowest level of governance, Belgium was often in first position, followed by the regional/community levels, the province and the local level. However in the 1995 and 1996 ISPO-studies the order was inversed, with the local level being presented first and also being adapted to where the respondent lived (e.g. Antwerp instead of 'your commune/city'). Also, as the Partirep survey followed the same logic, it put Europe in first position. The 1975 study also put the local levels first.

All these differences must be taken into account for a nuanced analysis of the evolutions of 'ethno-territorial' identities in Belgium (and mostly some of the quite surprising differences) based on the hierarchical question (for a more detailed analysis of the evolution of results for the hierarchical question, see Deschouwer & Sinardet, 2009).

The Linz-Moreno question

The second most used question in Belgian research on ethno-territorial identities is the Linz-Moreno question. This first appeared in 1995 in the ISPO/PIOP electoral survey and has been

** 'A quel groupe estimez-vous appartenir avant tout?'

†† 'Tot welk geheel rekent zichzelf op de eerste en op de tweede plaats?' / 'A quoi avez-vous le sentiment d'appartenir en premier et en deuxième lieu?'

used in most electoral surveys since then, mostly to allow comparison of Belgian data with those of other 'multi-national' countries. Because the wording remained constant the Moreno question also allows for more reliable longitudinal comparison, although this only covers the last 20 years and thus only half of the period covered by the hierarchical question (see tables 3 and 4).

Table 3: Ethno-territorial identities in Flemish region, based on the Linz/Moreno question (1995-2014)

Flemish region	1995	1999	2003	2004	2007	2010	2014i	2014 p
Only Flemish	3,6	7	7,2	7	7,3	8	6,8	8,7
More Flemish than Belgian	23,1	22,4	23,3	29	27,4	27,4	24,3	18,4
Equally Flemish and Belgian	45,3	42,2	42,3	45	35,5	41,3	38,7	41,7
More Belgian than Flemish	17,2	13,3	15,1	8	17,0	12,4	16,7	8,0
Only Belgian	10,8	15,1	12,1	11	12,7	10,9	13,1	23,2
Total %	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N	2088	2157	1202	517	1073			1002

Table 4: Ethno-territorial identities in Walloon region, based on the Linz/Moreno question (1995-2014)

Walloon region	1995	1999	2003	2004	2007	2010	2014i	2014 p
Only Walloon	1,5	2,30	3,6	3	1,6	4,4		2,1
More Walloon than Belgian	9,4	11,3	8,3	11	6,1	5,0		6,9
Equally Walloon and Belgian	44,7	41,8	39,7	31	38,0	21,1		42,7
More Belgian than Walloon	25,3	22,0	18,3	13	19,9	22,8		11,7
Only Belgian	19,1	22,5	30,0	42	34,4	46,7		36,6
Total %	100	100	100	100	100	100		100
N	1223	1381	764	310		467		1004

In general, the Moreno question presents the advantage that it allows respondents to put their regional and national identity at the same level, while the hierarchical question forces to choose between different identities. A disadvantage is that it reduces the etho-territorial

identification to those two levels, while these may not necessarily be the most important ones for all respondents (although results for the hierarchical question in Belgium show that on average about 4 respondents in 5 do choose either the regional or the national identification as their first).

However, in the Belgian context the Moreno question has an important disadvantage compared to most other countries it has been used in. The complexity of the institutional and identity landscape in Belgium, based on regional as well as community identities, is difficult to translate to the Moreno question which only allows for one type of regional identity to be measured.

This difficulty mostly rises in the French-speaking part of Belgium. Indeed, while the Flemish identity covers the regional as well as the community aspect, on the other side of the language border there is an important difference between the Walloon and the francophone identity. This difference reveals itself in the institutional landscape (community and regional institutions not having been merged such as on the Flemish side), in political and intellectual debate (where 'regionalists' and 'communitarians' have been at odds with each other) and also among public opinion, as is shown by the results of the hierarchical question. The problem also occurs for Dutch-speaking respondents when the Brussels population is included in the sample and most particularly in recent years when a Brussels regional identity has developed. Still, while a dual tension between substate and state does still more or less make sense for Flanders versus Belgium it does not make sense for Francophone Belgians who can be Belgian but also Walloon, Francophone or 'Bruxellois'.

A solution to this problem would be to use two Moreno questions for Walloon respondents: one comparing their Belgian with their Walloon identity, the other comparing their Belgian with their francophone identity. However, this is more time-consuming and might also be confusing for a number of respondents. Moreover it still doesn't allow to measure the relation between the two types of sub state identities.

Other types of measurement

While the hierarchical and the Linz-Moreno question have been most used, some surveys also included other types of identity measurement.

The Centre Liégeois d'Etude de l'Opinion (CLEO) uses a question which doesn't introduce any hierarchy between the identities, but measures the frequency and intensity of different possible identities. This was used in various -- usually non-electoral surveys -- since the late 1980s, including the 'Wallobaromètre'^{**}). Interestingly, this shows that there is not necessarily an opposition between regional and national identity, as it shows that those feeling most strongly Belgian also feel most strongly Walloon and European (Jacquemain et al, 2006).

^{**} The intensity/frequency question was formulated as follows:

- a) «Est-ce qu'il vous arrive de vous sentir (Wallon, Belge, etc.) ? Jamais, rarement, de temps en temps, souvent, très souvent ?
- b) «Quand vous vous sentez (Wallon, Belge, etc.), est-ce un sentiment faible, moyen, fort» ?

Unfortunately, these data are only available for the Walloon region (with the exception of 1995 when the question was also included in ISPO-PIOP).

The own identity can also be measured by looking at the differences with other relevant identities. The ISPO-PIOP surveys include a question asking respondents to which extent they perceive differences between Flemish and Walloon. Most of these also asked Flemish respondents whether they felt closer to a Dutch citizen than to a French-speaking Belgian and asked francophone respondents whether they felt closer to a French citizen than a Flemish one.

Some research used a much broader definition of identity than the strictly ethno-territorial version, interestingly showing its relativity. When asked in an open question which of the groups they belong to is the most important for them, only 5 % spontaneously refers to a geo-political group (more precisely 4,3% of the Flemish, 5,4 % of the Walloon and 7,8 of the Brussels francophone respondents). The ethno-territorial identification only comes after the primary group (family), a philosophical group (eg Catholics) and an organisation. Almost one third does not refer to any group (Doutrelepoint, Billiet & Vanderkeere, 2001: 14). Focusing specifically on ethno-territorial identities can thus attribute them more salience than they actually have or even to essentialise them.

Finally, a metric question using unidimensional scale was introduced in the Partirep 2014 surveys. In the next section we will compare these results with those for the hierarchical and Linz-moreno question.

4. Logical inconsistencies between identity questions: empirical findings

Belgium offers an interesting case for studying the effects and results of using different identity questions. Three different questions were used in the PIOP-ISPO surveys of 1995 (hierarchical, Moreno and intensity/frequency questions) while the most recent Partirep 2014 survey included the hierarchical, Moreno & metric questions. So we have some unique material to examine the results of three different types of question, and to evaluate the validity of these questions in their capacity to grasp identity by establishing the degree of “logical inconsistencies” that may exist between the answers given to different identity measurements. The degree of inconsistencies between the hierarchical, Moreno & intensity/frequency questions in the PIOP-ISPO surveys of 1995 has been analysed by De Winter (1998) for the Flemish sample and by De Winter & Frogner (1999) for the Walloon sample. They found a relative high level of logical consistency between the answers to the hierarchical and Linz/Moreno question (about five out of six), but low degree (about half) of consistent answers between these two questions and the frequency/intensity question. They also noted that the logical consistency between the answers to the hierarchical and Linz/Moreno question is considerably lower for the respondents that ticked the first answer category on either question, indicating considerable “recency effects”, i.e. the tendency of some (unsophisticated?) respondents to simply choose the first option that was offered on the response card.

Regarding the inconsistencies between the hierarchical, Moreno & metric measures included the most recent Partirep 2014 voter survey, we first present the exact formulation of these three identity measures in the Partirep 2014 voter survey, then discuss the operationalization of the concept on logical inconsistencies, present our actual findings regarding the occurrence of inconsistencies⁵⁵, to finish with some reflections on the use of different measurements in cross-regional and cross-country research.

The three identity question types are not formulated in fully equivalent forms in terms of questions asked and answer categories offered: the hierarchical scale includes other territorial identities (such as province and local) options than just Belgian vs. regional identities offered in the Linz/Moreno scale; and the metric scales do not force respondents to explicitly indicate a hierarchy between identities as do the other scales. Still we may consider some answer patterns as “inherently inconsistent”. In order to explain the operationalization of this “inconsistency” test, we need to carefully examine the wording of the three questions, and the answer categories offered to respondents, in the Partirep 2014 electoral survey.

In this survey, the hierarchical question was formulated as follows: *Which geographical or cultural entity do you consider yourself to belong to in the first place? And which geographical or cultural entity do you consider yourself to belong to in the second place?* The categories provided (in that order) were Europe, Belgium, Francophone community, Flemish community/region, German-speaking community, Walloon region, Brussels region, Your province, Your municipality or city.

The Linz/Moreno question was asked in the following way:

Which of the following statements most accurately describes your personal opinion? The answer categories were (again, in that order): I only feel Flemish/Walloon, I feel more Flemish/Walloon than Belgian, I feel as much Flemish/Walloon as Belgian, I feel more Belgian than Flemish/Walloon, I only feel Belgian.

Finally, the new metric measure was operationalised with the following three questions: *For each of the identities below, could you indicate to what extent they apply to you? You can do so using a scale ranging from 0 to 10, where 0 means not at all, and 10 means a lot.* This included the categories: Belgian, Flemish/ Walloon and European.

These three question types allow us to establish -- to some extent -- a hierarchy between respondents' identities: in the hierarchical question, they have to indicate a first and a second choice, the Linz/Moreno question also indicates a hierarchy (exception made for the 'central' category, i.e. “I feel as Flemish/Walloon as Belgian”), while the metric scales allow us to establish a hierarchy for all respondents that did not give exactly the same score on the Belgian and Flemish/Walloon scales.

We may presume that for instance, respondents with a consistent hierarchy in terms of their predominant identification with Belgium rather than their region, would display this hierarchy in the answers to all three identity measures. Hence, a respondent that opts for the Linz/Moreno category of “more Belgian than Flemish” should opt on the hierarchical question for Belgium in the first place, and Flanders in the second place (or at least for Belgium before

⁵⁵ Note that the analyses, as usual, were run separately for the Flemish and Walloon samples, excluding the more complex case of identities in the Brussels capital region (which were in any case not included in the partirep 2014 surveys, and which pose particular problems regarding the use of the Linz-Moreno question in a complex context.

Flanders as first or second choice). Likewise, in order to be internally consistent, such respondent would give a higher score on the Belgian “metric identity scale than his score on the Flemish metric scale. Hence, the respondent pattern of identity would be considered inconsistent if she opts for the Linz/Moreno category of “more Belgian than Flemish”, but in the hierarchical question for Flanders the first place, and Belgium in the second place (or at least for Flanders before Belgium as first or second choice), or in the metric measure would give a higher score for the Flemish one than on the Belgian scale.

Similar logical reasoning of internal consistency can be applied to most of the other categories of the Linz/Moreno scale, i.e. for those opting for the “more Flemish than Belgian” category, and those opting for “only Flemish” or “only Belgian” positions. *** The middle category of the Linz/Moreno scale poses a particular problem as the hierarchical question does not allow for *ex aequo*, i.e. balanced regional and Belgian identities, which are however predominant by now for both the Flemish and Walloon populations (Deschouwer et al. 2015à). Hence, we adopt a “inclusive”, “permissive” attitude (given the fact that the hierarchical question does not allow *ex aequo*?): we code as “consistent” a respondent when he feels “as much Belgian as regional” on the Linz/Moreno question, but on the hierarchical question mentions Belgium as first choice, and Flanders as second, as the respondent could not give both *ex aequo* identities. Equally, as the hierarchical question allows to identify a non national/regional identity as first or second choice (e.g. local, provincial), obscuring the =hierarchy between Belgian/regional second or third order identity preference (as only two could be indicated in the hierarchical question), a respondent that feels for instance in the first place “local”, an answer on the hierarchical question of indicating that his first belonging is local and his second is Belgian (or regional) is considered “consistent”, as the respondent could not indicate the *ex aequo* status of both identities.

Evidently this logic holds also for Walloons respondents, but as their territorial identities as much more skewed towards the Belgian “pole” (Deschouwer et al., 2015), we need to analyse consistencies separately for each regional sample.

Regarding the comparison of the hierarchy expressed in the Linz/Moreno question *vis-à-vis* the one expressed in the “hierarchical question”, we find a lower overall consistency for 78,9% among the Flemish respondents vs. 68,4% of the Walloon respondents (which is somewhat lower than the results found in the 1995 PIOP-ISPO survey). The comparisons between the Linz/Moreno question with the novel metric scales, do not yield better results, on the contrary. In fact, we find only 59,4% consistent Flemish respondents vs. 53,5 % of the Walloon respondents. However, we find a moderately higher degree of consistency between the hierarchical question and the metric scales: i.e. 81,5% among the Flemish respondents vs. 71,2% of the Walloon respondents.

Hence, our test of logical consistency produces mixed results. On the positive side, the (large) majority of respondents give answers on our three operationalisations of identity that are consistent with the presumed internal hierarchy thesis (allowing also for an *ex aequo* position) of national vs regional identities. Hence, these answers seem to be “structured” by an underlying internal hierarchy of identities, and do not seem just the result of random opinions, affected mostly by primacy effects or social desirability.

*** For a detailed explanation of the calculations of logical inconsistencies between the Moreno and hierarchical scale, see De Winter & Frogner (1999).

On the basis of the analysis of the consistency of the answers given to the three measures of identity included in the Belgian 2014 partirep survey, the verdict about the validity and reliability of the Linz/Moreno question, as well as its old and new competitors, is still open. The hierarchical and Linz/Moreno question forces respondents to establish a hierarchy between identities (with the latter allowing balanced regional/national identity, much used in the Belgian case). Other variables have been used in other regional/state contexts to test the validity of the Linz/Moreno question such as the “regional/state nationalism” measure^{†††} or the “attachment to the region/state” (a somehow metric version of the hierarchical scale, now measured on a 0-10 scale^{†††} (Guinjoan & Rodon, 2015). Other measurements about the intensity and saliency of identity feelings should be added, as well as open questions and interpretative analyses regarding the choices respondents make on all the existing measures mentioned above.

The validity of these questions is however seriously bounded by the context of the region. In some regions, the question of regional vs national identity has been politicized for decades, a politisation sometimes peaking during crucial elections or referendums where independence of the region is the most salient issue. In other regions, the question of regional vs national identity (let alone independence) is not a very salient issue (ex. Germany) or is competing with other salient territorial identities (i.e. the Brussels region, where Belgian vs Brussels regionalist identities compete, as well Flemish vs Francophone ones, and local identities compete). Also, in the provinces of Limburg and Luxemburg, we find some remnants of a provincial identity.

These precautions do not only warn us to be cautious about the validity of the Linz/Moreno question in complex societies like Belgium (given its changing centre/periphery relations of its regions/communities), but more importantly for its validity in comparative cross-national research.

Conclusion

In this paper we have reflected on the use of surveys for measuring national and subnational identities. We have followed the journey of the Linz-Moreno question that was designed for measuring the relations between two possibly conflicting identities: the Spanish and the subnational. This technique to measure identities by means of surveys has travelled well to those place where researchers have tried to understand the relation between identities and demands for subnational autonomy. These places include Canada, the UK and Belgium. Yet in Belgium the feelings of belonging to the national state and to regions and communities has also been measured in other ways. Exactly the complex setup of regions and identities has pushed the researchers towards other types of questions. One of these is the ‘hierarchical’ question, asking respondents to identify with one entity out of a more or less long list. In that list also more local (provincial and urban) and supranational (Europe) have – sometimes –

^{†††} “On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 is the minimum level of Catalan/Spanish identity and 10 the maximum level of Catalan/Spanish identity, which national identity do you relate more closely with?” (Guinjoan & Rodon, 2015).

^{†††} “On a 0 to 10 scale, where 0 means that you don’t feel any attachment and 10 that you feel strong attachment, which is your level of attachment to regiona/State?” (Guinjoan & Rodon, 2015).

been added. In the most recent election survey conducted by PartiRep a 'metric' question was also added, asking respondents to indicate on a 0-10 scale to what extent they feel Flemish/Walloon, Belgian and European.

The 2014 PartiRep survey contained three identity questions: the Linz-Moreno question, the hierarchical question and this new metric question. Comparing the responses to these three questions, we must however conclude that they are not very consistent. The hierarchies between the identities vary between the questions. When people are asked within one hour three times in a different way how they relate to Flanders, Wallonia, Belgium or other political communities, an important number of them respond in a different way. All three questions do measure something, but apparently they do not measure – contrary to what we assumed – fully the same thing. Similar comparisons between responses to identity questions in 1995 had already pointed into that direction.

This finding is sobering. It does oblige us to reflect on the validity (and possibly also reliability) of the instruments. Measuring identities in political systems in which these are debated is of course very relevant and useful. Understanding the intensity of (sub)national identities and the way in which they evolve over time, can add to our understanding of the political dynamics. Yet exactly in political systems where identities are debated, we might fail to capture exactly what they mean if we measure them by means of survey questions. Survey questions in general and therefore also survey questions about identities assume a number of elements that are a consequence of what is not measured. Identities are assumed to have a homogenous meaning for all respondents. Identities are assumed to be clear and well-understood. Identities are assumed to be important, which leads then to an answer that is meaningful and reliable. Identities are assumed to be the same across contexts. Yet one can imagine that answering a question about Belgian or subnational identities at the end of a long (and maybe boring) questionnaire about politics and parties and a wide variety of attitudes produces a different answer (activates different feelings and meanings) compared to a question asked at the very beginning. And in the PartiRep questionnaire the three questions were indeed asked in the beginning (Linz-Moreno), in the middle (hierarchical) and towards the end of the interview (metric).

Measuring identities is relevant and important. Yet there is some work ahead of us. If respondents appear to be 'inconsistent', they are of course inconsistent in our preset terms. Respondents themselves are probably consistent in a way that we fail to grasp. For further research one should therefore reflect on ways to also grasp the meaning of identities and their possible variation in the population and across contexts. Adding open questions to the measurement of identities, asking the respondents to explain why they have answers the way they did, might be an interesting technique. Yet while we can certainly refine the instruments for measuring identities with surveys, the qualitative logic of surveys has in-built disadvantages that cannot be avoided. Measuring identities should therefore also not limit itself to quantitative survey research. Understanding the *content* of identities, rather than their intensity or salience, requires qualitative research. That type of research has however too often been limited to elite studies. There is still some ground to be covered if we want to fully understand how identities play a role at the mass level.

References

- Abdelal, R., Herrera, Y., Johnston, A.I & Martin, T. (2001), Treating identity as a variable: measuring the content, intensity, and contestation of identity, paper presented at the *APSA Annual Conference*, San Francisco 2001
- Abdelal, R., Herrera, Y., Johnston, A.I. & McDermott, R. (2009), *Measuring identity. A guide for social scientists*, Cambridge UP
- ALONSO Sonia (2012), *Challenging the State: Devolution and the Battle for Partisan Identity. A Comparison of Belgium, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 278p.
- Anderson, B. (1983), *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso
- ANTÓN MERINO Javier (2015), "Preferencias identitarias y de la organización territorial del estado en Cataluña: un acercamiento longitudinal" , 13th Congress of the AECPA: *¿Dónde está hoy el poder?*, San Sebastián – País Vasco, July the 15th 2015, notes from GT 4.9 Las bases electorales de los partidos nacionalistas en las Comunidades Autónomas españolas, 29p.
- BILLIET Jaak, Geert LOOSVELDT & Lina WATERPLAS (1984), "Het Survey-interview Onderzocht: Effecten van het Ontwerp en Gebruik van Vragenlijsten op de kwaliteit van de antwoorden", in *Sociologische studies en documenten*, n°19, 272p.
- Billig, M. (1995), *Banal nationalism*, London: Sage Publications
- Brubaker, R. & Cooper, F. (2000), Beyond 'identity', *Theory and Society*, vol 29: 1-47
- BRUTER, Michael (2008). "Legitimacy, Euroscepticism & Identity in the European Union – Problems of Measurement, Modelling & Paradoxical Patterns of Influence." *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, Vol. 4 , n° 4, pp.273-285.
- COLLER Xavier (2006), "Collective Identities and Failed Nationalism. The Case of Valencia in Spain", *Pôle Sud*, n°25, vol. 2, pp. 107-136.
- DE WINTER Lieven & FROGNIER André-Paul (1999), "Les Identités Politiques Territoriales : Explorations dans un Champ de Mines Politique et Méthodologique", in FROGNIER André-Paul & Aish Anne-Marie (eds.), *Des Élections en Trompe-l'œil. Enquête sur le comportement électoral des Wallons et des Francophones*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, pp.67-96.
- DE WINTER Lieven (2007), "La recherche sur les identités ethno-territoriales en Belgique", *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, vol. 14, n°4, pp.575-595.
- DE WINTER, L. & A-P. FROGNIER, 'Les identités politiques territoriales : explorations dans un champ de mines politique et méthodologique', dans A-P FROGNIER, A-M. Aish (eds.) *Des Elections en Trompe-l'œil. Enquête sur le comportement électoral des Wallons et des Francophones*, Bruxelles, De Boeck, 1999, 67-96.
- De Winter, L. (1998), Etno-territoriale identiteiten in Vlaanderen: verkenningen in een politiek en methodologisch mijnenveld, in M. Swyngedouw, J. Billiet, A. Carton, R. Beerten, *De (on)redelijke*

kiezer. *Onderzoek naar de politieke opvattingen van Vlamingen. Verkiezingen van 21 mei 1995*, Leuven, Acco, pp.159-180.

Delruelle-Vosswinkel, Nicole, André-Paul Frogner, Josette Dawance-Goossens, Jean-Jacques Grodent, L'opinion publique et les problèmes communautaires (IV) in [Courrier hebdomadaire du CRISP](#) 1983/6 (n° 991-992)

Deschouwer Kris & Sinardet Dave, 'Identiteiten, communautaire standpunten en stemgedrag' in Kris Deschouwer, Pascal Delwit, Marc Hooghe & Stefaan Walgrave (ed.), *De stemmen van het volk. Een analyse van het kiesgedrag in Vlaanderen en Wallonië op 7 juni 2009*, Brussel: VUBPress, 2010, p. 75-98

DUCHESNE Sophie, (2008), 'Waiting for a European identity', *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, pp. 397-410.

DUPOIRIER Élisabeth (2007), "De l'usage de la Question Moreno en France", *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, vol. 14, n°4, pp.531-543.

FITJAR Rune Dahl (2010), *The Rise of Regionalism: Causes of Regional Mobilization in Western Europe*, London, Routledge, 208p.

Frogner André-Paul (1998), "Les Identités Politiques Territoriales", *Revue Internationale de Politique Comparée*, vol. 5, n°1, pp.11-21.

Gellner, Ernest (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

GINER Salvador (1984), "Ethnic Nationalism, Centre and Periphery in Spain", in ABER Christopher & TORRENTS Nissa (eds.), *Spain: Conditional Democracy*, London, Croom Helm, pp.78-99.

GUINJOAN Marc & RODON Toni (2015), "A Scrutiny of the Linz-Moreno Question", *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, online, 15p., doi:10.1093/publius/pjv031 (consulted on October the 18th, 2015).

Guinjoan, M, & Rodon, T. (2015). A Scrutiny of the Linz-Moreno Question, in *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, pp.1-15 doi:10.1093/publius/pjv031

GUNTHER Richard, SANI Giacomo & SHABAD Goldie (1986), *Spain after Franco. The Making of a Competitive Party System*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 516p.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 191 p.

KEATING Michael (2009a), "Scottish Independence", *Scottish affairs*, vol.68, n°1, pp.100-118.

KEATING Michael (2009b), "Social Citizenship, Solidarity and Welfare in Regionalized and Plurinational States", *Citizenship studies* vol.13, n°5, pp.501-513.

KEATING Michael (2014), "Class, Sector and Nation. Support for Minority Nationalism Among Peak Interest Groups in Four Western European Countries", *Territory, Politics, Governance*, vol.2, n°3, pp.322-337.

Keating, M. (1996), *Nations against the state. The new politics of nationalism in Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland*, London: MacMillan Press

Keating, M., Loughlin, J. & Deschouwer, K. (2003), *Culture, institutions and economic development. A study of eight European regions*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar

- LINZ Juan José (1973), "Early State-Building and the Late Peripheral Nationalisms against the State: the case of Spain", in EISENSTADT Samuel & ROKKAN Stein (eds.), *Building States and Nations: Models, Analyses and Data Across Three Worlds*, Beverly Hills, Sage, pp.32-116.
- LINZ Juan José (1975), "Politics in a Multi-Lingual Society with a Dominant World Language: The Case of Spain", in SAVARD Jean-Guy & VIGNEAULT Richard (eds.), *Les États Multilingues, Problemes et Solutions*, Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval, pp.367-444.
- LINZ Juan José, GÓMEZ-REINO Y CARNOTA Manuel, ANDRÉS ORIZO Fransisco & VILA CARRO Dario (1981), *Informe Sociológico sobre el cambio político en España 1975-1981*, Madrid, Eurameica, 658p.
- LINZ Juan José (1969), "Ecological Analysis and Survey Research", in DOGAN Mattei & ROKKAN Stein, *Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, M. I. T. Press, pp.91-131.
- Mackintosh John (1968), *The Devolution of Power: Local Democracy, Regionalism and Nationalism*, London, Penguin, 207p.
- McCrone, D. & Bechofer, F. (2015), *Understanding national identity*, Cambridge UP
- Miller, D. (1995), *On nationality*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Moreno Luis (2006), "Scotland, Catalonia, Europeanization and the 'Moreno Question'", *Scottish Affairs*, n°54, pp.1-21.
- Moreno Luis, Arriba Ana & Serrano Araceli (1998), "Multiple identities in decentralized Spain: The case of Catalonia", *Regional & Federal Studies*, vol. 8, n°3, pp.65-88.
- Moreno, Luis (1986), *Decentralization in Britain and Spain: The Cases of Scotland and Catalonia*, Doctoral thesis, Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh.
- Peres Hubert (2007), "Genèse et Contexte d'une Invention : le Questionnaire de Juan Linz Entre Identité Subjective et Prétentions Nationalistes", *Revue internationale de politique compare*, vol. 14, n°4, pp. 515-530.
- Pinard Maurice & Hamilton Richard (1977), "The Independence Issue and the Polarization of the Electorate: The 1973 Quebec Election", *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*, vol. 10, n°2, pp.215-259.
- Pinard Maurice & Hamilton Richard (1978), "The Parti Québécois Comes to Power: An Analysis of the 1976 Quebec Election", *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*, vol. 11, n°4, pp.739-775.
- Pinard Maurice (1968), "Mass Society and Political Movements: A New Formulation", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 73, n°6, pp.682-690.
- Pinard Maurice. 1992. "The Dramatic Reemergence of the Quebec Independence Movement." *Journal of International Affairs* 45 (2):471-497.
- Reuchamps Min, Sinardet Dave, Dodeigne Jérémy & Caluwaerts Didier, 'Reforming Belgium's federalism: Comparing the views of MPs and voters' in *Government and Opposition*, 2015
- Van Dam, D. (1996), *Blijven we buren in België? Vlamingen en Walen over Vlamingen en Walen*, Leuven: Van Halewyck
- Verdoodt Albert (1976), *Les problèmes communautaires belges à la lumière des études d'opinion*, *Courrier Hebdomadaire du CRISP*, 1976: 36 (n° 742)

