Territorially Based Linguistic Minorities in Western Europe

Austria: Slovenes
Magyars
Croats

Belgium: Flemings
Walloons
Germans

Great Britain: Gaels (Scotland)
Gaels (Isle of Man)
Gaels (N. Ireland)
Welsh
Channel Islanders

Denmark: Germans
Faroe Islanders
Greenlanders

Finland: Swedes (mainland)
Swedes (Aaland)
Lapps

France: Occitans
Corsicans
Alsatians
Flemings
Bretons

West Germany: Danes
North Frisians

Ireland: Gaels

Italy: Friulians
Ladins
Valdotians
South Tyroleans
Slovenes
Sards
Greeks
Albanians
Occitans

Netherlands: West Frisians

Norway: Lapps

Spain: Catalans
Basques
Galicians

Sweden: Lapps
Finns

Switzerland: Jurassians

SUMMARY PRESENTATION OF PREDICTIONS OF THREE THEORIES OF ETHNIC POLITICAL MOBILIZATION

_____

	Guiding Perspective		
Characteristic	*Developmental*	*Reactive*	*Competitive*
Size of Subnation (S)	$(1)^a$	$(1)^a$	1
Linguistic Base (L)	1	0	$(1)^a$
Relative Wealth (W)	$(0)^a$	0	1
Economic Status (G)	0	$?^b$	$?^b$

_____

[a] Predictions in parentheses are only weakly indicated by the theories.
[b] Question marks indicate that no clear prediction is made.

DATA ON TERRITORIALLY BASED LINGUISTIC MINORITIES

Minority	S	L	W	G	E
Lapps, Finland	0	0	0	0	0
Finns, Sweden (Torne Valley)	0	0	0	0	0
Lapps, Sweden	0	0	0	0	0
Lapps, Norway	0	0	0	0	0
Albanians, Italy	0	0	0	0	0
Greeks, Italy	0	0	0	0	0
North Frisians, Germany	0	0	0	1	1
Danes, Germany	0	0	0	1	1
Basques, France	0	0	0	1	1
Ladins, Italy	0	0	1	0	0
Magyars, Austria	0	1	0	0	0
Croats, Austria	0	1	0	0	0
Slovenes, Austria	0	1	0	0	1
Greenlanders, Denmark	0	1	0	0	1
Aalanders, Finland	0	1	1	0	2
Slovenes, Italy	0	1	1	1	1
Valdotians, Italy	0	1	1	1	2
Sards, Italy	1	0	0	0	1
Galicians, Spain	1	0	0	0	1
West Frisians, Netherlands	1	0	0	1	1
Catalans, France	1	0	0	1	1
Occitans, France	1	0	0	1	1
Welsh, Great Britain	1	0	0	1	2
Bretons, France	1	0	0	1	2
Corsicans, France	1	0	0	1	2
Friulians, Italy	1	0	1	1	1
Occitans, Italy	1	0	1	1	1
Basques, Spain	1	0	1	1	2
Catalans, Spain	1	0	1	1	2
Flemings, France	1	1	0	0	1
Walloons, Belgium	1	1	0	1	2
Swedes, Finland	1	1	1	0	2
South Tyroleans, Italy	1	1	1	0	2
Alsatians, France	1	1	1	1	1
Germans, Belgium	1	1	1	1	2
Flemings, Belgium	1	1	1	1	2

S = Size of subnation
L = Linguistic ability
W = Relative wealth of subnation
G = Growth vs. decline of subnational region
E = Degree of ethnic political mobilization

TRUTH TABLE REPRESENTATION OF DATA ON CAUSES OF ETHNIC POLITICAL MOBILIZATION

S	L	W	G	E	N
0	0	0	0	0	6
0	0	0	1	0	3
0	0	1	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	?	0
0	1	0	0	0	4
0	1	0	1	?	0
0	1	1	0	1	1
0	1	1	1	1	2
1	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	1	1	6
1	0	1	0	?	0
1	0	1	1	1	4
1	1	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	1	1
1	1	1	0	1	2
1	1	1	1	1	3

```
S = Size of subnation
L = Linguistic ability
W = Relative wealth of subnation
G = Growth vs. decline of subnational region
E = Degree of ethnic political mobilization
```

EQUATION: E = SG + LW

Solution for Presence of Ethnic Political Mobilization

	raw coverage	unique coverage	consistency
L·W+	0.421053	0.263158	1.000000
S·G	0.736842	0.578947	1.000000

solution coverage: 1.000000
solution consistency: 1.000000

Solution for Absence of Ethnic Political Mobilization

	raw coverage	unique coverage	consistency
w·g+	0.764706	0.411765	1.000000
s·l	0.588235	0.235294	1.000000

solution coverage: 1.000000
solution consistency: 1.000000

This solution includes remainders as "don't cares."

USING BOOLEAN ALGEBRA TO EVALUATE THEORIES

1. Intersection with the reactive ethnicity perspective

$R = lw$
$E = SG + LW$
$R(E) = SlwG$

Conforming cases (6): West Frisians (Netherlands), Catalans (France), Occitans (France), Bretons (France), Corsicans (France), and Welsh (Great Britain)

2. Intersection with the ethnic competition perspective

$C = SW$
$E = SG + LW$
$C(E) = SW(G + L)$

Conforming cases (9): Germans (Belgium), Flemings (Belgium), Swedes (Finland), Alsatians (France), Friulians (Italy), Occitans (Italy), South Tyroleans (Italy), Basques (Spain), Catalans (Spain)

3. Intersection with the developmental perspective

$D = Lg$
$E = SG + LW$
$D(E) = LWg$

One case uniquely covered: Aalanders (Finland)

4. Cases not covered by any theoretical perspective

$H = lw + SW + Lg$
$h = (L + W)(s + w)(l + G)$ (using De Morgan's Law)
   $= slW + sLG + sWG + LwG$

$h(E) = (slW + sLG + sWG + LwG)(SG + LW)$
    $= sLWG + SLwG$

Cases covered by sLWG: Slovenes (Italy) and Valdotians (Italy)
Case covered by SLwG: Walloons (Belgium)

FREQUENCIES AND CODES FOR VARIABLES USED IN BOOLEAN ANALYSIS OF CHALLENGING GROUPS

	Value	Freq.	Percent
Bureaucracy			
	0	29	54.7
	1	24	45.3
Lower Strata Constituency			
	0	28	52.8
	1	25	47.2
Displacement as Primary Goal			
	0	37	69.8
	1	16	30.2
Help From Outsiders			
	0	35	66.0
	1	18	34.0
Acceptance Achieved			
	0	28	52.8
	1	25	47.2
New Advantages Won			
	0	27	50.9
	1	26	49.1

Values show coding in qualitative comparative analysis: 1 indicates presence; 0 indicates absence.

Truth Table For Causes of New Advantages*

					Number of Cases	New Adv.	No New Adv.
BUR	LOW	DIS	HLP	ACP			
0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2
0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0
0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0
0	0	1	0	0	4	0	4
0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2
0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
0	1	0	0	1	0	remainder	
0	1	0	1	0	0	remainder	
0	1	0	1	1	2	2	0
0	1	1	0	0	5	0	5
0	1	1	0	1	0	remainder	
0	1	1	1	0	2	0	2
0	1	1	1	1	0	remainder	
1	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
1	0	0	0	1	4	1	3
1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0

```
1    0    1    0    0    1         0        1
1    0    1    0    1    0         remainder
1    0    1    1    0    0         remainder
1    0    1    1    1    0         remainder
1    1    0    0    0    2         1        1
1    1    0    0    1    7         6        1
1    1    0    1    0    0         remainder
1    1    0    1    1    5         5        0
1    1    1    0    0    0         remainder
1    1    1    0    1    0         remainder
1    1    1    1    0    0         remainder
1    1    1    1    1    0         remainder
```

[*] Column headings: BUR = bureaucratic organization; LOW = lower strata constituency; DIS = displacement as primary goal; HLP = help from outsiders; ACP = acceptance of the organization. 1 indicates presence; 0 indicates absence. The output is coded as follows: U = uniform new advantages; L = new advantages likely; P = new advantages possible. The don't care output coding is indicated with a dash.

Truth Table Spreadsheet for Gamson's Data (Sorted by Frequency)

bur	low	dis	hlp	acp	number	adv	consistency
1	1	0	0	1	7	1	0.857
0	1	1	0	0	5	0	0
1	1	0	1	1	5	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0.5
0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	4	0	0.25
1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1
0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
0	1	0	1	1	2	1	1
0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0.5
0	0	1	0	1	1	?	1
0	0	1	1	1	1	?	0
1	0	0	1	0	1	?	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	?	1
1	0	1	0	0	1	?	0

QCA RESULTS: GAMSON DATA

```
--- COMPLEX SOLUTION ---
frequency cutoff: 2.000000
consistency cutoff: 0.857143
```

	raw coverage	unique coverage	consistency
~bur*~low*~dis*hlp	0.153846	0.076923	1.000000
~bur*~low*~dis*acp	0.153846	0.076923	1.000000
bur*low*~dis*acp	0.423077	0.230769	0.916667
~bur*~dis*hlp*acp	0.153846	-0.000000	1.000000
low*~dis*hlp*acp	0.269231	-0.000000	1.000000

```
solution coverage: 0.730769
solution consistency: 0.950000
```

```
--- PARSIMONIOUS SOLUTION ---
frequency cutoff: 2.000000
consistency cutoff: 0.857143
```

	raw coverage	unique coverage	consistency
~dis*hlp	0.500000	0.153846	1.000000
~bur*acp	0.269231	0.115385	0.875000
low*acp	0.500000	0.230769	0.928571

```
solution coverage: 0.846154
solution consistency: 0.916667
```

```
--- INTERMEDIATE SOLUTION ---
frequency cutoff: 2.000000
consistency cutoff: 0.857143
                         raw          unique
                       coverage      coverage     consistency
                       ----------    ----------   ----------
hlp*~dis*~low          0.230769      0.115385     1.000000
acp*hlp*~dis           0.384615      0.076923     1.000000
acp*~dis*~low*~bur     0.153846      0.076923     1.000000
acp*~dis*low*bur       0.423077      0.230769     0.916667
solution coverage: 0.807692
solution consistency: 0.954545
```

Factoring the solution by constituency

SMOs representing lower strata groups (the poor, workers, minorities):

```
acp*hlp*~dis +
acp*~dis*bur

= acp*~dis(hlp + bur)
```

SMOs representing not-lower strata groups (~low):

```
hlp*~dis +
acp*hlp*~dis +
acp*~dis*~bur

= hlp*~dis + acp*~dis*~bur
= ~dis(hlp + acp*~bur)
```

Parsing the solution of lower strata constituency

The two recipes for SMOs representing lower strata share two ingredients, acp and ~dis. ~dis is a necessary condition for all SMOs.

Is acp a necessary condition for SMOs representing lower strata?

Here's the test for all cases:

```
Outcome variable: adv
Conditions tested:
                     Consistency              Coverage
acp                  0.769231                 0.800000
```

Here's the test for cases with low = 1

```
Outcome variable: adv
Conditions tested:
                     Consistency              Coverage
acp                  0.928571                 0.928571
```

An alternate formulation of the outcome

This data set also could be analyzed by nesting the outcome: (1) uniform new advantages versus (2) uniform or probable new advantages versus (3) uniform or probable or possible new advantages.

bur	low	dis	hlp	acp	number	uniform	probable	possible	consist
1	1	0	0	1	7	0	1	1	0.857143
0	1	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	1	1	5	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0.5
0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	0.25
1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0.5

Here are the first two:

Uniform

```
--- INTERMEDIATE SOLUTION ---
frequency cutoff: 2.000000
consistency cutoff: 1.000000
                        raw          unique
                        coverage     coverage     consistency
                        ----------   ----------   ----------
hlp*~dis*~low           0.230769     0.115385     1.000000
acp*hlp*~dis            0.384615     0.269231     1.000000
acp*~dis*~low*~bur      0.153846     0.076923     1.000000
solution coverage: 0.576923
solution consistency: 1.000000
```

Uniform or Probable

```
--- INTERMEDIATE SOLUTION ---
frequency cutoff: 2.000000
consistency cutoff: 0.857143
                        raw          unique
                        coverage     coverage     consistency
                        ----------   ----------   ----------
hlp*~dis*~low           0.230769     0.115385     1.000000
acp*hlp*~dis            0.384615     0.076923     1.000000
acp*~dis*~low*~bur      0.153846     0.076923     1.000000
acp*~dis*low*bur        0.423077     0.230769     0.916667
solution coverage: 0.807692
solution consistency: 0.954545
```

Notice that the second solution is more inclusive—an additional combination is appended to the first solution.