



GEARY DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

An Evaluation of the Measurement of National, Sub-National and Supranational Identity in Major Cross-National Surveys

Professor Richard Sinnott

Professor Richard Sinnott is a member of the Department of Politics and director of the Public Opinion and Political Behaviour Research Programme at the Geary Institute, University College Dublin.

This paper is produced as part of the Public Opinion and Political Behaviour Programme at Geary; however the views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of the GearyInstitute. All errors and omissions remain those of the author.

August, 2004

An evaluation of the measurement of national, sub-national and supranational identity in major cross-national surveys

Abstract

This research note assesses the various measures of national/sub-national/supranational identity that have been used in the main cross-national survey research projects. It reduces the variety of measures to three main types – identification rankings (type A), proximity ratings (type B) and identification ratings (type C). On the basis of cross-survey comparisons of the predictive power of each type, it tentatively concludes that B is better than A and that C is better than B. This tentative finding is strongly supported by a more rigorous test that capitalises on the occurrence of two of the measures within each of two of the international surveys as implemented in Ireland. The note concludes by making recommendations regarding the measurement of identity in established and new cross-national surveys.

Introduction

Traditionally, interest in identity as a political phenomenon was stimulated by problems of intra-state conflict that revolved around issues of national identity and self-determination. In the contemporary world, such interest is reinforced by the resurgence of national conflict, by the potential impact of national and other identities on responses to globalization and by the role that super-arching identities may play in processes of inter-state economic and political integration. Despite the obvious continuing relevance of the concept of identity, cross-national empirical research on the nature, extent and implications of sub-national, national and supranational identities in mass populations is rareⁱ. This gap is doubly odd, since, over a period of twenty to thirty years, all of the major comparative surveys of 'values' or political culture have asked questions about identity at least at the national level and in most instances at various sub-national and supranational levels as wellⁱⁱ. Given the availability of these data and their potential relevance, one must wonder whether the lack of research is due to weaknesses in the ways in which national and other levels of identity have been operationalised in the major comparative surveys. Could it even be that concepts such as identity are impossible to capture in mass survey research? Such a radically agnostic conclusion has in fact been advanced by one of the foremost scholars in the field of national identity and nationalism. Writing specifically about European identity, Anthony Smith argued that "In few areas is the attitude questionnaire of such doubtful utility as in the domain of cultural values and meanings" (Smith, 1992, p.57).

This research note tackles the issue of measurement by undertaking a comparative evaluation of the measures of identity that have been deployed in the major comparative surveys of social and political attitudes since the early 1980s. It begins by categorising the kinds of measures that have been used in the main comparative surveys into three types (labelled A, B and C) and then

compares the predictive ability of each of the three types across the different surveys in which they occur. Such analysis is, of course, subject to the limitations involved in comparing relationships between variables *across different surveys*. Fortunately, and crucially in terms of the evaluation that is the purpose of this note, in the case of two surveys conducted in the Republic of Ireland, each of the three types of measures coexists with one of the other types *in the same survey* - Types A and C occur together in the 1999 European Values Survey as implemented in the Republic of Ireland and Types B and C occur together in the 1995-96 Irish ISSP National Identity survey. This makes it possible to present a rigorous comparison of the predictive ability of the measures, albeit one that is limited to a single country and one that omits one of the possible comparisons (A versus B).

Types of measures of identity in comparative surveys

Operationalisations of national and related identities in mass public opinion can be distinguished according to four features. In logical order, these are: (1) the object of identification (national, sub-national or supranational), (2) the nature of the relationship envisaged between the respondent and the object, (3) the nature of the response demanded by the question and (4) the nature of the scale (if any) used in measuring the response (see Figure 1). The most important of these features are, in order of importance, the third and the second. The third feature (the nature of the response demanded) distinguishes between measures based on a *ranking* of a set of stimuli and measures based on *ratings* of each stimulus. The second feature (the nature of the relationship between respondent and object) covers a wide variety of formulations that can, however, be reduced to two kinds: a relationship of *identification* ("belong to", "identify with", "think of yourself as") and a relationship of *proximity* ("feel close to", "feel attached to"). Combining these two main criteria of differentiation yields, in principle, four types of measures

of identity. In practice, only three of these are found in the major comparative surveys examined in this paper. The three are: *ranking* in terms of *identification* (Type A), *rating* in terms of *proximity* (Type B) and *rating* in terms of *identification* (Type C).

Type A has been the main measure of identity in the two largest and longest running cross-national surveys (the World Values Surveyⁱⁱⁱ and the European Values Survey) (see Figure 1). This consistent use is a testament to the survival power of questions in longitudinal survey research and has the merit of providing data on a total of more than forty countries and on a substantial number of those countries over a twenty-year period stretching from 1980 to 2000. Type A measures were also used in the very early and a few later Eurobarometer surveys and have been used in the New Democracies Barometers in Central and Eastern Europe. Type B measures occur in the ISSP National Identity survey of 1995-96 and in a scattering of Eurobarometer surveys (in 1991, 1995 and 1999). Type C measures have been used in the bulk of Eurobarometer surveys between 1982 and 2000^{iv}. Finally, as already noted, Types A and C occur together in the same single-country survey in 1999 (the European Values Survey in the Republic of Ireland) and Types B and C occur together in the same single-country survey in 1996 (the ISSP National Identity survey in the Republic of Ireland)^v.

Figure 1 about here

Relationships based on Type A measures (identification rankings)

The identity question in the European Values Survey and in the World Values Survey asks: "Which of these geographical groups would you say you belong to first of all?" and then probes for a second choice identity by asking "And the next?" In terms of the two main distinguishing

features outline above, this is clearly a (truncated) ranking question focusing on a relationship of identification (belonging). The objects of this identification are: (i) the locality or town where you live, (ii) the state or region of the country where you live, (iii) [NAME OF COUNTRY] as a whole, (iv) [NAME OF CONTINENT OR SUB-CONTINENT] (v) the world as a whole. It should be emphasised that this original EVS/WVS wording is still being used in the current waves of the respective surveys (WVS 1995 and EVS 1999). This of course gives the measure the advantage of longevity and widespread use. However, this is only an advantage if, on the basis of this measure, the expected relationships with relevant attitudinal variables are confirmed.

In terms of the variables available in the EVS and WVS surveys, one would expect national identity to be related to a measure of national pride and European identity to be related to a European integration index (in the WVS) and to a measure of confidence in the European Union (in the EVS) (see Appendix 1 for question wording). These expected relationships are assessed in Table 1. Identity (national or European) is scored 1 if the respondent chooses that identity either first or second; otherwise the identity variable in each case is scored 0^{vi}. As can be seen from Table 1, the relationships between identity and the selected attitudinal variables, while statistically significant, are fairly meagre. Correlation coefficients range from 0.09 to 0.13 in the case of national identity and national pride and, in the case of European identity, are 0.14 for the WVS European integration index and 0.12 for the EVS confidence in the European Union variable. One could of course rationalise the modest character of these correlations by, for example, arguing that identification with Europe in a pan-European sense is not necessarily linked, indeed may be antithetical, to support for European integration or confidence in the EU. This kind of argument is more difficult to make in the case of national identity and national pride

and the suspicion must be that the correlations are low because there is a lot of measurement error involved in the attempt to capture feelings of national identity by means of a truncated ranking question. The findings suggest that identity is not very well captured by the WVS/EVS measure and that the apparent advantages of the measure (persistence over time and widespread use) are vitiated by its poor predictive capacity. The question of course is: does any other kind of measure to any better?

Table 1 about here

Relationships based on Type B measures (proximity ratings)

The next comprehensive cross-national survey dealing with the topic of identity is the ISSP National Identity Survey of 1995-96. This made a substantial break with the WVS/EVS approach. The most important difference is that the respondent was asked to rate each object instead of being asked to rank the two most important. Secondly, the relationship specified in the question is one of proximity ("How close do you feel to...") rather than identification. Taken together, these changes yield a different *type* of identity question, labelled Type B in Figure 1. In addition to these changes, the ISSP question used a slightly altered set of objects of identification (five in this case) and dropped the explicit reference to "geographical groups"^{vii}.

The ISSP National Identity Survey provides a wide range of attitudinal variables that are potentially related to sense of national identity. The most relevant ones include a set of ten items on pride in one's country and a set of seven items dealing with what might be described as nationalist orientations (see Appendix 1 for question wording). In order to make this array of data more manageable and to improve the reliability of the measurement involved, these

seventeen items have been reduced to three variables - an overall measure of national pride, a measure of patriotism and a measure of ethnic chauvinism. The measure of national pride was constructed by taking the average score across all ten specific pride items^{viii}. The patriotism and chauvinism measures were derived from a factor analysis of the seven nationalist items. As can be seen in Appendix 2, analysis of these seven items yields two factors. The first is a straightforward preference for and sense of the superiority of one's own country (here labelled patriotism) while the second factor suggests a narrow or exclusive sense of nationality combined with a degree of chauvinism of the "my country right or wrong" variety (here labelled ethnic chauvinism). Patriotism and ethnic chauvinism scores were calculated by averaging responses across the relevant subsets of items identified in the factor analysis^{ix}. In addition to these three measures (pride, patriotism and ethnic chauvinism), the data set contains two relevant policy preferences - one dealing with protection versus free trade and, for a subset of countries, one dealing with overall attitude to supranational integration.

As Table 2 indicates, the correlations between the ISSP Type B measure of national identity and the various attitudinal variables are, in general, a significant improvement on the correlations obtained using Type A measures. The highest correlation is with the patriotism variable (0.27), followed by national pride (0.22) and ethnic chauvinism (0.19). The correlation between European identity and support for European integration is 0.19.

Table 2 about here

The overall improvement in the correlations between national identity and attitudes as one moves from Type A to Type B measures is confirmed by Eurobarometer data. The main developments

in the Eurobarometer approach to measuring national identity have focused around Type C measure and are therefore dealt with in the next section of this paper. It is necessary, however, to anticipate an element of this story as, on just a few occasions, the Eurobarometer has departed from its usual set of questions to insert a proximity rating or Type B question. The Eurobarometer Type B question is very similar to the ISSP question, the main differences being the use, in the English language version, of the word "attached" in place of "close" and some slight alterations in the description of the set of objects of the proximity relationship envisaged. As Table 3 shows, the correlation with the unification and dissolution indicators of support for European integration is 0.25 and that with the membership indicator^x is 0.21. These correlations are clearly more substantial than the correlations with indicators of support for supranational integration found on the basis of Type A measures of identity in the EVS/WVS surveys.

Table 3 about here

Relationships based on Type C measures (identification ratings)

As noted at the outset, the Eurobarometer started out with a preferential identification question (i.e. a Type A measure); in fact the forerunner of the Eurobarometer (ECS71) was the first major comparative survey to use such a measure. However the Eurobarometer quickly departed from this approach, due in part, no doubt, to the low probability of the occurrence of European identity as either first or second choice in the truncated preference ranking. The new instrument introduced by the Eurobarometer in 1982 started by asking a categorical question ("As well as thinking of yourself as [NATIONALITY], do you ever think of yourself as European?" As Figure 1 and Appendix 1 indicate, there was some variation in the wording of this aspect of the question, the word citizen sometimes being added, as in: "Do you ever think of yourself not only

as an Irish citizen but also as a citizen of Europe"^{xi}. Those who answered affirmatively to either form of the question were then asked: "Does this occur often, sometimes or rarely?" This is clearly a rating question focusing on a relationship of identification; in other words it is a Type C measure.

The EB question just described survived until 1992. Its replacement still focused on a relationship of identification and still used a rating scale and so qualifies as a Type C measure. However, the details of the question were substantially different. In the first place, the new question was cast in the future tense; secondly, it used an anchored rating scale that presented alternative mixes of national and European identity ranging from [NATIONALITY] only, at one end, to European only, at the other, with two grades in between, namely [NATIONALITY] and European. and European and [NATIONALITY]. Taking Ireland as an example, the question reads: "In the near future do you see yourself as Irish only, Irish and European, European and Irish or European only?"

Since all of the three main variations in Eurobarometer Type C measures were used in the same survey in 1992 (EB37)^{xii}, it is possible to compare their performance. Of course the results also enable one to make the more important, though less rigorous, comparison between the correlations produced by these three Type C measures and the correlations produced by the Type A and B measures presented in previous tables. The results in Table 4 suggest that it does not matter which version of the Type C measure is used. All three measures ("think of yourself as European"; "think of yourself as a European citizen"; and "see yourself in the near future as [NATIONALITY] or European etc.") produce almost identical correlations with the three standard indicators of attitude to integration (unification, membership and dissolution), the

correlations with the membership indicator being somewhat lower. The more general and more important point, however, is that all of these correlations are substantially better than the correlations between identity and attitudes produced by the Type A measures and at least slightly better than the correlations produced by the Type B measures.

Table 4 about here

The question is: How much can we infer from the improved correlations obtained when Type B or Type C measures of identity have been used in place of Type A measures? And what can be inferred from the differences between the correlations based on Type C and those based on Type B?. The answer to both questions is a caveat. This is because we have been comparing correlations across these different types of measures of identity on the basis of different sets of dependent variables, on the basis of different surveys and samples and, in some cases, on the basis of sets of countries that are only partially overlapping. Accordingly, the results *suggest* that Type B measures are better than Type A and that Type C may be better than Type B. In short, they are interesting but not definitive. In order to reach firm conclusions, one would need to compare the performance of different types of measures of identity as applied to the same set of respondents in a single survey using the same set of dependent variables. Fortunately, as indicated in the introduction to this paper, it is possible to do this for two pairs of comparisons (C versus A, and C versus B) using, respectively, the 1999 European Values Survey as conducted in the Republic of Ireland and the 1996 ISSP National Identity Survey, also from the Republic of Ireland.

Test 1: Type C versus Type A

The European Values Survey as conducted in the Republic of Ireland in 1999 contained the standard EVS measures of national, supranational and subnational identities that have been classified in this paper as Type A measures. However, Type C measures of both national and European identity were added to the questionnaire (see question wording in Appendix 1). The questionnaire also included the standard EVS questions on national pride and confidence in the European Union and an additional indicator of nationalist attitudes vis a vis Northern Ireland ("How much say to you think an Irish government of any party should have in the way Northern Ireland is run?").

Dealing with national identity first, the results show no correlation between the Type A measure of national identity and national pride (the correlation coefficient is 0.02 and is non-significant). Similarly, there is no correlation between the Type A measure of national identity and attitude to the amount of say an Irish government should have in how Northern Ireland is run. In contrast, when a Type C measure is used to tap national identity, the correlation with national pride becomes very substantial (0.50) and the correlation with attitude to the role of the Irish government in Northern Ireland, while much lower (0.12), is significant at the .01 level^{xiii} (see Table 5).

Table 5 about here

On the European front, the story is similar. The Type A measure of European identity fails to produce a statistically significant correlation with confidence in the European Union. The Type C measure of European identity comes in two forms. The first is a scale running from 0 to 10

based on a combination of the categorical question ("Do you ever think of yourself as European?") and the ordinal scale (IF YES: "On a scale of 1 to 10 could you tell me how important it is to you that you are European?"). The second is a scale that excludes those who answered "no" to the categorical question and is simply the scale of the importance of being European (1 to 10) among the remaining respondents. As Table 5 shows, both measures produce correlations with confidence in the European Union that are statistically significant: 0.17 for the scale that includes those with no European identity and 0.23 for the scale of the importance of being European among those who think of themselves as, at least to some degree, European.

These findings confirm the previous indications based on the comparisons of different types of measures across different surveys: Type C measures of identity (identification ratings) are indeed better than Type A measures (identification rankings). Though the latter have the advantages of prevalence and longevity through their consistent deployment in the European Value Surveys and World Value Surveys, their use leads to a serious underestimation of the relationship between identity and several measures of relevant political attitudes and preferences.

Test 2: Type C versus Type B

Since the cross-survey comparisons also indicate that Type B measures are superior to Type A measures, the remaining question is: Which is preferable - Type B or Type C? This question can be tackled using the ISSP National Identity Survey as conducted in the Republic of Ireland. In addition to the standard ISSP measure of identity (Type B) and the ISSP panoply of measures of nationalist attitudes (see the discussion of the overall ISSP National Identity survey above), the Irish ISSP study included Type C measures of both national and European identity (see Appendix 1 for question wording). It also included the same indicator of attitudes towards the

"way Northern Ireland is run" that was used in the 1999 EVS survey considered in the preceding section.

Table 6 about here

In the case of national identity, the Type C measure is superior to the Type B measure in four of the five relationships examined. The exception occurs in the case of the composite measure of national pride, in regard to which the correlations are the same for both the Type C and the Type B measures. However, for each of the other four variables (patriotism, ethnic chauvinism, support for protectionism and attitude to how much say an Irish government should have in the running of Northern Ireland), the correlation with the Type C measure is stronger, in some cases very notably so. For example, in the case of the ethnic chauvinism scale, the correlation with the Type B measure is 0.17, whereas the correlation with the Type C measure is 0.36 and, in the case of support for limiting imports, the correlation moves from an insignificant 0.02 to a significant 0.15. These results for national identity are borne out in the case of the relationship between European identity and support for European integration. The proximity rating variable (Type B) shows a significant correlation of 0.12 but this moves up to 0.32 when the Type C measure of identity is used.

Summary and implications

The purpose of this note has been to undertake a comparative evaluation of the measures of identity that have been deployed in the major international comparative surveys of social and political attitudes since the early 1980s. The first conclusion is that, *pace* Smith, attempting to measure national and other identities in mass attitude surveys is not a lost cause -- at a minimum,

it is clear that some of the types of measures that have been used perform much better than others. The measures involved can be classified as belonging to one of three types: Type A (identification rankings), Type B (proximity ratings) and Type C (identification ratings). A comparison of the strength of the relationships between identity as measured in each of these three ways and a series of dependent variables across different surveys suggests that Type B measures are superior to Type A measures and that Type C are at least as good as and may be better than Type B. The crucial tests come, however, when one compares the performance of Type C versus Type A and Type C versus Type B measures *in the same surveys*. Such tests were possible using data from the EVS and ISSP surveys as carried out in the Republic of Ireland. The results demonstrate that Type C measures are vastly superior to Type A measures and substantially better than Type B measures.

The implications of these findings for secondary analysis of existing comparative data on national identity are sobering. One of the main implications is that the use of the most comprehensive comparative data sets (the European Values Survey and the World Values Survey) is unlikely to be very fruitful in so far as the analysis of identity is concerned. The ISSP 1995-96 National Identity survey and certain Eurobarometer surveys provide better data but the measures they use are not optimal. The best measure is found in the main Eurobarometer series of surveys since 1982; the limitation here, however, is that these measures deal mainly with European identity and, for the most part, with national identity only in relation to European identity.

This brings us to the implications of the findings for future measurement strategies in this area. Here, the message is clear: the best available measure of identity at the national, sub-national or

supranational level is a combination of a categorical identification question "Do you think of yourself as....", followed by a scale question that rates the importance or salience of the identification involved. Unfortunately, except in relation to the measurement of European identity in the Eurobarometer surveys, this measure is not in widespread use. Its use in further rounds of existing surveys that currently use other measures would lead to a substantial break in the continuity of the time series involved. Because of the weakness of the Type A measures, such a break would be entirely justified in the case of the European Values Survey and World Values Survey. In the case of the ISSP National Identity survey, one would have to weigh up the relative merits of maintaining continuity while using a less effective measure versus sacrificing continuity in order to gain greater validity. While this is a matter of judgement, the evidence suggests that the gain in predictive validity would be substantial. However, in the case of new comparative surveys, the recommendation is clear-cut. Barring the invention and validation of some entirely different method of measuring identity in mass survey research, the measure of identity used should be what in this paper is described as a Type C measure, i.e. either an identification measure with a built-in rating scale or a categorical identification measure followed by a rating scale. Given that the European Social Survey has not included either a national or a supranational identity measure in its first or second rounds and has, accordingly, not committed itself on this issue, the way lies open for this standard-setting survey to adopt the most efficient of the available measures in its third round (in 2006).

Figure 1 Types of measures of national/sub-national/supranational identity in major cross-national surveys

		Measurement features			
		<i>Object</i>	<i>Relationship</i>	<i>Response format</i>	<i>Scale</i>
Type A (identification ranking)	EVS 1980-99 WVS 1980-95 EB 1975-79 NDB	Levels of community/governance	Belong to/identify with/think of yourself as	Partial ranking	Not applicable
Type B (proximity rating)	ISSP 1995-96	Levels of community/governance	Feel close to	Rating scale	Closeness scale: very close ... not at all close
	EB 1991, 1995, 1999	Levels of community/governance	Feel attached to	Rating scale	Attachment scale: very attached ... not at all attached
Type C (identification rating)	EB 1982-92	European (Europe)	Think of yourself as (a citizen of...)	Categorical choice plus rating scale	Frequency scale: often, sometimes, never
	EB 1992-99	[NATIONALITY] vs. European	Think of yourself as...	Rating scale	Anchored scale: [NATIONALITY].... European

Table 1 *Pearson Correlations between Type A measures of national/supranational identity and relevant attitudinal variables*

	Country first/second WVS 1980	Country first/second WVS 1990	Country first/second EVS 1999	Europe first/second WVS 1990 (EU member states)	Europe first/second EVS 1999 (EU member states)
National pride	0.09** (N=24343)	0.13** (N=55920)	0.10** (N=34898)	-	-
European integration index	-	-	-	0.14** (N=15547)	-
Confidence in the European Union	-	-	-	-	0.12** (N=16658)

* significant 0.05

** significant 0.01

Source: WVS 1980-83, WVS 1990,
EVS 1999

Table 2 *Pearson Correlations between Type B measures of national/supranational identity and relevant attitudinal variables*

	Feeling of closeness to country	Feeling of closeness to supranational region	Feeling of closeness to Europe
National pride (specific)	0.22** (N=29255)	-	-
Patriotism	0.27** (N=29810)	-	-
Ethnic chauvinism	0.19** (N=29513)	-	-
Economic protectionism	0.12** (N=28642)	-	-
Support for supranational integration	-	0.18** (N=11289)	0.19** (N=4821)

* significant 0.05 ** significant
0.01

Source: ISSP 1995

Table 3 *Pearson Correlations between Type B measures of supranational identity and support for European integration*

	Feeling of attachment to Europe
Attitude to European unification	0.25** (N=12269)
Attitude to country's membership of EU	0.21** (N=11260)
Attitude to dissolution of EU	0.25** (N=12265)

** significant 0.01

Source: Eurobarometer 36, 1991

Table 4 *Pearson Correlations between Type C measures of national/supranational identity and support for European integration*

	Frequency of feeling European	Frequency of feeling that you are a European citizen	See yourself in the near future as [NATIONALIT Y] ... European
Attitude to European unification	0.29** (N=5842)	0.28** (N=5846)	0.28** (N=11598)
Attitude to country's membership of EU	0.22** (N=6326)	0.22** (N=6413)	0.26** (N=12617)
Attitude to dissolution of EU	0.31** (N=5734)	0.30** (N=5817)	0.31** (N=11438)

* significant 0.05 ** significant 0.01

Source: Eurobarometer 37, 1992

Table 5 *Pearson Correlations between measures of identity and relevant attitudinal variables - Type C versus Type A*

	Country first/second (Type A)	Importance of being Irish (Type C)	Europe first/second (Type A)	Importance of being European (0-10) (Type C)	Importance of being European (1-10) (Type C)
Proud to be an Irish citizen	0.02 (N=975)	0.50** (N=984)	-	-	-
How much say an Irish government should have in running Northern Ireland	0.05 (N=920)	0.12** (N=927)	-	-	-
Confidence in the European Union	-	-	0.05 (N=903)	0.17** (N=915)	0.23** (N=385)

* significant 0.05 ** significant
0.01

Source: EVS 1999 (Republic of Ireland)

Table 6 *Pearson Correlations between measures of identity and relevant attitudinal variables - Type C versus Type B*

	Feeling of closeness to Ireland (Type B)	Importance of being Irish (Type C)	Feeling of closeness to Europe (Type B)	Think of self as European: not at all ... very much (Type C)
National pride (specific)	0.22** (N=719)	0.22** (N=727)	-	-
Patriotism	0.25** (N=706)	0.37** (N=714)	-	-
Ethnic chauvinism	0.17** (N=945)	0.33** (N=954)	-	-
Economic protectionism	0.02 (N=978)	0.15** (N=984)	-	-
How much say an Irish government should have in running Northern Ireland	0.08* (N=981)	0.18** (N=987)	-	-
Support for supranational integration	-	-	0.12** (N=854)	0.32** (N=856)

* significant 0.05 ** significant
0.01

Source: ISSP National Identity Survey 1996 (Republic of
Ireland)

Appendix 1: Wording of questions referred to in the text

1. Measures of identity

Type A Questions

European Values Survey (EVS) 1981

To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong to first of all? And the next?

- Locality of town where you live
- Region or county where you live
- Your country as a whole
- Europe
- The world as a whole
- Don't know

World Values Survey (WVS) 1981-4, 1990-3

To which of these geographical groups would you say you belong first of all?

- Locality or town where you live
- State or region of country where you live
- [YOUR OWN COUNTRY] as a whole
- [YOUR OWN CONTINENT]
- The world as a whole
- Don't know [DO NOT READ OUT]

European Community Study (ECS) 71

To which of these areas do you feel you belong most strongly? And which next?

- City/locality
- Department
- Region
- Country
- Europe
- Other

Eurobarometer (EB) 1998

To which of these areas do you feel you belong most strongly? And which next?

- City/town/village
- Region
- Country
- Europe
- Whole world

Type B Questions

ISSP National Identity Survey 1995

How close do you feel to ...?

your neighbourhood

(or village)

your town or city

your county

Ireland

Europe

(Very close, close, not very close, not close at all, can't choose/doesn't apply to me)

Eurobarometer (EB) 1991, 1995

Please tell me how attached you feel to ...?

town or village

region

country

Europe (as a whole)

(Very attached, fairly attached, not very attached, not at all attached)

Type C Questions

Eurobarometer (EB) 1986, 1992^{xiv}

Do you ever think of yourself not only as (nationality) citizen, but also as a citizen of Europe?

Often

Sometimes

Never

Eurobarometer (EB) 1987 to 1991, 1992ⁱ

Do you ever think of yourself as not only (nationality), but also European?

Often

Sometimes

Never

Eurobarometer (EB) 1992 to 1999

In the near future do you see yourself as ...?

[NATIONALITY] only

[NATIONALITY] and European

European and [NATIONALITY]

European only

ISSP National Identity Survey 1996 (Republic of Ireland only)

Do you usually think of yourself as Irish?

Yes

No

Looking at this card, could you tell me how important it is to you that you are Irish (or other identity, if indicated)? (Show Card, please tick one box only)

Very important

Fairly important

Not very important

Not at all important

Can't choose

Not applicable

As well as thinking of themselves as Irish or whatever, some people also think of themselves as European. Others do not do so. How about you? On this scale of 1-7 please indicate how you think of yourself. (Show Card, please circle one number only)

1. Not at all as a European
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
7. Very much as a European

European Values Study 1999 (Republic of Ireland only)

Most people think of themselves in terms of some national identity, such as American or French or German. In these terms, how do you usually think of yourself?

- Irish
- Other (WRITE IN)
- Don't know
- No answer

Could you tell me how important it is to you that you are Irish/other?

- 1. Not important
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10. Very important
- 77. Don't know
- 99. No answer

Do you ever think of yourself as European?

- Yes
- No

On a scale from 1 to 10 could you tell me how important it is to you that you are European?

- Not importantVery important
- Don't know
- 99. No answer

2. Other attitudinal variables used in the analysis

World Values Survey (WVS) 1981-4, 1990-3

How proud are you to be [NATIONALITY]?

- Very proud
- Quite proud
- Not very proud
- Not at all proud
- Don't know

There is much talk about what the individual member states of the European Community have in common and what makes them distinct. (INTERVIEWER SHOWS CARD WITH 7-POINT SCALE. STATEMENT A IS AT ONE END; STATEMENT B IS AT OPPOSITE END.) Which statement is closest to your own opinion, the first or the second? Please use the scale listed. "1" would mean that you agree completely with A, and "7" would mean that you agree completely with B. The numbers in between allow you to show where your own opinion falls, if you would place yourself somewhere in between.

Statement A: If the European member states were truly to be united, this would mean the end of their national, historical and cultural identities. Their national economic interests would also be sacrificed.

Statement B: Only a truly united Europe can protect states' national, historical and cultural identities and their national economic interests from the challenges of the superpowers.

9. DK, NA

European Values Study (EVS) 1999

Please tell me how much confidence you have in the European Union?

- A great deal
- Quite a lot
- Not very much
- None at all

European Values Study (EVS) 1999 (Republic of Ireland only)

How much say do you think an Irish government of any party should have in the way Northern Ireland is run? Do you think it should have

- A great deal of say
- Some say
- A little say
- No say at all
- Don't know
- Refused/No answer

ISSP National Identity Survey 1995

How proud are you of [COUNTRY] in each of the following?

- The way democracy works
- Its political influence in the world

Ireland's economic achievements
Its social security system
Its scientific and technological achievements
Its achievements in sports
Its achievements in the arts and literature
Ireland's armed forces
Its history
Its fair and equal treatment of all groups in society
(Very proud, somewhat proud, not very proud, not proud at all, can't choose)

Some people say the following things are important for being truly [NATIONALITY]. Others say they are not important. How important do you think each of the following is?

To have been born in [COUNTRY]
To be able to speak [NATIONAL LANGUAGE]
To be [MAIN RELIGION OF COUNTRY]
(Very important, fairly important, not very important, not important at all, can't choose)

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I would rather be a citizen of [COUNTRY] than of any other country in the world
The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like the [NATIONALITY]
Generally speaking [COUNTRY] is a better country than most other countries
People should support their country even if the country is in the wrong
[COUNTRY] should limit the import of foreign products in order to protect its national economy
[COUNTRY] should follow its own interests, even if this leads to conflicts with other nations
It is impossible for people who do not share [NATIONAL] customs and traditions to become fully [NATIONALITY]
(Strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, can't choose)

Generally speaking, would you say that [COUNTRY] benefits or does not benefit from being a member of the European Union?

Benefits
Does not benefit
Have never heard of the European Union
Can't choose

Which of the following statements comes closer to your own view?

[COUNTRY] should do all it can to unite fully with the European Union
[COUNTRY] should do all it can to protect its independence from the European Union
Can't choose

ISSP National Identity Survey 1996 (Republic of Ireland only)

How much say do you think an Irish government of any party should have in the way Northern Ireland is run? Do you think it should have ...? (Please tick one box only)

- ▲ A great deal of say
- ▲ Some say
- ▲ A little say

- ⤴ Or no say at all
- ⤴ Can't choose

Eurobarometer (EB) Surveys

In general, are you for or against efforts being made to unify Europe? Are you ...?

- For – very much
- For – to some extent
- Against – to some extent
- Against – very much
- Don't know

Generally speaking, do you think that [OUR COUNTRY'S] membership of the European Union is ...?

- A good thing
- A bad thing
- Neither good nor bad
- Don't know

If you were told tomorrow that the European Union had been scrapped, would you be very sorry about it, indifferent or very relieved?

- Very sorry
- Indifferent
- Very relieved
- Don't know

Appendix 2

Factor analysis of nationalist items in 1995-96 ISSP National Identity Survey

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Ireland better country than most other countries	0.86	0.02
World better place if people from other countries more like Irish	0.78	0.2
Rather be citizen of Ireland than of any other country in world	0.61	0.29
Impossible for people who do not share Irish traditions to become fully Irish	-0.01	0.71
People should support their country even if country is wrong	0.20	0.63
Importance of having been born in Ireland	0.16	0.63
Ireland should follow own interests, even if conflicts with other nations	0.23	0.55
Percent variance	26.34	24.50

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with KaiserNormalization.

References

- Carey, S. 'Undivided Loyalties: Is National Identity an Obstacle to European Integration?', *European Union Politics*, Vol. 3, 2002, pp. 387-413.
- Dowley, Kathleen M. and Brian D. Silver (2000) 'Subnational and National Loyalty: Cross-National Comparisons' in *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, Vol. 12, No. 4.
- Duchesne, S. and Frogner, A.P. 'Is There a European Identity?', Niedermayer O. and Sinnott R. (eds.) *Public Opinion and Internationalized Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Marks G. and L. Hooghe, "National identity and European integration: A multi-level analysis of public opinion" draft paper, Wissenschaftszentrum, Berlin (March, 2003).
- McLaren, L. 'Public Support for the European Union: Cost/Benefit Analysis or Perceived Cultural Threat?', *The Journal of Politics*, Vo. 64, 2002, pp. 551-66.
- Miller, David (1995) *On Nationality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Niedermayer, Oskar "Trends and Contrasts" in Oskar Niedermayer and Richard Sinnott (eds.) *Public Opinion and Internationalized Governance*, Oxford: University Press.
- Sidanius, Jim et al. (1997) 'The Interface between Ethnic and National Attachment: Ethnic Pluralism or Ethnic Dominance?' in *Public Opinion Quarterly*. Vol. 61, 101-33.
- Smith, A.D. 'National Identity and the Idea of European Unity', *International Affairs*, Vol. 68, 1992, pp. 55-76.

ⁱ For cross-national empirical research, see Marks and Hooghe, 2003, Carey, 2002, McLaren, 2002, Norris, 2000, Dowley and Silver, 2000; Sidanius et al. 1997, de la Garza et al. 1996. Dusesne and Frogner, 1995.

ⁱⁱ The surveys referred to include the European Values Survey, the World Values Survey, the International Social Survey Programme survey on national identity, the Eurobarometer and the New Democracies Barometer.

ⁱⁱⁱ The 1990 World Values Survey also contains a question on belonging to broadly defined ethnic groups that vary from country to country. However, presumably because of the difficulty of finding comparable sub-national ethnicities in different countries, this question was only asked in eight of the forty or so countries in the survey. Even among these eight, cross-national

comparisons are very complex and this measure is not further considered in this paper. The data are used in Dowley and Silver, 2000.

^{iv} The reader will note that the Eurobarometer surveys have been the most experimental in their approach to the measurement of identity. While it may be that this experimentation was motivated as much by the practical search for an elusive European identity as by disinterested methodological concerns, the methodologist can, post factum, benefit from the variation in measurement thus introduced.

^v I would like to express my gratitude to the Irish Social Science Research Council, to the Andrew Greeley Trust and to the Economic and Social Research Institute for the financial support that made it possible to carry out these surveys in Ireland. I would also like to thank my co-principal investigators on both surveys (Liam Ryan (ISSP) and Tony Fahey and Bernadette Hayes (EVS)) for their willingness to have the extra questions included in the questionnaires.

^{vi} Alternative ways of scoring the responses to the EVS/WVS identity question (e.g., giving a score of 2 to a first choice and a score of 1 to a second choice) were also considered but were found to perform less well.

^{vii} Like the 1990 WVS, the ISSP National Identity survey also asked about closeness to ethnic group, having first ascertained which ethnic group the respondent belonged to. However, the ethnic closeness question was only asked in 13 of the 25 countries in the survey, presumably for the same reasons that led to limited use of the ethnic identity question in the WVS. In ten of the countries in which the question was asked, there was one major ethnic group that was closely identified with the state. Analysis of the association between this closeness-to-state-ethnicity variable and the range of attitudinal variable in the ISSP yielded correlations that were substantially lower than the correlations with the closeness-to-country variable reported in the

text. Taking all of these limitations into account, it was decided not to include this measure in the analysis undertaken in this note.

^{viii} It cannot be assumed that this procedure produces a measure that is equivalent to the measure of national pride in the EVS/WVS surveys. Specification of a set of dimensions of national pride, as in the ISSP question, is likely to limit the expression of sentiments of pride in a way that is less likely with the more general EVS/WVS question.

^{ix} The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the three-item patriotism scale is 0.68 and the item-total correlations vary from 0.41 to 0.57. The four-item ethnic chauvinism scale is somewhat less satisfactory in this regard: an alpha of 0.53 and inter-item correlations ranging from 0.31 to 0.36.

^x For a discussion of the unification, membership and dissolution indicators of support for integration in the Eurobarometer, see Niedermayer, 1995, pp. 53-7. The question wording underlying each of these indicators is set out in Appendix 1.

^{xi} For a detailed discussion of these variations, see Duchesne and Frogner, 1995, p.224, n. 2.

^{xii} The "think of yourself as European" and "think of yourself as a European citizen" variations were used in split-half samples.

^{xiii} As anyone familiar with the Northern Ireland situation will know, the complexities of the problem are such that any expectation of a strong linear relationship between Irish national identity and irredentism would be extremely naïve. The point is not the size of the correlation, but the fact that it is insignificant on one measure of identity and significant on the other.

^{xiv} Asked on a split-half sample in EB 37.