

RESEARCH OUTPUTS / RÉSULTATS DE RECHERCHE

Measuring (sub-)national identities in survey research

Sinardet, Dave; De Winter, Lieven; Niessen, Christoph; Dodeigne, Jérémy; Reuchamps, Min

Published in:
Public Opinion Quarterly

Publication date:
2023

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (HARVARD):

Sinardet, D, De Winter, L, Niessen, C, Dodeigne, J & Reuchamps, M 2023, 'Measuring (sub-)national identities in survey research: lessons from Belgium', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. Online first, Online first, pp. 1-26.

General rights

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

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

Take down policy

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

Measuring (sub-)national identities in survey research: lessons from Belgium

Dave Sinardet

Lieven De Winter

Christoph Niessen

Jérémy Dodeigne

Min Reuchamps

Abstract

This article explores different measurements of (sub-)national identities in survey research and examines to which extent they lead to different results. Using survey data from Belgium, where there is a long-standing tradition of (sub-)national identity surveys, three types of questions are scrutinized: the 'hierarchical' question (asking respondents to which of a list of given identities they feel most closely related in first and second place), the 'Linz-Moreno' question (asking respondents to situate their regional and national identity vis-à-vis of each other) and the more recent 'metric' question (asking respondents to situate themselves for multiple identities on distinct 11-point scales). This article analyses the extent to which respondents answer these questions consistently, how varying degrees of consistency can be explained and what this tells us about the way social scientists measure (sub-)national identities. The results show that, depending on the question, only 39,4% to 69,2% of the respondents answer the three (sub-)national identity questions consistently. Differences in consistency are found to be not only related to respondents' political knowledge and interest, but also to the question forms and wordings, obliging us to reflect on the validity of identity measurements.

1. Introduction: surveying (sub-)national identities

Since social identity theory drew attention to how group membership can contribute to people's self identification as well as to their relation to others – thus playing a significant role in intergroup conflicts (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), the concept of social identity has been used widely in the social sciences. It is widely accepted that social identities can fulfil a number of social functions, including instrumental ones (Kalin & Sambanis, 2018).

In comparative federalism and regionalism in particular, the attention for identities has increased as a consequence of the “new politics of nationalism” (Keating 1996) at the sub-national level. Henceforth, we will refer to such political identities on the sub-state level – be they territorial or non-territorial – as sub-national identities. Territorial politics and constitutional reform processes in countries such as Belgium, the UK, Spain or Canada are often analysed through the lens of such subnational identities, considered as a main driver of these processes (Sinardet, 2012). Simultaneously, the transfers of powers to supranational institutions like the EU have also sparked research on the development of corresponding (European) identifications (Opp, 2005).

Despite having attracted attention, the concept of identity has not necessarily been neatly defined: “the term is richly – indeed for an analytical concept – hopelessly – ambiguous” as Brubaker and Cooper (2000: 6) point out. Definitions and conceptualisations of identity are numerous and diverse (Abdelal et.al. 2006). Furthermore, compared to other social identities such as class or gender, which have shown to have a significant direct impact on behaviour and attitudes, the effects of national identities are more ambiguous (McCrone and Bechhofer 2015). Some even qualified them as “banal” (Billig 1995), i.e. largely taken for granted, not that often explicitly mentioned and with a meaning and content not often explicitly spelled out.

While people do most of the time not pay much attention to their national identity (Miller 1995), when challenged or activated, they do become more visible and awareness of them becomes more important. Their meaning and content are then explicitly discussed. This is what happened in several places in the course of the past few decades (e.g. Keating 2001). Claims of political self-determination made by sub-state nationalist movements and parties in Catalonia, Scotland, Quebec, Corsica, or Flanders – to cite only a few prominent examples – have activated a debate about national and sub-national identities in their countries. As a consequence, political science has paid attention to these debates and has tried to map the evolutions and varieties of social identities on multiple local, regional, national and even supra-national levels (e.g. Duchesne & Frogner 2008; Henderson & Medeiros 2021).

In the wake of these developments, measuring both the content and the strength of shared feelings of belonging to (sub-)state communities has become an important focus in research on sub-state reorganization. Doing so, different strands have developed. The

identities and, especially, identity discourses of political elites, but also among the population, have been researched using qualitative approaches (Van Dam 1997, Heyvaert et al. 2020), but more often citizens' political identities have been scrutinized with large-n surveys, trying to capture to which extent they subscribe to a (sub-)national identity (Henderson & Medeiros 2021). While allowing to research the self-positioning of a large number of citizens on different indicators of (sub-)national identity, the question arises how well this actually allows to capture their political identity, and if different questions lead to different results?

Drawing on a long tradition of (sub-)national identity surveys in a country where sub-state nationalism has proven of significant political importance, the objective of this article is to examine these questions. Doing so, the three most prominent survey questions on (sub-)national identities are studied (see Table 1 for the exact question wordings): (i) the 'hierarchical' question (asking respondents to which of a list of given identities they feel most closely related in first and second place), (ii) the 'Linz-Moreno' question (asking respondents to situate their regional and national identity vis-à-vis of each other) and the more recent (iii) 'metric' question (asking respondents to situate themselves for multiple identities on distinct 11-point scales). This article analyses the extent to which respondents answer these questions consistently, how varying degrees of consistency can be explained and what this tells us about the way social scientists measure sub-national identities.

2. Three assumptions in survey measures of (sub-national) identities

In the literature on nationalism studies, scholars emphasize the constructed and malleable nature of political identities, which can change over time, in different contexts and depending on the actors referring to it (Anderson [1983] 1991, Gellner 1983, Hobsbawm 1992). However, we notice that (sub-)national identity surveys often rely on assumptions that somewhat contradict this constructivist approach.

A first assumption attributes homogenous meaning to (sub-)national identities. Not the content of national identities is measured, but their relevance for respondents – assuming that it is a cognitively sound and relevant category for them. For example, if a survey question asks whether and to what degree somebody feels Scottish or British, we do not offer respondents the possibility to say what exactly being Scottish or British means for them.

A second frequent assumption consists in attributing 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 possible. Stability over time is not assumed though. By repeating the same questions in consecutive surveys, we may to some

extent assess the degree in which the intensity of identities evolves over time within a population.

A third prominent assumption is that the categories offered to 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.

Recent methodological improvements are trying to take the issues into consideration – notably in the form of measurement invariance testing and multiple-indicator approaches. Yet, the aforementioned assumptions remain prominent in many quantitative surveys and, more specifically, in the analyses that are made of them.

If the constructivist caveats apply, however, we can expect that using different questions will also amount to different results. While in the past, different questions have been used to measure identities (with the Linz-Moreno question being probably dominant), seldomly were more than one question used in the same survey – not allowing for invariance testing across questions. In the 2014 electoral survey in Belgium, three different questions measuring (sub-)national identities were used. We thus want to seize the opportunity to draw on them to conduct a comparison of the answers respondents gave in the same survey to the three different questions, and scrutinize their consistency.

3. Measuring (sub-national) identities in Belgium: beyond the Linz-Moreno question

Similar to other states characterised by processes of decentralisation, a long tradition of survey research on (sub-)national identities has developed in Belgium during the past four decades – a period largely coinciding with the Belgian federalisation process. Yet, this case is an outlier in a comparative perspective: in this country (and in all its regions), the proportion of the population identifying with the national (Belgian) level is high. Indeed, in all other states that have experienced sociological centrifugal decentralisation (Niessen, 2021), the population of the regions advocating for decentralisation show a much lower national identification, possibly because they are minority nations (Reuchamps 2015). In Belgium, the high level of national identification has even lead Flemish-nationalist parties to be ambiguous about their anti-Belgian and separatist agenda (Sinardet, 2021). It comes in the wake of Belgium's complex majority-minority nexus that, for long, did not coincide between demographical weight and political power. This is also why studying Belgium and (sub-)national entities identities was so relevant.

In this country, most often, (sub-)national identities were measured within the framework of larger quantitative surveys comprising a range of other socio-political indicators. Particularly since the 1990s, this was done as a part of (post-)electoral surveys, resulting in measurements at least every four years (Sinardet et al. 2018). Next to this, there have also been irregular polls on identities in Belgium, mostly carried out by media organisations. In this article, we will limit ourselves to scientific surveys. In these studies, three different types of survey questions have been used in particular. Their wording in the 2014 survey that we will scrutinize in greater detail later is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Wordings of three most prominent (sub-)national identity questions in Belgium (here from 2014)

Question	Answer options
<i>Hierarchical question</i>	
a) To which cultural or geographical entity do you feel belonging first and foremost?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Europe – Belgium – Walloon Region – Brussels-Capital Region
b) To which cultural or geographical entity do you feel belonging in the second place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – French-Community in Belgium – Flemish Region or Community – German-speaking Community – your province – your city or municipality
<i>Linz-Moreno question</i>	
Which of these affirmations corresponds most to your vision of yourself?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – I feel only Flemish/Walloon – I feel more Flemish/Walloon than Belgian – I feel as Flemish/Walloon as Belgian – I feel more Belgian than Flemish/Walloon – I feel only Belgian
<i>Metric question</i>	
Could you, for each of the identities below, indicate to which extent they apply to you? You can indicate this on a scale from 0 to 10, on which 0 signifies not at all, and on which 10 signifies a lot.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Belgian – Flemish/Walloon

3.1 The hierarchical question

The most often and consistently used way to measure identities in Belgium has been through the so-called ‘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. This question first appears in an inter-university surveys in 1975, up until the 2019 electoral survey. This renders the hierarchical question also pragmatically well suited to analyse evolutions of (sub-)national identities in Belgium over a long period of time, since it covers about the entire federalisation process (that started in 1970). At the same time, its two-fold and ranking nature requires different techniques of analysis (e.g. Baron 1996).

Table 2. First choice for (sub-)national identities in Flanders and Wallonia based on the hierarchical question in percentages (1975-2019)

Flemish respondents	1975	1979	1980	1981	1982	1986	1991	1995	1999	2003	2004	2007	2009	2010	2014	2019
Belgium	19	34	40	37	35	44	42	52	56	54	42	52	43	45	56	45
Flanders	17	45	44	47	48	33	40	25	27	30	39	34	27	29	21	31
Province	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	4	6	3	5	9	7	4
Municipality/City	61	19	14	13	14	20	13	17	13	12	12	10	15	13	15	9
Europe													9			10
Other							2	3	0	0		1	1	4	1	1
n	2150	1004	690	492	418	531	2379	2066	2497	1247	1000	1124	1531	1900	925	1006
Walloon respondents	1975	1979	1980	1981	1982	1986	1991	1995	1999	2003	2004	2007	2009	2010	2014	2019
Belgium	27	54	59	61	57	58	68	65	72	68	56	75	57	70	69	57
Wallonia	22	18	17	15	18	16	11	10	11	10	12	8	9	5	11	11
French Community	4	16	16	17	16	11	11	8	5	6	8	6	5	7	5	5
Province	4	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	2	5	1	3	2	4	4
Municipality/City	44	9	6	6	8	12	7	10	10	10	15	8	9	14	10	11
Europe													16			9
Other							3	7	0	4		2		2	1	2
n	1219	944	619	457	381	315	1391	1241	1294	742	880	662	800	337	911	1022

Sources (by research groups): 1975: AGLOP – GLOPO; 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1986: Régioscope (ULB-UCL); 1991, 1995, 1999, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2014: ISPO-PIOP; 2009, 2014: PartiRep; 2019: EOS-RepResent.

These evolutions can be found in Table 2, where we have for the first time brought together all available results. Particularly striking is the much higher importance attached to the municipality/city level in the surveys where this was proposed first (1975, 1995i and 1996). However, some of the differences in response distribution patterns can probably (at least in part) be explained by several method effects. Indeed, the way the hierarchical question has been put to respondents has differed (De Winter and Frogner 1999).

A first difference concerns the wording of the question. Between 1979 and 1986 (in the Régioscope studies) the question was: “To which group do you consider to belong above all?”. From 1995 onwards, this became: “Of which unit do you consider yourself part in the first and the second place?” for Flanders, while in Wallonia, one asked: “To what do you have the feeling to belong in the first and in the second place?” (Swyngedouw & Beerten, 1996; Swyngedouw & Rink, 2008). One notices that the former refers more to an actual group of people, while the second refers more to an institutional reality. In the PartiRep (2009, 2014) and EOS-RepResent surveys (2019), the wording became “To which cultural or geographic entity do you feel belonging most?” (Deschouwer & Sinardet, 2010; Deschouwer et al, 2015).

The wording of the identity categories also differed. The Régioscope studies referred to “all Belgians” (*‘l’ensemble des belges’*, to make the distinction with the other proposed identities), while later studies just used “Belgium”. 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 (2009, 2014) and EOS-RepResent surveys (2019) Europe was added as an option, which was also the case in the 1995 and 1996 ISPO studies (Sinardet et al, 2018).

In some cases, some types of identity categories were further specified and subdivided. This is for instance the case in the 1975 study, where the local level – which in other surveys was generally proposed as ‘your municipality or city’ – was divided into three options: your municipality, the entity of which your municipality and its surroundings are part of and your city.

The order in which the different identity options are presented to respondents also varied. Existing scholarship has shown that this 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 et al. 1984). 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 region/community levels, the province and the local level. Contrary to this governance level logic followed in about all surveys in Belgium, in the first ISPO survey (1991), the Flemish community was used as the first item, and Belgium as the second. This provoked a decline of the choice for Flanders from 40% to 25% in 1995). Also, as

the PartiRep and EOS-RepResent surveys followed the same logic, it put Europe in first position. The 1975 study also put the local levels first.

Taken together, these differences call for caution when interpreting the evolutions of (sub-)national identities in Belgium (and mostly some of the quite surprising differences) based on the hierarchical question.

3.2 The Linz-Moreno question

The second most used question in Belgian research on (sub-)national identities is the Linz-Moreno question (Linz 1975, Moreno 1986). It first appeared in 1995 in the ISPO-PIOP electoral survey and has been used in most electoral surveys since then, above all to allow comparison of Belgian data with those of other multi-national countries (De Winter 2007). Because the wording remained constant the Linz-Moreno question also allows for more reliable longitudinal comparisons (Sinardet et al, 2018), although it only covers the last 20 years – which is only half of the period covered by the hierarchical question. Its results can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. (Sub-)national identities in Flanders and Wallonia based on the Linz-Moreno question in percentages (1995-2017)

Flemish respondents	1995	1999	2003	2004	2007	2010	2014	2017
Only Flemish	3,6	7	7,2	7	7,3	8	8,7	11,9
More Flemish than Belgian	23,1	22,4	23,3	29	27,4	27,4	18,4	23,5
Equally Flemish and Belgian	45,3	42,2	42,3	45	35,5	41,3	41,7	36,9
More Belgian than Flemish	17,2	13,3	15,1	8	17,0	12,4	8,0	14,4
Only Belgian	10,8	15,1	12,1	11	12,7	10,9	23,2	13,2
N	2088	2157	1202	517	1073		1002	604
Walloon respondents	1995	1999	2003	2004	2007	2010	2014	2017
Only Walloon	1,5	2,30	3,6	3	1,6	4,4	2,1	5,8
More Walloon than Belgian	9,4	11,3	8,3	11	6,1	5,0	6,9	10,4
Equally Walloon and Belgian	44,7	41,8	39,7	31	38,0	21,1	42,7	34,6
More Belgian than Walloon	25,3	22,0	18,3	13	19,9	22,8	11,7	19,2
Only Belgian	19,1	22,5	30,0	42	34,4	46,7	36,6	30,1
N	1223	1381	764	310		467	1004	396

Sources (by research group): 1995-2014: same as Table 2; 2017: Belgian Tetris survey (Reuchamps et al. 2018).

In general, the Linz-Moreno 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 (sub-)national identification to those two levels only, although these may not necessarily be the most important ones for all respondents. One should note, though, that the results for the

hierarchical question in Belgium show that on average of 4 respondents out of 5 do choose either the regional or the national identity in the first place.

In the Belgian context, the Linz-Moreno question has a further disadvantage not present in most other countries. The complexity of the institutional and identity landscape in Belgium, based on partly overlapping regional and community identities, makes it indeed difficult to correctly use the Linz-Moreno which only allows for one type of regional identity to be measured. This difficulty mostly rises in the French-speaking part of Belgium. While the Flemish identity mostly covers both the regional and the community institutions, 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 the results of the hierarchical question show. 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. Hence, while a dual difference between sub-national and national identities does still more or less make sense for 'Flanders versus Belgium', it is more difficult for Francophone Belgians who can be 'Belgian' but also 'Walloon' and/or 'Francophone'.

A solution to this problem would be to use Linz-Moreno twice for Walloon respondents: once to compare the Belgian vs. Walloon identity, and once to compare Belgian vs. francophone identity. However, this is more time-consuming and might also be confusing for numerous respondents. Furthermore, it does still not allow to measure the relation between the two types of sub-national identities.

3.3 The metric question

As a way to combine elements from both types of questions, a metric scale was introduced in the 'Draw Belgium' research project (Reuchamps et al. 2014) and used on a population-wide representative sample in the PartiRep 2014 survey. Respondents were asked: "Could you indicate for each of the below to which extent they apply to you?" on a 0-10 scale where 0 meant "not at all" and 10 meant "a lot". As respondents can identify themselves strongly with the national as well as with several sub-national levels, these variables are not mutually exclusive but can be combined: respondents could indicate for each of these identities how important they are. This allows the metric scale to grasp both the hierarchy and complementarity of (sub-)national identities. Its disadvantage is the limited longitudinal coverage. In 2014, only three identities were included in the survey: the "Belgian", the "Flemish" or "Walloon", and the "European". Its results can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. (Sub-)national identities in Flanders and Wallonia based on the metric question in percentages (2014)

Flemish respondents	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Belgian	1,8	1,3	1,0	2,9	2,1	9,5	7,7	17,4	22,9	11,4	22,0
Flemish	2,0	0,4	1,6	1,4	1,8	8,2	7,7	16,0	23,2	14,9	22,8
European	3,9	2,1	3,8	5,6	4,4	17,3	14,0	18,4	13,5	6,9	10,1
Walloon respondents	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Belgian	0,6	0,3	0,4	1,1	0,9	6,6	4,5	9,0	18,8	14,2	43,6
Walloon	3,9	0,3	1,3	1,3	2,0	9,3	5,8	10,3	19,5	12,8	33,5
European	3,9	0,9	2,2	2,8	3,0	16,3	12,6	16,3	19,2	7,7	15,3

(Flemish respondents: n = 1000; Walloon respondents: n = 1018)

Source: PartiRep (2014)

2.4 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 Eurobarometer (Fitjar 2010) or the German Social Survey (ALLBUS 2016), for example, ask for respondents' 'attachment' to the local, regional, national and supra-national level on a four-point scale (very, fairly, not very, not at all). The Centre Liégeois d'Etude de l'Opinion (CLEO) uses a question which does not introduce any hierarchy between 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' (Jacquemain et al. 1990, Jacquemain et al. 1994). Interestingly, their results show that there is not necessarily an opposition between regional and national identities, since respondents feeling most strongly Belgian also feel most strongly Walloon and European (Jacquemain et al. 2005-2006).

Another way to measure (sub)national identities was to look at the differences with other identities prominent in general social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner 1986; Elliott, 2021). The ISPO-PIOP surveys (1995, 1996) 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 national version, interestingly showing its relativity. When asked in an open question which of the groups they belong to is the most important for them, in 2000 only 5% spontaneously refers to an (sub-)national group (more precisely 4,3% of the Flemish, 5,4% of the Walloon and 7,8% of the francophone respondents from Brussels). The national identification only comes after one's descent (family), philosophical/religious group and organisations. Almost one third of the respondents does not refer to any group identity (Doutrelepont et al. 2001). Focusing

specifically on (sub-)national identities can thus attribute them more relevance than they actually have or even essentialise them.

Despite being very interesting, the heterogeneity of these other types of measurement – both conceptually and longitudinally speaking – led us to focus our comparative analysis on the three aforementioned more typical questions, i.e. the hierarchical, Linz-Moreno and metric questions.

Note that neither the Partirep 2014 survey, nor the other surveys mentioned above, include “probes” asking respondents to clarify, explain their identity choice(s). All these surveys were post-electoral surveys focusing on explaining the way people vote, and why. Given the wealth of competing voting paradigms, there was limited for cognitive interviewing, probing with the meaning of identities with qualitative follow-up questions, nor for constructing national identity “factors”, drawn from items from various related identity questions (such as national pride) (Meitinger, 2017). This also means that sophisticated methods to test measurement reliability, validity, invariance or equivalence, like MTMM (multitrait-multimethod), Structural Equation Modelling, and Confirmatory Factor Analysis, commonly used in comparative survey research like WVS, ISSP, ESS, etc., could not be applied (Saris, Satorra & Coenders, 2004; Revilla & Saris, 2015; Davidov, 2009; Davidov et al. 2014). In this respect, our contribution has a more narrow focus, namely: describing consistency from an empirical viewpoint for the specific identity questions in the Belgian context (see below).

4. Methodological inconsistencies between identity questions

As illustrated in the previous section, all these questions use different methods for measuring (sub-)national identities. Considering their different properties, strengths and weaknesses, one may wonder what impact these questions have on the way respondents express their identity when surveyed. Are these questions equivalent in terms of measurement of the core attitude of this research, i.e. (sub-)national identities (Davidov, 2009)? More particularly, regarding national and regional identities, do these different measurements produce logically incompatible answers?

To examine these questions, we draw on a comparison of the answers respondents gave to the hierarchical, Linz-Moreno and metric questions in the same survey: the 2014 PartiRep survey that was conducted among a representative sample of Flemish (n=1000) and Walloon citizens (n=1018) in Belgium. Both samples were weighted by age, gender, education (and vote for the 2010 general elections). Overall, the questions had a high response rate. Among the respondents of the Flemish sample, the non-response rate was 0.2% and 0.8% for first and second choice on the hierarchical question, 0.6% for the Moreno question, and 0.1% for each of the metric questions. For the Walloon sample, we arrive at 0.4% and 0.7% for the hierarchical question, 0.7% for the Moreno question, and 0.0% for two first metric questions,

0.3% for the third.¹ In this section, we provide an overview on the various strengths and weaknesses of the three questions as well as on how we operationalized the theoretical inconsistencies that can arise between them and that we used to empirically capture them.

4.1 Weaknesses and strengths of the various identity questions

As alluded to previously, these three types of questioning methods are far from perfect, and stem from common survey pitfalls (Billiet, 2016). De Winter (1998), identified several weaknesses relevant to the hierarchical and Moreno questions used in the ISPO-PIOP surveys.

A first problem is that the number of possible sub-categories for a given level (e.g. city, municipality, agglomeration, etc. that are later considered jointly as the local level) influences the responses: the more items by category, the more likely it is, this category will be chosen. A second difficulty is linked to the emotional connotations of the identification items. The formulation of the propositions can induce rejection or adhesion. Therefore, researchers have to pay great attention in the wording of the alternatives which must be neutral. Thirdly, findings on *recency effects*, which implies that the latter category on the list is more often chosen, and *primacy effects*, which implies that the category on the top of the list is more often chosen (Billiet et al. 1984, Martin 2000), indicate that the order of the proposition has a great influence on the results (one may note for example the drop of ‘Flemish’ and the increase of ‘Belgian’ choices between 1991 and 1995 in Table 1). Those *recency effect* and *primary effects* may provoke the fourth weakness: the logical contradictions observed in the responses obtained through the Linz-Moreno question, hierarchical question, the frequency/salience question and the metric question (De Winter and Frogner 1999, De Winter 1998). Finally, a specific problem with the Linz-Moreno questioning is that it is difficult to apply to situations of multiple (i.e. more than two) identities. The Linz-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 Linz-Moreno question thus is less rich than the hierarchical question.

Consequently, regarding the respective strengths and weaknesses of the three questionings, the balance provided by the Linz-Moreno question and its benefit in terms of simplicity that makes it easily applicable in research designs, imply that it is the most favoured 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 Linz-Moreno question a methodological acuity: it can be “interpreted as an ordinal variable of the degree

¹ While these high response rates present sufficient empirical material for our analyses, one should note that the absence of an explicit “do not know” option could have boosted the response rate of undecided respondents (see for instance Billiet & Matsuo, 2012). This could have increased inconsistencies in voters’ responses. These results should, therefore, be analyzed cautiously.

of regional identity or conversely national identity, which allows for more detailed analyses” (De Winter 2007: 592).

4.2 Measuring inconsistencies

Belgium offers an interesting case for studying the effects and results of using different identity questions because of its multi-level identities and its long tradition of survey data on the matter. In the past, the degrees of inconsistency between the hierarchical, Linz-Moreno have been analysed based on the PIOP-ISPO surveys of 1995 (De Winter, 1998; De Winter & Frogner, 1999). A relatively high level of logical consistency was found between the answers to the hierarchical and Linz-Moreno question (about five out of six). However, they also revealed the considerable primacy effects.

In the 2014 PartiRep survey, the hierarchical, the Linz-Moreno and the metric questions were included in order to compare how respondents answer all three of them. Regarding the questionnaire location, the Moreno question came early and followed the questions on religion and income. The hierarchical question was situated around the middle of the questionnaire and followed the ones on satisfaction with European, national and regional government and a battery of questions about quota for women. The metric question was situated towards the end of the questionnaire following a battery of questions regarding immigration. They were far apart from each other in the questionnaire that counted nearly 500 (sub-)questions. Thus, we can presume that the context of preceding questions was probably not ‘leading’ the answers on the identity scales, apart from potential fatigue effect for the metric questions.

In terms of question wording simplicity, the Moreno question is most likely the easiest to answer, as each category contains a simple unequivocal sentence, e.g. “I feel more Flemish than Belgian”. It contains only five options (and two identity objects). The hierarchical question uses the official name of the (sub-)national entity of belonging, and thus the more complicated jargon of regions and communities (instead of more commonly used notions of “Flanders”, “Wallonia”, etc). It counts nine identity objects. Finally, the metric version requests that the respondent mentally transforms his (latent) identity (hierarchy) into a unique point on a 11-point scale, presented as a line where only the two extreme points are labelled, e.g. Belgian line: 0=not at all and 10=very strong). Of the three questions, this is mentally the most difficult task.

Now, when operationalizing the main (in)consistencies between the responses on these three questions, we examined the extent to which the prep “hierarchy” between national and sub-national identity was respected in the answers. A summary can be found in Table 5. 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 Flanders as first or second choice). Likewise, in order to be internally consistent, such respondent would have to 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 (s)he opts for the Linz-Moreno category of “more Belgian than Flemish”, but opts in the hierarchical question for Flanders in the first place, and Belgium in the second place (or at least for Flanders before Belgium as first or second choice), or if in the metric measure (s)he would give a higher score for the Flemish identity than for the Belgian one.

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, however, poses a particular problem as the hierarchical question does not allow for *ex aequo* answers, i.e. equally strong regional and national identities, which are predominant by now for both the Flemish and Walloon populations (Deschouwer et al. 2015). We adopted a strict attitude towards this problem by coding a respondent as “inconclusive” (and thus will be treated as missing) 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. Thus, when it is impossible to decide unequivocally on the consistency between response categories from two question types, we considered these responses as ‘inconclusive’ and treated them as a missing value. The same goes for respondents that did not answer both of the two compared questions. Consequently, some comparisons are calculated on only a part of the survey sample.

When operationalizing the (in)consistencies in this line, as summarized in Table 5, we see that the share of consistent options varies between the three pairs of comparisons. As a consequence, the ‘base likelihood to reply consistently’, i.e. the likelihood to find consistent answers if the data would be distributed randomly, varies between the three. For example, if the data were randomly distributed, there would indeed be a probability of 41.7% to score consistently on both hierarchical and Linz-Moreno questions, a probability of 17.2% to score consistently on the metric and Linz-Moreno questions and a probability of 31.2% to score consistently on the metric and hierarchical questions. If we want thus to evaluate how consistent respondents answered the three questions, it is thus against these base likelihoods that respondents’ effective consistency needs to be assessed.

Table 5. Consistency operationalization between the hierarchical, Linz-Moreno and metric questions

Hierarchical		Linz-Moreno					Base
1 st choice	2 nd choice	Reg. only	Reg. > Nat.	Reg. = Nat.	Reg. < Nat.	Nat. only	likelihood
Regional	National	⊗	●	–	⊗	⊗	1/4
National	Regional	⊗	⊗	–	●	⊗	1/4
Regional	Other	●	●	–	⊗	⊗	2/4
National.	Other	⊗	⊗	–	●	●	2/4
Other	Regional	●	●	–	⊗	⊗	2/4
Other	National.	⊗	⊗	–	●	●	2/4
Other	Other	–	–	–	–	–	NA
Base likelihood		2/6	3/6	NA	3/6	2/6	10/24 (41.7%)

Metric	Linz-Moreno					Base	
	Reg. only	Reg. > Nat.	Reg. = Nat.	Reg. < Nat.	Nat. only	likelihood	
Regional > National [=0]	●	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	1/5	
Regional > National [>0]	⊗	●	⊗	⊗	⊗	1/5	
Regional = National	⊗	⊗	●	⊗	⊗	1/5	
Regional [=0] = National [=0]	⊗	⊗	–	⊗	⊗	0/4	
National > Regional [>0]	⊗	⊗	⊗	●	⊗	1/5	
National > Regional [0]	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	●	1/5	
Base likelihood		1/6	1/6	1/5	1/6	1/6	5/29 (17.2%)

Metric	Hierarchical												Base likelihood
	1 st		2 nd		1 st		2 nd		1 st		2 nd		
	Reg.	Nat.	Reg.	Nat.	Reg.	Oth.	Nat.	Oth.	Reg.	Oth.	Nat.	Oth.	
Regional > National [=0]	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	●	●	⊗	●	⊗	–	–	–	2/6
Regional > National [>0]	●	⊗	●	●	⊗	●	⊗	●	⊗	–	–	–	3/6
Regional = National	–	–	–	–	⊗	⊗	–	–	–	–	–	–	0/2
Regional [=0] = National [=0]	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	–	–	–	0/6
National > Regional [>0]	⊗	●	⊗	●	⊗	●	⊗	●	⊗	●	–	–	3/6
National > Regional [0]	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	●	●	⊗	●	⊗	●	–	–	2/6
Base likelihood		1/5	1/5	2/6	2/6	2/5	2/5	2/5	2/5	NA	NA	NA	10/32 (31.2%)

Note: ● = consistent, ⊗ = inconsistent, – = inconclusive. Data: PartiRep (2014). To account for the Belgian specificity where the Walloon region partly overlaps with the French Community and entirely with the German-speaking Community, we had a specific coding for someone who scored the French- or German-speaking Community first and Wallonia second on the hierarchical question, and vice-versa. When compared to the Linz-Moreno question, we coded the response as consistent when ‘Reg. only’ or ‘Reg. > Nat.’ were scored, as inconclusive when ‘Reg. = Nat.’ was scored and as inconsistent when ‘Reg. < Nat.’ or ‘Nat. only’ were scored. When compared to the metric question, we coded the response as consistent when ‘Regional > National [=0]’ or ‘Regional > National [>0]’ were scored, as inconclusive when ‘Regional [=0] = National [=0]’ was scored and as inconsistent when ‘Regional [=0] = National [=0]’, ‘National > Regional [>0]’ or ‘National > Regional [=0]’ were scored.

In addition to estimating the overall degrees of (in)consistencies between the three questions, we wanted to test if these were related to certain characteristics of the respondents. To this end, we developed three main expectations and took a few control variables into consideration.

First, we expected respondents' degree of (in)consistency to be related to their degree of political knowledge (Converse, 1964; Bishop et al, 1980; Judd & Milburn, 1980). It is indeed reasonable to think that those who self-assess themselves as politically informed have a higher chance of well understanding the questions, their internal hierarchy and therefore answer them consistently.²

Secondly, and following a similar rationale, we expected respondents' degree of (in)consistency to be related to their degree of political interest. It is indeed equally reasonable to expect that not only those who self-assess themselves as politically informed but also those who have a higher interest for politics are more likely to correctly understand they questions, understand their internal hierarchy and there answer consistently.³

While the former two expectations were based on respondents' internal political efficacy, we developed a third expectation about their political orientation on the decentralization issue. We expected that respondents that were more in favour of decentralization would on the one hand have an well-formed opinion on the identity question and a strong internal hierarchy leading to coherent answers.⁴ To check whether this only concerned the voters of certain types of parties, we controlled for respondents' vote in the last election.

The dependent variable was operationalized as categorical variable with two categories for each of the three pairwise comparisons based on the operationalization set out in Table 5. Inconsistent answers were coded 1, consistent answers were coded 0, inconclusive answers were coded missing. To test for correlations, we used Kendall's tau correlation coefficient in order to have a non-parametric measurement capable of dealing with partly skewed variables. All analyses have been conducted three times: once for the entire sample, once for the Flemish sample only, and once for the Walloon sample only – in order to see if effects we see overall also hold among respectively Flemish and Walloon respondents (the survey was not conducted among the population of the Brussels-Region).

² We assessed respondents' political knowledge by asking them five questions about the functioning of Belgian politics. The final score corresponds to the sum of correct answers (min. 0 - max. 5).

³ We assessed respondents' political interest by asking them to situate themselves on a 0-10 scale to express "To which extent are you interested in politics" (with 0 signifying 'not at all' and 10 'very much').

⁴ We assessed respondents' decentralisation preferences by asking them to place themselves on a scale from 0 to 10 where 0 signified to 'transfer all competences to the sub-state entities', 10 signified to 'transfer all competences to the state level' and 5 signified to 'preserve the status quo'.

5. Results

Table 6 presents the results of our analyses. First, we looked at the overall degrees of inconsistencies among the three pairs of comparisons. The highest consistency rates were obtained when comparing the answers to the Linz-Moreno and the hierarchical questions – with nearly two thirds (65.7%) of consistent respondents. When comparing the answers to the metrical and hierarchical questions, only 58.4% were consistent. As for the comparison between the Linz-Moreno and the metric question, we obtained only 42% of consistent answers. Despite minor differences, these results largely hold for both the Flemish and Walloon samples.

While at first glance there thus seem to be important disparities in respondents’ ability to deal with different identity questions depending on their type, the comparisons of the consistency rates to the base likelihoods show that this is not the case. When compared to the base-likelihood, i.e. the probability of answers to be consistent if the data were distributed randomly, all comparisons achieve a roughly similar score: 24.0%-27.2%. This means that the higher consistency scores between the Linz-Moreno and hierarchical questions, or the lower consistency scores between the Linz-Moreno and metric questions can be attributed to the fact that due to the question formulation method, it is easier to be coherent on the former, while it is more difficult to be so on the latter. At the same time, it also shows us that the difference between potentially random and effective consistency only concerns about a quarter of the respondents.

While this conclusion largely holds for Flemish sample, the Walloon one has a slightly lower difference from the base likelihood for the comparison between the Linz-Moreno and hierarchical questions. This means that Walloon respondents are slightly less consistent with 18.3 percentage (which is 6.3 points lower than the average consistency in the Belgian sample). One possible explanation for this is the additional difficulty coming with two possible sub-national identities in the sample (Francophone and Walloon) that cannot be easily expressed consistently on both the Linz-Moreno (aggregating sub-national identities) and the hierarchical (allowing two items, be it national and sub-national or two sub-national) questions.

Table 6. Correlates (Kendall’s tau) of the (in)consistency measures between the three compared questions

	Entire sample			Flemish sample			Walloon sample		
	L-Moreno	L-Moreno	Hierarchical	L-Moreno	L-Moreno	Hierarchical	L-Moreno	L-Moreno	Hierarchical
	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.	vs.
	Hierarchical	Metric	Metric	Hierarchical	Metric	Metric	Hierarchical	Metric	Metric
Consistent cases ^a	65.7%	42.0%	58.4%	69.2%	43.4%	57.8%	60.0%	39.4%	59.3%
Difference with base likelihood	+24,0%	+24,8%	+27,2%	+27,5%	+26,2%	+26,6%	+18,3%	+22,2%	+28,1%

Political knowledge	0.063*	0.043*	0.121***	0.107**	0.072*	0.128***	ns	ns	0.125***
Political interest	0.080**	0.051*	0.092***	0.128**	ns	0.122***	ns	ns	ns
Decentralisation (=0)	ns	-0.042*	ns	ns	-0.080**	ns	0.075*	ns	0.071*
CD&V	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns	–	–	–
Groen	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns	–	–	–
N-VA	–	–	–	ns	-0.067*	ns	–	–	–
Open VLD	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns	–	–	–
sp.a	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns	–	–	–
VB	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns	–	–	–
cdH	–	–	–	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns
Ecolo	–	–	–	–	–	–	ns	ns	0.087*
MR	–	–	–	–	–	–	ns	ns	ns
PS	–	–	–	–	–	–	ns	ns	-0.129**
L-Moreno/Metric	0.254***	–	–	0.229***	–	–	0.278***	–	–
Hierarch./Metric	–	ns	–	–	ns	–	–	ns	–
L-Moreno/Hierarch.	–	–	0.237***	–	–	0.330***	–	–	0.140**

Note: ^a Consistency frequencies have been weighted based on respondents' age, gender, education, region and vote in the 2014 elections.

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001, ns = not significant, – = irrelevant. Source: PartiRep (2014).

After detecting these overly poor consistency scores across the three sets of pairwise comparisons, we wanted to dig deeper into why some respondents answer the questions in a consistent way, while others do not.⁵ One of the main reasons behind these inconsistencies may be the artificial, random and spur of the moment nature of some responses, whereby respondents chose a response category without having any preference, or even not understanding the question (Converse, 1964). The very high response rates mentioned above suggest a considerable effect, although it is hard to measure.

Testing respondents' political knowledge and interest in fact does reveal, as hypothesised before, significant differences. Respondents with higher political knowledge had a higher chance to give consistent answers for the three question comparisons. The same goes for respondents who declared greater interest in politics. While the correlations are significant for the three questions in the overall sample, some pairwise comparisons were not significant in the Flemish and Walloon sub-samples – probably because of the lower number of observations.

For the relation that we hypothesised to exist between respondents' opinions towards decentralisation and their political identity, results are more complex. On the one hand, we see that respondents in favour of decentralisation are more consistent on the Linz-Moreno and metric questions. A look into the data shows that respondents expressing a solely regional identity on the Linz-Moreno question are well served with the metric question because they

⁵ We tested for recency and primacy effects but did not find substantial differences. We also considered that consistency scores were calculated based on samples with different sizes (and respondents). We thus tested whether only taking into account respondents that answered all three questions (n=545) produced different results. But we did not find significant differences.

attribute a 0 value to the national identity, whereas on the hierarchical question, some of them still ticked the national identity (probably because it outperformed their local one). This explanation can be read jointly with the identical correlation found among N-VA voters (Flemish regionalist party), that were inclined to this type of response (for VB voters (Flemish nationalist party), the sample size may not have been large enough to detect a significant effect). The opposite, in turn, can be used as explanation for the two correlations found in the Walloon sample for the other two pairwise comparisons. Double identities can be well expressed on the hierarchical question without inconsistencies vis-à-vis the two others, and were linked to more recentralisation positions in the Walloon sample. For the hierarchical and metric questions, this pattern was found particularly among Ecolo voters (Francophone greens). As for the significant inconsistencies observed among PS voters (Francophone socialists) on the hierarchical and metric questions, a look into the data showed that many of them were related to a pattern of respondents choosing a Belgian and then regional identity on the hierarchical question, while they weighted both equally on the metric question.

Finally, we wanted to check to which degree the three inconsistency measurements were intercorrelated themselves. While one would expect correlations among all of them if inconsistencies were solely related to political knowledge and interest, the results show that this is not the case. Respondents who are inconsistent on the Linz-Moreno and metric questions are not the same than those who are inconsistent on the hierarchical and metric questions. In addition to issues of knowledge and interest, inconsistencies on the Linz-Moreno and metric questions can be expected to arise from the much larger possibilities that the metric question gives the respondents, while they are forced to a clear hierarchy in the Linz-Moreno question. As for the inconsistencies on the hierarchical and metric questions, one also has the flexibility of the metric question that is reduced in the hierarchical. The latter, however, also allows for sub-regional identities. In sum, this reaffirms that in addition to issues of political knowledge and interest, the question formulation method behind the inconsistencies is crucial.

6. Conclusion

In this article, we aimed at analysing to which extent respondents answer identity questions traditionally used in surveys consistently, how we can explain different degrees of consistency and what this tells us about the way social scientists measure identity. The results of our analysis are sobering: depending on the question, not even two thirds and sometimes not even half of the respondents answer identity questions consistently. While we showed that differences in consistency come with respondents' political knowledge and interest, we also demonstrated that a large share of inconsistencies was related to the question formulation method used.

The hierarchical and Linz-Moreno questions force respondents to establish a hierarchy between identities – with the latter allowing equally national and sub-national identities. The metric question allows for more nuances in responses, but thereby also presupposes that respondents are capable of responding in a nuanced way – which can be difficult when identity feelings are either not clear or complicated to think about for respondents.

The validity of these questions is furthermore constrained by the context of the region. In some regions, the question of regional versus national identity has been politicized for decades by nationalist parties and movements, a politization sometimes peaking during crucial elections or referendums where autonomy or independence for the region is a very salient issue. In other regions, the competition between regional and national identities (let alone independence) is not a very salient issue (e.g. Germany) or is competing with other salient (sub-)national identities (i.e. the Brussels region where Flemish vs. Francophone or Flemish / Francophone vs. Brussels regionalist compete, not to speak about the local level). In some provinces, like Limburg and Luxemburg, we even find remnants of a provincial identity.

Even when researchers are aware of and try to take into account all these caveats and specificities, they are often bound by practical limitations. On the one hand, these may come with the space and attention that is reserved for identity measurements in larger cross-topic surveys. On the other hand, one may want to reproduce the same questions over large periods of time for reasons of comparability. The three identity questions used in our analysis were drawn from previous surveys for reasons of comparability, but all three had never been used together in the same questionnaire, besides in 2014. In an ideal world, one would like to try out much more questions versions, test them in experiments or focus groups, use a split - ballot design, but this often falls short of practical limitations.

Notwithstanding these understandable practical excuses, our results oblige us to reflect on the validity (and possibly also the reliability) of the identity measurements we are using: on the presupposition that the question is sound to respondents and corresponds to the way they would actually express their political identity (if they have one); on the presupposition that the meanings of identities are homogenous across respondents; and on the fact that some questions, by their methodological set-up, allow some identities to be expressed more easily than others.

Measuring identities accurately is crucial to understand and evaluate their importance for contemporary politics and society. Yet, the present research shows that there is quite some work ahead of us. In this respect, different avenues seem promising to us. Regarding survey construction, one may want future questionnaires to capture in greater detail the meaning of identities. One avenue for this is adding open, and hence more qualitative, questions to surveys asking respondents to explain why they have answered the way they did and what their (sub-)national identity (if they have one) means for them. Another avenue is to include multiple identity indicators and operationalise them as latent variable. Regarding

methods of analysis, one may want to go beyond the consistency checks as used in this article and engage in measurement invariance testing which comes with the additional advantage that it can also be applied to data collected in the past. Furthermore, beyond cross-sectional verifications longitudinal panel-data could provide further insights into the evolution of (in)consistencies over time.

Eventually, beyond methodological and analytical improvements, if respondents appear to be 'inconsistent', they are of course inconsistent in our present terms. Many respondents themselves are maybe consistent in a way that we fail to understand. We hope that this article has provided another stepping-stone on the way to enhancing this understanding.

References

- ABDELAL, R., HERRERA, Y. M., JOHNSTON, A. I. & MARTIN, T. 2006. Treating identity as a variable: measuring the content, intensity, and contestation of identity. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4, 4 695-711
- ALLBUS 2016. *Die Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften*, Mannheim, Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.
- ANDERSON, B. R. [1983] 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso.
- BARON, H. 1996. Strengths and limitations of ipsative measurement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69(1), 49-56.
- BILLIET, J., LOOSVELDT, G. & WATERPLAS, L. 1984. Het Survey-interview Onderzocht: Effecten van het Ontwerp en Gebruik van Vragenlijsten op de kwaliteit van de antwoorden. *Sociologische studies en documenten*, 272 p.
- BILLIET, J. & MATSUO, H. 2012. Non-response and Measurement Error. In GIDEON, L. *Handbook of Survey Methodology for the Social Sciences*, New York: Springer, 149–178.
- BILLIET J. (2016). What Does Measurement Mean in a Survey Context?. In: WOLF, C., JOYE D., SMITH T., FU Y. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Survey Methodology*, Los Angeles: Sage, 193_209
- BILLIG, M. 1995. *Banal nationalism*, London, Sage Publications.
- BISHOP, G.D., HAMILTON, D.L., McCONAHAY J.B. 1980 "Attitudes and non-attitudes in the belief systems of mass publics: a field study." *Journal of Social Psychology* 110:53-64
- BRUBAKER, R. & COOPER, F. 2000. Beyond "Identity". *Theory and Society*, 29, 1-47.
- CONVERSE, P. 1964. The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent*, New York, NY: Free Press, 206-261.
- DAVIDOV, E. 2009. Measurement equivalence of nationalism and constructive patriotism in the ISSP: 34 countries in a comparative perspective. *Political Analysis*. 17(1):64–82
- DAVIDOV, E., MEULEMAN, B., CIECIUCH, J., SCHMIDT, P., & BILLIET, J. 2014. Measurement equivalence in cross-national research. *Annual review of sociology*, 40, 55-75.
- DE WINTER, L. 1998. Ethno-territoriale identiteiten in Vlaanderen: verkenningen in een politiek en methodologisch mijnenveld. In: SWYNGEDOUW, M., BILLIET, J., CARTON, A. & BEERTEN, R. (eds.) *De (on)redelijke kiezer. Onderzoek naar de politieke opvattingen van Vlamingen. Verkiezingen van 21 mei 1995*. Leuven & Amersfoort: Acco.
- DE WINTER, L. 2007. La recherche sur les identités ethno-territoriales en Belgique. *Revue internationale de politique comparée*, 144, 575-595.
- DE WINTER, L. & FROGNIER, A.-P. 1999. Les identités ethno-territoriales des Wallons: explorations dans un champ de mines politique et méthodologique. In: FROGNIER, A.-

- P. & AISH, A.-M. (eds.) *Des élections en trompe-l'oeil. Enquête sur le comportement électoral des Wallons et des Francophones*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Université.
- DELRUELLE-VOSSWINKEL, N., FROGNIER, A.-P., DAWANCE-GOOSENS, J. & GRODENT, J.-J. 1983. L'opinion publique et les problèmes communautaires. Régioscopes IV. *Courrier hebdomadaire du CRISP*.
- DESCHOUWER, K., & SINARDET, D. 2010. Langue, identité et comportement électoral *In*: DESCHOUWER, K., DELWIT, P., HOOGHE, M., & WALGRAVE, S. (eds.) *Les voix du peuple. Le comportement électoral au scrutin du 7 juin 2009*, Bruxelles: Editions de l'ULB, 2010, p. 61-80
- DESCHOUWER, K., DE WINTER, L., REUCHAMPS, M., SINARDET, D. & DODEIGNE, J. 2015. Les attitudes communautaires et le vote. *In*: DESCHOUWER, K., DELWIT, P., HOOGHE, M., BAUDEWYNS, P. & WALGRAVE, S. (eds.) *Décrypter l'électeur : Le comportement électoral et les motivations de vote*. Louvain: Lannoo Campus.
- DEVILLERS, S., BAUDEWYNS, P., DE WINTER, L. & REUCHAMPS, M. 2019. Who do you feel and what future do you want for Belgium? A comparison of candidates and voters' identities and institutional preferences. *In*: VANDELEENE, A., BAUDEWYNS, P. & DE WINTER, L. (eds.) *Candidates, Parties and Voters in the Belgian Partitocracy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- DODEIGNE, J., NIESSEN, C., REUCHAMPS, M. & SINARDET, D. 2021. The Effect of Institutional Affiliation and Career Patterns on (De)centralization Preferences in Advanced Multi-Level States: Parliamentarians' Support for (De)Centralization in Belgium. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 51, 262-282.
- DOUTRELEPONT, R., BILLIET, J. & VANDEKEERE, M. 2001. Profils identitaires. *In*: BAWIN-LEGROS, B., VOYÉ, L., DOBBELAERE, K. & ELCHARDUS, M. (eds.) *Belge toujours. Fidélité, stabilité, tolérance. Les valeurs des belges en l'an 2000*. Bruxelles: De Boeck & Larcier.
- DUCHESNE, S., & FROGNIER, A.-P. 2008. National and European Identifications: A Dual Relationship. *Comparative European Politics*, 6(2), 143-168.
- FITJAR, R. D. 2010. Explaining variation in sub-state regional identities in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 49, 522-544.
- FROGNIER, A.-P. & DE WINTER, L. 2013. Les Belges et le fédéralisme. Les leçons des enquêtes de 1970 à 2007. *In*: DANDOY, R., MATAGNE, G. & VAN WYNSBERGHE, C. (eds.) *Le fédéralisme belge. Enjeux institutionnels, acteurs socio-politiques et opinions publiques*. Bruxelles: Academia Bruylant.
- GELLNER, E. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- HENDERSON, A., & MEDEIROS, M. 2021. Identities and attitudes to decentralization in multi-level states: understanding the territorial scales of political life. *Comparative European Politics*, 19(2), 139-145.

- HEYVAERT, P., RANDOUR, F., DODEIGNE, J., PERREZ, J. & REUCHAMPS, M. 2020. Metaphors in political communication: A case study of the use of deliberate metaphors in non-institutional political interviews. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 19, 201-225.
- HOBBSAWM, E. J. 1992. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- JACQUEMAIN, M., DOUTRELEPONT, R. & VANDEKEERE, M. 1990. Identités sociales et comportement électoral. *Res Publica*, 32, 63-79.
- JACQUEMAIN, M., DOUTRELEPONT, R. & VANDEKEERE, M. 1994. L'identité Wallonne saisie par l'enquête. Une approche constructiviste de l'identité collective. *Res Publica*, 36, 343-360.
- JACQUEMAIN, M., ITALIANO, P., HESELMANS, F., VANDEKEERE, M., DEFLANDRE, D. & WILLEMS, I. 2005-2006. Introduction. Les racines de l'identité collective. *Fédéralisme Régionalisme*, 6, 7-14.
- JUDD, C. M., & MILBURN, M. A. (1980). The structure of attitude systems in the general public: Comparisons of a structural equation model. *American Sociological Review*, 627-643.
- KALIN, M., SAMBANIS, N. 2018. How to Think About Social Identity? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21: 239-57
- KEATING, M. 1996. *Nations Against the State: The New Politics of Nationalism in Quebec, Catalonia, and Scotland*, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York, Palgrave.
- KEATING, M. 2001. *Plurinational Democracy : Stateless Nations in a Post-Sovereignty Era*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- KEATING, M., LOUGHLIN, J. & DESCHOUWER, K. 2003. *Culture, institutions and economic development. A study of eight European regions*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- LINZ, J. J. 1975. Politics in a Multi-Lingual Society with a Dominant World Language: The Case of Spain. In: SAVARD, J.-G. & VIGNEAULT, R. (eds.) *Les États multilingues, problèmes et solutions*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- MARTIN, P. 2000. A quoi servent les politiques regionales europeennes ? *Economie Internationale*, 3-20.
- MCCRONE, D. & BECHHOFER, F. 2015. *Understanding National Identity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MEITINGER, K. 2017. Necessary but Insufficient Why measurement invariance tests need online probing as a complementary tool. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 81(2), 447-472
- MILLER, D. 1995. *On nationality*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- MORENO, L. 1986. *Decentralization in Britain and Spain: The Cases of Scotland and Catalonia*. Doctoral thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- OPP, K. 2015. Decline of the nation state? How the European Union creates national and sub-national identifications. *Social Forces*, 84 (2), 653-680.

- REUCHAMPS, M. (ed.) 2015. *Minority Nations in Multinational Federations: A comparative study of Quebec and Wallonia*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
- REUCHAMPS, M., DODEIGNE, J. & PERREZ, J. 2018. Changing your political mind: The impact of a metaphor on citizens' representations and preferences for federalism. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 28, 151-175.
- REUCHAMPS, M., KAVADIAS, D. & DESCHOUWER, K. 2014. Drawing Belgium: Using Mental Maps to Measure Territorial Conflict. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 2, 30-51.
- REUCHAMPS, M., SINARDET, D., DODEIGNE, J. & CALUWAERTS, D. 2017. Reforming Belgium's Federalism: Comparing the Views of MPs and Voters. *Government and Opposition*, 52, 460-482.
- REVILLA, M., & SARIS, W. E. 2015. *Estimating and comparing the quality of different scales of an online survey using an MTMM approach. Survey measurements: techniques, data quality and sources of error*, 53-74.
- SARIS, W. E., SATORRA, A., & COENDERS, G. 2004. A new approach to evaluating the quality of measurement instruments: the split-ballot MTMM design. *Sociological methodology*. 34(1), 311-347.
- SINARDET, D. 2012. Federal Reform and Party Politics. The case of the Fifth Belgian State Reform. In Benz, A., Knuepling, F., *Changing Federal Constitutions: Lessons from International Comparison*, Opladen / Farmington Hills, MI: Barbara Budrich Publishers, p. 135_160
- SINARDET, D., DE WINTER, L., DODEIGNE, J. & REUCHAMPS, M. 2018. Language, identity and voting. In: DESCHOUWER, K. (ed.) *Mind the Gap: Political Participation and Representation in Belgium*. Colchester: Rowman & Littlefield International / ECPR Press.
- SINARDET, D. 2021. Flemish Nationalism and the Left-Right Divide. Consequences for Constitutional Politics in Belgium. In A. LECOURE, N. BRASSARD-DION, G. LAFOREST (eds) *Constitutional Politics in Multinational Democracies*, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 132-157
- SWYNGEDOUW, M. & BEERTEN, R. (1996), Cognitieve en affectieve motieven van partijkeuze. De nationale verkiezingen van 21 mei 1995. *Res Publica*, 36 (4), 555-574
- SWYNGEDOUW, M. & RINK, N. 2008, Hoe Vlaams-Belgischgezind zijn de Vlamingen? Een analyse op basis van het postelectorale verkiezingsonderzoek 2007, Leuven: ISPO-PIOP
- TAIJFEL, H. and TURNER, J.C. 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin; S. Worchel (eds.). *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. 33-47.
- TAIJFEL, H. and TURNER, J.C. 1986. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In: Worchel, S. and Austin, W.G., Eds., *Psychology of Intergroup Relation*, Hall Publishers, Chicago, 7-24

- VAN DAM, D. 1997. *Flandre, Wallonie : le rêve brisé : Quelles identités culturelles et politiques en Flandre et en Wallonie*, Ottignies, Quorum.
- VERDOODT, A. 1976. Les problèmes communautaires belges à la lumière des études d'opinion. *Courrier hebdomadaire du CRISP*, 742, 1-21.