From Group Identity to Political Cohesion and Commitment

Leonie Huddy

Stony Brook University

Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392

(631) 632-7639

Leonie.Huddy@sunysb.edu

To appear in *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology.* 2013. Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack Levy (Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Thanks to Vicky D'Anjou-Pomerlau for prompt and thorough research assistance.

Group identities are central to politics, an inescapable conclusion drawn from decades of political behavior research (Huddy 2003). Partisan identities such as Republican and Democrat in the U.S., Conservative and Labor in the U.K., Social Democrat and Christian Democrat in Germany, or Labor and Likud in Israel play a very central role in shaping the dynamics of public opinion and electoral choice (Dalton & Wattenberg 2000; Green et al., 2002;Lewis-Beck et al 2008). Social identities based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and other characteristics can generate political cohesion through a shared outlook and conformity to norms of political activity (Lewis-Beck et al., 2008; Miller et al., 1981; Simon &Klandermans 2001). Within a democratic polity, national identities boost support for civic norms, drive democratic engagement, and increase support for a muscular response to national threat (Huddy&Khatib, 2007; Theiss-Morse, 2009). Other specific issue and ideological identities such as pro-environment, feminist, conservative, or right-to-life on abortion also generate strong political cohesion and drive commitment to political action. An understanding of the psychology of group identification lends substantial insight into the study of political behavior.

The political relevance of explicitly political identities such as partisanship and left-right ideology is self-evident. The political cohesion of certain racial, ethnic, and religious groups within specific polities such as African -Americans in the U.S. or religious Jews in Israel is also chronically apparent (Shamir & Arian 1999; Tate 1992). But most social groups do not cohere politically, or do not do so to any great degree. Socio-demographic groups based on social class, age, gender, or marital status exhibit only very modest levels of political cohesion in the U.S. and other western democracies (Dalton 1996; Lewis-Beck et al 2008; Huddy, Cassese &Lizotte 2008;Wattenberg, 2008). On occasion, a subset of group members develops a cohesive political ideology and outlook. Feminists are an example of a politicized subgroup of women, and gay and lesbian activists form a politicized subgroup of all gays and lesbians (Simon &Klandermans, 2001). Such politicized group identities can merge with explicitly partisan identities to enhance a group's political impact. The conditions under which group identities become politicized, the

psychology underlying this process, and the political consequences of political identities for cohesion and engagement are the subject of the current chapter.

The focus throughout this review is on the *political* effects of group membership, although I pay greater attention to political attitudes and electoral behavior than collective action which is discussed by Klandermans in this volume. I also stress the consequences of group membership for ingroup solidarity but spend little time discussing its implications for outgroup antipathy, a topic covered by Kinder (this volume). In reviewing a very large literature in both psychology and political science I cannot hope to comprehensively cover psychological research or major theoretical approach to social identity and intergroup relations which are well reviewed elsewhere (Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004; Brown 2000; Ellemers, Spears &Doosje 2002; Ellemers&Haslam 2012; Hornsey 2008; Taylor &Moghaddam, 1996;Simon 2004).

1.0 Group Membership, Group Identification, and Social Identity

To better understand the conditions under which group membership leads to a politicized identity several key definitions are required. *Group membership* is based on objective inclusion in a group and does not necessitate an internalized sense of membership. This definition is not as straightforward as it seems, however. Social class is a classic case of ambiguous group membership. In the United States, individuals in the same income and occupational group vary as to whether they consider themselves working or middle class because the criteria for class membership are not well defined. Race is another group in which membership can be unclear. The U.S. census constantly varies its racial and ethnic categories, revealing their subjective underpinnings (Martin, DeMaio, Campanelli 1990). Racial and ethnic categories are further complicated for individuals with mixed ancestry. In fact, membership is inherently vague for many if not most political groups. It is difficult, for example, to define membership in a political party when individuals are not required to formally join an organization.

The ambiguous nature of some group memberships and the fact that not all objective members internalize group membership heightens the importance of *group identification,* a more restrictive, subjective, or internalized sense of belonging to the group. I define group identification as an internalized state confined to a subset of objective group members. As noted, objective membership can be difficult to identify. There are some groups for whom objective membership criteria is clearly defined. Someone who lacks African ancestry is not black objectively. But even here, a few white individuals exist who identify as black perhaps because of darker skin color or an uncertain family tree. Male and female are mutually exclusive categories, and while men can sympathize with women most men and women identify with their respective genders (leaving aside a small subset of individuals who feel they are wrongly classified in this sense). In the end, I regard group membership as a precursor to identification, even though membership can be fuzzy or ill-defined.

Group identification involves a subjective sense of membership and can take different forms, including social identity or perceived common fate. There is growing consensus that political cohesion revolves centrally around *social identity* which involves the incorporation of group membership into the self concept. According to Tajfel, a social identity involves an individual's "knowledge of his membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to the membership" (Tajfel 1981, p.255). This also fits Campbell and colleagues' (1960) definition of partisan identification in *The American Voter* as not only a set of beliefs but also feelings which culminate in a sense of "psychological attachment" to a political group – in this instance, Democrats or Republicans. An emphasis on a subjective sense of belonging or identification as a precursor to political cohesion helps to explain why not all groups cohere politically.

Finally, a *political identity* is a social identity with political relevance. It typically entails an identity as part of a group with norms concerning shared political beliefs, and the "correct" group position on a political candidate, political party, policy issue, or course of political action (Campbell et al

1960). The term political identity is thud broader than Simon and Klandermans' (2001) concept of politicization which is restricted to groups that become engaged in a collective power struggle. Some identities such as those based on political party, ideology, or a specific policy issue, are inherently political. Other political identities emerge from social identities that have gained political content. A political identity is thus a social identity that is either defined on the basis of a common political outlook, or has become political through the emergence of explicitly political group norms governing members' outlook and action. Many social identities, such as Asian in the United States, Chinese in Indonesia, or Turks in the Netherlands, are not political (Freedman, 2000; Junn&Masuoka 2008; Phalet&Baysu 2010). The concept of political identity lays the groundwork for the development of group-based political cohesion.

1.1 The Measurement of Social Identity

The measurement of group identification and social identity has taken different paths over time and across social science discipline. One of the earliest measures of group identification in political science–felt group closeness--appeared in the original American National Election Studies (ANES) and was included in ANES surveys for many years. Typically, respondents were given a list of groups (e.g., working man, businessmen, Catholics) and asked to name the groups to which they felt close. In the 2000 ANES panel study, the question is worded in the following way: "Here is a list of groups. Please read over the list and tell me the number of those groups you feel particularly close to — people who are most like you in their ideas and interests and feelings about things" (http://www.electionstudies.org/). If respondents mention more than one group, they are then asked to name the group to which they feel closest. The telephone version of the ANES group identification improves on the closeness question by asking respondents a single question about each social group, forcing a specific answer on each group. Those interviewed by phone in the 2000 ANES panel study were asked whether they felt close to whites, poor people, Asian Americans, liberals, the elderly, blacks,

labor unions, feminists, southerners, business people, young people, conservatives, Hispanic-Americans, women, the working-class, middle-class and men (http://www.electionstudies.org/). Unfortunately, both forms of the closeness question are weak measures of identity because they do not capture gradations in identity strength, conflate identity with sympathy for a group to which one does not belong, and do not assess the value or emotional significance of the connection (Wong 2010).

A different approach has been pursued in political science to measure specific identifications such as partisan identification. It is typically measured with a single question that includes both direction and strength of partisanship. In the U.S., respondents are typically asked whether, and the degree to which, they think of themselves as Democrats, Republicans or Independents. A similar approach has been developed to measure partisan identity in other nations using questions such as the following from the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems: "Do you usually think of yourself as close to any particular political party?", "Which party is that?", and "Do you feel very close to this party, somewhat close, or not very close?" (Dalton & Weldon 2007). This approach yields a measure with roughly 3 or 4 levels of partisan identification strength. When compared to the original group closeness question, it better captures identity strength and avoids the problem of respondents who lack sufficient motivation to choose groups from a list.

Social identity researchers in psychology have taken a very different approach to the measurement of identity. First, they gauge identity very directly to avoid conflating of identity with sympathy felt by non-group members. Second, psychologists have relied on multi-item scales to measure social identity. There is not a uniform approach to the measurement of identity, however, and researchers have developed multiple subscales to form an overall measure of identity (Ashmore et al 2004; Ellemers, Kortekaas, & van Ouwerkerk, 1999; Jackson & Smith 1999; Leach, van Zomeren, Zebel, Vliek, Ouwerkerk, & Spears 2008). Cameron (2004) measures three dimensions that are central to Tajfel's definition of a social identity: a sense of belonging, positive feelings for the group, and viewing

membership as important to oneself. Ashmore and colleagues (2004) include these three dimensions and several others: self-categorization, evaluation, importance, interdependence, social embeddedness, behavioral involvement, and group meaning. Luhtanen and Crocker (1992; Crocker et al., 1994) developed a popular measure of collective self-esteem (CSE) with four subscales: interdependence of esteem with other members (membership), private collective self-esteem, public collective self-esteem, and the importance of identity to one's self image.

Four identity subscales have been used with some frequency by Political psychologists. They include the subjective importance of an identity, a subjective sense of belonging, feeling one's status is interdependent with that of other group members, and positive feelings for members of the ingroup. For example, Sniderman and colleagues adapt the CSE to measure Dutch identity with the following four questions:"I often think of myself as Dutch", "I consider myself a typical Dutchman", "I'm proud that I'm Dutch", and "If someone said something bad about Dutch people I feel as if they said something bad about me". With colleagues, I have developed a 4-item scale of national identity measured with the following questions: "How important is being American to you?", "To what extent do you see yourself as a typical American", "When talking about Americans how often do you say we instead of they", and how well does the term American describe you?" (Huddy&Khatib 2007). We have also adapted a similar scale to measure partisan identity (Mason, Huddy,&Aaroe, 2011). Other researchers also use multi-item scales to tap national (Schildkraut 2011; Theiss-Morse 2009), partisan (Bliuc et al., 2007; Greene 1999; Hogg et al, 2007), and ethnic identity (Sidanius et al., 2008). These scales exhibit good internal reliability, and scale reliability is reasonably robust to the inclusion of questions with slightly different wording. Multi-item scales are typically used by social psychologists to measure national, racial, ethnic and partisan identities (Bliuc et al 2007; Pratto&Glasford 2008).

Unfortunately, very few studies have compared the ability of single and multi-item identity scales to predict political attitudes and behavior. Research on partisan identities is something of an

exception and findings demonstrate the superiority of multi-item scales in predicting political attitudes and behavior. For example, Greene (1999) found that a multi-item measure of partisan identity (as either a Democrat or Republican) was a better predictor of political views than a single folded partisan identification scale. In our research (Mason, Huddy & Aaroe, 2011), a multi-item scale of Democratic and Republican identity is a far better predictor of political activity and engagement among Americans than a folded two or four-point version of the traditional single-item partisanship measure.

2.0 Major Theoretical Approaches

The ultimate goal of this chapter is to account for group-based political cohesion and I consider five broad classes of theory that lend insight into its have been put forward offered to explain its emergence and development (for a more exhaustive list, see Brewer & Brown, 1998).[1] Each theory highlights a somewhat different set of active ingredients in the development of political cohesion. My goal is not to evaluate how well each approach accounts for the emergence of group solidarity, but rather to derive a set of underlying factors. I define *political cohesion* as the existence of shared political attitudes, beliefs, and behavior among group members that can be directly attributed to group membership. A subjective group identity lies at the core of this cohesion and helps empirically to distinguish group-based cohesion from cohesion derived from a simple aggregation of members' individual political beliefs.

2.1 Cognitive Approach: Categorization & Group Salience

A cognitive approach underscores the importance of categorization to the development of group cohesion. Self-categorization theory (SCT) attributes group cohesion to cognitive factors such as the situational salience of a group identity which generates a collective sense of self. The shift from

[1] This is a selective account of the major theoretical approaches to ingroup cohesion. Other approaches not covered here include a psychodynamic approach (see Post, this volume) and social comparison theory (Brewer and Brown 1998).

personal to collective identity is accompanied by increased adherence to group norms and heightened self-stereotyping, factors that are logical precursors to political cohesion (Turner et al., 1987; Hogg, Hardie& Reynolds, 1995; Spears, Oakes, Ellemers&Haslam, 1997). Salience is typically defined as a combination of the readiness to adopt an identity and the relevance of an identity to a given situation, although SCT researchers have paid greater attention to situational factors such as salience than a pre-existing readiness to identify with a group (Simon, 2004). Self-categorization is best captured by measures that tap an internalized sense of group belonging, although SCT researchers have typically assumed rather than measured group identity under conditions of group salience (see the exchange on this point between Huddy, 2002 and Oakes, 2002).

Self-categorization theorists have an especially labile view of social identities and their meaning. They draw extensively on categorization research to argue that perceived similarity to a prototypic group member (e.g., Barack Obama for Democrats) plays a key role in the formation and development of a social identity and the emergence of group conformity (Hogg, 1996; Hogg &Hains, 1996; McGarty et al., 1992; Turner et al., 1987). According to SCT researchers social identities are driven almost completely by one's immediate perceptual context. From their perspective, identities vary, in part, because social categories such as age or gender vary in salience across situations. Indeed, one of the key tenets of self-categorization theory is that individuals constantly shift back and forth between an individual and a social identity (Turner et al., 1987). Thus, within a cognitive approach group cohesion and conformity rest heavily on the salience of group membership.

2.2 Realistic Interest Approaches

Realistic interest approaches include realistic group conflict, relative deprivation, social dominance theory, and Blumer's sense of group position (Blumer, 1958; Bobo& Hutchings, 1996; Sidanius&Pratto, 2000; see Brown, 2010 for an overview). They suggest collectively that group membership is politically consequential to the extent that tangible group gains and losses drive group

members' political decisions. Realistic interest theories include the protection of self and group-interests which might indicate long-term or future interests that are objective or subjective, direct or indirect (Bobo, 1983). Thus the unemployed might cohere politically around their mutual reliance on monthly unemployment benefits; the elderly could unite over threats to cut Social Security benefits or other national old-age pensions; and immigrants could unify in opposition to programs that deny them national rights and benefits.

In most studies of Americans' policy preferences, self-interest has had very circumscribed and limited effects on a range of policies including support for unemployment policies, taxation, busing, women's issues, bilingual education, and immigration (Hainemuller&Hiscox 2010; Sears & Funk, 1991). The political effects of self-interest are most pronounced when government decisions or actions have large, clear, and certain effects on an individual's interests (Sears & Funk, 1991). At times, self-interest can motivate political action (Begley &Alker, 1982; Green & Cowden, 1992). But the political effects of self-interest need to be disentangled from those of group interests which are often more powerful politically (Bobo 1983). Group interest is typically assessed with a measure of perceived interdependence. In the U.S., perceived economic and political interdependence with other blacks is typically used to measure common fate among African-Americans (Bobo & Johnson 2000; Tate 1994).

Some theorists argue that additional beliefs are needed to create political cohesion even when group members share a sense of common fate (Simon &Klandermans, 2001). A sense of subjective deprivation is critical to *relative deprivation theory* – the perception that one's group's finances are deteriorating relative to those of others, for example (Gay 2006). Relative deprivation theorists refer to this as a sense of fraternal deprivation and contrast it with egoistic deprivation which arises when an individual feels personally deprived compared to an individual or group with whom he compares himself (Brown 2010).

2.3 Symbolic Approaches: Social Identity Theory.

Social identity theory emphasizes the importance of symbolic concerns such as a group's social standing as central to the development of group cohesion. There are two distinct branches of social identity theory (SIT): the version developed by Tajfel (1981) and Tajfel and Turner (1979) known as social identity theory and self-categorization theory, a cognitive elaboration of SIT referred to earlier (Turner et al., 1987). Both theories acknowledge the origins of social identity in cognitive and motivational factors, although they place differing emphasis on them (Hogg, 1996; p. 67). The earliest versions of social identity theory developed by Tajfel (1981) and Tajfel and Turner (1979) placed key emphasis on the psychological motivations that lead a group member to endorse or disavow an existing group membership. Turner and colleagues (1987; p. 42) have described this motive as a need among group members "to differentiate their own groups positively from others to achieve a positive social identity."

In contrast, self-categorization theory developed by Turner and colleagues (1987) has concentrated on the cognitive underpinnings of social identity. This approach builds on Tajfel's (1981) early research and theorizing which began from a purely cognitive perspective, attempting to explain the perceptual distortions that accompanied categorization (Tajfel, 1981). But at some point, Tajfel concluded that cognitive factors -- the perceptual distortions that arise from the accentuation of intergroup differences -- could not solely explain the emergence of intergroup discrimination and, in response, modified social identity theory to include additional motivational factors linked to group status.

According to Tajfel, the effects of social identity are driven by a need for positive distinctiveness in which one's own group is distinguished favorably from an out-group. This means that group identity and ingroup bias emerges readily among members of high status groups because membership positively distinguishes group members from outsiders (Bettencourt et al 2001). In contrast, the development of

group identity is less certain among members of low status groups who need to additionally develop an identity around alternative, positively valued group attributes (social creativity) or fight to change the group's negative image (social change) before membership can enhance their status (Tajfel& Turner, 1979).[2] In recent years, the motives that contribute to the development of ingroup cohesion have been expanded beyond positive distinctiveness to include basic needs such as inclusiveness, distinctiveness, and a need for certainty (Leonardelli, Pickett, & Brewer 2010; Hogg 2007). These motives are discussed in greater detail in reference to individual differences in identity development.

2.4 Social Constructivism and the Meaning of Group Membership

The reach of social constructivism extends well beyond the dynamics of identity but I include it here for its insights into how the meaning of an identity affects political cohesion (Duveen, 2001; Erikson, 1993). Social constructivism – the notion that concepts derive their meaning through social processes – underlies a good deal of thinking across the contemporary social sciences and humanities. The notion that groups are social constructions that need to be imbued with meaning is implicit within social identity and self-categorization theory which stress the ease with which social groups and social identities can be created among members of arbitrarily designated groups. As a number of critics have noted, however, social identity theorists have explored the socially fluid nature of identities but have not closely examined or analyzed their meaning (Duveen, 2001; Huddy, 2001; Reicher 2004). From a social constructivist perspective, it is difficult to understand the consequences of group identification without understanding its subjective meaning to group members (Billig, 1995). This may be especially true for politically relevant identities which are often the target of political manipulation – efforts by politicians and group entrepreneurs to create, define, and redefine identities to serve their political ends (Erikson, 1993; Reicher 2004).

[2] For a more detailed overview of social identity theory see Brown (1995) and Brewer and Brown (1998).

From a social constructivist perspective, the emphasis on groups that lack meaning in research on social identity and self categorization theory may seriously hamper an understanding of both identity acquisition and its consequences (Huddy, 2001). For example, members of diverse groups may attach a different meaning to the same identity, such as national identity, depending on their race or ethnicity or the region of the country in which they live (Reicher& Hopkins 2001; Schildkraut 2011). Group membership can also take on diverse connotations when its meaning is contested, perhaps for political reasons. To complicate matters further, the internal meaning of a group can be quite different from its external meaning as group members actively reject external derogatory views of the group, for example (Cohen, 1986; Reicher 2004). Group members may even choose to internalize a group identity because they hold a different conception of what group membership means than potential members who fail to adopt the identity.

2.5 An Evolutionary Perspective

Evolutionary psychologists highlight the functional underpinnings of group identity. They stress the necessity of group coordination for human existence, including basic activities such as child rearing, food collection, tool development, food production, and group defense (see Sidanius&Kurzban, this volume).From this perspective, an internalized attachment to a small group evolved as a functional necessity for survival. Brewer (2007) argues that the key motive for group cohesion is not to maintain social status or positive distinctiveness as claimed by SIT researchers, but rather the need to cooperate with other group members for survival purposes (Brewer 2007;Brewer and Caporael 2006). She argues that social identity lies at the center of this evolutionary process, and believe it plays a critical role in helping group members to keep track of those with whom one should cooperate and trust.

An evolutionary approach is consistent with evidence that social identities form rapidly on a very minimal basis, and that group members react more strongly to the emotions of ingroup than outgroup members (Chaio et al., 2008; van Bavel, Packer, & Cunningham, 2011). The approach also fits

with a nascent body of research hinting at a genetic basis to identity and group cooperation. For example, Dawes & Fowler (2009) find a link between the strength of partisan attachment and a specific allele of the D2 dopamine receptor gene. This process may be further mediated by the hormone oxytocin which increases ingroup favoritism (Dreu et al., 2011).

There are several key insights that emerge from an evolutionary approach to group cohesion. First and most importantly, group identities do not necessarily foster outgroup antipathy since their primary function is to promote internal cooperation (Halevy et al., 2008). A link between identity and outgroup hostility arises, however, when the group is threatened since group defense is a key facet of cooperation for which identities likely developed (Brewer &Caporael 2006). Thus the link between ingroup identity and outgroup hostility revolves around the existence of perceived threat (Brewer 2007).

Second, an emphasis on cooperation provides a correction to researchers who have focused inordinately on the consequences of identities for political conflict. Political psychologists are only now beginning to address a number of intriguing questions concerning the link between identity and political cooperation: To what extent do group identifiers favor government programs that assist fellow group members (Theiss-Morse , 2009)? Follow politics, vote, and engage in other forms of political activity (Huddy&Khatib, 2007)? Or value the lives of fellow group members to a greater degree than those of outsiders (Pratto&Glasford, 2008)? Third, an evolutionary approach underscores the importance to group cohesion of group norms that foster cooperation and promote punishment of transgressors. This insight fits with a growing body of research that emphasizes group norms as a key to understanding political cohesion.

2.6 Contrasting the Five Approaches

These theoretical approaches highlight differing sources of commonality among members, place differing emphasis on the importance of conflicting interests with an outgroup, emphasize different types of groups as candidates for political mobilization, and stress different issues around which

members are likely to mobilize. The cognitive approach predicts cohesion among the members of a politically salient group; realistic interest theory confines cohesion to groups whose members share a common fate; social identity theory points to heightened unity among members of groups whose status is threatened; a social constructivist perspective predicts cohesion among members who share a common understanding of the political implications of group membership; and an evolutionary approach stresses the importance of identity for the development of cooperation and the emergence of intergroup conflict under conditions of threat.

3.0 From Social Identity to Political Cohesion

Membership in a social group does not necessarily prescribe a specific political outlook nor does it dictate mandatory political action on the group's behalf. This raises an important question concerning the conditions under which social identities are transformed into political identities to generate political cohesion. Additional factors beyond simple group membership are needed to explain the emergence of political cohesion. I discuss three factors that are key to this process: the existence of strong identities, the political meaning of group membership, and the existence of symbolic and realistic threats and grievances.

3.1 Strong, Subjective Group Identity

Political cohesion rests on the development of strong, subjective identities. But even weak subjective identities have a more powerful influence on political membership than objective group membership. The earliest voting studies provided evidence of greater support for the Democratic party among Jews, union leaders, and blacks who felt close to their respective membership groups (Berelson, Lazarsfeld& McPhee, 1954; Campbell et al., 1960). More recent research underscores the power of identities to shape political outcomes (Conover 1984). In the United States, African-Americans have an especially pronounced sense of group identification that makes them an ideal group in which to examine more closely the political effects of subjective identification (Tate 1994; Dawson, 1994; Bobo and

Johnson 2000). African-Americans who identify strongly with their race are more likely to adopt a pro-group position on a variety of racial and social welfare issues (Tate 1994). This extends to other ethnic groups as well. Sidanius and colleagues (2008) found that UCLA students who were strongly identified with their ethnic group (white, African-American, Latino, Asian) were more inclined to vote for a group member, and demonstrate and sign a petition on behalf of a group-related cause.

Strong identities are equally important in explaining the political effects of identities based on partisanship and ideology. Strong partisans are more likely than weak partisans to exhibit partisan bias in their evaluations of a president and assessment of factual economic and social conditions (Bartels 2002). Malka&Lelkes (2010) provide experimental evidence that such effects are linked to identity not beliefs, demonstrating that strong ideologues (liberal or conservative) were more persuaded then weak ideologues to support an American farm subsidy policy if advocated by those who shared their ideology regardless of the underlying arguments (see also Cohen 2003). When partisan leaders differ in their support of a specific policy, well informed strong partisans are the most likely to be exposed to these disagreement and fall in line behind their party leaders (Green, Plamquist & Schickler, 2002; Zaller, 1992).

Group salience further enhances the political effects of a strong identity. White Americans were more supportive of spending on minority education when their national identity was salient, but were less supportive of the same program when their racial identity was salient (Transue 2007). In essence, program support was confined to others in the same group. The 9/11 terrorist attacks may have had a similar effect on white Americans. In one study, experimental exposure to information about the events of 9/11 heightened American identity and increased support for multiculturalism policies (Davies, Steele, & Markus, 2008). Partisan and ideological identities are chronically salient within American politics, but others wax and wane in political influence depending on their salience within current political debate.

Political action is also more common among strong group identifiers. Strong partisans are more likely than weak partisans to have given money or volunteered their time to work for a political candidate or political party, voted, or engaged in other political activities (Fowler & Kam 2007; Mason, Huddy & Aaroe 2011). Strongly identified Americans are more likely to vote (Huddy & Khatib 2007). Wald (2008) found that American Jews' and Arab-Americans' who felt proud of their ethnicity and heritage were more likely to express interest and involvement in the middle-east conflict. There is ample evidence that strong identities also fuel collective action and related forms of group-based political activity (see also Klandermans, this volume). Simon and colleagues (1998) provide evidence that older people who identify strongly with the Gray Panthers and gay men who strongly identify with the gay movement were more likely than others to express willingness to participate in group-related political action, although the direction of causality remains untested in this research. Van Zomeren and colleagues (2008) offer compelling evidence of the link between identity and action in their meta-analysis based on over 60 studies. In general, the link between identity strength and political action is larger for explicitly political identities such as feminist, conservative, or pro-environment.

Other non-political aspects of group cohesion are also more common among strongly identified group members, helping to explain the maintenance of strong identities over time. For example, strong identifiers typically feel more positively about members of their group (Huo& Molina 2006; Simon, Kulla & Zobel 1995). At work, a strong company or organizational identity leads to greater job satisfaction, loyalty, and compliance (Tyler & Blader, 2000). In several western European countries, a greater sense of national pride increases tax compliance, an indicator of national cooperation (Torgler& Schneider, 2007). Strongly identified Americans place a higher value on the loss of American than Iraqi lives, leading to their greater opposition to government policies in Iraq that involved the loss of U.S. military troops (Pratto&Glasford, 2008). There are even protective psychological effects that come from a strong

identity, especially under conditions of intense intergroup conflict as observed in Northern Ireland (Muldoon, 2009).

Finally, a strong identity generates defensiveness in the face of group criticism. For example, priming societal (as opposed to internal) explanations for a lack of African American success resulted in greater defensiveness among white students strongly identified with their race but lead to greater support for blacks among weakly identified whites (Andreychick et al., 2009). Strong identifiers tend to draw group boundaries more tightly and are more careful about who they include within the ingroup. They are more exclusive, take longer to decide that a racially ambiguous face belongs to their group than reject an ambiguous face as belonging to the outgroup, and define their national group more exclusively in terms of race and ethnicity (Castano et al., 2002; Theiss-Morse, 2009).

3.2 Group Meaning

Not all strong, subjective group identities translate readily into group-based solidarity, however, and other factors are needed to understand the development of political cohesion. The second factor considered here is what group membership means to members, especially its implications for political behavior (Deaux, 1993; Sellers et al., 1998). Group membership gains political content through norms and beliefs that connect group membership to specific political attitudes and actions. As noted, some groups, based for example on partisanship and ideology, are inherently political and guaranteed to generate political cohesion among strong identifiers. Other groups can attain political meaning through the formation and existence of group norms that prescribe group members' specific beliefs or political actions. Groups can also acquire political meaning through the influence of group prototypes or leaders who advocate certain beliefs and policy positions or take specific political action.

3.2.1 Groups Norms &National Identity

National identity provides a fascinating example of an identity that differs in meaning internally among citizens of many nations, helping to explain variance within the nation in support for aggressive national security policies, civic engagement, immigration, and other policies. National identity researchers frequently tap support for group norms by asking about the desired attitudes and behaviors of "true" or "good" group members. Citrin and colleagues' explore the subjective meaning of being American and uncover widespread consensus that it depends on support for the fundamental American values of equality and individualism consistent with the view of the United States as a civic nation defined by common beliefs and ideals. These beliefs are considered a normative aspect of being American. Nonetheless, they also discover contested aspects of American identity that concern the need to believe in God or speak up for one's country in order to be considered a "true American" that are endorsed by a subset of Americans (Citrin, Reingold& Green, 1990; Citrin et al., 2001; Citrin & Wright, 2009). Researchers working in this area contrast such ethnocultural conceptions of national identity with civic conceptions that rest on shared values such as individualism or freedom.

Other researchers pursue a slightly different approach to the study of national identity and its meaning, identifying three distinct subjective facets of national attachments. Measures of patriotism or symbolic patriotism assess positive feelings of pride toward the nation and assess support for national symbols such as the flag and anthem. Political symbols such as the flag can be politically polarizing, resulting in greater symbolic patriotism among conservatives than liberals in the U.S. (Huddy&Khatib 2007). A second form of national attachment involves a sense of national superiority and is referred to variously as nationalism, chauvinism, blind patriotism, or uncritical patriotism; it also tends to be more strongly endorsed by political conservatives than liberals in the U.S. (De Figueiredo and Elkins 2003; Herrmann et al 2009; Kosterman and Feshbach 1989;Parker 2009; Schatz &Staub 1997; Schatz et al 1999). Finally, Schatz and colleagues (Schatz &Staub 1997; Schatz, et al 1999) developed a measure of

constructive patriotism that assesses the degree to which someone believes Americans should speak up and criticize the nation when needed. All three types of national attachments are linked to a strong national identity, but they obviously include different content (Theiss-Morse 2009; Herrmann et al. 2009).

Moreover, the political effects of national identity depend on its meaning (Schatz et al., 1999; Theiss-Morse 2009; Wong 2010). Individuals who endorse an ethnocultural view of American identity and place greater importance on nativist aspects of American identity such as being Christian are more likely to oppose policies designed to benefit new immigrants, view negatively the impact of immigration, support English-only vote ballots, endorse ethnic profiling of Arab Americans, and support restrictions on civil liberties for non-citizens in general (Citrin et al., 1990; Citrin et al., 2001; Schildkraut, 2011; Wong 2010). Those who rank highly the civic aspects of American identity are more supportive of increased immigration and less supportive of policies that favor English-speaking immigrants (Citrin& Wright 2009). They are also more inclined than others to think that volunteering, donating money to charity and serving in the military is an obligation they owe to other Americans (Schildkraut 2011).

In an international context, the meaning of national identity affects the formation of larger regional identities that transcend national boundaries. Breakwell (2000) documents differences among Europeans in the extent to which they see European identity as compatible with their existing national identity. In Eurobarometer data from 1992, as few as 13% of Italians but as many as 32% of Irish and 38% of those in the UK felt they would lose their national identity if all European countries came together in a European union. Clearly, a greater number of individuals living in the British Isles than other European nations see European identity as incompatible with their existing national identity. Hooghe& Marks (2004) report that Europeans who choose their nation but not Europe when asked whether they think of themselves in terms of their nation, nation and Europe, Europe and nation, or just Europe are far less likely to support European integration. The degree to which European and national

identity overlap, thus, influences support for policies designed to create a single community, affecting levels of national cohesion on the issue. The meaning of specific ethnic and racial identities also influences their political effects (Brady & Kaplan 2000; Gurin et al., 1994).

The direction of causality between meaning and political attitudes can be questioned, however: does the meaning of group membership drive policy attitudes, or vice versa? Evidence that the political effects of meaning are conditioned by identity strength in cross-sectional data circumvents this empirical impasse to some degree. Sindic and Reicher (2009) demonstrate that group meaning has its most marked political effects among the strongest group identifiers. In their research, strongly identified Scots who view Scotland as dominated by the English within Britain, felt their identity was undermined by a union with Britain, and saw the two identities as incompatible were far more likely than others to support Scottish nationalism and political independence from Britain (Sindic & Reicher, 2009). But in the absence of a strong Scottish national identity, these beliefs had far less political impact.

Meaning is tightly linked to acceptance of group norms and the degree to which the norms are consensual within a group. Terry, Hogg and colleagues have studied the effects of group norms in some detail, underscoring their importance to group-based action. In a series of studies, they demonstrate that strong group identifiers are most likely to adhere to group norms including those that prescribe actions such as protective health behaviors and sustainable farming practices (Fielding et al 2008; Terry and Hogg 1996; Terry, Hogg and Duck 1999). In a similar vein, several studies provide clear evidence that a strong national identity promotes civic engagement (Theiss-Morse 2009). Huddy&Khatib (2007) report higher levels of political engagement and voting among those with a strong American identity, suggesting that strongly identified Americans are more likely than weak identifiers to adhere to civic norms. It should be noted however that some forms of national attachment such as strongly nationalistic beliefs or uncritical patriotism dampen political engagement (Huddy&Khatib 2007; Schatz

et al, 1999). This underscores the importance of both strong identities and their perceived meaning in adherence to national civic norms.

In summary, group norms are central to the development of political cohesion. Research on the meaning of national identity, especially its association with norms of civic participation, helps to explain levels of political engagement and action. But even highly normative aspects of national identity are not entirely consensual. For example, blind patriots hold a strong national identity but are less likely than others to vote. The political implications of group membership are less clear in the absence of widely shared norms that dictate political attitudes and behavior. In general, political cohesion emerges in groups with large numbers of strongly identified members who adhere to common norms of political belief and action.

3.2.2 Prototypes and Leadership

The characteristics, beliefs, and actions of prototypic group members are a second way in which groups are infused with meaning. In self-categorization theory, groups are viewed as fuzzy sets with unclear boundaries and a "graded" or probabilistic structure (Turner et al 1987). From this vantage point, typical members define the group, and group identity is driven by feeling similar to the typical or prototypic group member. When group identity is salient, group members conform to the behaviors and beliefs of prototypic group members. The political beliefs, ideology, or actions of prototypic group members is thus crucial to the emergence of political cohesion.

Group prototypes influence political cohesion in at least two ways. First, they help to establish group boundaries and place limits on political assistance and cooperation to outsiders. In the context of national identity, an ethnocultural conception of national identity results in a group prototype constituted of majority group members exclusive of immigrants and ethnic minorities. Some Americans define American identity in this way by confining it to individuals who are Christian, speak English, or born in the U.S. (Citrin&Wright 2009). Theiss-Morse (2009) demonstrates that placing such boundaries

on the group prototype limits support for government policies that benefit members of ethnic and racial minority groups such as spending on welfare, education, urban areas, or improving the condition of blacks. In this way, the group prototype defines who constitutes "we" and places boundaries on ingroup cooperation.

Second, when it comes to political groups such as nations or political parties, the group prototype is often a national or political leader whose beliefs, actions or exhortations to action directly influence group members. John F. Kennedy's admonition to Americans to "ask not what your country can do for you — ask what you can do for your country" is a direct appeal to American civic engagement and a fine example of prototypic influence at work. In one sense, a prototype that includes the beliefs of typical group members is not very different from a norm that prescribes what group members ideally believe, although I consider prototypes to be more descriptive and less prescriptive than norms (cf. Hogg & Reid 2006). Once again, the influence of group prototypes is most pronounced among strong group identifiers who are most likely to conform to the group prototype, a process that has been well documented for political groups based partisanship and ideology (Malka&Lelkes 2010; Cohen 2003).

In general, group leaders are expected to play a powerful role in forging political cohesion. According to Hogg& Reid (2006), group leaders are individuals who communicate their prototypicality to their followers through the use of pronouns such as "we", and reference to common goals and concerns, language that is very common in political speeches. Such leaders can be regarded as identity entrepreneurs who manage norms and prototypes through their verbal and nonverbal communication. When George W. Bush identified Osama bin laden and al Qaeda as the enemy after 9/11 he went out of his way to make clear that Muslims and Muslim Americans were not the target of U.S. military action. His position was generally adopted by Americans and serves as a marked contrast to the vilification and internment of Japanese Americans after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1942 (Schildkraut 2002). Of

course, a group leader considered atypical by some members is far less likely to wield this kind of influence.

3.3 Shared Interests, Grievances, and Threat

Realistic interest theory underscores the insufficiency of subjective identity to motivate group-based political action. In addition, group members need to share common interests or, at least perceive that they do. From this perspective, affluent whites band together against affirmative action to protect what they see as threatened privileges, and women cohere around issues linked to gender discrimination (Lowery et al, 2006). In the first instance, common group interests are at risk and need to be defended while in the second group members feel aggrieved and wish to improve their position. The existence or perception of common fate and threats to shared interests is the third factor considered here as a basis for political cohesion.

Researchers typically equate common fate with the existence of shared material interests. I extend this discussion to include both shared *material* interests, such as income and employment, and *symbolic* concerns, such as the esteem and respect that group members receive from non-group members. A sense of common fate concerning material outcomes is derived from realistic interest theory and includes a sense that group members' share similar economic outcomes. A sense of symbolic common fate touches on concerns about group status and esteem, linked to social identity theory and related approaches. The distinction between the two types of interests matters because they hint at the emergence of political cohesion in different types of groups – high status groups whose status is threatened are more likely to cohere according to social identity theory whereas realistic interest approaches suggest political cohesion among members who share a similar economic fate. Stephan and Stephan (2000) incorporate both symbolic and material threats in their influential approach to the study of threat.

3.3.1 Material Interests

Material shared interests have been assessed in two ways. First, researchers have assessed the political consequences of a sense of perceived common fate and deteriorating group finances. Drawing on data from the 1984 American National Election Studies (ANES), Kinder and colleagues (1989) examined the impact of perceived common economic interests on vote choice. Americans who felt a sense of economic interdependence with other group members such as the elderly, farmers, or the middle class and who saw their group situation as deteriorating were more likely to rate the national economy negatively and vote on that basis. In Kinder and colleagues' research, a sense of common fate worked in conjunction with a sense of economic grievance to promote political cohesion. Lowery and colleagues (2006) experimentally manipulated the effects of various employment-related affirmative action programs and find lowered program support among whites with a strong white identity when the program was framed in terms of white job loss (as opposed to black gains). In this instance, a strong identity combined with worsened group outcomes increased opposition to affirmative action programs.

More commonly, however, shared economic interests have been examined in a second form -- as a function of fraternal deprivation, the sense that one's group is doing worse than another. This research provides consistent evidence that fraternal deprivation drives political cohesion. Whites who felt they were doing worse than blacks were more inclined to support George Wallace's candidacy in 1968 (Vanneman& Pettigrew, 1972) and become involved in the Boston anti-busing movement (Begley &Alker, 1982). Guimond and Dube'-Simard (1983) observed that Quebecois who felt deprived compared to Anglo Canadians were more likely to support Quebec nationalism. Tripathi and Srivastava (1981) found in a study of Muslims and Hindus in India that those who felt their group was relatively deprived

held more negative attitudes toward their religious outgroup.[3]

It would be tempting to conclude from these studies that a sense of fraternal deprivation drives political cohesion. But in some research the impact of fraternal deprivation is confined to individuals who strongly identify with their group, revealing an interaction between identity and perceived deprivation. Supportive evidence comes from a study by Struch and Schwarz (1989) in which hostility toward orthodox Israelis was most pronounced among non-orthodox who viewed the interests of the two groups as in conflict *and* who identified strongly as non-orthodox Jews. Brown and colleagues (2001) found that English passengers who were blocked from traveling to the continent by French fishermen were less positive toward the French than those whose trip took place, and that this negativity was most pronounced among those with a strong English identity.

Group identity also colors reactions to intergroup events, enhancing the perception of fraternal deprivation. Gibson (2008) finds, for example, that black South Africans who identify strongly with their ethnic group are far less likely to believe that justice has been adequately performed when asked to react to an experimental vignette in which a black squatter is evicted from land on which she is squatting. Typically, procedural justice (which is manipulated in the study) increases the perceived fairness of the eviction but this is less true for the majority of black South Africans who identify with either their racial or ethnic group (e.g., Zulu, Xhosa) as opposed to South Africa as a nation. The clear implication of these findings is that principles of justice are applied more broadly by those who identify with the nation. Without a sense of national identity, black South Africans question the fairness of government actions and harbor a standing sense of grievance.

[3]Other beliefs, such as blaming inequality on an external enemy or the perceived efficacy of protest, may be additionally needed to translate realistic grievances into political action (Klandermans 1984; Klandermans, this volume).

It thus appears that shared material interests and related grievances play a role in producing political cohesion, either directly or in combination with group identification. But some caution is needed in interpreting these results. Typically fraternal deprivation is assessed subjectively. But there is reason to believe that subjective material grievances are intensified among strong group identifiers, raising questions about the origins of perceived common fate. Evidence that ingroup identification heightens a sense of ingroup grievance, comes from two distinct sources: experimental studies in which group identity is made salient, providing a direct test of causal order (Smith, Spears, &Oyen, 1994; Kawakami & Dion, 1993) and weaker correlational studies in which strong group identification is linked to grievances (Dambrun et al., 2006; Gurin& Townsend, 1986; Reese & Brown, 1995). Riek and colleagues (2010) even find that making salient a shared identity as an American can reduce perceived partisan threat among both Democrats and Republicans. Findings such as these have prompted Simon and Klandermans (2001; p 325) to conclude that the "relationship between collective identity and awareness of shared grievances is therefore bi-directional."

3.3.2 Symbolic Interests.

In contrast to material interests focused on tangible economic and related concerns, social identity theory shifts the focus to the defense of group status as a source of political cohesion. There is ample evidence that symbolic concerns can increase political cohesion. After examining a large number of ethnic conflicts in post-colonial countries, Horowitz (1985) concluded that conflict over tangible resources was an insufficient explanation for ethnic violence because members of different ethnic groups were not frequently in direct economic competition and when groups were engaged in conflict it often had disastrous economic consequences for group members. As an example of the latter, Horowitz points to Sinhalese opposition to the demands of the Tamils for decentralization in Sri Lanka, a situation that would have furthered not opposed Sinhalese economic interests. He goes on to compile impressive

anecdotal evidence that ethnic conflicts are often fueled by disputes over non-economic factors concerning status and respect.

Group power, status, and culture all constitute symbolic interests and their threatened loss can produce opposition to the threatening outgroup and support for government policies designed to minimize the threat. Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior (2004) exposed Dutch participants to various scenarios concerning new immigrants and found less opposition to unskilled immigrants who might pose an economic threat than to immigrants who did not fit into Dutch culture and thus posed a symbolic threat. Moreover, a strong Dutch identity increased the perception that immigrants posed a cultural threat to the Netherlands, in a process akin to the intensification of realistic grievances among strong group identifiers. Symbolic grievances may be especially prone to identity-based intensification since they are highly subjective and more difficult to document than economic grievances. In addition, priming Dutch national identity increased opposition to the entry of new immigrants especially among Dutch participants who initially saw little cultural threat from immigrants. Other studies report similar findings in which cultural threat interacts with national identity to increase outgroup discrimination (Falomir-Pichastor, Gabarrot, &Mugny 2009).

Biological indicators underscore the power of status threat. In an innovative study, Scheepers & Ellemers (2005)demonstrate that group members react physically to both low status and a threat to high status. They measured blood pressure among participants assigned to a group with low or high status who were then told that their status could change in a second round of the study. As expected those assigned to a low status group experienced an increase in blood pressure after learning of their low status whereas blood pressure declined among those in the high status group. When subjects were told that their group status could change, blood pressure increased among the high status group and declined among the low. A possible decline in high status was just as stressful in this study as being

assigned a low status. Scheepers and colleagues (2009) followed up on this work, confirming the stressful effects of unstable high group status.

Strong group identification amplifies the cohesive effect of symbolic threat. Voci (2006) gave false feedback to northern and southern Italians on how they were viewed by the other group. One half learned that they were viewed positively and the other half negatively. When told that they were disliked by Italians in the other region, strongly identified northern or southern Italians rated their ingroup more positively; there was no regional ingroup bias, however, in the positive feedback condition. Similar findings are observed in Northern Ireland. Northern Irish who are strongly identified with their religion are far more likely than weak identifiers to translate perceived threats to their values or political power into negative outgroup attitudes (Tausch et al 2007). Haslam and Reicher (2006) find suggestive evidence that a strong group identity reduces stress as measured by cortisol levels in response to a threat to group status.

The effects of threat on group cohesion may depend on whether or not group members have an opportunity to affirm the positive attributes of the group and thus defuse a threat to their status. In research by Glasford,Dovidio, &Pratto (2009), strongly identified Americans felt less psychological discomfort when told that the U.S. had bombed civilians if they also had an opportunity to affirm the group's status by ranking positive American values such as freedom. Without such an opportunity, the discomfiting information about U.S. action lead to increased outgroup negativity among strong identifiers. In the same study, strongly identified Americans who valued universal health care and learned that the U.S. failed to provide it chose to express their views on Muslims and thus express outgroup animosity rather than express their support for a positive change to U.S. policy.

3.4 Group Consciousness

Group consciousness models link cohesion to identity and grievances, the two factors discussed so far, along with a third element: blaming the system for grievances and group disparities (McClain et al 2009). The model thus underscores the additional importance of beliefs about the political system to the emergence of political cohesion and action. Miller and colleagues' (1981) defined group consciousness as subjective group closeness (identification), feelings of power deprivation (grievances), polar affect (akin to ingroup bias), and blaming the system for group-based disparities. In their analysis of the 1972 and 1976 ANES data, political participation was enhanced among subjectively identified group members (based on age, class, race, and gender) who felt fraternally deprived and viewed this as the result of unfair systemic factors such as discrimination. A growing number of scholars see beliefs about group power and consciousness as a key to political action among members of racial and ethnic minority groups (Dawson 1994; Brown and Shaw 2002; Junn and Masuoka 2008).

Tajfel and Turner (1979) share a group consciousness perspective by arguing that grievances are necessary but not sufficient to motivate group-based action. According to Tajfel and Turner, group members need to identify with their group, perceive intergroup status differences, and view status differences as illegitimate before action is likely. This model has not been tested as a precursor to the development of political cohesion, but Ellemers and colleagues (1993) find related evidence in an experimental setting. In their study, subjects were randomly allocated to a high-status management role or a low-status worker role, told that their assignment was either arbitrary or meritorious, and that they could or could not work their way out of the lower status group. In accordance with the predictions of social identity theory, those allocated to their group in an arbitrary fashion were most angry about their group's position. The highest levels of identification were observed among individuals in low status groups whose low status seemed illegitimate because it was not based on performance. It remains to be

seen whether all three factors – low status, illegitimacy, and closed membership -- are needed to generate political cohesion.

Beliefs can also influence how one reacts to status threat. Townsend and colleagues (2011) subjected women to a sexist rejection in which they learned that they had been rejected as a co-worker in an experimental study because they would be "probably too emotional and won't be a strong partner". Women in the study reacted with greater stress, as assessed by higher levels of cortisol, if they chronically perceived sexism whereas women who saw little sexism in the world were not threatened by the incident. In this instance, status threats combined with an existing ideology affected reactions to an intergroup encounter.

In sum, there is extensive evidence that symbolic and material concerns can drive political cohesion, a process that is most evident among strong group identifiers. Few studies directly contrast the role of material and symbolic concerns, although research hints at the greater power of symbolic than material threats (Sniderman et al, 2004). The wealth of evidence from minimal intergroup studies underscores that economic competition is not a necessary condition for the development of group cohesion (Brewer, 1979; Brewer & Brown, 1998). The dual influence of group-linked interests and group identity on the development of political cohesion is consistent with popular models of collective action which center on grievances and identity as two of the three ingredients in collective action (van Zomeren, Postmes& Spears 2008). It remains unclear whether political cohesion additionally requires a sense that group deprivation derives from unfair systemic inequity and discrimination.

4.0 Emotions as a Catalyst for Action

Emotions play an important role in conveying and amplifying the political effects of strong group identities by reinforcing group cohesion and strengthening or weakening the willingness to act in defense of the group. Positive emotions consistently increase group commitment whereas negative

emotions have divergent effects: anger motivates an active response to group threat whereas anxiety leads to the avoidance of action and may dampen group commitment. Intergroup emotions theory (IET), a combination of emotional appraisal theory (see Marcus & Brader, this volume) and social identity theory (Mackie, Devos and Smith, 2000), lends insight into the conditions most likely to generate anger and anxiety. From the perspective of IET, threat is most likely to produce anger among strongly identified group members who view their group as likely to prevail over a threatening outgroup. In contrast, members of a weaker group should feel anxiety in response to a threat from a stronger outgroup. Moreover, the two emotions have differing implications for action with anger associated with action and anxiety with avoidance (Berkowitz & Harmon-Jones, 2004; Carver, 2004; Lambert et al., 2010).

When applied to a threatening international situation, for example, intergroup emotions theory predicts that citizens who view their country as strong militarily are most likely to feel outraged and angry at an attack by a weaker opponent. Citizens of weaker countries are more inclined to feel anxious in the same situation (although some individuals of weaker entities can also feel angry since group strength is a subjective judgment). In essence, members of stronger groups can afford to feel angry at an opponent because they are more certain that retaliatory action against their weaker opponent will succeed. As a corollary to this prediction, IET also states that individuals who identify most strongly with their nation or group are most likely to overestimate their country's or group's might and thus get far angrier than weak identifiers when the groups is threatened (Mackie et al 2000; Rydell 2008). This expectation stems from social identity theory's notion that strong group identifiers are motivated to view their group positively and thus see it as stronger than a threatening opponent.

4.1 Identity Strength and Emotional Reactivity

There is growing support for the various predictions of intergroup emotions theory. First, there is evidence that strong group identifiers react more angrily to group threat (Musgrove & McGarty 2008;

Rydell et al., 2008; van Zomeren, Spears & Leach 2008). For example, strong Democrats and Republicans react with greater anger to a threatened electoral loss (Mason et al, 2011). Strong American patriots reacted with greater anger toward terrorists in the lead up to the Iraq war (Feldman, Huddy & Cassese *in press),* and in response to an insulting message about the U.S. and Americans written by a foreigner (Rydell et al., 2008). Experimentally heightened identity salience also increases anger among group members in response to threat or victimization (Yzerbyt et al., 2003). For example, Fischer et al (2010) made salient British subjects' national or gender identity and then exposed them to photos of the July 7, 2005 London bombings. Subjects whose British identity was made salient were more likely to report feeling aggression and expressed greater support for the war on terror than those for whom gender identity was made salient.

Anger and identity may also be mutually reinforcing. In a series of studies, Thomas & McGarty (2009; Thomas, McGarty & Mavor, 2009) assign subjects to small groups and ask them to craft an information campaign to arouse interest in the issue of the lack of clean water in the developing world. Some groups were told that such information campaigns were successful if they convinced people that such programs work, creating a norm of efficacy. Others were told that the campaign would be more successful if it aroused a sense of outrage on the issue. Generating a norm of outrage among group members was especially effective in arousing anger, a commitment to action, and in boosting group identity. Inculcating a norm of efficacy was far less successful in arousing a commitment to action. In this research, anger thus strengthens group identity, a finding that has obvious implications for the formation and cohesion of political groups.

Strongly identified group members also feel other emotions more intensely than weak identifiers in response to threat and reassurance. Strong partisans in the U.S. feel increased schadenfreude when they read about bad things happening or reflecting poorly on a political candidate of the other party. Strong partisans feel greater schadenfreude even when an event, such as increased

U.S. military deaths in Iraq, is clearly negative (Combs et al., 2009). Strong partisans also feel more positive emotion than weak partisans when exposed to a reassuring message about future electoral victory (Mason et al 2011).

4.2 Group Strength and Anger

Research findings support a second prediction from intergroup emotions theory --that anger will be more pronounced among members of a group seen as strong in the face of threat. Mackie and colleagues (2000) sorted subjects into those for and against equal gay rights and then manipulated the group position by exposing members to a series of news headlines either for or against the group position. In the "strong" group condition, group members felt angrier at outgroup members than those in the "weak" group and were more inclined to take action (e.g., wanting to engage in an argument with an outgroup member). U.S. partisans who were confident their party would win the 2008 president election were more likely to get angry when threatened with electoral loss by someone from the opposing party (Huddy & Mason 2011). Musgrove & McGarty (2008) examined reactions to the war on terror in Australia and found that confidence in the government's ability to respond to terrorism was associated with anger at international terrorists.

Group confidence or strength does not just lie with military might or an electoral victory, it also includes a sense of moral strength. Mendes and colleagues (2008) found, for example, that an interracial rejection by someone of the other race was viewed as a challenge increasing anger and physical activation (cardiovascular efficiency) among both white and black subjects. In contrast, subjects rejected by a member of their own race reacted to this as a threat showing no increase in anger and exhibiting decreased cardiac efficiency. Other group-related moral transgressions can also be equated with group strength and lead to increased anger and a commitment to action among group members who feel they have been wronged or unfairly victimized. The experience of collective guilt and

responsibility for moral injustice has the opposite effect, weakening the group position and leading to conciliation and support for reparations (Doosje et al., 1998).

There is a subjective component to group strength with strong group identifiers being more inclined to see their group as likely to prevail or hold the moral high ground. We find supportive evidence in research on the 2008 U.S. presidential election. Strongly identified Democrats and Republicans were more likely than weak identifiers to believe they would win the presidential election, and gain a majority of seats in the House and Senate (Huddy & Mason 2011). Confidence was higher overall among Democrats than Republicans in the lead up to the 2008 election. Nonetheless, strong Republicans remained more confident of victory than their more weakly identified counterparts. This helps to explain why strong identifiers react more angrily to group threat.

4.3 Anger and Action

Finally, there is strong research support for IET's prediction that group-based anger increases a commitment to action whereas anxiety decreases it (Leach, Iyer & Pederson 2007; Mackie et al 2000; Musgrove & McGarty, 2008; van Zomeren, Spears & Leach 2008; Thomas & McGarty 2009). Reactions to terrorism confirm this prediction. American anger towards Saddam Hussein and terrorists in the build up to the Iraq war was linked to the view that a war in Iraq was not risky and increased overall support for the war (Huddy et al., 2007a). In contrast, terrorism-related anxiety lead Americans to view war in Afghanistan and Iraq as more risky and decreased war support overall (Huddy et al., 2005; Huddy et al., 2007a; Skitka et al, 2006; Sadler, Lineberger, Correll, & Park, 2005). Self-reported fear and anxiety after the 2004 Madrid terrorist bombings also increased avoidant behaviors among Spanish respondents such as staying at home, avoiding air travel, and avoiding contact with Muslims (Conejero & Etxebarria, 2007).

Similar findings have been observed in research that experimentally arouses anger or anxiety (Lerner et al., 2003; Fischhoff et al., 2005). For example, Lambert and colleagues (Lambert, Scherer,

Schott, Olson, Andrews, & O'Brien, 2010) undertook a series of carefully crafted experiments to demonstrate the existence and differing political consequences of anger and anxiety in reaction to 9/11. They randomly assigned subjects to watch a video about 9/11 and found that it generated both anger and anxiety. The two emotions had differing political effects: anger increased support for war whereas anxiety undercut it. They also demonstrated that experimentally aroused anger unrelated to 9/11 increased support for pro-war political candidates whereas experimentally heightened feelings of anxiety (again unrelated to terrorism) undercut support for such candidates.

Overall, there is much that is intuitively appealing in an intergroup emotions explanation of political reactions to group threat and reassurance. It is easy to understand, for example, why Americans felt angry after the 9/11 terrorist attacks: levels of patriotism among Americans are generally high and increased after 9/11, and Americans are likely to see the Unites States as far more powerful militarily than Iraq or al Qaeda. In general, intergroup emotions theory predicts that citizens of strong military entities such as Israel or the United States should feel more angry than anxious when threatened, inclining them to respond with disproportionate force in response to threat. Of course, the logic and reality of guerilla warfare underscores the point that members of weaker entities will also engage in action if they believe they can defeat a strong military entity.

5.0 Development of Group Identity

One of the crucial ingredients in the development of political cohesion is the existence of a strong, internalized subjective group identity. This finding raises an additional challenge for political psychologists: How do we explain an individual group member's decision to identify as a group member? Research on this question has moved well beyond Campbell et al's (1960) notion that subjective identification is simply a function of the percentage of one's life spent as a group member. Influenced in part by social identity theory, there has been recent research on several possible factors that promote the development of strong social identities.

5.1 Salient Identity

Self-categorization theory underscores the situational nature of identity with individuals constantly shift back and forth between an individual and a social identity (Turner et al., 1987). Thus, if a national figure contrasts the valor of one ethnic group of citizens against the sloth of another, ethnic identities rise to the fore. But if, in contrast, the politician rails against the evils of an opposing nation, national identity is transcendent. Social identity researchers consider group salience an essential ingredient in the development of identity and group political cohesion. According to Oakes (in Turner et. al.,1987) salience is heightened by any factor that increases the "separateness" and "clarity" of a category, and one of the factors most likely to increase a category's clarity is minority status, when a group's members are outnumbered by members of an out-group (see also Brewer & Brown, 1998).

Category salience plays a clear role in shaping identity. For instance, McGuire and colleagues report evidence that children in an ethnic minority in their classroom (and whose ethnicity is therefore salient) are more likely to describe themselves in terms of their ethnicity; children in families where there are more members of the opposite gender are more likely to mention their gender when describing themselves (McGuire &Padawer-Singer, 1976; McGuire et al., 1978). In a similar vein, Hogg and Turner (1985) found that increasing the salience of study participants' gender increased the likelihood that they thought of themselves in gender-stereotypic terms. The importance of group salience is confirmed in a meta-analysis in which group salience promoted the development of in-group bias across a large number of studies (Mullen et al., 1992).

Eifert and colleagues (2009) provide an interesting example of group salience at work within a political context. Drawing on data in the Afrobarometer, they record an increase in the intensity of ethnic identity and a decline in occupational and class identities closer to elections, especially competitive elections. They attribute the increase in ethnic identity to the increased salience of

ethnicity in African elections during which politicians' emphasize ethnic loyalties and distribute goods along ethnic lines. In essence, the authors argue that African politicians exploit ethnic identities to gain electoral support and thus increase the salience of ethnic identities around election time.

Political behavior research findings point, however, to the limited effect of category salience on the development of social identity. Members of diverse ethnic and racial groups in the US, who form salient minorities, identify primarily as American and only secondarily as members of their ethnic or racial group, despite the greater salience of minority group status in the U.S. (Citrin et al., 2001; Sears et al., 1999). Hispanic students who attended a high school with relatively few other Hispanics, and whose ethnic group membership was thus highly salient, were less likely to identify as Hispanic than Hispanic students attending schools in heavily Hispanic areas (Eschbach& Gomez, 1998). In a similar vein, blacks living in more segregated areas expressed higher levels of racial identification than those in integrated areas where race is more chronically salient (Postmes and Branscombe 2002). This evidence raises important questions about the extent to which the salience of one's ethnic or racial group– the key ingredient in identity development for many social identity researchers – explains the emergence of ethnic and racial identities.

5.2 Meaning and Valence of Identity

If salience has a limited impact on the development of group identity in real-world groups, other factors are needed to account for the emergence of potent political identities. The meaning of group membership is a crucial additional ingredient in identity development, especially in large groups with competing conceptions of membership (Huddy, 2001). As already noted, national identity is typically fraught with disputes over who qualifies as a "good" citizen. For example, Erikson (1993) highlights ambiguity surrounding the meaning of a German identity. Does it include all German speakers; people of German ancestry; or Germans living in another country? Disputes over group meaning have real political consequences as reflected in altered German citizenship laws in the late 1990s that awarded

citizenship to the children of immigrants born in Germany, signifying a shift away from a purely ethno-national conception of German identity. If German law or norms suggest that immigrants are not German, it would not be surprising to find that immigrants have a weak or nonexistent German identity.

Identity meaning also revolves around the normative *values* with which an identity is associated. Schwartz and colleagues (1990) illustrate one way in which to assess the values underlying group membership. They asked German and Israeli students to rank 19 terminal and 18 instrumental values on the basis of their own preference order and that of their national group. Not surprisingly, one's own views and that of one's group are related, although the link is stronger for Israeli than for German students. This suggests that an important source of national identity – shared values – is stronger among Israeli than among German students and hints at an important source of weakened national identity among Germans.

Valence plays a further role in affecting identity development; a negatively regarded group will have *greater* difficulty eliciting strong group members all else being equal. There is evidence that ethnic identity is more strongly developed among members of objectively identified, higher status groups and among individuals who perceive their group as holding higher societal status. For example, national identity is more strongly developed among Cubans in the US than among other Latinos because they believe their social status far exceeds that of Mexican-Americans or Puerto Ricans (Huddy& Virtanen, 1995). Ethier and Deaux (1994) demonstrated that freshmen Hispanic students at an Ivy league university who found the university environment threatening to their Hispanic identity viewed their group as having lower status which, in turn, weakened their identification as Hispanic.

Junn and Masuoka (2008) were able to strengthen Asian identity by experimentally increasing group status through photos of powerful Asian political figures. They showed Asian respondents photos of two Asian cabinet secretaries: Elaine Cho (Secretary of Labor) and Norman Mineta (Secretary of Transportation) both of whom served in the Bush administration. After receiving this information, the

percent of Asians who felt close to other Asians increased from 67% to 78%, the percent reporting a sense of linked fate increased from 46% to 56%, and the percent reporting that their racial political identity was somewhat or very important increased from 54% to 65%.

5.3 Acquired v. Ascribed Identities

Identity strength is also related to identity choice. Acquired identities, adopted by choice, are likely to be stronger than ascribed identities. Turner and colleagues (1984) report a study in which subjects were either ascribed or could choose to belong to one of two teams competing in a problem solving exercise. Members of winning teams indicated higher self-esteem and cohesion when they had been ascribed to the team. But members who voluntarily chose their team were more likely to report high self-esteem and group cohesion when they had lost, suggesting a stronger sense of group commitment when identity is acquired than when ascribed. Perreault and Bourhis (1999) extend this research to include the effects of identity acquisition on the development of out-group discrimination. They found that group identification increased in strength with the sense that lab group membership was voluntary.

5.4 Permeable Group Boundaries

One of the most important implications of identity choice is that it allows members of low status groups to abandon group identity because of permeable group boundaries. Tajfel and Turner (1979) refer to this strategy as social mobility and several researchers provide evidence of its existence among members of low status groups (Jackson et al., 1996; Taylor et al., 1987; Wright, Taylor, &Mogghaddam, 1990). Wright (1997) finds that boundary permeability does not have to be very extensive for group members to contemplate individual rather than collective solutions to problems of low in-group status. Permeability is not just a feature of highly fluid groups but can also characterize membership in relatively fixed groups based on ethnic and regional boundaries. For example, East Germans who

thought it was easy to be considered West German had weaker East German identities than those who thought it was difficult to pass as West German and were more likely to think of themselves as simply German (Mummendey et al., 1999).

Finally, there is some intriguing evidence that upward mobility may weaken race identification. Race is far from permeable in the U.S. Nonetheless, a sense of black identity appears to weaken among blacks who move to better neighborhoods or who grow up in less segregated neighborhoods, in part, because they feel rejected by other blacks and worry that they have effectively abandoned their racial grouping (Gay 2004; Postmes and Branscombe 2002). In contrast when group boundaries are impermeable, there is evidence that members of low status groups bolster their identity and enhance their group's standing through the strategies of social creativity and social change (Tajfel& Turner, 1979). Jackson and colleagues (1996) found that members of a low status group attempted to change their group's status by rating an undesirable attribute more positively or rating the group more favorably on other dimensions less central to the group's negative image.

Overall, questions of group permeability raise concomitant questions about the influence of external labeling on identity acquisition. If group membership is obvious to others, it will be more difficult for a group member to avoid external identification. It may be relatively easy for an East German to pass as someone from the West but much more difficult for an African-American to escape the label black. Less permeable group boundaries and a higher incidence of external labeling should increase the likelihood that a group member will internalize group identity. Relevant external cues include skin color, gender, group-specific physical features, language, and cultural practices. Conversely, attributes that can be hidden or disguised enhance the role of choice in identity acquisition (see McKenna &Bargh, 1998).

5.5 Group Size

Group identification is typically more pronounced among members of minority than majority groups and Brewer developed optimal distinctiveness theory to account for this asymmetry (Brewer (1991; Leonardelli, Pickett, & Brewer 2010; Mullen et al., 1992). Brewer views group life as characterized by two competing needs—the need to belong to a group, and the need to differentiate oneself from others. From this perspective, identities need to confer the optimal mix of distinctive and common attributes to explain why members of large, majority groups evince weaker in-group identities than do members of smaller, minority groups. Group identities develop to the extent that a group satisfies both needs by providing a sense of inclusiveness within the group and distinctiveness between an ingroup and outgroup. Optimal distinctiveness theory hints at the difficulty in forging political cohesion among members of large majority groups among whom identity provides too little differentiation, and among members of very small groups who feel overly distinctive and insufficiently collective.

One problem with the approach, however, is that there are many numerically large political entities that elicit strong group identities. Political parties, for example, comprise an amorphous group of unknown size yet elicit powerful emotions, identities, and a commitment to action. The same holds for nations. Are small nations more likely to hold strong national identities than larger nations? There is no supportive evidence for this. The tendency for minority groups such as African Americans or Latinos to evince political cohesion in the U.S. may have more to do with common interests and grievances than an optimal group size.

5.6 Individual Differences

Social identity researchers have largely ignored individual variation in the general proclivity to identify with social groups but others have been digging profitably into this question. Several basic personality traits are associated with the tendency to affiliate with political groups (for a discussion of personality traits see Vecchione and Caprara, this volume)? Gerber and colleagues (*in press)* analyze the origins of partisan identity strength in the big-5 personality traits using data from a 2010 national U.S.

survey. They find that extraverts and those who score highly on agreeableness exhibit the strongest partisan identities, attesting to the social and emotional motivational basis of partisan identification. Those low in openness to experience are also stronger partisans, confirming predictions that strong partisanship may provide cognitive benefits in the form of increased cognitive certainty and coherence.

The role of cognitive uncertainty in the development of group identification is further developed in a program of research by Hogg (2007). While he regards uncertainty as more situational than personality-based, his findings compliment those emerging in personality and politics research by highlighting the strong link between identity and the reduction of uncertainty. In his view, group members "need to feel certain that their perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors are correct" which pushes them to identify with a group (Grieve & Hogg, 1999; p.927). For example, Hohman and colleagues (2010) manipulate certainty or uncertainty feelings by assigning research participants to read and mark sections in a speech on the environment by President George W. Bush. Some participants were randomly assigned to mark passages that made them feel certain about their place in the world and others were assigned to mark sections that made them feel uncertain. Both Democrats and Republicans reported stronger partisanship in the uncertain than in the certain condition.

In addition to increasing identity strength, uncertainty decreases identity complexity and increases identification with homogeneous and unified groups (Hogg et al., 2007). Kim and Ng (2008) examined Chinese and Hong Kong identities among Hong Kong college students. Students who held a single identity as either Hong Kong or Chinese (as opposed to a dual identity) viewed changes in Hong Kong since reunification as leading to uncertain future outcomes in the realms of economics, politics, welfare, education and housing. They argue that a singular identity may satisfy a need for cognitive closure.

5.7 Threat

I have focused so far on ingroup cohesion and, for the most part, put aside discussion of intergroup hostilities. But the notion of threat – which typically involves an external threat from a known outgroup – is relevant here because it can strengthen ingroup unity, in addition to inflaming out-group hostilities (a topic discussed in greater detail by Kinder, this volume). An external threat enhances in-group solidarity and tightens in-group boundaries in direct proportion to the degree of threat (Coser 1956; Levine & Campbell, 1972). Giles and Evans (1985) found that white respondents in the 1972 ANES who perceived blacks as more threatening rated whites more positively as a group, an effect that was more pronounced in the south than in the north, though significant in both regions. The rise in American patriotism after the 9/11 terror attacks provides another compelling example of this process at work (Gallup 2005). Grant & Brown (1995) manipulated identity threat in a complex experiment involving small groups of female students, selected on the basis of their support for gender equality, who drafted a joint statement about gender-based wage inequities. Identity was threatened by the other group in two manipulations: a negative evaluation of the in-group's statement and opposition to the values expressed in the group statement. They found stronger in-group bias among group members' whose work has been negatively evaluated by the outgroup.

Duckitt and Mphuthing (2002) underscore the greater power of symbolic than economic threat in intensifying social identity. They report that black-African students in South Africa who were upset or angry about differences between the socio-economic status of black Africans and white Afrikaans identified more strongly as African. They interpret this as consistent with the effects of symbolic not economic threat because economic differences are far more pronounced between blacks and English-speaking whites than between blacks and white Afrikaans but the perceived economic differences with English whites had no impact on black African identity. They suggest that the greater sense of outrage at disparities with white Afrikaans is driven by the belief that white Afrikaans are more prejudiced toward

blacks than English-speaking whites, who played a greater role in the opposition to apartheid. In essence, Afrikaan whites pose a greater identity threat than English-speaking whites to black South Africans.

Threat may have its strongest effects on those who already hold a strong group identity as seen in research by Ethier & Deaux (1994). They found that Hispanics attending Ivy Leagues schools with an initially strong Hispanic identity increased the strength of their Hispanic identification over time. In contrast, students with a weak initial identity perceived greater anti-Hispanic threat in the school environment and their Hispanic identity weakened over time. Verkuyten and Nekuee (1999) observed a similar process among Iranian immigrants to the Netherlands. Iranians who identified strongly with their nationality group and who perceived the Dutch as discriminatory toward their group were more likely to self-stereotype themselves as typically Iranian. The impact of perceived anti-Iranian discrimination on self-stereotyping was less pronounced among Iranians who identified less strongly with their group.

Finally, existential threats to the self can also intensify group attachment and identity. Research within the paradigm of terror management theory demonstrates heightened ingroup cohesion when one's mortality is made salient. Greenberg et al (1990) found that Christians who were asked to form an impression of a Jewish and Christian individual evaluated the Christian more positively and the Jew more negatively when their mortality had been made salient. In other studies, mortality salience heightens ingroup identification (Castano, Yzerbyt et al 2002).

6.0 Future Research

There are several promising areas for future research on political identity. I discuss two key areas: convergent identities and the role of leadership in forging group cohesion. Both deserve greater scrutiny than they have received to date.

6.1 Convergent Identities

Most people have more than one identity and can identify with various groups based on various religion, race, ethnicity, language, and nationality. The ways in which these identities converge holds promising insight into their political effects. Roccas and Brewer (2002) develop the concept of identity complexity to capture such overlap, measuring it as the degree to which groups share similar members or attributes. They find that a more complex (and less convergent) set of identities increases tolerance of various outgroups in the U.S. and Israel. Identity complexity is not fixed but can can change in response to situational cues. In Northern Ireland, for example, threat reduced social identity complexity, leading to increased overlap between an identity as Catholic and Irish, or Protestant and British (Schmid et al., 2009). Political identities have exhibited this type of fusion in the U.S. in recent years as partisans become sorted more fully along the lines of political ideology (Levendusky 2009). Mason (2011) has examined this process and finds that convergent partisan and ideological identities lead to more polarized political attitudes and greater political activism.

The overlap of national and ethnic or racial identities among members of minority groups has particular importance for political engagement and citizenship. Simon and colleagues report that a dual identity as a Russian-German or Turkish-German, indicated by statements such as "Sometimes I feel more as a German and sometimes more as a Turk," enhances political activity and support of group-related political issues among immigrants in Germany (Simon & Ruhs 2008; Simon & Grabow 2010). These dual identities exhibit attributes of Brewer and Roccas' complex identities in which no one of the two identities dominates. In the absence of national identity, a sole ethnic identity can increase support for radical organizations and enhance protest activity (Simon & Ruhs 2008; Lowrance 2006). In general, members of minority groups are typically less identified with a nation than members of majority groups (Sidanius et al., 1997; Staerkle et al, 2010).

Research on multiple identities is thus important for the study of national identities and may lend insight into levels of cohesion within political groups. Within the context of national identity, a dual national and minority group identity fosters engagement on behalf of the group within mainstream politics. Members of minority groups who do not identify with the nation are more inclined to engage in less traditional forms of protest politics and support more radical organizations. In this instance, convergent identities hold positive connotations. In contrast, overlapping partisan and ideological identities may have more negative normative implications in the context of electoral politics by increasing extreme political views. Growing partisan rancor in the U.S. provides a very direct example of this process at work. More research along these lines would help to determine the degree to which assessment of multiple identities is required to understand the emergence of group cohesion.

6.2 Political Leadership

Early political behavior researchers were well aware that group-based political cohesion occurred in response to political events and the actions of political leaders (Berelson et al., 1944; Campbell et al., 1960). All of the major psychological factors discussed in this chapter as determinants of political cohesion – salient identities, a common political meaning associated with membership, and the existence of common interests and threats to those interests -- can be influenced by the political environment and manipulated by political rhetoric. Leadership and political language thus constitute an additional powerful ingredient in the development of group loyalties and their political manifestation (see also Condor, this volume).

Group political salience can be increased by enhancing the connection between a group and politics. Campbell and colleagues (1960) referred to this link as *political proximity* and argued that it increased, in part, whenever a group member ran for political office, helping to explain virtually unanimous black support for Barack Obama in the 2008 U.S. presidential election (Huddy & Carey 2009). Shamir and Arian (1999) illustrate changes over time in the relationship between group membership and

electoral outcomes. They draw on data from Israel to document a growing division in vote choice between religious and secular Jews over the last several decades. The two groups hold differing national and religious identities -- secular individuals identify as Israelis while the religious think of themselves as Jews. And the two groups are politically distinctive, differing in their support of security issues very generally. As security issues have risen to the fore in Israeli politics, religious and national identities have had a growing impact on vote choice in Israeli elections. In this instance, political events elevated the political significance of religious affiliations in Israel. In a similar vein, Eifert and colleagues (2009) provide compelling evidence that politicians enhance the salience of ethnicity within African elections.

The meaning of an identity, and the prospects for political cohesion, also varies with political rhetoric. Hopkins and Reicher (1996) highlight the influence of politics on the meaning of national identity in the context of Scottish independence. They examined speeches from the 1992 Scottish elections and documented the salience and meaning of Scottish and British identity. The Scottish National Party, which favored independent statehood in 1992, emphasized that Scottish identity was incompatible with English identity and denied the existence of a true all-encompassing British identity. In contrast, the conservatives, who supported continued ties with Britain, emphasized Britishness and the commonalities between the Scots and English while downplaying Scottish distinctiveness. In this election, political leaders were in competition over the salience of British and Scottish identity; they were also involved in defining their meaning.

Increasing the salience or altering the meaning of group identities is not the only way in which political leaders can affect the emergence of political group cohesion. Social movement scholars argue that group members' grievances are manufactured or brought to the fore by social movement organizations and their leaders in an effort to mobilize potential members (Snow et al., 1986; Klandermans, this volume)). Thus, the politicization of a hate crime targeted at someone of a specific

race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation is likely to increase group members' perception of societal discrimination against their group. Group members' awareness of grievances can thus be strengthened by the way in which politicians and group leaders respond to and interpret political events. These tactics are common in the world of politics and deserve close research scrutiny from political psychologists.

Conclusion

One thing is resoundingly clear from this review. Group membership may be a necessary condition for the development of political cohesion, but it is certainly not sufficient. This analysis has focused on several factors that are pivotal to the development of a cohesive political outlook and a strong group identity. But there is more to be done. For instance, partisanship and political ideology can be profitably studied as social identities. The approach is gaining traction but remains understudied. And yet the benefits from such an approach are considerable. An identity approach sheds light on factors such as a threatened electoral loss that can weaken partisan identity and potentially influence the dynamics of an election. It also underscores the role of emotions in motivating political action and highlights the emotional nature of strong partisanship. Strongly identified individuals are typically the most passionate about the group and far from the rational decision makers envisioned by democratic theorists.

Other interesting questions concerning political identity also remain unanswered. Are there limits, for example, to politicians' ability to redefine the meaning of group membership? Are these efforts most or least successful among individuals who identify strongly with their group? Are there certain kinds of people who develop a sense of group identification more readily and hang on to this identity more firmly than others? What are the cognitive and motivational mechanisms by which strong group identifiers maintain positive feelings for their group? And are symbolic concerns such as identity threat sufficient to account for the development of ingroup cohesion and intergroup antipathies?

Answers to these and other questions will propel research forward on the political effects of group membership at a time when real-world international, civil, and internal political conflicts have amplified interest in group identification across the social sciences.

REFERENCES

Andreychick, M. R., & Gill, M. J. (2009). Ingroup identity moderates the impact of social explanations on intergroup attitudes: External explanations are not inherently prosocial. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*(12), 1632-1645.

Ashmore,R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, *130*(1), 80-114.

Bartels, L. M. (2002). Beyond the running tally: Partisan bias in political perception. *Political Behavior, 24*(2), 117-150.

Begley, T. M., & Alker, H. (1982). Anti-Busing Protest: Attitudes and Actions. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 45,* 187-197

Berelson, B. R., Lazarsfeld, P.F., & McPhee, W. N. (1954). *Voting: A study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berkowitz, L., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2004). Towards an understanding of the determinants of anger. *Emotion, 4*, 107-130.

Bettencourt, B. A., Dorr, N., Charlton, K., and Hume, D. L. (2004). Status Differences and In-Group Bias: A Meta-Analytic Examination of Status Stability, Status Legitimacy, and Group Permeability. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(4) 520-542.

Billig, M. (1995). Rhetorical psychology, ideological thinking, and imagining nationhood. In H. Johnston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bluic, A.-M., McGarty, C., Reynolds, K., & Muntele, D. (2007). Opinion-based group membership as a predictor of commitment to political action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 19-32.

Blumer, H. (1958). Race and prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review, 1,* 3-7.

Bobo, L. D. (1983). Whites' opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45,* 1196-1210.

Bobo, L. D., & Hutchings, V. L. (1996). Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial context. *American Sociological Review, 61,* 951-972.

Bobo, L. D., & Johnson, D. (2000). Racial attitudes in a prismatic metropolis: Mapping identity, stereotypes, competition, and vies on affirmative action. In Bob, L.D., Melvin, O.L., Johnson, J.H. Jr., & Valenzeual, A. Jr. (Eds.), *Prismatic Metropolis: Inequality in Los Angeles* (pp.81-163). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Brady, H. E., & Kaplan, C.S. (*In press).* Categorically wrong: Nominal versus graded measures of ethnic identity. *Studies in Comparative International Development.*

Breakwell, G. M., & Lyons, E. (1996). *Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Brewer, M. 2007. The Importance of being *We:* Human Nature and Intergroup Relations. *American Psychologist, 62*(8): 728-738.

Brewer, M. B., and Caporael, L. R. 2006. An Evolutionary Perspective on Social Identity: Revisiting Groups. In Mark Schaller, Jeffrey A. Simpson. Douglas T. Kenrick (Eds.), *Evolution and Social Psychology* (pp. 143-162), New York: Psychology Press.

Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal inter-group situation: A cognitive motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86,* 307-324.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 17,* 475-482.

Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.) *Handbook of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2. 4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Brown, R., Maras, P., Masser, B., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (2001). Life on the ocean wave: testing some intergroup hypotheses in a naturalistic setting. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 4,* 81-97.

Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30,* 745-778.

Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice: Its social psychology*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.

Brown, R., & Shaw, T. C. (2002). Separate Nations: Two Attitudinal Dimensions of Black Nationalism. *The Journal of Politics*. *64*, 22-44.

Cameron, J.E. (2004). *A* three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity*, *3*, *239-262.*

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W.E., & Stokes, D.E. (1960). *The American Voter.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Carver, C. S. (2004). Negative affects deriving from the behavioral approach system. *Emotion, 4,* 3-22.

Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Paladino, M. P., & Sacchi, S. (2002). I belong, therefore, I exist: Ingroup identification, ingroup entitativity, and ingroup bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 135-143.

Castano, E., Yzerbyt, V. Y., Bourguignon, D., & Seron, E. (2002). Who may enter? The impact of in-group identification on in-group/out-group categorization. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 315-322.

Chaio, J. Y., Bowman, N. E., & Gill, H. (2008). The political gender gap: Gender bias in facial inferences that predict voting behavior. *PLoSONE,* 3(10), e3666.

Citrin, J., Wong, C., & Duff, B. (2001). The meaning of American national identity: Patterns of ethnic conflict and consensus. In R. D. Ashmore & L. Jussim (Eds), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction.* London, England, Oxford University Press.

Citrin, J., Reingold,B., & Green, D.P. (1990). American identity and the politics of ethnic change. *Journal of Politics, 52,*1124-1154.

Citrin, J., & Wright, M. (2009). Defining the Circle of We: American identity and Immigration Policy. *Forum, 7*(3). Article 6. http://www.bepress.com/forum/vol7/iss3/art6/

Cohen, A.P. (1986). Of symbols and boundaries, or, does Ertie's greatcoat hold the key? In A.P. Cohen (Ed.), *Symbolising boundaries: Identity and diversity in British cultures*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Cohen, G. L. (2003). Party over policy: The dominating impact of group influence on political beliefs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 808-822.

Combs, D. J. Y., Powell, A.J., Schurtz, D. R., Smith, R. H. (2009). Politics, Schadenfreude, and ingroup identification: The sometimes happy thing about a poor economy and jobs. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45, 635-646.*

Conejero, S., & Etxebarria, I. (2007). The impact of the Madrid bombing on personal emotions, emotional atmosphere and emotional climate. *Journal of Social Issues, 63,* 273-287.

Conover, P. J. (1984). The influence of group identification on political perception and evaluation. *Journal of Politics, 46,* 760-785.

Coser, L. (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press.

Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B, & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 503-513.*

Dalton, R. J. (1996). Political cleavages, issues, and electoral change. In LeDuc, L., Niemi, R.G., & Norris, P (Eds.) Comparing Democracies: Elections and voting in global perspective (pp 319-342).

Dalton, R.J, & Wattenberg, M.P. 2000 Parties without Partisans: Political Change in Advanced Industrial Democracies (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000)..

Dalton, R. J, & Weldon, S. (2007). Partisanship and Party system institutionalization. *Party Politics, 13*(2) 179-196.

Dambrun M., Taylor, D. M., McDonald, D. M., Crush, J., & Méot, A. (2006). The relative deprivation-gratification continuum and the attitudes of South Africans toward immigrants: A test of the V-curve hypothesis, *Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, *91*(6), 1032-1044.

Dawes, C. T., & Fowler J. T. (2009). Partisanship, Voting, and the Dopamine D2 Receptor Gene. *Journal of Politics, 71*(3), 1157-1171.

Dawson, M.C. (1994). *Behind the mule: Race and class in African-American politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

De Figueiredo, R. J. P., & Elkins, Z. (2003). Are Patriots Bigots? An Inquiry into the Vices of In-Group Pride. *American Journal of Political Science, 47* (1) 171-188.

Deaux, K. (1993). Reconstructing social identity. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 19,*4-12.

Davies, P. G., Steele, C. M., & Markus, H. R. (2008). A nation challenged: The impact of foreign threat on America's tolerance for diversity. *Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, *95*(2), 308-318.

Doosje, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(4), 872-886.

De Dreu, C.K.W., Greer, L. L., Van Kleef, G. A., Shalvi, S., & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2011). Oxytocin promotes human ethnocentrism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108* (4), 1262-1266.

Duckitt, J., & Mphuthing, T. (2002). Relative deprivation and intergroup attitudes. In I. Walker & H.J. Smith (Eds.), *Relative Deprivation: Specification, development, and Integration* (pp. 69-90). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duveen, G. (2001). Representations, identities, resistance. In K. Deaux and G. Philogene (Eds.) *Representations of the Social* (pp. 257-270). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Eifert, B., Edward, M., & Posner, D. N. (2010). Political Competition and Ethnic Identification in Africa. *American Journal of Political Science, 54*(2) 494-510.

Ellemers, N., Wilke, H., &. Van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status as individual and collective status-enhancing strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64,* 766-778.

Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (2002).Self and social identity. *Annual review of Psychology*, *53*, 161-186.

Ellemers, N., & Haslam, A.S. (2012). Social identity theory. In P.A.M. van Lange, A.W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds) *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 379-398). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P.,& van Ouwerkerk, J.P. (1999). Self-categorisation, commitment to the group and group self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of identity. *European Journal of Social psychology, 29,* 371-389*.*

Eschbach, K., & Gomez, C. (1998). Choosing Hispanic identity: Ethnic identity switching among respondents to High School and Beyond. *Social Science Quarterly, 79,* 74-90.

Erikson, T. H. (1993). *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 67,* 243-251.

Falomir-Pichaster, Juan M., Gabarrot, Fabrice, & Mugny, Gabriel (2009). Group motives in threatening contexts: When loyalty conflict paradoxically reduces the influence of an anti-discrimination ingroup norm. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 196-206.

Feldman, Stanley, Huddy, Leonie and Cassese, Erin. *In press. "*Emotions, Threat, and Political Reasoning." In Ron Sun (Ed.), Grounding Social Sciences in Cognition". Cambridge: MIT Press.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7,* 117-40.

Fielding, K. S., Terry, D. J., Masser, B. M., & Hogg, M. A. (2008). Integrating social identity theory and the theory of planned behaviour to explain decisions to engage in sustainable agricultural practices. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *47*, 23-48.

Fischer, P., Haslam, A.S., & Smith, L. (2010). "If you wrong us, shall we not revenge?" Social identity salience moderates support for retaliation in response to collective threat. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 14,* 143-150.

Fischhoff, B., Gonzalez, R. M., Small, D. A., & Lerner, J. S. (2005). Evolving judgments of terror risks: Foresight, hindsight and emotion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 11,* 124-139.

Fowler, J. H. and Kam, C. D. (2008). "Beyond the Self: Social Identity, Altruism, and Political Participation. *The Journal of Politics, 69*(3): 813-827.

Freedman, A. L. (2000). Chinese Overseas in Malaysia, Indonesia, and the United States. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gallup. (2005). Post -9/11 patriotism remains steadfast. http://www.gallup.com/poll/17401/post911-patriotism-remains-steadfast.aspx)

Gay, C. (2004). Putting race in context: Identifying the environmental determinants of black racial attitudes. *American Political Science Review, 98*(4): 547-562.

Gay, C. (2006). Seeing Difference: The Effect of Economic Disparity on Black Attitudes toward Latinos. *American Journal of Political Science, 50*, 982-997.

Gerber, A., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. *In press.* Personality and the strength and direction of partisanship. *Political Behavior.*

Gibson, J. L. (2008). Group identities and theories of justice: An experimental investigation into the justice and injustice of land squatting in South Africa. *The Journal of Politics*, *70*(3), 700-716.

Giles, M. W., & Evans, A.S. (1985). External threat, perceived threat, and group identity. *Social Science Quarterly, 66*, 50-66.

Glasford, D. E., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). I continue to feel so good about us: Ingrou identification and the use of social identity-enhancing strategies to reduce intragroup dissonance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*(4) , 415-427.

Grant, P. R., & Brown, R. (1995). From ethnocentrism, to collective protest: Responses to relative deprivation and threats to social identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58,* 195-211.

Green, D., Palmquist, B., & Schickler, E. (2002). *Partisan Hearts and Minds: Political Parties and the Social Identities of Voters.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Green, D. P., & Cowden, J.A. (1992). Who protests: Self-interest and white opposition to busing. *Journal of Politics, 54,* 471-496.

Greene, S. (1999). Understanding party identification: A social identity approach. *Political Psychology, 20,* 393-403.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeded, M., & Kirkland, S. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural world view. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 308-318.

Grieve, P. G., Hogg, M. A. (1999). Subjective uncertainty and intergroup discrimination in the minimal intergroup situation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 926-940.

Guimond, S., & Dubé-Simard, L. (1983). Relative deprivation theory and the Quebec nationalist movement: The cognition-emotion distinction and the personal-group deprivation issue. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*, 526-535.

Gurin, P., & Townsend, A. (1986). Properties of gender identity and their Implications for consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 139-148.

Gurin, P., Hurtado, A., & Peng, T. (1994). Group contacts and ethnicity in the social identities of Mexicanos and Chicanos. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 521-532.

Hainmueller, J., & Hiscox, M. J. (2010). Attitudes toward Highly Skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment. *American Political Science Review, 104*, 61-84

Haslam, A. S., & Reicher, S. (2006). Stressing the Group: Social Identity and the Unfolding Dynamics of Responses to Stress. Journal of *Applied Psychology, 91*(5), *1037-1052.*

Halevy, N. Bornstein, G., & Sagiv, L. (2008). "In-group Love" and Out-group Hate" as motives for individual participation in intergroup conflict. *Psychological Science, 19*(4), 405-411.

Herrmann, R. K., Isernia, P., and Segatti, P. (2009). Attachment to the Nation and International Relations: Dimensions of Identity and Their Relationship to War and Peace. *Political Psychology, 30*(5), 721-754.

Hogg. M. A. (2007). Uncertainty-identity theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *39*, 69-126.

Hogg, M. A., Sherman, D. K., Dierselhuis, J., Maitner, A. T., & Moffitt, G. (2007). Uncertainty, entitativity, and group identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*, 135-142.

Hogg, M. A, & Reid , S. A. (2006). Social Identity, self-categorization, and the communication of group norms. *Communication Theory*, *16*, 7-30.

Hogg, M. A. (1996). Intragroup processes, group structure, and social identity. In Robinson, W. P (Ed.), *Social Groups and Identities: Developing the Legacy of Henri Tajfel*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, (pp. 65-93).

Hogg, M. A., Hardie, E. A., & Reynolds, K. J. (1995). Prototypical similarity, self-categorization, and depersonalized attraction: A perspective on group cohesiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25,*159-177.

Hogg, M. A., & Hains, S. C. (1996). Friendship and group identification: A new look at the role of cohesiveness in groupthink. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *28*, 323-41.

Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J.C. (1985). Interpersonal attraction, social identification, and psychological group formation. *European Journal of Social Psychology 15*, 51-66.

Hohman, Z. P., Hogg, M. A., & Bligh, M. C. (2010). Identity and intergroup leadership: Asymmetrical political and national identification in response to uncertainty. *Self and Identity, 9*, 113-12

Hooghe L., & Marks G. (2004). Does identity or economic rationality drive public opinion on European integration? *Political Science and Politics, 37*(3), 415-420.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social Identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(1), 204-222.

Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Huddy, L. (2003). "Group Identity and Political Cohesion." In Sears, D. O., Huddy, L., & Jervis, R. (Eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political P*sychology. New York: Oxford University Press (pp. 511-558).

Huddy, L., & Khatib, N. (2007). American Patriotism, National Identity, and Political Involvement. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*(1), 63-77.

Huddy, L., Cassese, E., & Lizotte, M.-K. (2008). Gender, Public Opinion, and Political Reasoning. In Wolbrecht, C., Beckwith, K., & Baldez, L. (Eds.), *Political Women and American Democracy.* Cambridge University Press, (pp. 31-49).

Huddy, L. (2002). Context and Meaning in Social Identity Theory: A Response to Oakes. *Political Psychology, 23*, 825-838.

Huddy, L. & Mason, L. (2011). Yes We Can: The Emotional Power of Electoral Confidence. Stony Brook, NY: Unpublished manuscript.

Huddy, L., Feldman, S. & Cassese, E. (2007). On the Distinct Political Effects of Anxiety and Anger. In Neuman, W. R., Marcus, G. E., Crigler, A., & MacKuen, M. (Eds.). *The Affect Effect: Dynamics of Emotion in Political Thinking and Behavior*. University of Chicago Press, (pp 202-230).

Huddy, L., Feldman, S., Taber, C., & Lahav, G. (2005). Threat, Anxiety, and Support of Anti-Terrorism Policies. *American Journal of Political Science, 49*(3), 610-625.

Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology, 22*, 127-156.

Huddy, L., & Carey, T. (2009). Group Politics Redux: Race and Gender in the 2008 Democratic Primaries. *Politics & Gender, 5*, 1-16.

Huo, Y. J., & Molina, L. E. (2006). Is pluralism a viable model of diversity? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *9*, 359-376.

Jackson, J. W., & Smith, E. R. (1999). Conceptualizing social identity: A new framework and evidence for the impact of different dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25,* 120-135.

Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., Harnish, R., & Hodge, C. N. (1996). Achieving positive social identity: Social mobility, social creativity, and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 241-254.

Junn, J., & Masuoka, N. 2008. Asian American Identity: Shared Racial Status and Political Context, *Perspectives on Politics*, *6*, 729-740.

Kawakami, K., & Dion, K. (1993). The impact of salient self-identities on relative deprivation and action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 23*, 525-540.

Kim, J., & Ng, S. H. (2008). Perceptions of social changes and social identity: Study focusing on Hong Kong society after reunification. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *11*, 232-240.

Kinder, D. R., Adams, G.S., & Gronke, P.W. (1989). Economics and politics in the 1984 American presidential election. *American Journal of Political Science, 33*, 491-515.

Kosterman, R., & Feshback, S. (1989). Toward a Measure of Patriotic and Nationalistic Attitudes. *Political Psychology, 10*(2): 257-274.

Lambert, A. J., Scherer, L. D., Schott, J. P., Olson, K. R., Andrews, R. K., O'Brien, T. C., & Zisser, A. R. (2010). Rally effects, threat, and attitude change: An integrative approache to understanding the role of emotion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(6), 886-903.

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennelamp, S. F., Doosje, B., *et al.* (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-involvement: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(1), 144-165.

Leach, C. W., Iyer, A., & Pederson, A. (2007). Angry opposition to government redress: When the structurally advantaged perceive themselves as relatively deprived. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 191-204

Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory: A framework for social identity, social cognition, and intergroup relations. In Zanna, M. P., & Olson, J. M. (Eds.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 43, pp. 63-114).

Levendusky, M. (2009). *The partisan sort: How liberals became Democrats and conservatives became Republicans.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lerner, J. S., Gonzalez, R. M., Small, D. A., & Fischhoff, B. (2003). Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: A national field experiment. *Psychological Science, 14,* 144-150.

Lewis-Beck, M. S., Jacoby, W. G., Norpoth, H., Weisberg, H. E. (2008). *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D.T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Behavior.* New York: John Wiley.

Lowery, B. S., Unzueta, M. M., Knowles, E. D., & Goff, P. A. (2006). Concern for the In-Group and Opposition to Affirmative Action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(6), 961-974.

Lowrance, S. (2006). Identity, grievances, and Political action: Recent evidence from the Palestinian community in Israel. *Internatinoal Political Science Review, 27*(2), 167-190.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 18,* 302-318.

Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(4), 602-616.

Malka, A., & Lelkes, Y. (2010). More than ideology: Conservative-Liberal Identity and Receptivity to Political Cues. *Social Justice Research, 23*(2-3), 156-188.

Martin, E., DeMaio, T. J., & Campanelli, P. C. (1990). Context effects for census measures of race and Hispanic origin. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *54,* 551-566.

Mason, L.. 2011. Political Identity Alignment and Polarized Behavior. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey, July 9-12, 2011

Mason, L., Huddy, L., & Aaroe, L. (2011). *Measuring Partisanship as a Social Identity, Predicting Political Activism*. Stony Brook, NY: Unpublished manuscript.

McGarty, C., Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., David, B., & Wetherell, M. S. (1992). Group polarization as conformity to the prototypical group member. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 1-20.

McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 511-520.

McGuire, W. J., & Padawer-Singer, A. (1976). Trait salience in the spontaneous self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33*, 743-754.

McKenna, K. Y. A., &. Bargh, J. A. (1998). Coming out in the age of the internet: Identity demarginalization through virtual group participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(3), 681-694.

Mendes, W. B., Major, B., McCoy, S., & Blascovich, J. (2008). How attributional ambiguity shapes physiological and emotional responses to rejection and acceptance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(2), 278-291.

Miller, A. H., Gurin, P., Gurin, G., & Malanchuk, O. (1981). Group Consciousness and Political Participation. *American Journal of Political Science, 25*, 494-511.

Muldoon, O. T., Schmid, K., & Downes, C. (2009). Political violence and psychological well-being: The role of social identity. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 58*(1), 129-145.

Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 22,* 103-122.

Mullin, B. A., & Hogg, M. A. (1998). Dimensions of subjective uncertainty in social identification and minimal intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 37,* 345-65.

Mummendey, A., Kessler, T., Klink, A., & Mielke, R. (1999). Strategies to cope with negative social identity: Predictions by social identity theory and relative deprivation theory. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 76*(2), 229-45.

Musgrove, L., & McGarty, C. (2008). Opinion-based group memberships as a predictor of collective emotional responses and support for pro- and anti-war action. *Social Psychology, 39*(1), 37-47.

Oakes, P. (2002). Psychological groups and political psychology: A response to Huddy's "Critical examination of social identity theory." *Political Psychology, 23*(4), 809-824.

Parker, C. S. *(*2009). Symbolic versus blind patriotism: Distinction without difference? *Political Research Quarterly*.

Perreault, S., & Bourhis, R.Y. (1999). Ethnocentrism, social identification, and discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(1), 92-103.

Phalet, K., Baysu, G., & M. Verkuyten. (2010). Political mobilization of Dutch Muslims: Religious identity salience, goal framing, and normative constraints. *Journal of Social Issues*, *66*(4), 759-779.

Postmes, T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2002). Influence of long-term racial environmental composition on subjective well-being in African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(3), 735-751.

Pratto, F., & Glasford, D. E. (2008). Ethnocentrism and the value of human life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1411-1428.

Reese, L., & Brown, R.E. (1995). The effects of religious messages on racial identity and system blame among African Americans. *Journal of Politics*, *57*, 24-43.

Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change. *Social Psychology, 25*(6), 921-945.

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation: Categorization, Contestation and Mobilization*. London: Sage.

Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., Gaertner, S. L., McDonald, S. A., & Lamoreaux, M J. (2010). Does a common ingroup identity reduce intergroup threat? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13*(4), 403-423.

Roccas, S. & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*(2), 88-106.

Rydell, R. J., Mackie, D. J., Maitner, A. T., Claypool, H. M., Ryan, M. J., & Smith, E. R. (2008). Arousal, processind, and risk-taking: Consequences of intergroup anger. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(8), 1141-1152.

Sadler, M.S., Lineberger, M., Correll, J., & Park, B. (2005). Emotions, attributions, and policy endorsement in response tot he September 11th terrorist attacks. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27,* 249-258.

Schatz, R. T., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of Blind and Constructive Patriotism: Personality Correlates and Individual-Group Relations. In Bar-Tal, D., & Staub, E. (Eds.) *Patriotism: In the Lives of Individuals and Nations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall (pp. 311-326).

Schatz, R.T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology, 20,* 151-174.

Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (2005). When the pressure is up: The assessment of social identity threat in low and high status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 192-200.

Schildkraut, D. J. (2011). *Americanism in the twenty-first century. Public opinion in the age of immigration.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schildkraut. D. J. (2002). The more things change… American identity and mass and elite responses to 9/11. *Political Psychology, 23*(3), 511-535.

Schmid, K., Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2008). The effects of living in segregated vs. mixed areas in Northern Ireland: A simultaneous analysis of contact and threat effects in the context of micro-level neighborhoods. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 2*, 56-71.

Schwartz, S. H., Struch, N., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Values and intergroup social motives: A study of Israeli and German students. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 53,* 185-198.

Sears, D.O., Citrin, J., Cheleden, S.V., & van Laar, C. (1999). Cultural diversity and multicultural politics: Is ethnic balkanization psychologically inevitable? In Prentice, D. & Miller, D. (Eds.), *Cultural divides: The social psychology of cultural contact.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Sears, D. O., & Funk, C. (1991). The role of self-interest in social and political attitudes. *Advances in Experimental Psychology*, *24,* 1-91.

Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *2*, 18-39.

Shamir, M., & Arian, A. (1999). Collective identity and electoral competition in Israel. *American Political Science Review*, *93*, 265-277.

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sears, D. O. (2008). *The diversity challenge. Social identity and intergroup relations on the college campus. New York:* Russell Sage

Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (1997). The interface between ethnic and national attachment: Ethnic pluralism or ethnic dominance? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61*, 102-133.

Simon, B. (2004). *Identity in modern society: A social psychological perspective.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Simon, B., Kulla, C., & Zobel, M. (1995). On being more than just a part of the whole: Regional identity and social distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25,* 325-340.

Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 319-331.

Simon, B., Loewy, M., Sturmer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C., *et al*. (1998). Collective identification and social movement participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 646-658.

Simon, B., & Ruhs, D. (2008). Identity and politicization among Turkish immigrants in Germany: The role of dual identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1354-1366.

Simon, B., & Grabow, O. (2010). The politicization of migrants: Further evidence that politicized collective identity is a dual identity. *Political Psychology, 31*(5), 717-738.

Sindic, D., & Reicher, S. D. (2009). 'Our way of life is worth defending': Testing a model of attitudes towards superordinate group membership through a study of Scots' attitudes towards Britain. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 114-129.

Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., Aramovich, N. P., & Morgan, G. S. (2006). Confrontational and preventative policy responses to terrorism: Anger wants a fight and "fear" wants them to go away. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 28,* 375-384.

Smith, H. J., Spears, R., & Oyen, M. (1994). People like us: The influence of personal deprivation and group membership salience on justice evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 277-299.

Sniderman, P., Hagendoorn, L., & Prior, M. (2004). Predispositional Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities. *American Political Science Review, 98*(1), 35-49.

Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B. Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, *51*, 456-581.

Spears, R., Oakes, P. J., Ellemers, N., & Haslam, S. A. (1997). *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Staerkle, C., Sidianus, J., Green, E. G. T., & Molina, L. E. (2010). Ethnic minority-majority asymmetry in national attitudes around the world: A multilevel analysis. *Political Psychology, 31*(4), 491-519.

Stephan, W. G. & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of intergroup behavior. In Worchel, S., & Austin, W. G. (Eds.) *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall (pp. 7-24).

Struch, N., & Schwartz, S.H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 364-373.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tate, K. (1994). *From protest to politics: The new black voters in American elections.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (Enlarged edition).

Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., Cirns, E, & Christ, O. (2007). Cross-community contact, perceived status differences, and intergroup attitudes in Northern Ireland: The mediating roles of individual-level versus group-level threats and the moderating role of social identification. *Political Psychology, 28*(1), 53-68.

Taylor, D. M., Moghaddam, F. M., Gamble, I., & Zellerer, E. (1987). Disadvantaged group responses to perceived inequality: From passive acceptance to collective action. *Journal of Social Psychology, 127*, 259-272.

Taylor, D., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1996). *Theories of intergroup relations*. Westport, Conn: Praeger.

Terry, D. J., & Hogg, M A. (1996). Group Norms and the Attitude-Behavior Relationship: A Role for Group Identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 776-793.

Terry, D. J., Hogg, M. A., & Duck, J. M. (1999). Group Membership, Social Identity, and Attitudes. In Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (Eds.) *Social Identity and Social Cognition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing (pp. 280-314).

Theiss-Morse, E. (2009). *Who counts as an American: The boundaries of national identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. (2009). The role of efficacy and moral outrage norms in creating the potential for international development activism through group-based interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 48,* 115-134.

Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. I. (2009). Aligning identities, emotions and beliefs to create commitment to sustainable social and political action. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*(3), 194-218.

Torgler, B., & Schneider, F. (2007). What shapes attitues toward paying taxes? Evidence from multicultural European countries. *Social Science Quarterly, 88*(2), 443-470.

Townsend, S. S., Major, B., Gangi, C. E., & Mendes, W. B. (2011). From "In the air" to "Under the skin": Cortisol responses to social identity threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Buletin, 37*(2), 151-164.

Transue, J. E. (2007). Identity salience, identity acceptance, and racial policy attitudes: American national identity as a uniting force. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*, 78-91.

Tripathi, R. C., & Srivastava, R. (1981). Relative deprivation and intergroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 11*, 313-318.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Turner, P. J., & Smith, P. M. (1984). Failure and defeat as determinants of group cohesiveness. *British Journal of Social Psychology 23*, 97-111.

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2000). *Cooperation in groups. Procedural justice, social identity, and behavioral engagement.* Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

van Bavel, J. J., Packer, D. J., & Cunningham, W. A. (2008). The neural substrates of ingroup bias. *Psychological Science, 19*(11), 1131-1139.

van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., and Spears, R. (2008). Toward an integrative social identity model of collective action: Quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(4), 504-535.

Vanneman, R. D., & Pettigrew, T. F. (1972). Race and relative deprivation in the urban United States. *Race, 13,* 461-486.

Verkuyten, M., & Nekuee, S. (1999). Ingroup bias: The effect self-stereotyping, identification, and group threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29,* 411-418.

Voci, A. (2006). The link between identification and in-group favouritism: Effects of threat to social identity and trust-related emotions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 265-284.

Wald, K. D. (2008). Homeland interest, hostland politics: Politicized ethnic identity among Middle-Eastern heritage groups in the United States. *International Migration Review, 42*(2), 273-301.

Wattenberg, M. P. (2008). *Is voting for young people? With a postscript on citizen engagement.* New York: Pearson Longman.

Wong, C.J., 2010. *Boundaries of obligation in American politics: Geographic, national, and racial communities.* New York, Cambridge University Press.

Wright, S. C. (1997). Ambiguity, social influence, and collective action: Generating collective protest in response to tokenism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23,* 1277-1290.

Wright, S. C., Taylor, D. T., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1990). Responding to membership in a disadvantaged group: From acceptance to collective protest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 994-1003.

Yzerbyt, V., Dumont, M., Wigboldus, Grodijn, E. (2003). I feel for us: The impact of categorization and identification on emotions and action tendencies. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 533-549.

Zaller, J. R. (1992). *Nature and nature of mass ideology.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.