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3 Methodology

A large proportion of existing empirical research on regionalism has focused on single case studies and has sought to explain the development and social origins of regionalist movements in a particular region, with the aim being to provide a complete picture of all causal mechanisms. However, regionalisation is not presented in the same way nor always with the same motivations. Differences can, to a large extent, be traced back to lasting discrepancies in political contexts between different states. Differences at the level of the autonomy of regional authorities, asymmetrical regionalisation, and the incorporation of public demand, can be related to different state traditions of government. Therefore, the goal of this research, which analyses the effects of regionalisation on political regionalism, is best served by comparative research involving different states with different state traditions and differences as regards the design of their regional administrative structures. On the other hand, another large proportion of the research on regionalism consists of comparative studies or collections of studies of regionalism in very different circumstances, with very different types of conflict, and in very different parts of the world. This may indicate that an attempt to come up with explanations for very diverse phenomena will produce partial or contradictory patterns of explanation. Both the single case study and the comparison of a diverse plethora of cases, go against two of the suggestions to strengthen comparative research mentioned by Lijphart (1971): focus research on key variables, and on comparable cases. This study concentrates on the consequences of one particular factor, namely regionalisation, for regionalism. The research is limited to three European states, all member states of the European Union, as European integration is believed to have had a particular impact on regionalisation. This chapter includes an explanation of how to move from theory to empirical research, of the research approach used, the method of selecting cases and the methods used to gather empirical information. First of all, however, a number of research sub-questions are proposed.

3.1 Research questions and operationalisation

In order to operationalise the concept of regionalism, this study traces the distinction between the construction and maintenance of an ‘imagined community’, and the politicisation and mobilisation of the members of the imagined community in order to gain support for a political project. As far as this research is concerned, this means a distinction can be made between the analysis of, firstly, the institutionalisation of the region after regionalisation and the changes of regional and national identities and, secondly, the adapta-
tions of political parties and changes in the support they get as regards the introduction of regional autonomy.

Firstly, the research of the consequences of regionalisation for the ‘construction and maintenance of the imagined community’ at the level of the region focuses on the one hand on trends in the strength of regional identities and the legitimacy of constitutional arrangements, and on the other hand on the institutionalisation of the region, as discussed and connected to the emergence of regional consciousness by Anssi Paasi (1986, 1996). This means attention is paid to ways in which regionalisation influences the emergence, maintenance or demise of the territorial, symbolic and institutional dimensions of the region, to the building of a regional identity as potential for regionalist mobilisation, and to questions of regional identification of inhabitants of the region. To unravel the institutionalisation process and the development of regional institutions as described by Paasi, two concrete elements are chosen to focus the research, namely regional mass media and regional language, particularly in education. Both are central elements in the institutionalisation process in general (Paasi, 1986), and also of specific significance here because of their role in the development of a regional political arena and the communication of political ideas, regional symbols, and the demarcation of the region. This leads to five research questions:

- To what extent has attachment to the regions by their inhabitants changed after regionalisation, compared with attachment to the (nation-)state?
- What role has regionalisation played in establishing the territorial extent of the region, in terms of the recognition of boundaries, the emergence or persistence of boundary conflicts, and tensions with other (internal) territorial divisions?
- How has regionalisation affected the development and usage of symbols used to distinguish it from other regions, and their status compared with other, for instance national, territorial symbols?
- To what degree has regionalisation affected the development of regional institutions, specifically mass media and regional language education, and their status compared to other, for instance national, institutions?
- Has regionalisation, and the introduction of regional governments, affected regional identity policies, aimed at stimulating regional distinctiveness or at assimilation into a state-wide national community?

Secondly, an analysis of the effects of regionalisation on the politici-
ideology and the organisation of political parties, regionalist and non-regionalist, and the growth or decline of their support. Sometimes research takes a single political party as the unit of analysis. Numerous studies of regionalism undertaken by political scientists have used the method of focusing solely on one regionalist party. In order to discover the developments of regionalism, we chose to focus attention on other parties as well, and on whether or not regional sections of state-wide parties adopt a more regionalist outlook, and if so why.

- To what extent have preferences of inhabitants for arrangements of regional autonomy changed since regionalisation?
- To what extent has electoral support for regionalist political parties changed since regionalisation?
- To what extent has the region emerged as a separate political arena since regionalisation?
- To what extent have regionalist parties adapted their objectives on key regionalist issues, regional autonomy and the protection of regional cultural distinctiveness, since regionalisation?
- Have there been organisational changes within the regionalist parties and within the regionalist party-family, for instance splits, mergers, or have new parties emerged as a reaction to regionalisation?
- Has the approach to, and adoption of, regionalist ideas by regional sections of state-wide political parties changed since regionalisation?
- To what extent have regional sections of state-wide political parties obtained more organisational autonomy and have the regional sections developed programmes differentiated from their party at the national level and sections in other regions?

3.2 Research design

The nature of those research questions calls for the application of different types of research methods. Whereas trends in public opinion require a quantitative approach, changes in party ideology may be better suited to a qualitative approach. The preference for international comparative research necessitates the selection of a number of different states which have implemented regionalisation policies in different ways. On the other hand, most research questions deal with phenomena in one or more regions, and the primary units of analysis are the regions affected by regionalisation. Mostly, regionalisation involves the creation of quite a large number of administrative regions. The arguments for, and the implementation and effects of, regionalisation can differ not just between states but also within states, that is between various regions. Due to these considerations, the research has been divided into two parts, with a mainly quantitative analysis of developments in all ad-
ministrative regions in three regionalised states, and case studies which concentrate on one region in each of these states.

Yin (1994, p.13) defines a case study as an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, in which the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, which relies on multiple sources of evidence, and benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. Because we want to compare different methods of regionalisation, a multiple case-study design is the most appropriate approach. Due to the fact that regionalisation is a top-down policy, which is implemented by the state government and which mostly affects every part of the state’s territory, albeit sometimes in different ways, a number of states were selected as cases. Certain regions were then selected, making the structure similar to what Yin (1994, pp.51) describes as multiple embedded case studies. In this way, the selection of cases does not follow a sampling logic in which findings for the units studied represent those for the entire universe of potential units. Therefore, the regions picked as cases should not be regarded as representative, nor designated as being ‘typical’ of all regions of that state. Rather, selection should enable a comparison between cases, where different findings can be attributed to different ways of regionalisation. This does not exclude an illustrative role for the regional cases within their respective states (Ragin, 1989, p.76), but their role should not be limited to that since that is one of the main criticisms of this case study method. The main function of the regional cases is to allow a mutual of the cases.

**Time span and spatial demarcation of the research**

Because of the goal of the research, the moment of regionalisation is decisive in determining its time span. The main time frame of the research is the period after regionalisation, up until the present. However, in order to analyse the changes that have occurred since, data on the situation before regionalisation is used as well wherever such is possible. Because regionalisation took place at different moments in different states, the time span will not be exactly the same in all cases. This implies a number of practical differences. In instances in which regionalisation occurred relatively recently, and the time span of the research was shorter, more present-day actors will have been active before regionalisation and will be able to recall the situation before that moment. In the case of those states that were regionalised longer ago it is possible to look back on more long-term developments, while few present-day actors will be able to make reliable recollections of events before the moment of regionalisation. The time span should still be long enough to enable the research questions to be answered. The differences also mean that attention should be paid to the (international) context at different moments in contemporary history as well, such as the stage of European integration,
the demise of communism, and the temporary popularity of the model of a 'Europe of the regions', following or preceding the moment of regionalisation.

Picking one single moment of regionalisation can be seen as another complication. First, there are several moments that can be proposed as 'the' moment of regionalisation such as a decisive referendum, the passing of legislation on regionalisation by Parliament, the first democratic regional elections, or the first day the new government is installed and starts work. Secondly, the transfer of specific powers to a new level of government may entail a process spanning a number of years, and may be a continuous process. What is most important for this study is not so much to determine a moment of regionalisation in legal terms, but to understand it as a moment that is recognised as a turning point by regional actors and inhabitants. On this basis, of the various events mentioned, the first regional elections are probably the moment most recognised by the general public as the moment of change to be therefore regarded as the moment of regionalisation. Nevertheless, a focus on developments on the middle and longer term means there is no reason to stick too rigidly to that precise date.

It is functional to limit this comparative research to Europe and the European Union because, in Europe in particular, many countries have implemented regionalisation measures in the last few decades. European integration itself played a role in stimulating the formation of a regional level of government for states to be able to compete for regional funds. Moreover, while there is plenty of diversity on this issue within Europe to enable a viable comparison to be made, the same diversity often proves problematic when comparing European findings with cases from the world as a whole.

European integration itself has also been called regionalisation and, as discussed in the previous chapter the term 'region' is used in different ways and is notoriously difficult to define. The research goal means we are spared the dilemma of choosing between different types of regions. Those regions that are the result of administrative and political regionalisation are the ones we take as territories to study. Of course, these administrative regions are not always territorially the same as those referred to by regionalist movements. In some instances the latter are completely different in scale to the existing administrative regions, much larger (e.g. Occitania or Padania) or smaller (e.g. Cornwall or Savoy). Those cannot be included in the main analysis of changes in the administrative regions, but a reaction of regionalism to regionalisation in the form of protest against the regional division itself will be taken into account. In most cases, however, the administrative region and the territory defended by regionalist movements refer to the same name, history, symbols and cultural characteristics and core areas, and debates focus on where the boundaries of the region should be drawn (e.g. Brittany, Catalonia, the Basque Country). This poses less practical problems since, if a choice needs to be made, the administrative territories are used and
conflicts concerning regional boundaries which are related to the development of the territorial shape of the region after regionalisation are a central theme of this study.

3.3 Selection of cases

Selection of states

Because of the goals of this research potential cases should have both a regional layer of administration which has been created or empowered relatively recently, and some presence of political regionalism. All member states of the European Union have an administrative or political regional structure, with the exception of Luxembourg (Loughlin et al., 1999). The administrative and political structures however show an incredible variation, ranging from regions only for statistical or planning purposes to those in federations with important autonomous executives and legislative powers. There are large differences in population size of ‘regions’ between states, and what is considered as the regional level in some states would be the local level in others. A number of EU member-states have a regional structure that has remained more or less unchanged since the late 1940s (Germany and Austria), or even since the nineteenth century (Sweden and the Netherlands), while others have introduced regions in the late 1990s. In other cases only a small, peripheral part of the state has been included in regionalisation. For instance, in Portugal only the Azores and Madeira are political regions. Finally, a recently regionalised case as Belgium might pose methodological problems as well, because regionalisation in 1970 was followed by three more moments when more autonomy was given to the regions, which makes it impossible to distinguish one single moment of regionalisation.

If based on the inventories of Müller-Rommel (1998), Lane et al. (1997) and the European Free Alliance (the European Parliamentary group of regionalist parties) members, most European Union states (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom and even Luxembourg) have one or more active regionalist parties. Although the absence of regionalist movements in some states with political regions (Austria, Sweden, Ireland) may be an interesting notion in itself, it rules these countries out as cases for researching the development of regionalism and regionalist movements. It should be added that in Finland, Greece and Denmark (apart from the Faeroe islands which is not inside the European Union), there is only one marginal irredentist (Swedish, Macedonian and Schleswig-German) party, while in Belgium, France, Italy, Spain and the United Kingdom there are several regionalist parties in more than one region.

The discussion of different state traditions and their relation to forms of regional autonomy in the previous chapter make it clear that the
classification of some states into a limited number of categories is more ambiguous than others. However, a widely used distinction is that between 'stateless' and 'state' societies (Nettl, 1968), and between Anglo-Saxon and European Continental states. This latter category is often divided into a French or Napoleonic one and a Germanic family, and sometimes a Scandinavian category as well, as in the example given in chapter 2 (see table 2.1). The latter type is more the result of fine-tuning of the typology, and Loughlin recognises that this is really a mixture between the Anglo-Saxon and Germanic model (1993, p.231). Because of this, as well as because of time constraints, this research analyses three regionalised states, ranging from the 'pragmatic' Anglo-Saxon type to the 'jacobin' Napoleonic type, and the integral federalist Germanic type. Moreover, the stocktaking of key elements shows that there are a limited number of potential cases, and an ideal-type research design where various combinations of different features of regionalisation in a large number of states as cases is not possible. It also shows that the research design used for experiments, in which some cases get a treatment and others none (or a placebo) is not possible in practice, simply because there is no example in Europe of a state with regionalist conflict that has not introduced a regional level of administration.

The United Kingdom and France seem the best choices as states of the Anglo-Saxon and Napoleonic types respectively. After all, they have implemented regionalisation policies, each in their own way, which have the characteristics described by Loughlin and they include a number of active regionalist movements. The third state chosen would be Spain, a regionalised state with regionalist movements. Although it has characteristics of the Napoleonic state tradition, as well as some of the British acceptance of multi-nationality, its integral regionalisation with high levels of autonomy with relations between state and regional levels of government being laid down in detail in the constitution, most resembles the Germanic model. While it does not formally call itself a federation, it has many characteristics of federations, and has been called a quasi-federal state (Smith, 1985, p.14), or one in the process of federalisation (Moreno, 2001b). Of course, this applies to the post-Franco situation only, and under Franco Spain fitted better into the Napoleonic category of centralised, 'one and indivisible' states. What Spain also has in common with Germany and Austria is the ideological rationale behind regionalisation through its association with democratisation after authoritarian rule. In Germany and Austria this occurred after the Second World War, and in Spain after Franco (Sharpe, 1993, pp.14-15). In this respect Spain may be comparable with other states, particularly those in Southern and Eastern Europe that have witnessed a transformation from an authoritarian regime towards a democratic state more recently. Some of them have introduced, or may introduce in the future, a regional level of government, for instance because of the influence of European integration. The change in the political structure of the state may go hand in hand with a
search for new identities, new social and cultural relations and choices, a re-
focusing on surviving regional and local traditions, and a rethinking of the
nation state (Linz & Stepan, 1996, Pérez-Díaz, 1993, pp.102-107). The
United Kingdom, France and Spain therefore appear to be the best choices
as regards states which have implemented a policy of regionalisation in the
last few decades, which have a number of active regionalist movements, and
where different state contexts have generated different guises of regionalisa-
tion.

All three states have territories that require further elaboration as re-
gards the spatial demarcation of the regions included in this study. Peripheral
islands and regions on continents other than Europe are part of the territo-
ries of all three states, according to the definition of the state’s territory. The
Balearic Islands, the Canary Islands and the African territories of Ceuta and
Melilla are all part of Spain. France has overseas territories and regions (terri-
toires d’outremer and départements d’outremer) in various areas of the world which
are formally still part of the France state. Northern Ireland is part of the
United Kingdom, Gibraltar, the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands are
overseas territories and Crown dependencies, while the sun still never sets on
the territories of which the Queen of the United Kingdom is head of state.
The degree to which such territories are regarded and treated, both formally
and practically, as integral parts of a single state says a lot about the state tra-
dition and the respective conceptions of state territoriality of the three dif-
ferent states. However, the regular inclusion or exclusion of regions in state-
wide surveys means there are also practical implications. This study includes
the Canary Islands and Balearic Islands when discussing Spain because they
are ‘normal’ regions without many special provisions and, in almost all cases,
are treated as part of Spain. Ceuta and Melilla are left out because they are
tiny regions with an exceptional status and are usually left out of state-wide
surveys. In the case of France, the same applies, with Corsica, which is al-
most always included, and the départements d’outremer and territoires d’outremer,
which are mostly not included in surveys, and for which specific administra-
tive arrangements exist. The United Kingdom is mostly regarded as consist-
ing of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The Channel Islands,
the Isle of Man and other territories are often regarded as dependent territo-
ries, do not have direct representation through Parliament, and are not in-
cluded here. However, because of the nature of the territory and the topic of
this study, it is best to focus on the territory of Great Britain and therefore
not include Northern Ireland. In many ways the conflict there is not compa-
rable with territorial conflict in Great Britain. It is not simply a conflict of re-
gionalism or separatism, but of irredentists against unionists. The Northern
Ireland conflict has been dealt with by policy makers as a different issue and
is studied separately from British peripheral nationalist topics. Finally,
Northern Ireland is mostly not included in the surveys used here. In the case
of the United Kingdom this research is therefore limited to the island of Great Britain.

Selection of regions

As mentioned above whether a case in case study research is 'typical' of a larger population is no criterion for case selection. Therefore, the regions that are selected for regional case studies should not be considered representative of developments in the states they are part of. This does not mean that we should not take account of the position of the regional cases within the state. The region selected as a case should fit the characteristics of the way in which regionalisation was implemented in that state. For example, researching the effects of the relatively low degree of regional autonomy in France would not be aided by selecting Corsica, the only region with a higher level of autonomy.

One criterion should be the prior presence of a political regionalist movement that defended a territory similar to that used for administrative regionalisation. This rules out quite a lot of regions and reduces the potential cases to Andalusia, the Canary Islands, Catalonia, Galicia, the Basque Country (Spain), Alsace, Brittany, Corsica (France), Wales and Scotland (Great Britain). As mentioned above, Corsica is not an ideal case because of its exceptional position in France. Neither is the Basque Country ideal because of the complications inherent in the violence used there. To be able to make a comparison between cases, they should preferably not differ too much in terms of size, economic position and historical status but, most importantly, not in terms of their regional identity and support for regionalism before regional autonomy was introduced. Because of this, Galicia, Brittany and Wales are the preferred regional cases. Andalusia would be a possibility as well, but poses more problems as regards finding statistical data than Galicia. All three regions have a history of regionalist conflict, although without the more dominant position regionalism has in Scotland, Catalonia and the Basque Country. All three also have a recognised regional language, and a relatively strong regional identity. They are of similar size (about three million inhabitants) and all are also relatively poor regions within their respective states. Finally, because of their 'intermediate' position in terms of regional identity and regionalism, when compared with 'front-runners' such as Scotland, Catalonia and Corsica and regions where this is less apparent such as for instance the East Midlands, Murcia and Poitou-Charentes, it is possible to analyse the role other regions play as example, and thus take more aspects of the effects of asymmetrical regionalisation into account.
3.4 Data collection and analysis

Validity and reliability

The quality of empirical research can be evaluated by tests of validity and reliability. Validity tells us to what extent the research actually measures what it intends to measure, and to what extent findings are not based on the investigator's impressions alone. In comparative research this means that we should be measuring what we intend to measure in each system under consideration (Przeworski & Teune, 1970, p.103). A way to increase validity in case study research is to use multiple sources of evidence. Both the need and opportunities to use more than one type of data are larger for case studies than for other research designs (Yin, 1994). According to Yin, the triangulation of different data sources and methods, or the development of converging lines of inquiry, increases the validity of research findings and conclusions. Another tactic to increase validity is to have the research findings for each case reviewed afterwards by informants (Yin, 1994). Both approaches are applied in this study. The maximisation of a research's reliability, or the minimisation of errors and biases, means that the objective is to make sure that another researcher following exactly the same research procedures for the same case study would come up with the same findings and conclusions (Yin, 1994). In order to ensure reliability in a case study it is necessary to document research procedures conscientiously by drafting a detailed research plan or protocol, especially when carrying out a multiple case study to ensure correspondence of research procedures between cases, and by maintaining an organised case study database.

As mentioned above, it is best to use multiple sources of evidence in case studies. This does not exclude the use of quantitative data, as is sometimes suggested by equating case studies with research methods such as participant observation. The state-wide part of this research relies, in particular, on quantitative data, surveys and election results. The regional cases allow for the usage of other research methods, interviews, analysis of documents and newspapers, as well as the use of more specific survey data.

Data sources

In total, France, Spain and the United Kingdom have 50 administrative regions. All of those have been covered by periodic mass surveys, or 'barometers', including relevant survey questions on issues of territorial identity, regional autonomy, regional government and voting preference. Because we do not just want to find out whether people feel attached to a region, but need to make a comparison between regional and national loyalties, we have also
The ‘Moreno question’ involves asking about someone’s identification with certain groups in a way that tries not to force the respondent to choose between two groups. It leaves room for expressions of exclusive as well as complementary identities. An example would be, “Which of the statements best describes how you see yourself? – Dutch, not European; More Dutch than European; Equally Dutch and European; More European than Dutch; European, not Dutch; Other”.
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The introduction of regional elections is a major element of regionalisation. Given that, in democracies, the votes for regionalist candidates at elections are the clearest expression of the level of support for regionalism, new types of elections offer new insights into the support for regionalism. This study uses election results at regional and national parliamentary elections. Regional elections are the ‘natural’ environment for regionalist political parties to mobilise support for their political projects. The focus of the debate is more on regional issues than during other elections. At national parliamentary elections, regional issues compete much more for attention with other issues with a national or international dimension. However, the na-

included data on regional and national identity. The ‘Moreno question’ was designed to measure dual identities statistically (Moreno, 2001b), and has been used frequently in research in Spain and the United Kingdom, while a variation has also been used in France. The Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS) in Spain, Observatoire Interrégional du Politique (OIP) in France, and the National Centre for Social Research (NCSR) in the United Kingdom have held such surveys over longer periods of time. The surveys in Spain are either national surveys, held in all regions at the same time, with a total of between 3,356 and 10,476 respondents, or in various regions at different moments, using the same questions and methodology. However, these surveys have been held more frequently in some regions than others. In France the OIP has held the same surveys annually since regionalisation, involving 700 respondents per region. However, not every region was included each time. The total number of respondents on each occasion was between 11,286 and 16,216. Surveys have been held in the United Kingdom since the early 1990s, although they have recently become more regular, either in the form of state-wide British surveys, or covering just Scotland and/or Wales. This study uses data from a number of relevant survey series, namely British Election Panel Studies and British Social Attitudes Surveys with between 3,143 and 3,620 respondents state-wide, as well as the Scottish Referendum Study, Welsh Referendum Study, Scottish Social Attitudes Surveys, Welsh Election Studies, and Wales Life and Times Studies. Weighing factors are used if applicable for all surveys to make sure certain regions are not overrepresented. Not all data is similar in the three different countries. However, this is not a major obstacle because we are primarily interested in differences in trends rather than in differences in public opinion between states as such, and each case is analysed on its separate entity.
tional political arena is also the place where important decisions about regional autonomy are taken. Another advantage of including national election results is that, unlike regional elections, they are not completely new, and make it possible to compare results before and after regionalisation. In France there are national presidential elections as well as national parliamentary elections, but the former are less relevant here, as regionalist parties do not usually put forward candidates. Regionalist parties do, in general, participate at local elections, and sometimes at European elections as well, but this is done less consistently. Moreover, because the campaigns do not focus specifically on regional issues, and regional autonomy is not decided at local or European levels, they are less useful as an indicator of the support for their regionalist proposals.

The survey and election result data are used in the state-wide analyses as well as in the three regional case studies, but the latter use other methods as well. Fieldwork trips were made to all three regions, involving a first ‘pilot’ fieldwork period in Galicia, followed by a general evaluation, one fieldwork period in Wales and Brittany each, plus a final trip to Galicia. During those fieldtrips, a number of semi-structured interviews were held with key actors and regional academic experts (for a list of interviews see Annex A). The interviews were held with representatives of regionalist and non-regionalist political parties, and particularly spokespersons for issues such as regional autonomy and the regional language, as well as regional administration civil servants responsible for the relevant policy fields, and representatives of regionalist cultural organisations. When selecting interviewees, priority was given to those who had been involved in regional politics for a relatively long time, and who were perhaps able to reflect on developments over time. The interviews dealt with the impact that the introduction and presence of a new regional level of government, and the ensuing regional elections and institutions, had on the objectives, organisational structure and opportunities for mobilising support, for the interviewees and his or her organisation. They also included issues specific to the regionalisation as implemented in each state, such as the role of other regions as an example, the drawing of regional boundaries, and the level of autonomy. Because interviews with individuals reflect personal perspectives, they are not taken as the view of the organisation as a whole, but as individual accounts of experiences of the consequences of regionalisation. Still, whereas beforehand there was reason to believe that there were significant disagreements on these topics within an organisation, the aim was to cover this by including interviews with representatives of different camps. In total 49 interviews were held, and 13 locally-based academics consulted.

Interviews are a helpful way of finding out more about the argumentation behind decisions and relationships between events. However, in a research project that spans more than two decades, interviews are not a very reliable way of acquiring information about the past through recollection. To
find out about the ideological development of regionalist parties after regionalisation we need to look at documents in which political demands and proposals have been laid down. The clearest periodical expressions of political party ideas are election manifestos, combined with other types of relevant policy documents. The most important of these are, in particular, general introductions which present the main objectives and ideas and sections dedicated to regional autonomy and constitutional issues, to regional culture and to language policy. Besides the election manifestos and political programmes of regionalist parties, those of regional sections of state-wide parties have also been used to establish the position of regionalist ideas within those parties, at different moments since regionalisation. (for a list of political party documents consulted, see Annex C).

With a view to analysing the development of regional language usage and education, questions on language policies were included in the interviews. It was partly with this topic in mind that representatives of regional language organisations, both semi-public bodies and regional cultural pressure groups, were also included. In addition, policy documents and reports were analysed pertaining to regional language usage and policies from the regional administrations. The development of the usage and knowledge of regional languages itself is determined through surveys like those mentioned above, or others if no questions on regional languages had been included. The same applies to the development of the readerships and viewing figures of newspapers and television, with comparisons being made between regional and national media. However, it is also important to establish the development of the content of reporting, and the share of regional reports. We focus on newspapers because most have a longer and more stable existence and ‘programming’ than television broadcasters, and also have more widely accessible archives. Regional and national newspapers offering general news are also included, although sports newspapers like l'Equipe and Marca, which are very popular in some countries, have been left out. A relatively small sample was taken covering one week every five years, these being weeks outside election campaign periods, and this formed the basis for an examination of the share of the main regional newspapers devoted to regional reports, compared with national, local and international reports and, in particular, the attention paid to regional politics. (see Annex D). In addition, the development was monitored of the usage of territorial symbols, for instance in subtitles, logos and weather maps.

Finally, secondary sources were used, not just by consulting regional academic experts but also by incorporating the findings in existing studies on Brittany, Galicia and Wales, or regionalism. In the same context, documents originating from the organisations themselves and reports on regional politics and regionalism in regional media were also used. All three regions, Galicia, Wales and Brittany, have regional daily newspapers, although these focus to varying degrees on regional politics.