Nationalities Papers (2024), 52: 4, 707–734
doi:10.1017/nps.2023.66

RESEARCH NOTE

Forms of National and European Identity: A Research Note Reviewing Literature of Cross-National Studies

Philipp König

Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, Political Science Methods, and Empirical Democracy Research, Philipp University of Marburg, Germany
Email: philipp.koenig@uni-saarland.de

Abstract
In the past decades, numerous publications have been addressing questions of national and European Identity on the micro level. Only few shed light on the contents that constitute these identities in the minds of Europeans. As different meanings of national and European identity are connected to different consequences such as hostile attitudes toward immigrants or Euroskepticism, reviewing attempts to measure these contents in existing cross-national surveys seems to be promising. This research note summarizes relevant literature on whether and which different forms of national and European identity have been found empirically, which specific contents constitute them, and which determinants and consequences of them are relevant. By comparing articles relying on cross-national survey data since 1995, it will be shown that the field of forms of national and European identity involves different operationalizations and numerous methodological concerns. This leads to considerations for further research in the field.

Keywords: forms of national identity and European identity; meanings of national and European identity; contents of national identity; literature review

Forms of National and European Identity in Europe

With Euroskepticism on the rise (Hooghe and Marks 2009; Isernia et al. 2012; Gernand 2018) and right-wing populist parties fuelling discourses about the 'true' national and European people (Mudde 2007; Inglehart and Norris 2016), the European Union (EU) is facing numerous challenges. The question of "Who belongs to the nation or Europe?" is becoming more salient as immigration rates increase, evoking social comparisons of foreigners and conationals (Theiss-Morse 2009). At the core of those questions is a certain "we-feeling" that generates the awareness of belonging together as a group, sharing common political structures and fate (Easton 1965). Without such a common identity, an essential characteristic of legitimate democratic rule with the prospect of stability (e.g., Westle 2003a) and a core requirement for social cohesion is missing (Arant et al. 2017). A common identity can act as glue that holds the citizens together by reducing social conflict, while increasing the willingness to cooperate, which in turn enhances the production of public goods, facilitates the democratic consensus-building processes, and allows for more efficient collective action (Tamir 1993; Canovan 1996; Miller and Ali 2014).

Investigations about National and European identity on the micro level have drawn some attention in the past. Previous articles have focused on questions regarding the intensity or different

relationships between national and European identification (Westle, 2003a) as well as on their determinants or consequences (Hooghe and Marks 2004; Clark and Rohrschneider 2019). One of the main findings remains that national identification is stronger than identification with Europe and that European identification does not seem to change significantly over time (Duchesne and Frognier 1995; Westle and Graf Buchheim 2016). Regarding aggregated attachment to Europe over time, from 1970 to 2007 there is no indicator for attachment to Europe moving up (Isernia et al. 2012) and even from 2008 to 2013, after the financial crisis, there are only marginal changes in attachment to the EU (Bergbauer 2017). Overall, attachment to Europe seems to neither increase nor decrease significantly over time.

But why is Euroskepticism on the rise when the strength of European identity has not changed? One possible explanation could be that the meaning citizens attach to national and European identity are not taken into consideration in studies that measure national and European identity as a one-dimensional construct, such as attachment (Dennison et al. 2020), feeling of belonging (Hooghe and Marks 2004; Koos 2012), or closeness to the nation/the EU (Plescia, Daoust, and Blais 2021). Only few contributions consider what it means for citizens to identify with their nation or with Europe. Although there are some qualitative approaches to measuring the meanings or contents of national or European identity for some countries (Bruter 2004a, 2004b), those approaches do not allow for large-scale cross-country comparisons. This article therefore asks which forms of national and European identity were found by previous research on the basis of standardized cross-national survey data. What are the similarities and what are the differences regarding their meaning and their contents? Which determinants and consequences accompany these different forms on the micro level? To answer these questions, the objective of the present literature review is to analyze quantitative articles that concern different meanings, objects, or contents of national and European identity, summarized under the term "forms" of national/European identity.

The following part will give an overview of theoretical approaches to forms of national or European identity. Thereafter, the basis on which the articles have been researched and selected is presented and the different operationalizations of forms across international surveys are reviewed. Then findings about which specific forms were found are compared, and a brief overview about determinants and consequences of these forms is presented. This article closes with the conclusion and discussion.

Theoretical Approaches on Forms of National and European Identity

In social psychology, social identity theory (SIT) is the most recognizable approach when it comes to explaining group identities. Social identity is described as "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel 1974, 69). This collective social identity contains cognitive, affective, and evaluative elements (Tajfel 1982). Further described in the self-categorization theory (SCT; Turner et al. 1987), individuals cognitively refer to social categories as prototypes, capturing intragroup similarities (assimilation) and intergroup differences (contrast). These "symbolic boundaries" separate a collective and internal "us" from a diffuse "them" (Eisenstadt and Giesen 1995; Hogg and Reid 2006). By shaping what it means to be part of a specific group, the content of an identity is constructed. This is what the term *form* is supposed to capture in this review. If an individual self-categorizes to belong to a certain social group, the groups' identity is adopted through social identification and individuals' self-esteem will become bound up to this social group (Tajfel and Turner 1979).

Constructivist approaches regard identity as a product of social cognition within social groups that is open to processes of change (David and Bar-Tal 2009). A group identity emerges when a number of individuals identify with the same object while being aware of this identification (Lichtenstein 2014). Although some argue this awareness of belonging together is mainly enforced

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by elites (Giesen 1993), it can also be based on individual feelings of togetherness. One source of identification can be based on the assumption of communalities between group members that contrast differences to outsiders (Estel 1997). In the national and European context, such similarities can only be assumed, as most of the group members cannot be experienced personally. Such social groups are often referred to as "imagined communities" (Anderson 1991, 49).

Both approaches share the prerequisite that an individual has to refer to the specific social group as part of its self-understanding. On the individual level, the relationship between a person and a group can be considered as vertical identification, describing an individual's specific perceptions of sharing precious and exclusive commonalities characterizing the group (belonging to). On the group level, collective identity is based on horizontal relationships between group members who share a common collective identity (belonging together; Eisenstadt and Giesen 1995; Westle 2003b; Kaina 2012). This sense of belonging together can also be a part of an individuals' psychology; therefore, vertical as well as horizontal identification can be applied to the micro level.

Potential Forms of National and European Identity

Research on forms of national identity is a lot more extensive than on European identity. Thus, it was decided to structure this part along relevant theories of forms of national identity, whereas theories about forms of European identity are mentioned separately at the end of this part.

In political science, macro-level theories of nation-building offer directives for the investigation of forms on a more micro level. The most prominent approach stems from Kohn's work on nationalism (Kohn 1944), which is in turn rooted in previous insights of Meinecke's distinction between *Staatsnation* (state nation) and *Kulturnation* (culture nation) of nation-building processes (Meinecke 1908, 1970). A civic nation is founded upon political institutions and political ideals, whereas an ethnic nation is built upon the belief in a historical, prepolitical culture uniting the nation. Although the ethnic form is assumed to be more prominent in Eastern European countries, Western European countries are mostly based on civic conceptions (Kohn 1944). One point of interest is therefore to see whether these theoretical discrepancies between Eastern and Western European countries are found empirically.

A similar approach differentiates between the demos and ethnos principles as nation-founding ideas. Following the principle of the ethnos, a nation is built upon common ancestry, history, place of birth, socialization, and culture, whereas the idea of demos does not attribute any relevance to ethnic or cultural factors but instead relies on the commitment to democracy (Francis 1965). This distinction can be transferred to the micro level and is referred to as "ethnic–civic dichotomy" (Giesen and Junge 1991; Ignatieff 1994) or ascribed and achieved social identities (Huddy 2001).

The ethnic form is often linked to organic/illiberal/exclusionary and the civic to rational/liberal/inclusive tendencies of the nation (Brown 1999). While some argue that societies are either ethnic or civic (Miller 2000), others criticize those different forms of national identity are considered simultaneously (Smith 1991; Giesen 1993; Brubaker 2004). Even though the ethnic–civic dichotomy is the most common typology that is used to distinguish different forms of national identity, there are also alternative approaches and the critique that a simple dichotomy is not able to cover the complexity of national identity (Kymlicka 1999; Nielsen 1999; Kuzio 2002).

Some researchers argue that ethnic and cultural aspects should be distinguished from each other because ancestry or the place of birth is inherent and therefore clearly more restrictive toward outsiders than cultural aspects (Kymlicka 1999; Nielsen 1999). In line with this argument, Eisenstadt and Giesen (1995) developed a theoretical model of collective identity that contains primordial, civic, and cultural forms.

On the other side, it might occur that cultural aspects interweave with the ethnic or civic form. Brubaker (2004) states that it is not possible to say whether an element is clearly civic or ethnic, and cultural aspects belong to both. Ethnic nationalism is always ethnocultural and civic nationalism, as a purely acultural understanding of nationhood, is not widely held. This means that besides being a

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stand-alone cultural form of national identity, cultural aspects might merge with the previously formulated civic and ethnic forms. A common language and culture can be seen as part of the political aspects of a nation, as common language is essential for participation and cultural aspects such as norms are essential for common laws and the political rules of living together. Cultural heritage such as a common history and religion can be seen as parts of ethnicity and might belong to an ethnic or ethnocultural form. Empirically, this will be reflected within the problems of assignment of single items to specific forms of national identity.

Another source of identification might derive from the economic, social, and welfare systems of the nation. Economic outputs and welfare benefits, as well as technological and scientific achievements, may be seen as sources for a socioeconomic form of national identity. Previous studies on national pride hint at the high relevance of economic aspects, although doubting the stability of economic issues and thus whether they can constitute a form of collective identity (Mohler and Götze 1992). Socioeconomic aspects, similar to cultural, might interweave with the civic or ethnic form of national identity, as questions about the distribution of socioeconomic goods depend on the underlying concept of who is regarded as eligible.

Another field in political science that might contribute to specific forms of national and European identity is the field of nationalism and patriotism. Variants of nationalism or patriotism might be closely linked to conceptions of national identity. Nationalists often idealize their nation and decide who belongs to it based on descent, race, or heritage (Kosterman and Feshbach 1989; Blank and Schmidt 2003; Huddy 2016). This highlights some similarities to ethnic national identity. Constructive patriots cherish humanistic and democratic principles and endorse citizenship toward the state, if they see those ideals endangered (Schatz, Staub, and Lavine 1999). This clearly shares some similarities with the concept of civic national identity. Nevertheless, from a sociopsychological point of view, nationalism and patriotism do not refer to the content of identity directly. Past research often confounded the content of identities with processes of identification. The latter addresses the cognitive or affective orientation toward a group, such as nationalism or patriotism (Ditlmann and Kopf-Beck 2019). Also described as modes of identification (Roccas and Elster 2012), items for these concepts often ask how strongly respondents identify with different identity content. Some researchers even highlight the distinctiveness to forms of national identity by declaring nationalism and patriotism as consequences of them (Blank and Schmidt 2003). As this literature review focuses on contents or forms of identity, it was decided to not include studies that investigate variants of nationalism or patriotism.

Although, some researchers argue that national pride can be equated with patriotism (Rose 1985) or even nationalism (Solt 2011), it is still regarded as an important and distinguished component of social identity (Smith 2007). In line with a differentiation between an abstract general national pride and pride toward specific domains (Evans and Kelley 2002), Hjerm (2003) suggests a differentiation between political (civic, economic, and social security) and cultural (history, cultural practices and achievements connected to the people) national pride. In sum, scholars of nation-building, nationalism, and patriotism, as well as national pride, point to the existence of at least an ethnic/cultural and a civic form of national identity.

Europe can be regarded as a culturally and historically defined social space, and the EU as a distinct civic and political entity. Previous qualitative studies indicate that this distinction is valid in the minds of the citizens in Europe (Bruter 2004a, 2004b). In contrast to national identity, this allows for a clearer distinction of cultural and civic identity. Similarly, a distinction between the EU as a common cultural heritage and a political project can be drawn (La Barbera, Ferrara, and Boza 2014). The cultural form of European identity derives from a common historical-cultural memory and heritage of Europe (Eder 2004) and is the outcome of cultural conditions within European civilization (Delanty 2005).

The civic form describes the relationship between people and the EU in the same manner as on the national level, focusing primarily on the political institutions, citizenship, and the legal implications of it (Shaw 1997). When thinking about the EU's original idea as an economic

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

community, a potential socioeconomic form of identity might be especially important for the European level. In line with that, Lichtenstein (2014) distinguishes between an economic (single market, currency), political (democratic values), cultural (e.g., history, religious values), and geographic (borders) community.

Presented concepts of a cultural form of European identity contain aspects such as a common history and religious values and are thus ethnocultural. Besides those aspects, this article argues that European identity construction may also be based on more essentialistic traits, such as the place of birth or having European ancestry.

Selection Criteria, Data, Measurement, and Operationalization of the Articles

This literature review compares empirical contributions on the basis of standardized survey data about different forms of national and European identity on the micro level. To find relevant literature, a list of different search terms (Appendix I) was created and applied to different scientific search engines and databases.[1] Then, relevant articles were selected based on the following:

(a) Content Criteria
The studies must investigate different forms (meanings) of national or European identity. This excludes studies that operationalize identity with one-dimensional measures such as questions about attachment, closeness, or belonging to a nation or Europe. As mentioned in the theory part, studies about nationalism and patriotism are also excluded. It was decided to keep this as a strict limitation to improve the comparability between the studies and to limit the already large body of literature. Although, studies about nationalism often use similar measures, the articles must explicitly mention investigating questions of identity as their main focus of analysis.
(b) Formal Criteria:
The underlying data has to be based on cross-national surveys. As the objective of this literature review is to summarize studies about different forms of national and/or European identity in Europe, the articles must yield a comparative character. As a minimum requirement, articles have to analyze at least three European countries. Single-country studies were excluded. Also, the articles have to be published in English. The starting point of the analysis was determined to be the year 1995 when the first national identity module of the International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) was introduced, as this turned out to be the most used data source.

First, an overview about the data sources, measurements, and operationalization of all articles found will be presented. As the different operationalization of forms is the core concern in the field of national and European identity research, this part focuses on the different approaches found. To do so, articles are ordered according to the cross-national survey data they are based on.

International Social Survey Programme

The national identity module of International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) has been conducted in three waves in 1995, 2003, and 2013. Table 1 summarizes all studies based on these data and gives detailed information about the assignment of its items to specific forms (see Table 1). The publications are ordered according to their derived forms of national identity. As the survey only focuses on national identity, European forms cannot be considered.

The first and dominant approach to measuring forms of national identity was introduced within this survey. Respondents were asked about the importance of different aspects of being a true member of the national group (which from here on will be referenced as the 'true national' battery).

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. ISSP true national question

International Social Survey Program National Identity module (1995, 2003, 2013)
National Identity Module I–1995 *"Some people say the following things are important for being a true [e.g., German]. Others say they are not important. How important do you think each of the following is…?"* [1(very important) – 4(not important at all)] 1. To have been born in [respondent's country]. (**born**) 2. To have citizenship in [respondent's country]. (**citizenship**) 3. To have lived in [respondent's country] for most of one's life. (**residence**) 4. To be able to speak [the dominant language in respondent's country]. (**language**) 5. To be a [believer in the dominant religion/denomination of respondent's country (e.g., Protestant, Christian, etc.)]. (**religion**) 6. To respect political institutions and laws of [respondent's country]. (**institutions and laws**) 7. To feel [British, Spanish, Hungarian, etc.] (**feel**) **2003 and 2013 addition of:** 8. To have [country nationality] ancestry (**ancestry**) **Additional items:** *"How much do you agree or disagree with the following [statement]:"* • It is impossible for people who do not share the customs and traditions [of respondent's country] to become fully [nationality of respondent's country] (**custom & traditions**) [1(agree strongly)–5 (disagree strongly)]

			Forms			
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
Ethnic and civic						
Hjerm (1998)	N = 3 Australia, Germany, Sweden	*Cluster analysis (squared Euclidean correlation)*	*Ethnic*: born, residence	*Civic*: institutions and laws, feel, citizenship, language		*Multiple*: Ethnic + Civic *Pluralist:* No national identity at all
Jones and Smith (2001)	N = 23 Mostly European sample	*Factor analysis*	*Ascriptive:* born, religion, residence	*Subjective civic:* feeling, institutions and laws		
Rusciano (2003)	N = 23 Mostly European sample	*Factor analysis*	*Nation*: born, citizenship, residence, language, religion, feel	*State*: laws and institutions		

Continued

Table 1. *Continued*

			Forms			
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
Haller and Ressler (2006)	N = 18 European sample	*Factor analysis*	*Ethnocultural:* ancestry, citizenship, language	*State-nation:* citizenship, institutions and laws		
Kunovich (2009)	N = 31 Mostly European sample	*Confirmatory factor analysis*	*Ethnic:* born, residence, ancestry, citizen, religion	*Civic:* feel, language, institutions and laws		
Heath, Jean, and Spreckelsen (2009)	N = 31 Mostly European sample	*Exploratory Factor analysis*	*Ethnic: ancestry, born, religion, residence*	*Civic:* feel, institutions and laws, language		
Reeskens and Hooghe (2010)	N = 33 Global sample	*Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis + mgcfa*	*Ethnic:* born, religion, ancestry	*Civic*: language, institutions and laws, feel		
Berg and Hjerm (2010)	N = 18 European sample	*Factor analysis*	*Ethnic*: ancestry, feel, born, religion	*Civic*: institutions and laws, citizenship, language		
Helbling, Reeskens, and Wright (2016)	N = 25 Mostly European sample	*Exploratory factor analysis*	*Ethnic*: born, ancestry, residence, religion, citizenship	*Civic*: language, institutions and laws, feel		*Additive*: Combined importance of all criteria
Ariely (2020)	N = 38 Global sample	*Relativized scores (Wright et al., 2012)*	*Ethnic*: ancestry + institutions and laws	*Civic*: gap between ancestry and institutions and laws		
Larsen (2021) [all three waves]	N = 44 Global sample	*Multi-classification-analysis (MCA)*	*Ethnic* Important: religion, born Unimportant: laws and institutions, language, feel	*Civic*: Highly important: laws and institutions Unimportant: born, residence, religion		

Continued

Table 1. *Continued*

			Forms			
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
Aichholzer, Kritzinger, and Plescia (2021)	N = 18 European sample	*Principal component analysis (PCA)*	*Ethnic*: born, religion, ancestry	*Civic*: language, Institution and laws, feel		
Civic and cultural						
Shulman (2002)	N = 16 Mostly European sample	*Theoretical*		*Civic*: feel, citizenship, institutions and laws, born, residence	*Cultural*: language, religion, customs and traditions	
Koning (2011)	N = 26 Mostly European sample	*Shulman (2002)*		*Civic:* feel, citizenship, laws and institutions, born, residence	*Cultural:* language, religion, customs and traditions	
Ethnic only						
Canan and Simon (2019)	N = 21 Mostly European sample + 28 German districts	*Theoretical*	*Ascriptive*: ancestry, religion			
Ariely (2019)	N = 74 Global sample	*Single item measure*	*Ethnic*: ancestry			
Ariely (2021) ISSP 2003, 2013 + EVS and WVS 5	N = 93 Global sample	*Single item measure*	*Ethnic:* ancestry			
Cultural only						
Vlachová and Hamplová (2023) ISSP 2003 + 2013	N = 17 European sample	*Single indicators*			*Cultural*: religion, customs, and traditions	

Continued

Table 1. *Continued*

			Forms			
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
Ethnic, civic, and cultural						
Pehrson, Vignoles, and Brown (2009)	N = 31 Mostly European sample	*Single indicators*	*Ethnic:* ancestry	*Civic:* citizenship	*Cultural*: language	
Taniguchi (2021)	N = 33 Global Sample		*Ethnic:* ancestry	*Civic:* institutions and laws	*Cultural:* language	
Other approaches						
Jayet (2012)	N = 3 France, Great Britain, Western Germany	*Multiple correspondence analysis*				Greatest opposition between respondents is finding any of the criteria important or not (no clear form)
May (2023) ISSP 1995, 2003 & 2013	N = 42 Global sample	*Latent class analysis*				Four ideal types: a) Exclusionists: High probability to perceive any membership criterion as important b) Assimilationists: All criteria high but religion and ancestry c) Integrationists: Support for language, laws citizenship and feel but reject born, religion and ancestry d) Pluralists: Reject most characteristics to define compatriots

The intention of this question is to measure forms of national identity based on the societal boundaries of the respondents. An item for the importance of having national ancestry was added in the second wave. In the second and third wave, the question and its specific items are the same. It is difficult to tell whether the question measures horizontal or vertical identification, as the question can be understood in various ways.

Although not worded identically, most studies follow the logic of the ethnic-civic dichotomy. Two studies identify a cultural vs civic form distinction (Shulmann 2002; Koos 2012).

Some researchers focused on the ethnic form only (Ariely 2019, 2021; Canan and Simon 2019). Jayet (2012) distinguished between respondents according to the importance they give to any of the criteria overall.

There are some similarities and differences in the assignment of items to forms. The item being born in the country was ascribed to the ethnic form in all studies, being supplemented by the ancestry item since it was added in 2003. Not as clearly assigned to the ethnic form was the item representing belonging to the dominant religion, which in some studies was part of the ethnic form (Heath, Jean, and Spreckelsen 2009; Berg and Hjerm 2010; Reeskens and Hooghe 2010) while others regarded it as cultural indicator (Koning 2011; Vlachová and Hamplová 2023). Some also allocated the residence item (Hjerm 1998; Jones and Smith 2001) to the ethnic form and others to the civic form (e.g., Shulman 2002; Koning 2011). Although giving importance to the place of birth seems to be the core feature of ethnic national identity, when thinking about it in terms of the jus soli versus jus sanguinis, it can be regarded as a feature that makes acquiring citizenship more accessible in comparison to ancestry.

Nearly all studies including a civic form assigned the respect for laws and institutions item to it. Although some regarded language also as part of the civic item (Hjerm 1998; Berg and Hjerm 2010; Aichholzer, Kritzinger, and Plescia 2021), others allocated it as a part of an ethnocultural form (Haller and Ressler 2006; Pehrson, Vignoles, and Brown 2009). The different allocation of items to factors might be explained by measurement inequivalence, indicating that the meaning of specific items varies between countries (Heath, Jean, and Spreckelsen 2009).

Jayet (2012) distinguished respondents according to the importance they give all of the criteria overall, building no clear form. Ariely (2020) used relativized scores (Wright, Citrin, and Wand 2012), and in his following work (Ariely 2021) he used a single-item measure (ancestry) for an ethnic form of national identity only. Taniguchi (2021) used single-item measures for the ethnic (ancestry), civic (institutions and laws), and cultural (language) forms of national identity.

Larsen (2021) combined the true national battery with measures of intensity of national identity and distinguished between ethnic and civic national identity. The former consisted of people assigning religion and being born in the country importance, but respecting laws and institutions, speaking the language, and feeling national was viewed as unimportant. The latter contained those who gave high importance to respecting laws and institutions and low importance to being born or having residence in the country or sharing the dominant religion.

Beyond the usual variable-centered approaches that mostly produce an ethnic-civic factor solution, May (2023) chose latent class analysis as a person-centered approach. Four ideal-typical patterns of national boundary making were repeatedly found across 42 countries and all three waves of ISSP. May differentiates between (1) the "Exclusionists" (rating all criteria high, except for religion), (2) the "Assimilationists" (rating all criteria high, born and residence only moderately high, rejecting religion and ancestry), (3) the "Integrationists" (high support for language, laws, and institutions; rather supporting citizenship and feel; rejecting born, religion, and ancestry), and (4) the "Pluralists" (rejecting most criteria).

The ISSP also included questions about national pride. Two articles were found to connect those questions to national identity (see Table 2). Based on this question, Domm (2004) differentiates between political and cultural national pride. By merging the true national question with a question about national pride, Koos (2012) finds an ethnocultural, welfare,

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. ISSP National Pride

National Identity Module I–1995
National Pride
"How proud are you of [country] in each of the following?"
[1 = very proud – 4 = not proud at all]
1. the way democracy works (**way democracy works**)
2. its political influence in the world (**influence**)
3. [COUNTRY]'s economic achievements (**economy**)
4. Its social security system (**social security**)
5. Its scientific and technological achievements (**science and technology**)
6. Its achievements in the arts and literature (**arts and literature**)
7. [COUNTRYS]'s armed forces (**armed forces**)
8. Its history (**history**)
9. Its fair and equal treatment of all groups in society (**fair and equal**)

National Identity Module II–2003
10. + Its achievements in sports (**sports**)

			Forms		
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural
Domm (2004)	N = 8 EU member states	*Factor analysis*		*Political pride:* way democracy works, influence, economy, social security	*Cultural pride:* sports, arts, armed forces, history
Koos (2012)	N = 29 Mostly European sample	*Principle component analysis*	*Ethnocultural:* ancestry, born, religion *Ethnocultural/ pragmatic:* residence *Pragmatic/ ethnocultural:* language	*Civic/pragmatic:* citizenship, laws, and institutions *Great-power-civic:* history, political influence *Great-power-civic/pragmatic:* influence *Welfare-civic/pragmatic:* way democracy works *Welfare-civic:* fair and equal, social security	*Pragmatic:* Feel, economy, science and technology. Sports, arts and literature

and great-power civic form of national identity The presented forms are additionally distinguished and labeled as "pragmatic" (e.g., ancestry, born, religion = e*thnocultural*; residence = *ethnocultural/pragmatic*). The welfare-civic form shows some similarities to a socioeconomic form of national identity (fair and equal treatment of all groups, social security system), whereas other socioeconomic factors are labeled as "pragmatic" (economic, scientific, and technological achievements).

European Values Study

Of the three studies based on data from the European Values Study (EVS) and World Values Survey (WVS) data (see Table 3), two of them focused on forms of national identity (Ariely 2013; Simonsen and Bonikowski 2019), one on national and European identity (Wegscheider and Nezi 2021), and one on European identity only (Voicu and Ramia 2021). All of them used the imported true national battery of ISSP, which was also translated into an additional item for the European forms in EVS 2018. Articles based on these data revealed the ethnic–civic dichotomy.

Simonsen and Bonikowski (2019) differentiated between thin (rating all criteria low), thick (rating all criteria high), undifferentiated (all criteria neither high nor low), and constitutional (institutions and laws, language) forms. Ariely (2013) decided to measure ethnic (ancestry) and civic (institutions and laws) forms via single indicators and further used relativized scores (Wright, Citrin, and Wand 2012), which indicates the surplus of importance of the ethnic form over the civic form, as most respondents rate civic criteria high, anyway. Wamsler (2023) differentiates between ethnic (born and ancestry) and civic national identity (laws and institutions and language). The only study focusing on forms of national and European identity simultaneously (Wegscheider and Nezi 2021) differentiated between ethnic and civic on both national and European level. Again, ancestry and born are assigned to the ethnic form of national and European identity. Voicu and Ramia (2021) tested for measurement inequivalence of the cultural and ethnic form of European identity. Their results point towards a common understanding of an ethnic form of European identity (born, ancestry, and religion) but an uncommon conception of a cultural form. This means that cross-country comparisons based on EVS 2017 data are possible for ethnic European identity, but not for the cultural form. On the European level, religion was also added to the ethnic form. The national civic form contains institutions and laws, language as well as culture. On the European level, the civic form contains culture. This contrasts with the theoretical expectation of a civic–culture dichotomy on the European level but also indicates that a more primordial ethnic form might exist on the European level. In contrast to the theoretical conceptions previously introduced, an ethnic form of European identity is formulated which contains ethnocultural (religion) and purely ethnic items alike (born and ancestry).

Integrated and United Project

The four articles based on data from the 2007 Integrated and United Project (IntUne; see Table 4) used the "true national/European" battery to measure respective forms and transferred the national questions to the European level. Compared with the original true national battery from ISSP, the items "exercising citizen rights" and "sharing cultural traditions" were added.

Best (2009) finds an ascribed and acquirable form on the national level, with cross-loadings of the cultural tradition item. Serricchio and Bellucci (2016) identify the same forms on the national and European level. Guglielmi and Vezzoni (2016) discovered that parts of the meanings of national and European identity seem to merge and found a national and European civility form but a merged ancestry, citizenship, and Christianity form. This has been replicated in Segatti and Guglielmi (2016). This indicates that national and European ancestry, citizenship, and religion refer to

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. Studies based on EVS data

European Values Studies (EVS)						
EVS 2008 *"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?"* *[1 = very important – 4 = not important at all]* 1. To have been born in [COUNTRY] **(born)** 2. To respect [COUNTRY]'s political institutions and laws **(institutions and laws)** 3. To have [COUNTRY]'s ancestry **(ancestry)** 4. To be able to speak [THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE] [NOTE: if more than one national languages, ask the national languages] **(language)** 5. To have lived for a long time in [COUNTRY] **(residence)**						
			Forms			
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
Ariely (2013)	N = 44 European sample	*Exploratory factor analysis*	*Ethnic*: ancestry	*Civic*: institutions and laws		*Relativized scores*: Gap between civic and ethnic factor
Simonsen and Bonikowski (2019)	N = 41 European sample	*Latent class analysis*		*Civic*: Constitutional: institutions and laws, language		*Thin:* Rating all criteria low *Thick:* Rating all criteria high *Undifferentiated:* all criteria neither very high nor very low

Continued

Table 3. *Continued*

EVS 2018 National: Same as EVS 2008, only "To have lived for a longtime in [Country]" was replaced by: • To share [NATIONAL] culture European: *"People differ in what they think it means to be European. In your view, how important is each of the following to be European?"* *[1 = very important – 4 = not at all important]* 1. To be born in Europe **(born)** 2. To have European ancestry **(ancestry)** 3. To be a Christian **(religion)** 4. To share European culture **(culture)**						
Wegscheider and Nezi (2021)	N = 20 European sample	*Theoretical*	National *Ethnic:* born, ancestry European *Ethnic:* born, ancestry, religion	National *Civic:* Institutions and laws, language, culture European *Civic:* culture		
Voicu and Ramia (2021)	N = 30 European sample	*Confirmatory factor analysis*	European *Ethnic:* Born, ancestry, religion		European *Cultural:* culture	
Wamsler (2023)	N = 28 European Sample	*Additive index*	**National** *Ethnic*: born, ancestry	**National**: *Civic*: Institutions and laws, language		ethnic factor - civic factor: Values < 0 = primarily civic, Values > 0 = primarily ethnic., Binary dummy: civic (0), ethnic (1)

Table 4. Studies based on IntUne data

IntUne 2007

National:
People differ in what they think it means to be (NATIONALITY). In your view, how important is each of the following to be (NATIONALITY)? [1 = very important – 4 = not at all important]
European:
And for being European, how important do you think each of the following is …? [1 = very important – 4 = not at all important]

1. To be a Christian (**religion**)
2. To share (NATIONALITY) cultural traditions (**cultural traditions**)
3. To be born in (OUR COUNTRY) (**born**)
4. To have (NATIONALITY) parents (**ancestry**)
5. To respect (NATIONALITY) laws and institutions (**institutions and laws**)
6. To feel (NATIONALITY) (**feel**)
7. To master (COUNTRY LANGUAGE) (IF MULTILANGUAGE COUNTRY: "to master one of the official languages of (OUR COUNTRY) (**language**)
8. To exercise citizens' rights, like being active in the politics of (OUR COUNTRY) (**citizen rights**)

			Forms		
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural
National Identity					
Best (2009)	N = 18 European sample	Factor analysis	*Ascribed*: born, ancestry	*Acquirable*: respecting institutions and laws, citizen rights	
National and European identity					
Guglielmi and Vezzoni (2016)	N = 16 European sample	MGCFA	*Ancestry*: born (national + European) ancestry (national + European)	*National civility*: cultural traditions, feeling, language, institutions and laws *European civility*: cultural traditions, feeling, language, institutions and laws *Citizenship*: citizen rights (national + European)	*Christianity*: religion

Continued

Table 4. *Continued*

			Forms		
Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Ethnic	Civic	Cultural
Serricchio and Bellucci (2016)	N = 16 European sample	Theoretical	National *Ascribed*: born, ancestry, religion European *Ascribed*: born, ancestry, religion	National *Achieved*: Institutions and laws, citizen rights, language, cultural traditions, Feeling national European *Achieved:* institutions and laws, citizen rights, language, cultural traditions, feeling	
Segatti and Guglielmi (2016)	N = 16 European sample	MGCFA	*Ancestry*: born (national + European), ancestry (national + European)	*National civility*: cultural traditions, feeling, language, institutions and laws *European civility*: cultural traditions, feeling, language, institutions and laws *Citizenship*: citizen rights (national + European)	*Christianity*: religion

common forms of identity in the minds of Europeans, whereas in the case of civility, they still distinguish a national from a European one.

Across all studies, the "born" and "ancestry" items are assigned to the ethnic form on both the national and European level. Respecting institutions and laws as well as exercising citizens' rights are constantly assigned to a civic form.

Eurobarometer

Five studies relied on Eurobarometer (EB) data. One study focused on the national level only (Janmaat 2006), two of them on the European level (Pichler 2008; Schlenker 2013), and two on both (Ruiz Jiménez et al. 2004; Koos 2012) (see Table 5).

Janmaat (2006) derives an ethnic, political (civic), cultural, patriotic and army, and borders form. Using the equivalent question for European identity, Ruiz Jiménez et al. (2004) find a cultural, civic, instrumental, and affective-symbolic form on the national and European level. Koos (2012) distinguishes between great-power civic, welfare civic, and ethnocultural forms on the national and European level. Concentrating on European forms only, Pichler (2008) derives a political (civic) and cultural form. Based on a "true national/ European" question in EB 71.3 (2009), Schlenker (2013) finds an ethnic, civic, and cultural form of European identity.

Overall, ancestry is part of the ethnic form in both studies that include an ethnic form, whereas it is allocated to the cultural form in those without an ethnic form. Political and legal systems as well as rights and duties are a stable part of the derived civic forms.

On the European level the civic–cultural distinction is the most prominent, being supplemented by instrumental/affective-symbolic (Ruiz-Jiménez et al. 2004) or great-power-civic, welfare-civic, and pragmatic forms (Koos 2012). Among others, the instrumental as well as welfare civic forms contain social security system and economy items. This indicates the relevance of socioeconomic aspects. In the instrumental approach, a distinguished form is derived—whereas the welfare-civic form merges civic with socioeconomic aspects. In contrast to the true national/European questions in other surveys, the number and variety of items seems to allow for a broader distinction of forms.

After reviewing the different approaches on measuring forms in the different international survey data, the overall core findings are summarized. Overall, even earlier studies state that the citizens across most European countries favor civic criteria (Jones and Smith 2001) and that ethnic criteria lost relevance over time (Canan and Simon 2019). Comparing the appearance of specific forms of national identity between Eastern and Western Europe, there is no consensus regarding whether there is an ethnic–civic gradient between those regions. Citizens of Eastern European countries often lean toward ethnic or ethnocultural national identity compared with Western European citizens in some studies (Janmaat 2006; Best 2009; Ariely 2013; Larsen 2021). Other studies find no clear distinction (Shulman 2002; Björklund 2006).

For European identity most studies find a civic and a cultural form (Haller and Ressler 2006; Pichler 2008). Although most Europeans give more importance to civic aspects of their European identity, some empirical results show that the cultural form is much stronger than expected (Ruiz Jiménez et al. 2004). Most Eastern European countries favor cultural ideas of European identity, whereas Western and Southern European countries mostly favor civic or instrumental considerations (Ruiz Jiménez et al. 2004; Janmaat 2006; Koos 2012).

Most of the studies operate on pooled data, albeit there are some concerns about the comparison of forms between countries. Many studies report measurement inequivalence across countries. This indicates that the meaning of specific items vary across countries and are not comparable. One strategy to face this problem is to use the least ambiguous single-item indicators (e.g., Reeskens and Hooghe 2010) or to choose analysis methods that are person-centered such as latent class analysis (e.g., Wegscheider and Nezi 2021).

Overall, the most important insight is that single indicators are not consistently assigned to certain forms. Speaking the national language, for example, is an indicator for the cultural form of

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 5. Studies based on Eurobarometer data

Eurobarometer (EB)
57.2(2002) **National** *Different things or feelings are crucial to people in their sense of belonging to a nation. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?* *"I feel (Nationality) because I share with my fellow (Nationality)…"* *[1 = strongly agree – 4 = strongly disagree]* 1. I do not feel (Nationality) (**feel**) 2. A common culture, customs and traditions (**culture and traditions**) 3. A common language (**language**) 4. Common ancestry (**ancestry**) 5. A common history and a common destiny (**history and destiny**) 6. A common political and legal system (**political and legal system**) 7. Common rights and duties (**rights and duties**) 8. A common system of social security/welfare (**social system**) 9. A national economy (**economy**) 10. A national army (**army**) 11. Common borders (**borders**) 12. A feeling of national pride (**pride**) 13. National independence and Sovereignty (**sovereignty**) 14. Our national character (**character**) 15. Our national symbols (the flag, the national anthem, etc.) (**symbols**) **European** *Different things or feelings are crucial to people in their sense of belonging to Europe. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?* *"I feel European because I share with my fellow European …" [1 = strongly agree – 4 = strongly disagree]* 1. I do not feel European (**feel**) 2. A common civilization (**civilization**) 3. Membership in a European society with many languages and cultures (**cultural diversity**) 4. Common ancestry (**ancestry**) 5. A common history and a common destiny (**history and destiny**) 6. The European Union institutions and an emerging common political and legal system (**political and legal system**) 7. Common rights and duties (**rights and duties**) 8. A common system of social protection within the European Union (**social security system**) 9. The right to free movement and residence in any part of the European Union (**free movement and residence**) 10. An emerging European defense system (**defense**) 11. A common European homeland (**homeland**) 12. A feeling of pride for being European (**pride**) 13. Sovereignty of the European Union (**sovereignty**) 14. (EXCEPT IN UK) a common European Union currency (IN UK) a future common European Union currency (**currency**) 15. A set of European Union symbols (flag, anthem, etc.) (**symbols**)

Continued

Table 5. *Continued*

Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Forms			
			Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
National Identity						
Janmaat (2006)	N = 10 European sample	Factor analysis	*Ethnic:* ancestry, history	*Political:* political and legal system, rights and duties, social security, economy	*Cultural*: culture, language	*Patriotic:* pride, sovereignty, character, symbols *Army and borders:* army, borders
National and European Identity						
Ruiz-Jiménez et al. (2004)	N = 10 European sample	Factor analysis		National: *Civic:* rights and duties, political and legal system European: *Civic:* political and legal system, rights and duties	National: *Cultural*: culture, customs and traditions, language, ancestry, history European: *Cultural:* civilization, cultural diversity, ancestry, history and destiny	National: *Instrumental:* social security system, economy, army, borders *Affective-symbolic:* pride, character, symbols, sovereignty European: *Instrumental:* social security system, free movement and residence, defense, borders, currency *Affective-symbolic:* pride, symbols, sovereignty
Koos (2012)	N = 29 Mostly European sample	Principal component analysis		National *Great power civic:* army, borders, pride, sovereignty, character, symbols *Welfare civic*: political system, common rights, social security system, national economy	National *Ethnocultural*: culture and traditions, language, ancestry, history and destiny European *Ethnocultural*:	

Continued

Table 5. *Continued*

Author(s)	Countries	Dimension reduction	Forms			
			Ethnic	Civic	Cultural	Others
				European *Great power civic*: currency, defense, homeland, pride, sovereignty, symbols *Welfare civic*: political and legal system, rights and duties, social security system, free movement and residence, currency, defense	civilization, ancestry, history and destiny, cultural diversity	
European Identity						
Pichler (2008)	N = 9 European sample	Confirmatory factor analysis		*Political:* political and legal system, rights and duties, social security system, free movement and residence, defense, pride, homeland, sovereignty, currency, symbols	*Cultural:* civilization, society, ancestry	
71.3 (2009) *(Pre-quest: People differ in what they think it means to be (NATIONALITY). In your view, among the following, what do you think are the most important characteristics to be (NATIONALITY)?)* *"And in terms of being European, among the following, what do you think are the most important characteristics?"* 1. To be a Christian (**religion**) 2. To share European cultural traditions (**cultural traditions**) 3. To be born in Europe (**born**) 4. To have at least one European parent (**ancestry**) 5. To feel European (**feel**) 6. To master any European language, in addition to your own language (**language**) 7. To exercise citizens' rights, for example voting in the European elections (**citizen rights**) 8. To have been brought up in a European country (**residence**) 9. Being active in any association or organization involving other EU citizens (**participation**)						
Schlenker (2013)	N = 27 European sample	Confirmatory factor analysis	*Ethnic:* ancestry	*Civic:* participation, citizen rights	*Cultural:* cultural traditions, history	

national identity in some exhibitions (Koos 2012), whereas it is assigned to the civic form in others (Björklund 2006). In summary, all of these methodological concerns raise doubts about the comparability of distribution, determinants, and consequences of specific forms.

Determinants of Forms of National and European Identity

Within micro-level determinants, higher age and religiosity have a positive relation with ethnic forms across all studies. Less educated and people from lower social status also favor ethnic forms (Haller and Ressler 2006). In contrast, higher education, younger age, and experiences abroad are found to reduce ethnic forms of national identity (Jones and Smith 2001; Kunovich 2009). National pride (Ariely 2019), identification with the nation, higher levels of in-group trust, and anti-immigrant attitudes also positively correlate with the ethnic form (Wegscheider and Nezi 2021). Vlachová and Hamplová (2023) found no evidence that the increasing share of Muslim and immigrant population in countries influences the importance of cultural national identity.

Notably, some determinants influence the civic form similarly. Right-wing ideology and religiosity also foster the civic form of national identity (Haller and Ressler 2006; Guglielmi and Vezzoni 2016). Higher education and higher social status (Kunovich 2009), as well as left-wing ideology (Guglielmi and Vezzoni 2016) reduce the importance of the civic form of national identity. People at higher ages tend to give higher importance to all criteria, whereas people with university degrees tend to give less importance (Jayet 2012). This indicates that socioeconomic differences tend to influence the overall importance of social boundaries instead of specific forms.

Only two studies concern determinants of forms of European identity. The ethnic and civic forms of European identity are both positively influenced by national and European identification, higher levels of in-group trust, and anti-immigrant attitudes. Additionally, identification with the world reduces ethnic national and European conceptions (Wegscheider and Nezi 2021).

European civility positively correlates with female gender, age, religiosity, living in small towns, right self-placement on the political spectrum, higher education, EU knowledge, and experiences abroad. In this article, a common ancestry factor for national and European levels is derived. The importance of this criterion is fostered by higher age, living in a small town, being part of the working class, religiosity, being born in the country or in another EU state, and right self-placement on the political spectrum (Guglielmi and Vezzoni 2016). Strikingly, right self-placement seems to foster an overall ethnic and civility on the national and European level alike.

The most important finding is that the same determinants on the micro level seem to foster both ethnic and civic forms of national identity alike. Generally, the more socially vulnerable (being older, lower educated, having no experiences abroad) tend to give higher importance to ethnic and civic criteria alike to narrow the in-group. In contrast, at the European level, the importance of civic aspects of European identity seems to be stronger among the more privileged citizens of Europe.

Consequences of Forms of National and European Identity

Two major branches of research on consequences could be distinguished: attitudes toward out-groups and political attitudes.

Attitudes toward Out-Group Members

Ethnic national identity fosters anti-immigrant attitudes (Kunovich 2009; Taniguchi 2021), negative attitudes towards Muslims (Simonsen and Bonikowsi 2019) and xenophobia (Janmaat 2006). In most studies, civic national identity has a reducing effect on Xenophobia (Hjerm 1998) and anti-immigrant attitudes (Pehrson, Vignoles, and Brown 2009, Simonsen and Bonikowski 2019). However, it also shows positive relations to anti-immigrant attitudes (Janmaat 2006) and xenophobia (Taniguchi 2021) in some studies. Kunovich (2009) finds that a commitment to the ethnic as well as civic form of national identity is associated with restrictive sentiments concerning

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

immigrants, preferences for assimilation, and following national interest in international politics. A preference for civic national identity is related to less restrictive sentiments for those indicators (Kunovich 2009). Wamsler (2023) found that the ethnic form is a negative predictor of trust in strangers (for individuals living in more civic-oriented nations), which also applies for the civic form (although not as strong).

All in all, the theoretically assumed exclusiveness of an ethnic identity proves to be true for all research results reviewed here. However, the effects of civic national identity seem to be ambivalent.

Political Attitudes

Civic national identity correlates positively while ethnic national identity correlates negatively with trust in political institutions (Berg and Hjerm 2010). Ethnic national identity fosters patriotism and nationalism, but the civic form inhibits both (Ariely 2020). Rating all criteria of belonging high (Exclusivists) is shown to be positively related to national attachment, general and domain-specific pride, and national chauvinism, whereas rating all of them low (Pluralist) is negatively related to them (May 2023). Domm (2004) finds that both political and cultural national pride increase support for European integration. Emphasizing national and European ancestry reduces while emphasizing European civility increases identification with Europe (Segatti and Guglielmi 2016). In line with this finding, people giving low importance to all criteria of national belonging show only average EU support, whereas people with high levels of civic and low levels of ethnic connotations showed the highest support for EU (Aichholzer, Kritzinger, and Plescia 2021). One study finds that both achieved and ascribed national identity reduce support for the EU (Serriochio and Belluci 2016). One study demonstrates that the civic form of European identity has a strong positive, the cultural a moderate positive, and the ethnic a negative relation with cosmopolitan attitudes (Schlenker 2013).

In conclusion, most articles indicate that people defining their national group in mainly civic terms tend to support the idea of the EU more than people who give importance to ethnic criteria in national identity.

Conclusion, Discussion, and Outlook

This research note reviewing literature captured cross-national studies on forms of national and/or European identity in Europe based on international surveys from 1995 to 2023. Overall, the majority of articles scrutinized forms of national identity solely, but only a few focused on the European or both levels at the same time, revealing a gap in the existing literature.

Most studies about forms of national identity empirically derived the well-known ethnic–civic dichotomy, but only a few find additional forms, such as a cultural form, when supplementing the ISSP measure with other items (Shulman 2002; Koning 2011). In the few articles concerning the European level, the most common distinction relates to a civic–cultural dichotomy (Ruiz-Jiménez et al. 2004; Pichler 2008; Koos 2012; Schlenker 2013). However, in most of these articles (Ruiz-Jiménez et al. 2004; Pichler 2008; Koos 2012) the cultural form often contains items that are typically classified as ethnic in other studies, such as ancestry. No study empirically derived a possible socioeconomic form, although some of them reveal items that might contribute to such a form. In conclusion, cultural and socioeconomic aspects seem to interweave with the more prominent approaches (e.g., welfare-civic; Koos 2012).

Regarding determinants and consequences, the main finding is that the ethnic and the civic form are sometimes influenced in the same way by the same variables and sometimes have similar consequences, which contradicts the common expectation that both forms have different effects on political attitudes. This might be rooted in the different allocation of specific items to various forms. Another explanation could be that respondents who favor ethnic notions of nationhood do so by

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also embracing civic conceptions (Helbling, Reeskens, and Wright 2016). Last, the possibility that these shortcomings might be rooted in the measurement instruments has to be considered.

In nearly all articles, the *true national/European* battery was employed. Two major concerns can be summarized:

Concerns with the question: Most importantly, by asking about criteria of belonging, this measurement tool does not necessarily account for personal identification. It is not clear whether respondents rate the importance of specific items based on their personal affection or evaluation or according to the perceived collective importance. In countries with descent principle (*ius sanguinis)*, the importance of having ancestry to become a citizen is structurally high—even if the ethnic component of national/European identity has no personal importance for the respondents.

Concerns with items: Another concern is the lack of measurement invariance, indicating that the items inherit different meanings across different countries. Further, the inconsistent allocation of the same items to different forms between the analyzed articles and the reported issues with cross-loadings indicate the ambivalence or two-dimensionality of some items.

Recent person-centered approaches of latent class analysis (May 2023; Simonsen & Bonikowski 2019) try to overcome these issues. They also reveal that some respondents rank all criteria low and some rank all criteria high and that certain ideal types act similar to the ethnic–civic dichotomy by emphasizing ethnic or civic criteria over the other. This indicates that the question measures two underlying aspects. First, it measures the degree of exclusiveness respondents emphasize regarding membership criteria. Second, it measures the importance of different aspects according to ethnic and civic conceptions.

How could research improve the measurement of forms of national/European identity? Some suggestions are as follows:

(1) One possible way could be to move away from the rating of in-group criteria. An alternative approach might ask respondents about their own identification based on certain aspects of their country/Europe. Respondents might be asked how different aspects (e.g., "the constitution of [COUNTRY]") affect their own attachment (e.g., increasing or decreasing it). This would allow for a clearer distinction between the personal relevance of certain aspects or the perceived collective importance.

(3) Existing measures should take more items into consideration that might account for additional shades of national/European identity. For example, some studies suggest the existence of additional cultural and socioeconomic forms. Some aspects seem to interweave with established forms of identity, but they could as well constitute a separate form, if enough items are integrated to allow for adequate analysis.

(3) Existing items should be more specific to reduce the problem of different interpretations. Items concerning language and culture are probably known as best examples (Brubaker 2004), as both of them can be understood in civic, ethnic, or cultural terms.
Distinguishing between ethnocultural meanings (e.g., national traditions and customs, cultural heritage) and more value-based connotations (e.g., socially liberal values) might offer a more nuanced perspective.

(4) Existing items should avoid carrying different stimuli. One example is the item "to respect institutions and laws," as it could produce opposing reactions for different people because both constructs in this item can be fundamentally distinct and therefore carry different meanings. It can be associated with respect for the constitution and democracy as ideals, which seem to be indicators for a civic form—because without it, one can hardly speak of a civic identity. Yet, respondents could also associate it with the functioning of the institutions and laws, which some might evaluate as good but others might perceive as bad and therefore emphasize or reject it as a component of identity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(5) A further suggestion is to separate items concerning political ideas from items concerning their realization. Respondents might identify with the principle of democratic values but not identify with the realization of them.

Even recent studies have to rely on relatively out-of-date survey data. In the most recent ISSP 2023 National Identity and Citizenship module the true-national battery has not received any innovation, but some recently included questions (e.g., concerning the possibility to become "truly [NATIONALITY]," where respondents must choose between two fictional persons with different traits) might be promising.

Only a few articles are based on cross-national data after the refugee crisis in 2015 (Wegscheider and Nezi 2021; Voicu and Ramia 2021). Available surveys also lack theoretically relevant correlates. Concerning determinants, most studies rely on sociodemographic variables exclusively. Social-psychological and right-wing populism research may contribute further correlates of potential forms of national and European identity such as perceptions of distributive or procedural justice (Tyler and Blader 2003), the fit between the individuals' and the groups' values and norms (Hogg 2000), economic deprivation (Rippl and Seipel 2018), or welfare chauvinism/ populism (van der Waal et al. 2010). Regarding consequences, no article was found concerning questions of social cohesion. Investigating the connections between forms of identity and solidarity between citizens of the EU or toward outward groups seems to be promising.

In summary, future research should try to overcome relying on the rating of perceived group criteria as an indicator for forms of national and European identity. Research should be encouraged to test new measurement tools that include more aspects of national/European identification and test them alongside relevant theoretical variables.

As globalization progresses and global challenges arise, one necessary step is to understand what constitutes feelings of togetherness. Being able to empirically capture the complexity of national and European identity might be a cornerstone to comprehend under which conditions social cohesion emerges.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and editors for their valuable feedback. Special thanks go to Prof. Dr. Bettina Westle and my other colleagues of the EUNIDES project for their support on writing this article.

Disclosure. None.

Financial support. This work was funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF)).
(Grant number: 01 UG2111).

Note

1 Google Scholar, Web of Science, Sage Pub, Elsevier, Scopus, JSTOR

References

Aichholzer, Julian, Sylvia Kritzinger, and Carolina Plescia. 2021. "National Identity Profiles and Support for the European Union." *European Union Politics* 22 (2): 293–315.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Arant, Regina, Georgi Dragolov, and Klaus Boehnke. 2017. *Sozialer Zusammenhalt in Deutschland 2017*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann Stiftung.

Ariely, Gal. 2013. "Nationhood across Europe: The Civic–Ethnic Framework and the Distinction between Western and Eastern Europe." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 14 (1): 123–143.

Ariely, Gal. 2019. "The Nexus between Globalization and Ethnic Identity: A View from Below." *Ethnicities* 19 (5): 763–783.

Ariely, Gal. 2020. "Measuring Dimensions of National Identity across Countries: Theoretical and Methodological Reflections." *National Identities* 22 (3): 265–282.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ariely, Gal. 2021. "National Identity and Globalization: Findings from Cross-National Surveys." In *Globalisation, Cultural Identity and Nation-Building—The Changing Paradigms, Globalisation, Comparative Education and Policy Research*, vol. 23, edited by J. Zajda and S. Majhanovich, 17–35. Berlin: Springer Nature.

Berg, Linda, and Mikael Hjerm. 2010. "National Identity and Political Trust." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 11 (4): 390–407.

Bergbauer, Stephanie. 2017. *Explaining European Identity Formation: Citizens' Attachment from Maastricht Treaty to Crisis*. Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing AG.

Best, Heinrich. 2009. "History Matters: Dimensions and Determinants of National Identities among European Populations and Elites." *Europe-Asia Studies* 61 (6): 921–941.

Björklund, Fredrika. 2006. "The East European 'Ethnic Nation'—Myth or Reality?" *European Journal of Political Research* 45: 91–121.

Blank, Thomas, and Peter Schmidt. 2003. "National Identity in a United Germany: Nationalism or Patriotism? An Empirical Test with Representative Data." *Political Psychology* 24 (2): 289–312.

Brown, David. 1999. "Are There Good and Bad Nationalisms?" *Nations and Nationalism* 5 (2): 281–302.

Brubaker, Roger. 2004. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruter, Michael. 2004a. "Civic and Cultural Components of a European Identity: A Pilot Model of Measurement of Citizens' Levels of European Identity." In *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU*, edited by R. K. Herrmann, T. Risse, and M. B. Brewer, 186–213. Lanahm, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bruter, Michael. 2004b. "On What Citizens Mean by Feeling 'European': Perceptions of News, Symbols and Borderlessness." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30 (1): 21–39.

Canan, Coscun, and Mara K. Simon. 2019. "Immigration, Diversity and the Relevance of Ascriptive Characteristics in Defining National Identity across 21 Countries and 28 West-German Districts." *Migration Studies* 7 (2): 201–219.

Canovan, Margaret. 1996. *Nationhood and Political Theory*. Cheltenham: Elgar.

Clark, Nicholas J., and Robert Rohrschneider. 2019. "The Relationship between National Identity and European Union Evaluations 1993–2017." *European Union Politics* 20 (3): 384–405.

David, Ohad, and Daniel Bar-Tal. 2009. "A Sociopsychological Conception of Collective Identity: The Case of National Identity as an Example." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 13 (4): 354–379.

Delanty, Gerard. 2005. "What Does It Mean to Be a 'European'?" *Innovation* 18 (1): 11–22.

Dennison, James, Eldad Davidov, and Daniel Seddig. 2020. "Explaining Voting in the UK's 2016 EU Referendum: Values, Attitudes to Immigration, European Identity and Political Trust." *Social Science Research* 92:article 102476.

Ditlmann, Ruth K., and Johannes Kopf-Beck. 2019. "The Meaning of Being German: An Inductive Approach to National Identity." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 7 (1): 423–447.

Domm, Rory. 2004. "Explaining Public Support for European Integration in Eight Member States: A Battle for the Hearts as Well as the Minds of Europe's Citizens." PhD diss., European University Institute. http://hdl.handle.net/1814/5252

Duchesne, Sophie, and André-Paul Frognier. 1995. "Is There a European Identity?" In *Public Opinion and Internationalized Governance*, edited by Oskar Niedermayer and Richard Sinnot, 193–226. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Eder, Klaus. 2004. "The Two Faces of Europeanization: Synchronizing a Europe Moving at Varying Speeds." *Time and Society* 13 (1): 89–107.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel Noah, and Bernhard Giesen. 1995. "The Construction of Collective Identity." *European Journal of Sociology* 36 (1): 72–102.

Estel, Bernd. 1997. "Moderne Nationsverständnisse: Nation als Gemeinschaft." In *Kollektive Identität in Krisen. Ethnizität in Religion, Nation, Europa*, edited by Robert Hettlage, Petra Deger, and Susanne Wagner, 73–85. Opladen:Westdeutscher Verlag.

Evans, Mariah, and Jonathan Kelley. 2002. "National Pride in the Developed World: Survey Data from 24 Nations." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 14 (3): 303–338.

Francis, Emerich. 1965. *Ethnos und Demos: Soziologische Beiträge zur Volkstheorie*. Berlin: Duncker and Humblot.

Gernand, Lukas. 2018. "Euroskeptizismus." In *Europasoziologie*, edited by Maurizio Bach and Barbara Hönig, 301–311. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Giesen, Bernhard. 1993. *Die Intellektuellen und die Nation*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Giesen, Bernhard, and Kay Junge. 1991. "Vom Patriotismus zum Nationalismus." In *Nationale und kulturelle Identität*, edited by Bernhard Giesen, 255–303. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Guglielmi, Simona, and Cristiano Vezzoni. 2016. "Meanings of National and European Identities." In *European Identity in the Context of National Identity: Questions of Identity in Sixteen European Countries in the Wake of the Financial Crisis*, edited by Bettina Westle and Paolo Segatti, 140–164. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haller, Max, and Regina Ressler. 2006. "National and European Identity: A Study of Their Meanings and Interrelationships." *Presses De Sciences Po* 4 (47): 817–850.

Heath, Anthony, Martin Jean, and Thees Spreckelsen. 2009. "Cross-National Comparability of Survey Attitudes Measures." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 21 (3): 293–315.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Helbling, Mark, Tim Reeskens, and Mark Wright. 2016. "The Mobilisation of Identities: A Study on the Relationship between Elite Rhetoric and Public Opinion on National Identity in Developed Democracies." *Nations and Nationalism* 22 (4): 744–767.
Hjerm, Mikael. 1998. "National Identity: A Comparison of Sweden, Germany and Australia." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 24 (3): 451–469.
Hjerm, Mikael. 2003. "National Sentiments in Eastern and Western Europe." *Nationalities Papers* 31 (4): 413–429.
Hogg, Michael A. 2000. "Subjective Uncertainty Reduction through Self-Categorization: A Motivational Theory of Social Identity Processes." *European Review of Social Psychology* 11:223–255.
Hogg, Michael A., and Scott A. Reid. 2006. "Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms." *Communication Theory* 16:7–30.
Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks. 2004. "Does Identity or Economic Rationality Drive Public Opinion on European Integration?" *Political Science and Politics* 37 (7): 415–420.
Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks. 2009. "A Postfunctionalist Theory of European Integration: From Permissive Consensus to Constraining Dissensus." *British Journal of Political Science* 39 (1): 1–23.
Huddy, Leonie. 2001. "From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory." *Political Psychology* 22:127–156.
Huddy, Leonie. 2016. "Unifying National Identity Research." In *Dynamics of National Identity: Media and Societal Factors of What We Are* edited by Jürgen Grimm, Leonie Huddy, Peter Schmidt, and Josef Seethaler, 9–21. London: Routledge,
Ignatieff, Michael. 1994. *Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism*. New York: Macmillan.
Inglehart, Ronald F., and Pippa Norris. 2016. *Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School.
Isernia, Pierangelo, Irena Fiket, Fabbio Serricchio, and Bettina Westle. 2012. "But Still It Does Not Move: Functional and Identity-Based Determinants of European Identity." In *Citizens and the European Polity: Mass Attitudes towards the European and National Polities* edited by David Sanders, Pedro Magalhaes, and Gabor Tóka, 110–139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Janmaat, Jan Germen. 2006. "Popular Conceptions of Nationhood in Old and New European Member States: Partial Support for the Ethnic-Civic Framework." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29 (1): 50–78.
Jayet, Cyril. 2012. "The Ethnic-Civic Dichotomy and the Explanation of National Self-Understanding." *European Journal of Sociology* 53 (1): 65–95.
Jones, Frank L., and Philip Smith. 2001. "Diversity and Commonality in National Identities: An Exploratory Analysis of Cross-National Patterns." *Journal of Sociology* 37 (1): 45–63.
Kaina, Viktoria. 2012. "How to Reduce Disorder in European Identity Research?" *European Political Science* 12:184–196.
Kohn, Hans. 1944. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*. New York: MacMillan Press.
Koning, Edward A. 2011. "Ethnic and Civic Dealings with Newcomers: Naturalization Policies and Practices in Twenty-Six Immigration Countries." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34 (11): 1974–1994.
Koos, Agnes Katalin. 2012. "Common Origin, Common Power, or Common Life: The Changing Landscape of Nationalisms." *Open Journal of Political Science* 2 (3): 45–58.
Kosterman, Rick, and Seymour Feshbach. 1989. "Toward a Measure of Patriotic and Nationalistic Attitudes." *International Society of Political Psychology* 10 (2): 257–274.
Kunovich, Robert M. 2009. "The Sources and Consequences of National Identification." *American Sociological Review* 74 (4): 573–593.
Kuzio, Taras. 2002. "The Myth of the Civic State: A Critical Survey of Hans Kohn's Framework for Understanding Nationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25 (1): 20–39.
Kymlicka, Will. 1999. "Misunderstanding Nationalism." In *Theorizing Nationalism*, edited by Ronald Beiner, 131–140. Albany: State University of New York Press.
La Barbera, Francesco, Pia Cariota Ferrara, and Mihaela Boza. 2014. "Where Are We Coming from versus Who We Will Become: The Effect of Priming Different Contents of European Identity on Cooperation." *International Journal of Psychology* 49 (6): 480–487.
Larsen, Christian Albrekt. 2021. "National Identity across Two Dimensions." In *National Identity and Social Cohesion* edited by Nils Holtug, and Eric M. Uslaner, 31–46. Lanham, MD: ECPR Press.
Lichtenstein, Dennis. 2014. *Europäische Identitäten. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung der Medienöffentlichkeiten ost- und westeuropäischer EU-Länder*. München: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft mbH.
May, Antonia. 2023. "And If They Don't Dance, They Are No Friends of Mine: Exploring Boundaries of National Identity." *Nations and Nationalism* 29 (2): 579–597.
Meinecke, Friedrich. 1908. *Wetlbürgertum und Nationalstaat. Studien zur Genesis des Deutschen Nationalstaates*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag.
Meinecke, Friedrich. 1970. *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*, vol. 10, translated by Robert B. Kimer. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Miller, David. 2000. *Citizenship and National Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Miller, David, and Sundas Ali. 2014. "Testing the National Identity Argument." *European Political Science Review* 6 (2): 237–259.

Mohler, Peter Ph., and Hartmut Götze. 1992. "Worauf sind die Deutschen stolz?" In *Blickpunkt Gesellschaft 2—Einstellungen der Bundesbürger in Ost und West*, edited by Peter Ph. Mohler and Wolfgang Bandilla, 45–63. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Mudde, Cas. 2007. *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nielsen, Kai. 1999. "Cultural Nationalism, Neither Ethnic nor Civic." In *Theorizing Nationalism*, edited by Ronald Beiner, 119–130. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pehrson, Samuel, Vivian L Vignoles, and Rupert Brown. 2009. "National Identification and Anti-Immigrant Prejudice: Individual and Contextual Effects of National Definitions." *Social Psychology Quarterly* (72): 24–38.

Pichler, Florian. 2008. "European Identities from Below: Meanings of Identification with Europe." *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 9 (4): 411–430.

Plescia, Carolina, Jean-François Daoust, and André Blais. 2021. "Do European Elections Enhance Satisfaction with European Union Democracy?" *European Union Politics* 22 (1): 94–113.

Reeskens, Tim, and Marc Hooghe. 2010. "Beyond the Civic-Ethnic Dichotomy: Investigating the Structure of Citizenship Concepts across Thirty-Three Countries." *Nations and Nationalism* 16 (4): 579–597.

Rippl, Susanne, and Christian Seipel. 2018. "Modernisierungsverlierer, Cultural Backlash, Postdemokratie. Was erklärt Rechtspopulistische Orientierungen?" *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 70:237–254.

Roccas, Sonia, and Andrey Elster. 2012. "Group Identities." In *The Oxford Handbook of Intergroup Conflict*, 1st edition, edited by Linda R. Tropp, 106–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rose, Richard. 1985. "National Pride in Cross-National Perspective." *International Social Science Journal* 37 (1): 85–96.

Ruiz Jiménez, Antonia M., Jaroslaw Józef Górniak, Maren Kandulla, Paszkal Kiss, and Ankica Kosic. 2004. "European and National Identities in EU's Old and New Member States: Ethnic, Civic, Instrumental and Symbolic Components." *European Integration Online Papers*, 8 (11).

Rusciano, Frank. 2003. "The Construction of National Identity: A 23-Nation Study." *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (3): 361–366. DOI:10.2307/3219795.

Schatz, Robert T., Ervin Staub, and Howard Lavine. 1999. "On the Varieties of National Attachment: Blind versus Constructive Patriotism." *Political Psychology* 20 (1):151–74. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792008.

Schlenker, Andrea. 2013. "Cosmopolitan Europeans or Partisans of Fortress Europe? Supranational Identity Patterns in the EU." *Global Society* 27 (1):25–51.

Segatti, Paolo, and Simona Guglielmi. 2016. "Unpacking the Components of National Identity and Their Effects on Identification with Europe." In *European Identity in the Context of National Identity: Questions of Identity in Sixteen European Countries in the Wake of the Financial Crisis*, edited by Bettina Westle and Paolo Segatti, 165–191. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Serricchio, Fabio, and Paolo Bellucci. 2016. "The Consequences of European Identity." In *European Identity in the Context of National Identity: Questions of Identity in Sixteen European Countries in the Wake of the Financial Crisis*, edited by Bettina Westle and Paolo Segatti, 272–290. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shaw, Jo. 1997. "European Citizenship: The IGC and Beyond." *European Integration Online Papers* 1 (3): 1–24. http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/1997-003a.htm

Shulman, Stephen. 2002. "Challenging the Ethnic/Civic and West/East Dichotomies in the Study of Nationalism." *Comparative Political Studies* 35 (5): 554–585.

Simonsen, Kristina Bakkær, and Bart Bonikowski. 2019. "Is Civic Nationalism Necessarily Inclusive? Conceptions of Nationhood and Anti-Muslim Attitudes in Europe." *European Journal of Political Research* 59 (1): 114–136.

Smith, Anthony D. 1991. *National Identity*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.

Smith, Tom W. 2007. "Social Identity and Socio-Demographic Structure." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 19 (3): 380–390.

Solt, Frederick. 2011. "Diversionary Nationalism: Economic Inequality and the Formation of National Pride." *The Journal of Politics* 73 (3): 821–830.

Tajfel, Henri. 1974. "Social Identity and Intergroup Behavior." *Social Science Information* 13 (2): 65–93.

Tajfel, Henri. 1982. *Gruppenkonflikt und Vorurteil. Entstehung und Funktion sozialer Stereotypen*. Bern: Huber.

Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. 1979. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict." In *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel, 33–47. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tamir, Yael. 1993. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taniguchi, Hiromi. 2021. "National Identity, Cosmopolitanism, and Attitudes toward Immigrants." *International Sociology* 36 (6): 819–843.

Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. 2009. *Who Counts as American? The Boundaries of National Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, John C., Michel A. Hogg, Penelope J. Oakes, Stephen D. Reicher, and Margaret S. Wetherell. 1987. *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2023.66 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tyler, Tom R., and Steven L. Blader. 2003. "The Group Engagement Model: Procedural Justice, Social Identity, and Cooperative Behavior." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 7:349–361.

van der Waal, Jeroen, Peter Achterberg, Dick Houtman, Willem de Koster, and Katerina Manevska. 2010. "Some Are More Equal than Others: Economic Egalitarianism and Welfare Chauvinism in the Netherlands." *Journal of European Social Policy* 20 (4): 350–363.

Vlachová, Klára, and Dana Hamplová. 2023. "The Importance of Christianity, Customs, and Traditions in the National Identities of European Countries." *Social Science Research* 112:article 102801.

Voicu, Malina, and Ioana Ramia. 2021. "European Identity: An Analysis of Measurement Equivalence across Countries and Mode of Data Collection in the European Values Survey 2017/2018." *Social Indicators Research* 154:815–834.

Wamsler, Steffen. 2023. "Dimensions of Social Trust and National Identity: Addressing a Multifaceted Relationship." *Nations and Nationalism* 29 (2): 598–617.

Wegscheider, Carsten, and Roula Nezi. 2021. "Who Belongs to ›the People‹? The Societal Boundaries of National and European Notions of Citizenship." In *Democratic Citizenship in Flux*, edited by Markus Bayer, Oliver Schwarz, and Toralf Stark, 173–192. New York: Columbia University Press.

Westle, Bettina. 2003a. "Europäische Identifikation im Spannungsfeld regionaler und nationaler Identitäten. Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Befunde." *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 44 (4): 453–482.

Westle, Bettina. 2003b. "Universalismus oder Abgrenzung als Komponente der Identifikation mit der Europäischen Union?" In *Europäische Integration in der öffentlichen Meinung, Opladen: Leske and Budrich*, edited by Frank Brettschneider, Jan van Deth, and Edeltraud Roller, 115–152). Wiesbaden: Verlag

Westle, Bettina, and Roman Graf Buchheim. 2016. "National and European Identification—Their Relationship and Its Determinants." In *European Identity in the Context of National Identity: Questions of Identity in Sixteen European Countries in the Wake of the Financial Crisis*, edited by Bettina Westle and Paolo Segatti, 93–139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, Matthw, Jack Citrin, and Jonathan Wand. 2012. "Alternative Measures of American National Identity: Implications for the Civic-Ethnic Distinction." *Political Psychology* 33 (4): 469–482.

Cite this article: König, P. 2024. Forms of National and European Identity: A Research Note Reviewing Literature of Cross-National Studies. *Nationalities Papers* 52: 707–734, doi:10.1017/nps.2023.66