

Marc Hooghe & Dieter Stiers

Regional Identity and Support for Restrictive Attitudes on Immigration. Evidence From A Household Population Survey in Ghent (Belgium)

Ethnic and Racial Studies, forthcoming

© Ethnic and Racial Studies

Abstract

It has been argued that supporting a restrictive view on the inclusion of immigrants finds its origin in a distinct and localized feeling of group identity. We test this hypothesis with a household survey that was conducted in the Belgian city of Ghent (n= 3,735). The results show that local and national identities are salient, but also that regional, European, and cosmopolitan identities are supported simultaneously. The analyses suggest that especially the regional, Flemish identity is strongly associated with a restrictive, ethnic attitude toward new groups in society. A European identity, on the other hand, was not significantly associated with this restrictive attitude. Our conclusion is that not just the geographical scale of group identity is important in explaining anti-immigrant sentiment. The specific historical and cultural connotations of every geographical level should be considered. A comparison between generations, i.e. parents and their late adolescent children, suggests that this association between specific group identities and ethnic citizenship norms is equally present among younger age cohorts.

Keywords: Regional Identity, Local Identity, Belgium, Ghent Study, Common Ingroup Identity

Introduction

According to social identity theory, negative attitudes toward outsider groups mostly find their origin in a strong attachment to the in-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Given the endemic high levels of anti-immigrant sentiments in European societies, it becomes all the more important to understand how in-group identity contributes to a negative attitude toward outsiders (Simonsen & Bonikowski, 2020). Most of the current research is focused on national identity as a form of in-group identification, implicitly taking for granted that it is the most prevalent and strongest form of in-group identity (Yogeeswaran & Dasgupta, 2014; McAllister, 2018). These studies usually confirm the hypothesis that a strong attachment to the nation-state is associated with restrictive attitudes toward outsiders. The main goal of this paper is to ascertain to what extent this exclusive focus on national identity is still valid in the current era, that is defined by the adherence to multi-layered forms of citizenship (Yuval-Davis, 1999). Citizens are not just defined by one specific ingroup-membership, but they actively combine different group-based identities, based on local, regional and national forms of identity (Benhabib, 2004). The literature does not yet allow us to determine what specific level of identity is most strongly associated with restrictive feelings toward outsider groups.

Especially the role of regional identities has grown more important in the recent era. In various Western societies, there is a trend to stress regional identities, and it is not clear what this implies for immigration attitudes (Anderson & McGregor, 2016). In the case of Catalan regional identity in Spain, adhering to a regional identity is associated with a more open attitude to immigrants, compared to an adherence to the national, Spanish level (Wilson-Daily, Kimmelmeier & Prats, 2018). In the United States, on the other hand, it has been shown that support for a Southern identity within the United States (i.e., identifying with the Southern states of the US), is associated with a more restrictive attitude toward immigration (Hackett, Rast & Hohman, forthcoming). It does remain an ongoing discussion, therefore, whether sub-national identities (regional, local, ...) are associated with a more positive or negative attitude toward immigrants.

In this paper, we contribute to the literature in four distinct ways. First, we acknowledge the fact that citizens are not just defined by one specific level of in-group identity, but that they combine various levels of geographic identity. While this insight has been well developed in postcolonial thinking, it has hardly been addressed in social psychological work (see however Verkuyten et al., 2019). Therefore, we analyse data from a culturally divided society like Belgium, where national and regional identities are strongly present. Second, we also include

European identity as an in-group identity, thus contributing to the debate whether or not European identity contributes to a more hostile attitude toward non-European immigrants (Luedtke, 2005). Third, we contribute to the literature by also including the concept of a local identity, that is routinely overlooked in this line of research, despite the fact that various studies have shown that local identities clearly remain present. Finally, by investigating the differences between age-groups, we can ascertain whether younger age groups are indeed more at ease in accepting cultural and ethnic diversity (McLaren & Paterson, 2020).

Literature

A classic approach in the literature is that different in-group identities will lead to more or less restrictive attitudes toward immigration (Brubaker, 1992). Citizens, indeed, use different criteria to allow others access to the community, and not all of these criteria are equally accessible to immigrants (Bloemraad, 2006). Traditionally, the literature makes a distinction between civic and ethnic requirements for full integration. While ethnic citizenship is based on birth or ancestry, civic citizenship can be seen as a more permeable citizenship requirement, as it is based on attitudes and behaviours which can be acquired by newcomers (Delanty, 1997). Although the distinction between civic and ethnic citizenship requirements has been challenged (Reijerse et al., 2013; Verkuyten & Martinov, 2015), it is important to note that societies tend to develop distinct criteria to allow immigrants into their society (Reeskens & Hooghe, 2010). Holding on to ethnic criteria for full inclusion constitutes a barrier for new groups. Understanding why inclusion criteria are more or less inclusive, therefore, is important to understand the dynamics of cultural and ethnic diversity within European societies (Koning, 2011). To some degree, there are distinct cultural differences across societies, as a result of a country's history and cultural legacy (Shulman, 2002). Opposition against immigration at least partly finds its origin in notions of identity, and the potential threat to this established collective identity (Ariely, 2012). Therefore, we investigate whether the self-identification of an individual determines her/his attitudes on immigration (Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009).

Given the current trends toward a more salient regional identity, especially in some divided societies, it becomes all the more important to understand what kind of identity citizens consider to be most important. In contrast to earlier studies we do not assume that citizens adhere to just one identity, but that they combine different identities (Landberg et al., 2018). Feeling close to a traditional, close-knit community should make it harder for immigrants to be

accepted in that community, while the opposite holds for more cosmopolitan forms of community (Hjerm, 1998).

Investigating the relationship between national and regional identity and immigration attitudes is important, because the older literature has a reputation of applying a rather essentialist view on group identities (Pehrson, Brown & Zagefka, 2009). Brubaker (1992), e.g., tends to assume that there is something like a 'quintessential' German or French identity, which is widely shared. Group identities have become more complex and multi-layered in contemporary society, and the notion that citizens can only have one, or one dominant form of group identity, is by now considered to be obsolete (Benhabib, 2004). Even if we stick to the traditional Brubaker example: citizens of Germany are not just Germans, they can also feel proud to be a Berliner, or they might identify as a citizen of Europe. Within the literature, it has been suggested that citizens combine different layers of group identity, and these identities may have different consequences for the attitudes toward cultural diversity. Diverse societies, like Canada or Belgium, offer an ideal test-case to test his relation, as citizens in these countries are more frequently confronted with different group identities (Breton, 1998). As far as we know, this paper is the first to apply the notion of multiple and overlapping group identities to investigate the relation between collective identity and attitudes toward immigration. Some authors assume a linear geographical pattern: the more localized a group identity, the more likely it is that citizens will adopt a restrictive attitude toward new groups. Abstract and universal notions of group identity, on the other hand would be associated with a more open, cosmopolitan attitude (Pehrson, Vignoles & Brown, 2009; Esses, Dovidio, Semenya & Jackson, 2005). Not all authors, however, agree with this assumed linear relation between the geographical scale of one's identity, and the openness toward diversity. Community studies have drawn attention to the fact that the local level of the neighbourhood or the city can function as a real-life cosmopolitan laboratory, where diverse groups shape a new, diverse urban community (Blokland, 2017; Driel & Verkuyten, forthcoming). A strong orientation toward this local level might thus function as a more open form of identity and this might make it easier to develop a common ingroup identity at the city level (Gaertner, Dovidio & Bachman, 1996). Further deviating from this strict geographical pattern is the notion that regional identities can be associated with anti-immigrant sentiments. Earlier comparative research suggests that holding on strongly to a regional identity is associated with a more hostile attitude toward diversity (Ariely, 2012). Again, however, this is a disputed claim. These types of regional identities are strong in cases like Scotland, Catalonia, Quebec or the regions of

Belgium, and currently we do not know whether all these regional identities relate in the same manner to restrictive attitudes toward immigrant groups (Escandell & Ceobanu, 2010).

Within the literature there is also disagreement about the role of European identity (Delanty, 1997; Luedtke, 2005). Some authors argue that holding on to a European identity is mainly an instrumental move to highlight the difference with non-European immigrants (Ciulinaru, 2018). Other authors present more positive views of European citizenship, highlighting the fact that this form of identity is open to inhabitants from multiple European societies. As such, European identity might even serve as a stepping stone toward a more international, and tolerant form of identity (Esses et al., 2005; Habermas, 2011).

A more nuanced argument on this relation is based on the argument that while citizens indeed have access to multiple simultaneous identities, they will attach greater importance to some of these (Meeus et al., 2010). This line of research claims that it is not just important to know with what kind of community citizens identify, but also whether this is an 'exclusive' identity, or whether it is shared with other, possibly competing forms of group identity (Esses et al., 2005).

It is a constant finding in the literature that anti-immigrant sentiments are stronger among old age groups (for a review see McLaren and Paterson, 2020), and various hypotheses have been formulated to explain this pattern. Building on the insights of the contact hypothesis theory, it is important to know that younger generations, on average, will have much more experience with cultural diversity than older groups, given the specific demographic characteristics of immigration flows in Western Europe (Vervae, Van Houtte & Stevens, 2018). The expectation therefore is that this will have an enduring effect on their attitudes: "younger cohorts have been socialised in a climate where the presence of 'Others', in this case migrants, is commonplace when compared to previous cohorts (...) Thus, the expectation is that younger cohorts will retain relatively more positive attitudes to immigrants and immigration because of these socialisation effects" (McLaren and Paterson, 2020, p. 668). Following this line of research we expect strong differences between generations.

This overview of the current debate about the relation between distinct identities and restrictive attitudes toward immigrants leads to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Adhering to a small-scale geographical identity is associated with a more restrictive attitude to the inclusion of immigrants.

Hypothesis 2: Adhering to a European identity is associated with a more restrictive attitude to the inclusion of immigrants.

Hypothesis 3: Younger age groups will develop more cosmopolitan forms of identity, resulting in less restrictive attitudes toward immigrant groups.

Data and methods

In order to investigate the relationship between different layers of identity on the one hand, and attitudes toward immigration on the other hand, we need data from a context where these different identities are salient. Furthermore, the survey questionnaire will have to include a rather detailed module on how to conceptualize one's identity. Another consideration is that we also know that especially regional and European identity levels have evolved quite rapidly in recent years. For this reason, it seemed appropriate to also include information on adolescents, whose concept of identity will be more likely to reflect these recent trends (Anderson & McGregor, 2016; Davidov & Semyonov, 2017; Gaertner, Dovidio & Bachman, 1996). Based on these considerations, we opted for a recent and large scale household survey in Belgium. The country is an ideal test-case, as for various historical reasons both regional and European identities are well developed within the population. The fact that we have access to a household survey, allows us to make a difference between the identities of a younger and an older generation. More specifically, our analysis is based on the results of the Ghent Study, a large-scale household survey conducted on the occasion of the local elections in autumn 2018. A unique characteristic of this study is that it includes both adolescents and young adults (aged between 15 and 20), and the generation of their parents. Ghent is a major city in the northern part of the country, and an important centre for education, services and industry. Hence, although the survey was limited to one major city in the Northern part of Belgium (population = 260,000), there is no apparent reason to assume that the population of the city would differ considerably in this respect. The survey was conducted in the city of Ghent, as the municipality intended to encourage political participation of adolescents in politics by granting 16- and 17-year-olds the possibility to vote in a mock election. In order to investigate the effects of this initiative, we were granted access to the official population records. The study is, therefore, not based on a sample, but *all* 11,016 inhabitants of the city between the ages of 15 and 20 were invited to participate as well as one of their parents. Everyone received a written questionnaire, and after two reminders, 21.6 per cent of them responded, resulting in 2,360 valid responses among adolescents. Using a form of snowball recruitment, the adolescents were asked to pass

another questionnaire on to one of their parents. In total, 1,375 parents did fill in the questionnaire leading to a second subsample of parents. These respondents are between the ages of 34 and 78, and they have as a common characteristic that they are the parent of at least one child between the ages of 15 and 20. This unique feature of the Ghent Study allows us to test Hypothesis 3 about the occurrence of difference between generations.

In the analysis, we will use both subsamples of the Ghent Study, with distinct analyses for parents and adolescents. The city of Ghent is a rather typical modern large European city, with large communities from Mediterranean or Eastern European origins. In order to capture the identity and the attitudes of the 'native' population, in the analysis we will limit ourselves to the respondents that were born in Belgium, and from whom we know that both their parents were born in Belgium. This restricts the total sample to 1,550 late adolescents and 1,121 parents. In Online appendix B, we report the same analysis, but this time we include all respondents, resulting in the same conclusions as the findings presented here.

Case Study and Operationalization

Belgium offers an excellent case study to investigate the relation between collective identity and attitudes toward immigration, because regional identities are extremely important in the country (Deschouwer, 2012). A deeply divided society like Belgium provides us with a unique opportunity to analyse the occurrence and the effects of regional identity, and here we can draw a comparison with some of the recent studies on Catalonia and Scotland (Escandell & Ceobanu, 2010). Furthermore, Belgium is one of the founding members of the European Union and there is a high level of support for European integration in the country, and this also allows us to take into account the European level of identity (Hooghe & Marks, 2005). Finally, the fact that we rely on a very local household survey also allows us to measure local identity in a reliable manner.

The fact that the survey is restricted to one major city in the country indeed has a major advantage. The survey questionnaire includes the name of the city, while in other, nation-wide surveys, this is usually referred to in a rather anonymous manner to "your city or municipality". In some surveys, the feeling of national identity is presented as a discrete choice: respondents have to indicate what level of identity is most important for them. In the *Ghent Study*, a respondent could express their adherence to more than one identity. Respondents were thus

asked to indicate how important five different geographical levels of identity were for them, ranging from the city, over the region, and the country to Europe and feeling a citizen of the world. It was relevant to include identification with the city, as Ghent is a major city, with a long historical past (Carson & Danhieux, 1972). The regional identity corresponds to the Flemish identity, as the city is situated in the Flemish region of Belgium. For each of these levels of identity, respondents could indicate the strength of their identification on a scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (very strong). All variables used in the analyses are listed in more detail in Online appendix A.

In this first operationalization of “identity”, we merely use the scores on the different items as they were provided by the respondents. This way of presenting the data, however, is sensitive to the fact that some respondents have a tendency to give a high score to every item, and this could lead to a positive association. It has indeed been suggested that, when presenting a choice-set of group identities, not the absolute *rating* is important, but rather the *ranking* of the different identities (Wright, Citrin, and Wand, 2011). To test the claim that ranking is more important than rating, we have operationalized the same question also in a different manner, by grouping the respondents according to the identity that respondents considered to be the most important, no matter how strong that identity is. For instance, a respondent indicating to identify strongly with the city and weakly with all other levels, receives a score 1 for city and a score 0 for the other identities. A respondent indicating a moderate identification with every level receives score 0 for all identities, as there is not one prevalent identity.

The fact that we have access to five different levels of identification, allows us to investigate the claim that specialising in one specific identity, will lead to more restrictive attitudes (Meeus et al., 2010). We therefore include a “strong identity” variable, distinguishing respondents who give a unique highest score to only one identity (code 1), as opposed to all others (code 0).

As we are interested in the association between identity and restrictive attitudes toward immigrants, we use as dependent variable the support for ethnic citizenship requirements, with criteria as having been born in the country, or even of having parents or ancestors born in the country. The wording of this question is included in the same manner in the European Social Survey since 2002. Ethnic citizenship is traditionally seen as a very restrictive form of entry requirement, as for ethnic minority groups in a country it is out of the question to change their place of birth, let alone the place of birth of their ancestors (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2015). Ethnic citizenship is operationalized in this questionnaire by asking respondents: “(...)

According to you, how important are the following things to be a real Belgian?” Respondents could answer the items “being born in Belgium”, “that your parents are born in Belgium”, and “that your grandparents are born in Belgium” each time using a scale ranging from 0 (“Not at all important”) to 3 (Very important”).

Civic citizenship requirements, on the other hand, are considered to be much more open (Reeskens & Hooghe, 2010). A standard operationalization of this requirement is asking about the capability to learn the language of the host country, and by adapting to the prevailing customs. These were measured with two additional items in the same question and on the same scale as described above: “To speak Dutch or French”, and “To follow the Belgian custom and traditions”.

The expectation is that the five items will form two distinct factors – ethnic and civic citizenship requirements (Reeskens & Hooghe, 2010).¹ To test whether the five items that tap into different notions of citizenship indeed form two latent attitudes, we include all items in an exploratory factor analysis. As we expect two separate factors, we present the results of a rotated analysis in Table 1. These results show that there is a strong factor for the ethnic citizenship notion, as all three items load strongly on this specific factor. The civic items do not load strongly on this factor, which indicates that there are indeed two separate notions of citizenship. However, when we look at the second extracted factor, the loadings of the two civic items are not very high – albeit clearly higher than those of the three ethnic items. However, they do not correlate sufficiently strongly to form one independent factor. An explanation for this finding can be that in most societies, learning the language is an element of civic citizenship, as new groups in society are able to acquire a new language (Reijerse et al., 2013: 620). However, as the political and cultural division within Belgian society is mainly based on language, this item does not behave in the same manner in this survey. To balance our analysis on ethnic citizenship, we therefore opt for a safe comparison, by using the single item on ‘following the customs of the country’ as a dependent variable closely related to the concept of civic citizenship. As this is only a single item, however, the results of this analysis should be taken with caution.² What is important for our theoretical goal is that the three ethnic items correlate strongly, and refer to requirements for immigrants that cannot be met by these new groups. We now have several options to work with these variables in the regression models that follow: we can either create an additive index, or use factor scores. The former has as its advantage that the measurement scale remains the same, allowing for a straightforward interpretation of the model coefficients. Therefore, we report the results using an index here,

and we create the index ‘ethnic citizenship notion’ by adding up the scores of the different items and dividing this by three. However, to be on the safe side, we also conducted our analyses using factor scores. These results ([Online appendix E](#)) are in line with the findings presented here.

Table 1. Rotated Factor Analysis Citizenship Requirements Items

Item	Factor 1: Ethnic	Factor 2: Civic
Born in Belgium	0.722	0.172
Parents born Belgium	0.911	0.176
Grandparents born Belgium	0.806	0.176
Speak language	0.189	0.574
Follow customs/traditions	0.323	0.587
Variance	2.141	0.765

Entries are the result of a factor analysis, Varimax rotation.

Now that it has been established that ethnic and civic citizenship requirements are empirically distinguishable, a last test is to investigate whether there is variation in the answers on the identity components. To test for this, we look at the correlation between the answers to the different levels (Table 2). While there is a substantial correlation between some of the components, it is clear that every level also has unique aspects. Furthermore, the correlations are not too high to cause problems of multicollinearity.

Table 2. Correlations between the Different Identity Items

	City	Region	Country	European	World
Parents					
City	1				
Region	0.507	1			
Country	0.514	0.556	1		
European	0.383	0.411	0.535	1	
World	0.269	0.090	0.289	0.602	1
Adolescents					
City	1				
Region	0.570	1			
Country	0.643	0.665	1		
European	0.478	0.527	0.627	1	
World	0.345	0.265	0.413	0.643	1

Entries are correlation between adhering to the different identities. Source: Ghent Study.

First, we provide an overview of the distribution of answers to the different items (Table 3). The most important identities among the parents are the *city* and *national* levels. While this might be slightly exceptional in comparative research, it has to be remembered that in earlier research too, it was shown that Belgians rather persistently tend to hold on to their distinct and often historically rooted local identity (Deprez & Vos, 1998). The second place, with an almost equally high score, goes to the country level of Belgium. Despite the fact that in the international media the country is often portrayed as sharply divided the feeling of a Belgian identity remains very important. Finally, the regional (i.e., Flemish), European and world identity are all less important. Among the adolescents in the Ghent Study as well the city and the country identity are most important. These average scores might still be the result of the fact that the respondents tend to give high scores to all possible identities. If we look at rankings rather than ratings, we can observe which identity is the most highly ranked. Among the adults we can again observe that the Ghentian and the Belgian identity are most popular, as is world citizenship. Less than three percent of all adults and adolescents list the Flemish regional identity as their most important identity.

Table 3. Identity and Citizenship among Respondents

	Parents	Adolescents
City	2.443	2.675
Region	2.147	2.194
Country	2.446	2.52.
Europe	2.265	2.097
World	2.359	2.114
Highest score for:		
City	11.86%	20.06%
Region	2.77%	2.71%
Country	19.98%	25.81%
Europe	5.26%	3.68%
World	17.75%	13.80%
n	1100-1121 ⁺	1533-1550 ⁺

Note: identity on a 0-4-scale. Unique strong identity: percentage of respondents that gives one specific identity a higher score than all others.

⁺: The exact number of observations slightly differs between the different items.

Subsequently, we use these different identity scores to explain the restrictive, ethnic form of entry requirements (Table 4) using our 'ethnic citizenship index' as dependent variable. Given the fact that our dependent variable is continuous, we opted for an ordinary least squares

regression. As the five identity items are related to some extent, we first enter them one by one (Models 1 to 5 in Table 3), before using them all simultaneously in Model 6. Tests show that there are no multicollinearity problems in this model.

First, we discuss the model including the feeling of a city identity. We observe a positive significant relation with ethnic requirements, although the effect is not that strong. Age and gender do not have an effect in any of the models, and we observe that education levels have a very strong effect: the higher the education level, the less support for an ethnic form of entry requirement. Despite the fact that this is a rather thin model, we have a high level of explained variance.

Subsequently, it can be observed that the regional, national and European identity all contribute to upholding ethnic entry requirements, but in varying degrees. Only for those who have a cosmopolitan identity, we see a negative ~~relation~~ association, as these respondents are less in favour of an ethnic concept of citizenship. The real test of the relation comes in Model 6 where all indicators are used simultaneously. Here it can be observed that only the regional and the country identity contribute significantly to an ethnic concept of entry requirements, while a cosmopolitan identity continues to correlate negatively. A Wald test shows that the coefficient for regional, Flemish identity is not significantly higher than for the national, Belgian identity.

Finally, we look at the variable indicating whether the respondent has a stronger preference for one specific identity (no matter which one), in contrast to all possible others. This variable does not correlate significantly with an ethnic notion of citizenship in any of the models we tested. Apparently, a specialization into one level of identity does not matter for attitudes on immigration.

Table 4. The Relation between identities and Ethnic Citizenship Requirements (Adults)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.074*** (0.020)					-0.032 (0.024)
Identity: region		0.200*** (0.020)				0.171*** (0.026)
Identity: country			0.157*** (0.022)			0.107*** (0.029)
Identity: Europe				0.065** (0.023)		0.006 (0.032)
Identity: World					-0.059** (0.021)	-0.102*** (0.025)
Unique strong identity	-0.056 (0.049)	-0.017 (0.047)	-0.007 (0.048)	-0.001 (0.052)	-0.068 (0.049)	-0.017 (0.050)
Age	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.004)
Gender	0.079 (0.051)	0.083 (0.049)	0.049 (0.051)	0.081 (0.051)	0.089 (0.051)	0.069 (0.049)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.536*** (0.128)	-0.549*** (0.123)	-0.562*** (0.126)	-0.530*** (0.128)	-0.510*** (0.128)	-0.568*** (0.121)
High	-1.013*** (0.122)	-0.947*** (0.117)	-1.003*** (0.120)	-1.033*** (0.123)	-0.972*** (0.123)	-0.909*** (0.117)
Constant	1.850*** (0.264)	1.599*** (0.254)	1.644*** (0.262)	1.910*** (0.264)	2.085*** (0.263)	1.602*** (0.254)
N	1032	1032	1032	1032	1032	1032
R ²	0.125	0.191	0.155	0.121	0.121	0.216

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

If we turn to the adolescent sample, our expectation was that the coefficients would be smaller, given the fact that this age cohort was raised in a more multicultural environment. When we look at the results in Table 5, however, they are similar to those of their parents. Here too (Model 6), the regional identity is most strongly related to an ethnic form of citizenship requirements. Basically, we do not observe differences between the parents and the generation of their children.

Table 5. The Relation between different identities and Ethnic Citizenship Requirements (Adolescents)

	Model 1 B (s.e.)	Model 2 B (s.e.)	Model 3 B (s.e.)	Model 4 B (s.e.)	Model 5 B (s.e.)	Model 6 B (s.e.)
Identity: city	0.047** (0.017)					-0.078*** (0.021)
Identity: region		0.201*** (0.016)				0.249*** (0.022)
Identity: country			0.112*** (0.018)			0.064* (0.026)
Identity: Europe				0.028 (0.019)		-0.033 (0.028)
Identity: World					-0.081*** (0.017)	-0.117*** (0.021)
Unique strong identity	-0.022 (0.044)	0.072 (0.043)	0.018 (0.044)	0.006 (0.047)	-0.062 (0.045)	0.030 (0.045)
Age	-0.009 (0.014)	0.002 (0.014)	-0.004 (0.014)	-0.009 (0.014)	-0.010 (0.014)	0.006 (0.013)
Gender	-0.179*** (0.043)	-0.215*** (0.040)	-0.199*** (0.042)	-0.169*** (0.043)	-0.127** (0.043)	-0.162*** (0.040)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.038 (0.127)	-0.079 (0.122)	-0.061 (0.126)	-0.031 (0.128)	-0.020 (0.127)	-0.079 (0.119)
High	-0.352** (0.118)	-0.340** (0.112)	-0.354** (0.116)	-0.342** (0.118)	-0.334** (0.117)	-0.317** (0.109)
Constant	1.672*** (0.261)	1.127*** (0.251)	1.421*** (0.261)	1.706*** (0.264)	1.965*** (0.259)	1.301*** (0.247)
N	1442	1442	1442	1442	1442	1442
R ²	0.041	0.128	0.062	0.037	0.050	0.175

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

In the previous analysis, we used the full battery of identity items. It could be argued that some respondents have a tendency to give high scores to all forms of identity. Therefore we repeated the analysis with only those respondents who give a unique highest score to one identity. The results of this operationalization are summarized in [Online a-Appendix D](#), confirming the conclusion that an exclusive preference for the regional Flemish identity is associated with the most restrictive attitude toward immigrants.

We also asked respondents whether new citizens should adapt to the customs of the country. In the literature, it is suggested that this is a less restrictive inclusion requirement. Looking at the relation with identity, however, we see exactly the same pattern as in the earlier analyses on ethnic citizenship requirements (Table 6). Those who emphasize a regional identity are strongly in favour of immigrants adapting to the prevailing customs, while we see the opposite

pattern among those who identify as citizens of the world. These results suggest that the question about adapting to the customs of the host country is not a lenient inclusion requirement, but rather seems to express an *additional* inclusion requirement, that comes on top of the ethnic citizenship requirement. Those who hold on to a strong regional identity not only require that new members were born in the community (and their parents and ancestors), but also that they adapt to the prevailing customs (Hooghe, 1999). Items that are often seen as civic, and hence more open, seem to be used as an additional hurdle to prevent full inclusion of immigrant groups.

Table 6. Identity and support for 'Immigrants should adapt to Belgian customs and traditions' (parents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.056*					-0.082***
	(0.022)					(0.024)
Identity: region		0.275***				0.282***
		(0.021)				(0.027)
Identity: country			0.164***			0.096**
			(0.024)			(0.030)
Identity: Europe				0.051*		0.013
				(0.025)		(0.032)
Identity: World					-0.129***	-0.170***
					(0.022)	(0.026)
Unique strong identity	-0.058	-0.005	-0.008	-0.017	-0.095	-0.013
	(0.053)	(0.049)	(0.052)	(0.056)	(0.053)	(0.051)
Age	0.009	0.007	0.009	0.008	0.012*	0.010*
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Gender	0.101	0.101	0.069	0.103	0.115*	0.097
	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.055)	(0.050)
Education Level: low						
Middle	0.006	-0.030	-0.027	0.009	0.027	-0.036
	(0.138)	(0.128)	(0.136)	(0.138)	(0.136)	(0.124)
High	-0.329*	-0.250*	-0.323*	-0.346**	-0.262*	-0.167
	(0.132)	(0.123)	(0.129)	(0.133)	(0.131)	(0.120)
Constant	1.550***	1.117***	1.296***	1.590***	1.826***	1.246***
	(0.285)	(0.265)	(0.281)	(0.284)	(0.279)	(0.258)
N	1033	1033	1033	1033	1033	1033
R ²	0.043	0.172	0.078	0.040	0.067	0.233

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

There is a vast literature on the relation-association between group identities and attitudes toward outside group members (Brubaker, 1992). The current analysis allows us to contribute to this debate in four distinct ways.

First, the results suggest that it is important not just to include one national level of group identity, but to include various levels of geographical identification simultaneously. Most of the literature on this topic thus far deals with just national identity, thus remaining oblivious to the fact that in contemporary society different group identities will be present simultaneously. In this specific sample, local, regional and European forms of group identity were clearly

present and important to respondents. From the point of view of ethnic and racial studies, furthermore, it is just as important that each one of these group identities is related in a specific manner to the attitudes toward outsider groups. As we know of no other survey questionnaire where all of these geographical levels were included simultaneously, our recommendation would be to include them in future survey research on this topic. The local, urban identity proved to very important in this survey, while this is a level that is often neglected in this literature. In future research, it should be investigated to what extent this is a specific characteristic of Belgian society. We can build on earlier research in divided societies (Canada, Catalonia, Scotland, ...) to assume a similar pattern as in those countries, but that does not imply that these local and regional identities should be absent in more traditional and homogeneous nation-states.

Second, and in contrast to hypothesis 2, the smaller, local identities were not associated with more restrictive attitudes toward immigrants. **The rather surprising finding was that the local, urban identity was associated with a more open attitude.** This suggests that there is no linear relation between the geographical scale one identifies with, and attitudes toward immigrants. Rather than just considering the scale, it seems important for future research to pay attention to the specific cultural and historical characteristics of every level of identity.

Third, we did not find any support for Hypothesis 3 about the occurrence of generational differences. Despite the fact that the adolescent respondents were socialized in more diverse setting than the generation of their parents, the relations we have found are remarkably similar in both age groups. This would suggest that the pattern in the relation between identity and attitudes on migration is rather stable across time.

Fourth, our results point at the rather ambiguous status of European citizenship. While some authors have argued that European identity will be associated with more restrictive attitudes toward immigrants, for others this is a first form of international identity (Habermas, 2011). Our results indicate that the relation is, taking all things into consideration, rather neutral, ~~and we do not find support for hypothesis 3.~~ A European identity does not seem to be significantly related to attitudes on immigrants, and this is halfway between the more restrictive attitudes associated with national (in this case: Belgian) identity, and the open attitudes associated with a global identity.

Fifth, and most importantly the results of this analysis confirm that identities relate in very distinct, and sometimes opposing, ways to attitudes toward immigrants. While some identities

Commented [DS1]: Het is wat moeilijk, natuurlijk, aangezien de modellen met enkel lokale identiteit wel een positieve correlatie laten zien. Dus de vraag is hoe het net komt dat het negatief wordt in de volledige modellen. Maar ik neem aan dat de assumptie is dat er daar dan een betere controle is voor alle verschillende lagen van de identiteit.

are associated with more restrictive attitudes, others are associated with open attitudes. The highest levels of hostility to immigrants were not recorded among those who hold on to a local identity, but rather to those who hold on to a regional identity. From the regional level on, all subsequent levels (national, European, global) are associated with a more positive attitude toward immigrants. Thus far, most of the literature on the relation between a regional identity and attitudes toward immigrants was based on Catalonia, but obviously these findings cannot be generalized to the case of Flanders (Belgium). The current analysis does not allow us to explain why the region is more closely associated with restrictive attitudes than the city. A plausible suggestion for further research is that, in the current politics of Belgium, the region is routinely portrayed as a highly salient identity, whose interests should be defended. This might be one of the reasons for a positive relation between a strong Flemish regional identity and hostility toward immigrants (Breuning & Ishiyama, 1998; Vermeulen & Deleu, 2017). Given the ongoing cultural and political debate, respondents who adhere to this regional identity apparently are more likely to adopt a defensive attitude, also against newcomers that might threaten the acquired status-quo (Bilodeau, Turgeon & Karakoç, 2012). Earlier research suggests that national identities have a distinct relation to anti-immigrant sentiments (Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009). The current analysis suggests that a similar pattern holds for regional identities. The exact historical reason why a Catalan regional identity is associated with a more open attitude toward immigration, while a Flemish regional identity is associated with a more restrictive attitude, remains to be investigated.

A mobilizing discourse on the importance of defending group interests is completely absent on the level of the city, and therefore it is plausible that this local identity is much more open to immigration than the regional level. On the city level, it is easier to construct a common ingroup identity (Gaertner, Dovidio & Bachman, 1996). Theoretically, therefore, this would mean that it is essential to include the specific cultural history and the associations that are related to one specific level of identity.

A limitation to the current study is that it was conducted in one city only. One might speculate that large urban areas (like Ghent) may develop a more open concept of local identity than smaller rural communities. It is important therefore to ascertain whether our findings are also supported in nationally representative samples. Furthermore, as has been noted, all the adults in the Ghent Study are parents. Although this applies to a vast majority of 90 % of all adults in Belgium, it is important to ascertain whether the relations we have found are also significant among a full population study. It has to be remembered, furthermore, that the Ghent Study was

conducted both among parents and among adolescents. On average, there is an age difference of 32 years between both groups, but the results of our analysis suggest that the relations we find are very similar across both generations. The hypothesis that younger age groups somewhat 'automatically' will adopt a more open attitude toward diversity, is therefore clearly not supported. Given what we know about the stability of both identity and attitudes toward immigrants, the comparison between the two generations does not suggest that the established pattern will become weaker in the decades ahead. From a policy perspective, this renders it all the more important to investigate on what level common ingroup identities could be established. The current analysis suggests that both the local, as the European and global level of identity are appropriate for this goal. While the local level is often neglected in this line of research, the Ghent data suggest that developing a common identity could be most easily established on the city level.

References

- Anderson, C., & McGregor, R. (2016). Explaining stability and change of territorial identities. *Nations and Nationalism*, 22(1), 84-102.
- Andrew, M., and Hauser, R. (2011). Adoption? Adaptation? Evaluating the Formation of Educational Expectations. *Social Forces*, 90(2), 497-520.
- Ariely, G. (2012). Do Those who Identify with Their Nation Always Dislike Immigrants? An Examination of Citizenship Policy. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 18(2), 242-261.
- Benhabib, S. (2004). *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Blokland, T. (2017). *Community as Urban Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Breton, R. (1998). From ethnic to civic nationalism: English Canada and Quebec. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 11(1), 85-102.
- Breuning, M., and Ishiyama, J. (1998). The Rhetoric of Nationalism: Rhetorical Strategies of the Volksunie and Vlaams Blok in Belgium, 1991-1995. *Political Communication*, 15(1), 5-26.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Carson, P., and Danhieux, G. (1972). *Ghent: A Town for All Seasons*. Gent: Story-Scientia.
- Ciulinaru, D. (2018). When “Inclusion” Means “Exclusion”: Discourses on the Eviction and Repatriations of Roma Migrants, at National and European Union Level. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 19(4), 1059-1073.
- Davidov, E., and Semyonov, M. (2017). Attitudes toward Immigrants in European Societies. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 58(5), 359-366.
- Delanty, G. (1997). Models of Citizenship. Defining European identity and citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 1(3), 285-303.
- Deprez, K., and Vos, L. (1998). *Nationalism in Belgium*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Driel, E., and Verkuyten, M. (forthcoming). Local identity and the reception of refugees: the example of Riace. *Identities*, in press.
- Escandell, X., and Ceobanu, A. (2010). Nationalisms and Anti-immigrant Sentiment in Spain. *South European Society and Politics*, 15(2), 157-179.
- Esses, V., Dovidio, J., Semanya, A., & Jackson, L. (2005). Attitudes toward Immigrants and Immigration. The Role of National and International Identity, pp. 317-338 in Abrams, D., Hogg, M., & Marques, J. (eds.), *The Social Psychology of Inclusion and Exclusion*. New York: Psychology Press.

- Gaertner, S., Dovidio, J., and Bachman, B. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common ingroup identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(3-4), 271-290.
- Habermas, J. (2011). *Zur Verfassung Europas*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hackett, J., Rast, D. & Hohman, Z. (forthcoming): Identification with the American South and Anti-Muslim Attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, in press.
- Hjerm, M. (1998). National identities, national pride and xenophobia: A comparison of four western countries. *Acta Sociologica*, 41(4), 335-347.
- Hooghe, L., and Marks, G. (2005). Calculation, Community and Cues: Public Opinion on European Integration. *European Union Politics*, 6(4), 419-443.
- Hooghe, M. (1999). The Notion of Complex Equality and the Beauty of Alcibiades. *Ethical Perspectives*, 6(3-4), 211-215.
- Kinder, D. R., & Kam, C. D. (2009). *Us against them: Ethnocentric foundations of American opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Koning, E. (2011). Ethnic and civic dealings with newcomers: naturalization policies and practices in twenty-six immigration countries. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(11), 1974-1994.
- Kunovich, R. M. (2009). The sources and consequences of national identification. *American Sociological Review*, 74(4), 573-593.
- Landberg, M. et al. (2018). Being both – A European and a national citizen? Comparing young people's identification with Europe and their home country across eight European countries. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 15(3), 270-283.
- Luedtke, A. (2005). European Integration, Public Opinion and Immigration Policy. *European Union Politics*, 6(1), 83-112.
- McLaren, L., and Paterson, I. (2020). Generational Change and Attitudes to Immigration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(3), 665-682.
- Meeus, J., Duriez, B., Vanbeselaere, N., and Boen, F. (2010). The Role of National Identity Representation in the Relation between In-group Identification and Out-group Derogation: Ethnic versus civic representation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(2), 305-320.
- Pehrson, S., Brown, R., and Zagefka, H. (2009). When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist in-group definitions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(1), 61-76.
- Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V., and Brown, R. (2009). National Identification And Anti-Immigrant Prejudice: Individual And Contextual Effects Of National Definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 72(1), 24-38.

- Reeskens, T., and Hooghe, M. (2010). Beyond the Civic–Ethnic dichotomy. Investigating the structure of citizenship concepts across thirty-three countries. *Nations and Nationalism*, 16(4), 579-597.
- Rijerse, A., et al. (2013). Beyond the Ethnic-Civic Dichotomy: Cultural Citizenship as a New Way of Excluding Immigrants. *Political Psychology*, 34(4), 611-630.
- Shulman, S. (2002). Challenging the Civic/Ethnic and West/East Dichotomies in the Study of Nationalism. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(5), 554-585.
- Sides, J., & Citrin, J. (2007). European opinion about immigration: The role of identities, interests and information. *British Journal of Political Science*, 37(3), 477–504.
- Simonsen, K., & Bonokowski, B. (2020). Is civic nationalism necessarily inclusive? Conceptions of nationhood and anti-Muslim attitudes in Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 59(1), 114-136.
- Verkuyten, M., and Martinovic, B. (2015). Behind the ethnic–civic distinction: Public attitudes towards immigrants’ political rights in the Netherlands. *Social Science Research*, 53, 34-44.
- Verkuyten, M., Wiley, S., Deaux, K., and Fleischmann, F. (2019). To Be Both (and More): Immigration and Identity Multiplicity. *Journal of Social Issues*, 75(2), 390-413.
- Vermeulen, A., and Deleu, J. (2017). *Hoe Vlaming te zijn? Zes teksten van August Vermeulen en Jozef Deleu*. Antwerpen: Polis.
- Vervaet, R., Van Houtte, M., & Stevens, P. (2018). Multicultural school leadership, multicultural teacher culture and the ethnic prejudice of Flemish pupils. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 68-77.
- Violante, A., Cain, K., & Mukherjee, S. (forthcoming). What does it mean to be American? Perceptions of national identity amongst adults and children. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, in press.
- Wilson-Daily, A., Kimmelmeier, M. & Prats, J. (2018). Intergroup contact versus conflict in Catalan high schools. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 64, 12-28.
- Wright, M., Citrin, J., and Wand, J. (2011). Alternative measures of American national identity. Implications for the civic-ethnic distinction. *Political Psychology*, 33, 469–482.
- Yogeeswaran, K., & Dasgupta, N. (2014). Conceptions of national identity in a globalised world: Antecedents and consequences. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25(1), 189-227.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). The Multi-layered Citizen. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1(1): 119–136.

ONLINE APPENDIX

Appendix A. Variables used in the Analysis

Dependent variables

-Ethnic citizenship requirements: Respondents were asked: “some people say that the following things are very important to be a real Belgian. Others say that they are not that important. According to you, how important are the following things to be a real Belgian?” This question was asked about five items – three of which we use to measure an ethnic notion of citizenship:

- That you are born in Belgium
- that your parents are born in Belgium
- that your grandparents are born in Belgium

Respondents could answer each item using a scale ranging from 0 (“Not at all important”) over 1 (“not very important”) and 2 (“Rather important”) to 3 (Very important”). The variable is created as a sumscale by adding the answers to the different items and dividing by three.

-Civic citizenship requirements: Respondents were asked: “some people say that the following things are very important to be a real Belgian. Others say that they are not that important. According to you, how important are the following things to be a real Belgian?” This question was asked about five items – two of which we use to measure a civic notion of citizenship:

- To speak Dutch or French [i.e., the two main languages in the country]
- To follow the Belgian custom and traditions

Respondents could answer each item using a scale ranging from 0 (“Not at all important”) over 1 (“not very important”) and 2 (“Rather important”) to 3 (Very important”). As the factor analysis indicated that the answers to these two items does not load very strongly onto one latent factor (see Table 1 of the main text), the results presented in the main text use the answers to the second item as measure of civic citizenship, while we report a robustness test using a sumscale of the answers to both items in Appendix C.

Independent variables

-Identity: Respondents were asked “How attached are you to the following identities” for five levels: “Ghentian”, “Fleming”, “Belgian”, “European”, and “citizen of the world”. For each level, they could indicate the strength of the identity on a scale ranging from 0 (“not at all”)

over 1 (“not”), 2 (“moderately”), 3 (“strong”), to 4 (“very strong”). The variables for the different levels indicate the respondent’s answer for each identity respectively.

-Unique strong identity: Dummy variable that indicates whether the respondent identifies more strongly with one level than with all others. Hence, a respondent receives code 1 if s/he scores higher for one level than for all others, and 0 otherwise. Hence, respondents with an usually strong identity for two or more levels, receive code 0. See Table A.1 for an example.

-Identity dummy: Series of dummy variables indicating for every level respectively whether or not the respondent identifies more strongly with that level than with any other. See Table A.1 for an example

Table A.1. Example data set and coding

Identity score for...					Identity dummy					Unique strong identity
City	Region	country	Europe	World	City	Region	country	Europe	World	
3	4	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
2	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1

-Age: The age of the respondent

-Sex: Sex of the respondent: female (code 0 – reference category) vs male (code 1).

-Education: Education level of the respondent, distinguishing three groups: (0 – reference category) lowly educated respondents (no or lower secondary education); (1) middle educated respondents (secondary education); (2) highly educated respondents (tertiary education). As most respondents in the adolescent sample are still in school, we follow common practice (Andrew & Hauser, 2011) and use a measure of expected education for this age group (distinguishing the same groups).

Table A.2. Descriptive statistics of the variables included in the analyses

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Parents				
Ethnic citizenship	1.100	0.834	0	3
Civic citizenship	2.165	0.703	0	3
Identity: city	2.443	1.201	0	4
Identity: region	2.147	1.178	0	4
Identity: country	2.446	1.088	0	4
Identity: Europe	2.265	1.133	0	4
Identity: world	2.359	1.196	0	4
Unique strong identity	0.576	0.494	0	1
Age	48.762	5.504	34	78
Sex	0.632	0.482	0	1
Education	1.649	0.566	0	2
Adolescents				
Ethnic citizenship	1.259	0.819	0	3
Civic citizenship	1.917	0.773	0	3
Identity: city	2.675	1.267	0	4
Identity: region	2.194	1.215	0	4
Identity: country	2.519	1.190	0	4
Identity: Europe	2.097	1.163	0	4
Identity: world	2.114	1.256	0	4
Unique strong identity	0.661	0.474	0	1
Age	17.087	1.498	15	20
Sex	0.549	0.498	0	1
Education	1.778	0.491	0	2

Appendix B. Results using the full sample of respondents (i.e., also respondents not born in Belgium)

Table B.1. Rotated Factor Analysis Citizenship items

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
Born in Belgium	0.698	0.175
Parents born Belgium	0.904	0.179
Grandparents born Belgium	0.805	0.161
Speak language	0.183	0.570
Follow customs/traditions	0.324	0.583
Variance	2.088	0.755

Table B.2. Identity and Citizenship among Respondents

	Parents	Adolescents
City	2.444	2.617
Region	2.099	2.140
Country	2.444	2.482
Europe	2.291	2.166
World	2.397	2.257
Highest score for:		
City	10.55 %	16.27%
Region	2.47%	1.95%
Country	19.05%	21.36%
Europe	5.96%	4.15%
World	17.09%	16.86%
n	1303-1375 ⁺	2232-2360 ⁺

Note: identity on a 0-4-scale. Unique strong identity: percentage of respondents that gives one specific identity a higher score than all the others.

⁺: As we report all available information, the exact number of observations slightly differs between the different items.

Table B.3. The Relation between different identities and Ethnic Citizenship (Adult Sample)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.078*** (0.019)					-0.023 (0.023)
Identity: region		0.200*** (0.019)				0.165*** (0.024)
Identity: country			0.156*** (0.021)			0.106*** (0.027)
Identity: Europe				0.055* (0.021)		0.008 (0.029)
Identity: World					-0.065*** (0.019)	-0.106*** (0.024)
Unique strong identity	-0.014 (0.046)	0.013 (0.044)	0.034 (0.045)	0.034 (0.049)	-0.029 (0.046)	0.010 (0.047)
Age	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.004)	-0.002 (0.004)
Gender	0.064 (0.048)	0.071 (0.046)	0.045 (0.047)	0.068 (0.048)	0.073 (0.048)	0.060 (0.046)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.145 (0.095)	-0.193* (0.091)	-0.163 (0.093)	-0.128 (0.095)	-0.121 (0.095)	-0.219* (0.091)
High	-0.578*** (0.089)	-0.551*** (0.086)	-0.563*** (0.088)	-0.584*** (0.090)	-0.548*** (0.089)	-0.534*** (0.085)
Constant	1.372*** (0.229)	1.168*** (0.219)	1.190*** (0.226)	1.456*** (0.228)	1.666*** (0.228)	1.228*** (0.220)
N	1198	1198	1198	1198	1198	1198
R ²	0.091	0.158	0.121	0.084	0.087	0.184

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table B.4. The Relation between different identities and Ethnic Citizenship (Adolescent Sample)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.054*** (0.014)					-0.079*** (0.019)
Identity: region		0.196*** (0.014)				0.239*** (0.019)
Identity: country			0.119*** (0.015)			0.062** (0.022)
Identity: Europe				0.035* (0.016)		-0.013 (0.023)
Identity: World					-0.070*** (0.014)	-0.110*** (0.017)
Unique strong identity	-0.016 (0.036)	0.077* (0.035)	0.034 (0.036)	0.019 (0.039)	-0.044 (0.037)	0.064 (0.038)
Age	-0.011 (0.012)	-0.002 (0.011)	-0.008 (0.012)	-0.010 (0.012)	-0.011 (0.012)	0.001 (0.011)
Gender	-0.157*** (0.035)	-0.180*** (0.034)	-0.175*** (0.035)	-0.152*** (0.036)	-0.116** (0.036)	-0.139*** (0.033)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.038 (0.086)	-0.056 (0.083)	-0.040 (0.085)	-0.041 (0.086)	-0.064 (0.086)	-0.097 (0.081)
High	-0.281*** (0.079)	-0.276*** (0.076)	-0.274*** (0.078)	-0.278*** (0.079)	-0.290*** (0.079)	-0.287*** (0.074)
Constant	1.542*** (0.213)	1.061*** (0.207)	1.303*** (0.213)	1.561*** (0.217)	1.850*** (0.213)	1.250*** (0.205)
N	2069	2069	2069	2069	2069	2069
R ²	0.033	0.111	0.055	0.029	0.038	0.152

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table B.5. Identity and support for ‘Immigrants should adapt to Belgian customs and traditions’ (Adult Sample)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.068** (0.021)					-0.085*** (0.024)
Identity: region		0.300*** (0.020)				0.292*** (0.026)
Identity: country			0.187*** (0.023)			0.105*** (0.028)
Identity: Europe				0.064** (0.024)		0.040 (0.030)
Identity: World					-0.128*** (0.021)	-0.179*** (0.025)
Unique strong identity	0.004 (0.051)	0.044 (0.047)	0.060 (0.051)	0.058 (0.054)	-0.034 (0.051)	0.048 (0.049)
Age	0.011* (0.005)	0.009* (0.004)	0.010* (0.005)	0.010* (0.005)	0.012** (0.005)	0.011* (0.004)
Gender	0.097 (0.054)	0.102* (0.050)	0.073 (0.053)	0.099 (0.054)	0.108* (0.053)	0.099* (0.048)
Education Level: low						
Middle	0.367*** (0.106)	0.271** (0.098)	0.335** (0.104)	0.377*** (0.106)	0.380*** (0.105)	0.243* (0.095)
High	0.091 (0.100)	0.119 (0.092)	0.103 (0.097)	0.078 (0.100)	0.130 (0.099)	0.149 (0.090)
Constant	0.956*** (0.255)	0.552* (0.234)	0.687** (0.250)	0.999*** (0.254)	1.334*** (0.251)	0.772*** (0.230)
N	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
R ²	0.035	0.177	0.078	0.032	0.055	0.236

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table B. 6. Identity and support for ‘Immigrants should adapt to Belgian customs and traditions’ (Adolescents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.081*** (0.017)					-0.059** (0.022)
Identity: region		0.232*** (0.017)				0.277*** (0.023)
Identity: country			0.130*** (0.018)			0.013 (0.026)
Identity: Europe				0.071*** (0.019)		0.028 (0.027)
Identity: World					-0.058*** (0.017)	-0.118*** (0.020)
Unique strong identity	-0.068 (0.043)	0.044 (0.042)	-0.012 (0.043)	0.000 (0.046)	-0.088* (0.044)	0.042 (0.045)
Age	0.071*** (0.014)	0.082*** (0.013)	0.075*** (0.014)	0.073*** (0.014)	0.071*** (0.014)	0.084*** (0.013)
Gender	-0.135** (0.042)	-0.158*** (0.040)	-0.150*** (0.042)	-0.132** (0.042)	-0.092* (0.042)	-0.118** (0.040)
Education Level: low						
Middle	0.020 (0.102)	-0.008 (0.098)	0.011 (0.101)	0.016 (0.102)	-0.010 (0.102)	-0.046 (0.097)
High	0.011 (0.093)	0.014 (0.090)	0.017 (0.093)	0.015 (0.094)	0.002 (0.094)	-0.001 (0.089)
Constant	0.238 (0.252)	-0.287 (0.245)	0.032 (0.253)	0.211 (0.256)	0.580* (0.253)	-0.101 (0.245)
N	2069	2069	2069	2069	2069	2069
R ²	0.028	0.102	0.041	0.023	0.022	0.127

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Appendix C. Results using civic citizenship index

Table C.1. Identity and support on two items of the Civic Citizenship Scale (Adult Sample)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.054** (0.018)					-0.059** (0.020)
Identity: region		0.231*** (0.017)				0.230*** (0.022)
Identity: country			0.137*** (0.020)			0.069** (0.024)
Identity: Europe				0.055** (0.020)		0.032 (0.026)
Identity: World					-0.103*** (0.018)	-0.147*** (0.021)
Unique strong identity	-0.027 (0.043)	0.018 (0.040)	0.015 (0.043)	0.018 (0.046)	-0.056 (0.043)	0.020 (0.042)
Age	0.008 (0.004)	0.006 (0.004)	0.008 (0.004)	0.007 (0.004)	0.010* (0.004)	0.008* (0.004)
Gender	0.124** (0.045)	0.124** (0.042)	0.098* (0.045)	0.125** (0.045)	0.136** (0.045)	0.123** (0.041)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.017 (0.113)	-0.045 (0.105)	-0.042 (0.111)	-0.016 (0.113)	0.003 (0.111)	-0.054 (0.101)
High	-0.240* (0.108)	-0.171 (0.100)	-0.233* (0.106)	-0.259* (0.108)	-0.184 (0.107)	-0.115 (0.097)
Constant	1.763*** (0.232)	1.415*** (0.215)	1.566*** (0.229)	1.793*** (0.232)	2.003*** (0.228)	1.518*** (0.210)
N	1033	1033	1033	1033	1033	1033
R ²	0.038	0.173	0.073	0.036	0.059	0.232

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table C. 2. Identity and support on two items of the Civic Citizenship Scale (Adolescents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.043** (0.016)					-0.065** (0.021)
Identity: region		0.191*** (0.016)				0.247*** (0.021)
Identity: country			0.082*** (0.017)			-0.026 (0.025)
Identity: Europe				0.062*** (0.019)		0.043 (0.027)
Identity: World					-0.052** (0.017)	-0.097*** (0.020)
Unique strong identity	-0.072 (0.043)	0.019 (0.041)	-0.042 (0.043)	-0.017 (0.045)	-0.097* (0.043)	0.024 (0.044)
Age	0.078*** (0.014)	0.088*** (0.013)	0.081*** (0.014)	0.078*** (0.014)	0.077*** (0.014)	0.089*** (0.013)
Gender	-0.128** (0.041)	-0.163*** (0.039)	-0.139*** (0.041)	-0.129** (0.041)	-0.091* (0.041)	-0.117** (0.039)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.076 (0.121)	-0.124 (0.116)	-0.093 (0.120)	-0.070 (0.121)	-0.065 (0.121)	-0.116 (0.114)
High	-0.081 (0.111)	-0.078 (0.106)	-0.082 (0.111)	-0.073 (0.111)	-0.071 (0.111)	-0.061 (0.105)
Constant	0.659** (0.249)	0.157 (0.240)	0.503* (0.251)	0.596* (0.251)	0.879*** (0.249)	0.316 (0.238)
N	1437	1437	1437	1437	1437	1437
R ²	0.033	0.119	0.043	0.036	0.035	0.151

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Appendix D. Analyses including identity dummies

Analyses based on the fact that a respondent gives the highest **ranking** to an identity (in contrast to the rating – see Appendix A).

Table D. 1. The Relation between different identities and Ethnic Citizenship (Adult Sample)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity dummy: city	-0.062 (0.075)					-0.081 (0.078)
Identity dummy: region		0.245 (0.147)				0.203 (0.146)
Identity dummy: country			0.320*** (0.061)			0.234*** (0.065)
Identity dummy: Europe				-0.093 (0.107)		-0.129 (0.107)
Identity dummy: World					-0.403*** (0.063)	-0.366*** (0.067)
Age	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.005)
Gender	0.084 (0.052)	0.086 (0.051)	0.076 (0.051)	0.081 (0.052)	0.098 (0.051)	0.087 (0.050)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.512*** (0.128)	-0.518*** (0.128)	-0.506*** (0.127)	-0.511*** (0.128)	-0.506*** (0.126)	-0.508*** (0.125)
High	-1.001*** (0.123)	-1.007*** (0.123)	-0.945*** (0.122)	-0.996*** (0.123)	-0.943*** (0.121)	-0.909*** (0.120)
Constant	1.995*** (0.262)	1.977*** (0.260)	1.865*** (0.258)	1.983*** (0.261)	1.944*** (0.256)	1.905*** (0.256)
N	1032	1032	1032	1032	1032	1032
R ²	0.114	0.115	0.136	0.114	0.147	0.164

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table D. 2. The Relation between different identities and Ethnic Citizenship (Adolescents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity dummy: city	-0.041 (0.052)					-0.044 (0.057)
Identity dummy: region		0.477*** (0.125)				0.454*** (0.126)
Identity dummy: country			0.245*** (0.048)			0.172** (0.054)
Identity dummy: Europe				-0.185 (0.110)		-0.184 (0.111)
Identity dummy: World					-0.419*** (0.060)	-0.374*** (0.065)
Age	-0.009 (0.014)	-0.011 (0.014)	-0.006 (0.014)	-0.009 (0.014)	-0.008 (0.014)	-0.006 (0.014)
Gender	-0.161*** (0.042)	-0.141*** (0.042)	-0.158*** (0.042)	-0.164*** (0.042)	-0.139*** (0.042)	-0.127** (0.042)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.031 (0.128)	-0.038 (0.127)	-0.039 (0.127)	-0.033 (0.128)	-0.033 (0.126)	-0.047 (0.124)
High	-0.339** (0.118)	-0.356** (0.117)	-0.322** (0.117)	-0.344** (0.118)	-0.325** (0.116)	-0.323** (0.115)
Constant	1.772*** (0.257)	1.792*** (0.256)	1.626*** (0.257)	1.771*** (0.257)	1.786*** (0.253)	1.692*** (0.252)
N	1442	1442	1442	1442	1442	1442
R ²	0.036	0.045	0.053	0.037	0.067	0.088

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table D. 3. Identity and support for ‘Immigrants should adapt to Belgian customs and traditions’ (Adult Sample)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity dummy: city	-0.101 (0.081)					-0.116 (0.081)
Identity dummy: region		0.553*** (0.158)				0.498** (0.152)
Identity dummy: country			0.447*** (0.065)			0.333*** (0.068)
Identity dummy: Europe				0.050 (0.115)		-0.002 (0.112)
Identity dummy: World					-0.635*** (0.067)	-0.561*** (0.071)
Age	0.009 (0.005)	0.009 (0.005)	0.010* (0.005)	0.009 (0.005)	0.011* (0.005)	0.011* (0.005)
Gender	0.104 (0.056)	0.109* (0.055)	0.093 (0.054)	0.107 (0.056)	0.126* (0.053)	0.118* (0.053)
Education Level: low						
Middle	0.023 (0.138)	0.009 (0.138)	0.033 (0.135)	0.024 (0.138)	0.033 (0.133)	0.025 (0.131)
High	-0.322* (0.132)	-0.337* (0.132)	-0.245 (0.130)	-0.322* (0.132)	-0.231 (0.127)	-0.202 (0.126)
Constant	1.660*** (0.281)	1.631*** (0.278)	1.467*** (0.274)	1.623*** (0.280)	1.581*** (0.268)	1.508*** (0.267)
N	1033	1033	1033	1033	1033	1033
R ²	0.037	0.047	0.078	0.036	0.113	0.148

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table D. 4. Identity and support for ‘Immigrants should adapt to Belgian customs and traditions’ (Adolescents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity dummy: city	-0.040 (0.050)					-0.074 (0.055)
Identity dummy: region		0.608*** (0.120)				0.550*** (0.122)
Identity dummy: country			0.075 (0.046)			0.013 (0.052)
Identity dummy: Europe				0.214* (0.107)		0.168 (0.108)
Identity dummy: World					-0.391*** (0.057)	-0.381*** (0.062)
Age	0.077*** (0.014)	0.074*** (0.013)	0.078*** (0.014)	0.076*** (0.014)	0.078*** (0.013)	0.076*** (0.013)
Gender	-0.110** (0.040)	-0.085* (0.040)	-0.108** (0.040)	-0.103* (0.040)	-0.090* (0.040)	-0.067 (0.040)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.071 (0.121)	-0.081 (0.120)	-0.074 (0.121)	-0.069 (0.121)	-0.080 (0.119)	-0.086 (0.118)
High	-0.073 (0.112)	-0.093 (0.111)	-0.071 (0.112)	-0.075 (0.112)	-0.067 (0.110)	-0.074 (0.109)
Constant	0.725** (0.246)	0.757** (0.244)	0.682** (0.247)	0.732** (0.245)	0.744** (0.242)	0.762** (0.242)
N	1437	1437	1437	1437	1437	1437
R ²	0.027	0.043	0.028	0.029	0.057	0.075

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Appendix E: Results using factor scores as dependent variables

Table E.1. The Relation between different identities and *Ethnic Citizenship Requirements* (factor score – Adults)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.077*** (0.022)					-0.032 (0.027)
Identity: region		0.202*** (0.023)				0.165*** (0.030)
Identity: country			0.168*** (0.025)			0.120*** (0.033)
Identity: Europe				0.072** (0.025)		0.007 (0.036)
Identity: World					-0.053* (0.023)	-0.100*** (0.028)
Unique strong identity	-0.055 (0.054)	-0.015 (0.053)	-0.003 (0.054)	0.004 (0.058)	-0.065 (0.055)	-0.010 (0.056)
Age	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.005 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.004 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.005)
Gender	0.084 (0.057)	0.086 (0.055)	0.052 (0.056)	0.085 (0.057)	0.094 (0.057)	0.069 (0.055)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.608*** (0.142)	-0.622*** (0.137)	-0.635*** (0.140)	-0.603*** (0.142)	-0.580*** (0.142)	-0.642*** (0.136)
High	-1.119*** (0.135)	-1.053*** (0.131)	-1.109*** (0.133)	-1.141*** (0.136)	-1.080*** (0.136)	-1.020*** (0.131)
Constant	0.787** (0.294)	0.533 (0.285)	0.561 (0.291)	0.843** (0.293)	1.022*** (0.292)	0.518 (0.285)
N	1028	1028	1028	1028	1028	1028
R ²	0.120	0.174	0.149	0.117	0.115	0.195

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table E.2. The Relation between different identities and *Ethnic Citizenship Requirements* (factor score – Adolescents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.045* (0.019)					-0.086*** (0.024)
Identity: region		0.207*** (0.019)				0.255*** (0.025)
Identity: country			0.118*** (0.020)			0.081** (0.030)
Identity: Europe				0.021 (0.022)		-0.046 (0.031)
Identity: World					-0.090*** (0.019)	-0.123*** (0.023)
Unique strong identity	-0.019 (0.050)	0.079 (0.049)	0.024 (0.050)	0.003 (0.053)	-0.065 (0.051)	0.028 (0.052)
Age	-0.016 (0.016)	-0.006 (0.015)	-0.011 (0.016)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.017 (0.016)	-0.001 (0.015)
Gender	-0.192*** (0.048)	-0.230*** (0.046)	-0.214*** (0.048)	-0.181*** (0.048)	-0.137** (0.048)	-0.174*** (0.045)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.096 (0.143)	-0.138 (0.138)	-0.121 (0.142)	-0.088 (0.143)	-0.076 (0.142)	-0.140 (0.134)
High	-0.450*** (0.132)	-0.437*** (0.127)	-0.452*** (0.131)	-0.440*** (0.132)	-0.431** (0.131)	-0.413*** (0.124)
Constant	0.700* (0.293)	0.143 (0.285)	0.427 (0.294)	0.749* (0.296)	1.004*** (0.291)	0.323 (0.280)
N	1432	1432	1432	1432	1432	1432
R ²	0.041	0.115	0.060	0.038	0.052	0.159

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table E.3. Identity and support for *Civic Citizenship Requirements* (factor scores – parents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.045** (0.016)					-0.051** (0.018)
Identity: region		0.197*** (0.016)				0.199*** (0.020)
Identity: country			0.112*** (0.018)			0.053* (0.022)
Identity: Europe				0.044* (0.018)		0.026 (0.024)
Identity: World					-0.090*** (0.016)	-0.125*** (0.019)
Unique strong identity	-0.024 (0.039)	0.013 (0.037)	0.011 (0.039)	0.013 (0.041)	-0.047 (0.039)	0.014 (0.038)
Age	0.008* (0.004)	0.007 (0.003)	0.008* (0.004)	0.007* (0.004)	0.010** (0.004)	0.009* (0.003)
Gender	0.104* (0.041)	0.103** (0.038)	0.082* (0.040)	0.105* (0.041)	0.114** (0.040)	0.104** (0.037)
Education Level: low						
Middle	0.040 (0.102)	0.016 (0.095)	0.020 (0.100)	0.042 (0.102)	0.057 (0.101)	0.010 (0.092)
High	-0.122 (0.097)	-0.064 (0.091)	-0.116 (0.096)	-0.136 (0.098)	-0.073 (0.096)	-0.014 (0.089)
Constant	-0.327 (0.211)	-0.640** (0.197)	-0.493* (0.209)	-0.299 (0.210)	-0.114 (0.207)	-0.538** (0.193)
N	1028	1028	1028	1028	1028	1028
R ²	0.028	0.151	0.058	0.027	0.049	0.204

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Table E.4. Identity and support for *Civic Citizenship Requirements* (factor scores – adolescents)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	B	B	B	B	B	B
	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)	(s.e.)
Identity: city	0.036*					-0.054**
	(0.014)					(0.019)
Identity: region		0.158***				0.208***
		(0.014)				(0.019)
Identity: country			0.064***			-0.033
			(0.015)			(0.023)
Identity: Europe				0.055***		0.043
				(0.017)		(0.024)
Identity: World					-0.039**	-0.078***
					(0.015)	(0.018)
Unique strong identity	-0.070	0.005	-0.045	-0.020	-0.088*	0.014
	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.040)
Age	0.074***	0.082***	0.077***	0.075***	0.074***	0.083***
	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Gender	-0.099**	-0.128***	-0.107**	-0.101**	-0.069	-0.089*
	(0.037)	(0.035)	(0.036)	(0.036)	(0.037)	(0.035)
Education Level: low						
Middle	-0.035	-0.068	-0.047	-0.031	-0.024	-0.052
	(0.109)	(0.105)	(0.109)	(0.109)	(0.109)	(0.103)
High	-0.008	0.002	-0.006	-0.001	0.004	0.024
	(0.100)	(0.096)	(0.100)	(0.100)	(0.100)	(0.095)
Constant	-1.358***	-1.780***	-1.479***	-1.421***	-1.188***	-1.653***
	(0.223)	(0.216)	(0.225)	(0.224)	(0.223)	(0.215)
N	1432	1432	1432	1432	1432	1432
R ²	0.035	0.109	0.042	0.038	0.035	0.137

Note: Entries are OLS coefficients, standard errors in parentheses. Source: Ghent Study. Significance levels: *: p<0.05; **: p<0.01; ***: p<0.001.

Notes

¹. While some studies distinguish a cultural concept of citizenship (Reijerse et al., 2013; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2015), in the current questionnaire we replicated the module that is used since 2002 in the European Social Survey, and that has proven to be remarkably robust (Reeskens & Hooghe, 2010).

². As a robustness check, we have also included the same analysis, but based on the two items (correlation .50). This additional analysis (Appendix C), however, confirms the analysis based on the single item.