CSD Center for the Study of Democracy
An Organized Research Unit
University of California, Irvine
www.democ.uci.edu

Common fate is considered essential to black collective identity, solidarity, and mobilization.[1] Tate (1991, 1994, 2003), for example, finds that feelings of common fate and Black identity increases Black rates of political participation. Citing a recent survey of African Americans nationwide, Bobo, Dawson, and Johnson (2001) emphasize the "durable two-ness of the African-American experience" as indicated by the continued strong feelings of common fate among "nearly a third of the black population." Sociological theories have long held that collective identity and feelings of solidarity are critical to protest and movement participation (Melucci 1988:334; Hunt and Benford 2004:437; Klandermans 2004:366-367). Polletta and Jasper (2001:3) define collective identity as "an individual's cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution. It is a perception of a shared status or relation." Derived from group membership in a social category that similarly experiences social relations (Tilly 2002:19), collective identity is a "shared sense of 'we-ness" (Hunt and Benford 2004:440), and "common cause, threat, or fate" (Snow 2001:2214).

While, empirically, this study aims to increase our knowledge of political participation among African Americans, it also seeks to expand our methodological approach and theoretical understanding concerning the relative importance of collective identity in predicting the likelihood of political participation. This paper expands upon the considerable body of work that asks why some individuals choose to participate in political activities while others do not. Sociologists and political scientists have grappled with this question for some time, but their methodological and empirical approaches have differed. Much like Schussman and Soule (2005), who seek to synthesize the two literatures, this study draws on the work of scholars (e.g. McAdam 1982, 1986, 1988, 1992; Taylor and Whittier 1992; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995, Putnam 2000; Dalton 2002; Martinez 2005; Schussman and Soule 2005) in both disciplines to examine the effect of collective identity on political participation.

This paper deviates from previous research in several ways. First, to date, no other study directly tests the role of *feelings of collective identity* on the likelihood of participating in unconventional political activity such as protest participation. Typically,

[1] I would like to thank Frank Bean, David Meyer, David Snow, and members of both the Social Movement/Social Justice Workgroup, and the Gender, Work, Family Workgroup at UCI, for helpful comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper. Also, I am grateful for funds provided by the Center for the Study of Democracy at UCI.

feelings of collective identity are measured with black identification, or black consciousness measures that assess group political ideology and interests rather than feelings that one's fate is tied to the group. For example, Fitzgerald's and Spohn's (2005) study of the role of the black church in promoting protest, tests the relative importance of black identification and black consciousness as measured by feelings about the ability of blacks to "get ahead in life", and the degree to which the legal system, corporations, and American society in general treat black people fairly. Such measures garner insight into the ideological beliefs held by black Americans in predicting protest activity, but these are not measures of collective identity or common fate. In point of fact, liberal whites may similarly share such feelings. It says little about the extent to which respondents perceive their fate and life's chances as tied to that of their racial group.

Second, while previous research examines the role of collective identity on voting behavior (Gurin, Hatchett, and Jackson 1989; Tate 1991, 1994, 2003), no studies compare its relative effect on other forms of conventional behavior, such as participation in a voter registration drive, or unconventional political participation including signing a petition or participating in a protest or demonstration. African Americans are found to have higher levels of unconventional political participation (protest) than whites (Paulsen 1991; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995:484) and often employ such practices because they "continue to perceive themselves as excluded from institutional politics (Schussman and Soule 2003:28)." McAdam (1986) emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between high-risk unconventional behavior and relatively low-risk electoral-oriented activity as structural and individual motivational factors in predicting the likelihood of participation may differ considerably.

Third, as Schussman and Soule (2005:1087) note, most of the sociological work on collective identity employs case studies of social movements or social movement organizations. This methodological approach makes it difficult to assess its relative importance in stimulating political participation. Typically, studies that include analyses of collective identity rest on data from individuals who already belong to the organization or movement as is the case of civil rights movement participants (e.g. Morris 1984, Robnett 1997, 2005), lesbian feminist movement activists (e.g.Taylor and Whittier 1992), International Gay and Lesbian Association members (e.g. Gamson 1997), anti-nuclear power adherents (e.g. Downey 1986), and peace and justice movement activists (e.g. Hunt and Benford 1994). Instead of a case study approach, this paper utilizes attitudinal data from a national cross-sectional survey that includes individuals who do not belong to movement organizations, or civic organizations.

Literature Review

Sociology, Political Science, and Approaches to the Study of Collective Identity

Within sociology, most of what we know about the relationship between collective identity and political participation centers on unconventional politics. Major reviews of the sociological literature suggest that analyses of collective identity employ a

constructionist approach that is concerned with the "construction and maintenance of joint action, negotiation, and interpretive work" rather than "dispositional correlates" (Snow and McAdam 2000). Accordingly, the focus is on the formation, sustenance, strategic choices, and outcomes of social movements (Polletta and Jasper 2001), "'micromobilization and participation'" including "the relationships between collective identity, solidarity, and commitment" (Hunt and Benford 2004 p. 433), and collective identity processes (Melucci 1992; Snow and McAdam 2000; Snow 2001). Research on collective identity within the social movement context, is concerned with activists' rituals (Taylor and Whittier 1992), boundary maintenance (Taylor and Whittier 1992; Gamson 1997), and identity talk (Hunt and Benford 1994). Although I concur with and employ the constructionist approach in much of my work, the shift in focus has left a void in sociological research. Given the approach, none of the studies are able to determine the relative importance of collective identity in predicting the likelihood of political participation.

In contrast, political scientists focus less on the processes and mechanisms driving collective identity in social movement contexts than on the biographical and structural characteristics that predict political participation. This work differs from that of sociologists in that survey data is more often employed, but there is a tendency to neglect the importance of collective identity. Political scientists don't often refer to "shared we-ness" as collective identity, but rather as "group consciousness". However, most of this research takes place prior to 1985. As Bobo and Gilliam (1990:377) note these studies (with the notable exception of Fitzgerald and Spohn 2005) examine data on African American behavior during the 1950s or 1960s (Verba and Nie 1972; Shingles 1981; Guterbock and London 1983). Unlike the finding of Fitzgerald and Spohn (2005), this earlier work concludes that "group consciousness, was the stimulus to heightened black participation (Bobo and Gilliam 1990:377)." Although, socioeconomic status continues to be a major predictor of political participation, Verba and Nie (1972) find that group consciousness "overcomes the socio-economic disadvantages of blacks (p.158)." Perhaps, in the post-civil rights era, group consciousness is less of a predictor of political participation than it was in the past.

In recent years, only a few studies directly test the effect of collective identity on political participation (Gurin, Hatchett, and Jackson 1989; Tate 1991, 1994, 2003). Although Tate (1991, 1994, 2003) focuses exclusively on voting behavior in the 1984, 1988, and 1996 elections, she finds it to have a positive effect on Black participation in the 1984 primary, and the 1988 and 1996 elections. Conversely, analyzing data from their 1989-1990 American Citizen Participation Study, Verba, Schlozman and Brady (1995:356) find no effect of group consciousness on political participation among African Americans which they posit may be due to the nature of the questions. Their measures of Black consciousness that include group closeness and attitudes toward government policies aimed at Blacks may not accurately capture its effect. Tate (1991: 1166) argues these measures are inadequate because they only measure the, "simple awareness of group membership." Instead, she employs a combined measure that includes feelings that one's fate is tied to the group and the degree to which one "thought about being black (1166)."

Data and Analyses

This study employs data from a national cross-sectional telephone survey with a multiple frame, random-digit probability sample of 1205 adult African American respondents from the 1993-1994 National Black Politics Study (NBPS) conducted by the Center for the Study of Race at the University of Chicago (Dawson, Brown, and Jackson, 1993).1 The data was collected from December 4, 1993 through February 13, 1994. In addition to demographic information, the sample includes responses to questions regarding political climate, economic conditions, feelings and beliefs about Black Americans, the role of religion, ideas and opinions about politics, feelings about political leaders, groups, and prominent people, views on important national policy debates, and sources of information.2

The data are used to assess the extent to which collective identity predicts the likelihood of African American conventional and unconventional political participation. As Martinez (2005) points out, not all unconventional participation is high-risk, so it is important to delineate several types of participation. It is not a stretch to presume that high-risk unconventional participation requires a stronger commitment. Therefore, I posit a typology in which low-commitment conventional behavior is measured through voting. In general, voting requires little commitment other than to show up at the polls on Election Day or to send in an absentee ballot. Though without risk, high-commitment conventional behavior such as participation in a voter registration drive includes investing time and energy. Following Martinez (2005), signing a petition is considered unconventional behavior which I categorize as low-commitment. It takes little time and few resources to sign a petition. Although Martinez (2005) considers participation in a protest march or demonstration as low-risk unconventional behavior, it is generally considered a high-risk activity (McAdam 1986), as it is in this model. Often participation in such events entails the risk of arrest, loss of employment, or injury.

Several logistic regressions, that employ maximum likelihood analyses calculating probabilities into logged odds, are performed on each of the four dichotomous dependent dummy variables, coded for whether or not the respondent participated in the following political activities: voted, helped with a voter registration drive, signed a petition, or attended a protest meeting or demonstration. For every one-unit change in the independent variable, the logistic regression coefficient indicates the shift in the predicted logged odds of the occurrence of the dependent variable. In SPSS, Version13.0, four models are run for each dependent variable to test the relative effect of biographical availability, political engagement, structural availability, and collective identity on low- and high commitment conventional and unconventional political behavior. Next, on those dependent variables in which collective identity is a significant predictor, the first three logistic regressions run in the previous analysis are replicated but control for feelings of collective identity. There is one analysis on only those with somewhat strong to strong feelings of collective identity, and a separate analysis of those with weak to no feelings of collective identity.3 Finally, an analysis designed to delineate the relationship between structural availability and collective identity is run holding those structurally available predictors of political participation constant. Again, the first three logistic regression models run in the initial analysis are replicated but control for those structural availability variables found to be significant predictors of the likelihood of political participation.

Goodness of Fit Tests are used to assess the model's fit including The Hosmer and Lemeshow Goodness of Fit Tests, where N's exceed 400 and significance values above .05 indicating a good fit, the Cox & Snell R Square, and the Nagelkerke R Square. The odds ratios are presented in each table (for negative coefficients 1 – EXP(B)= odds ratio; and, for positive coefficients Exp(B) – 1.000 = odds ratio).

Dependent Variables

To ascertain the effect of collective identity, several binary logistic regression models are employed on the four dependent variable measures including 1) low-commitment conventional political participation (voting), 2) high-commitment conventional political participation (participation in a voter registration drive), 3) low-commitment unconventional political participation (signed a petition), and 4) high-commitment political participation (attended a protest meeting or demonstration). The responses are coded into dummy variables, (1) yes, (0) no. In the NBPS, 78.6% of respondents had voted, 23.4% had helped out with a voter registration drive, 60.6% had signed a petition, and 29.7% had attended a protest meeting or demonstration. See the Appendix for measurement details of each of the variables.

Independent Variables

Biographical Availability. Sociological studies concerned with biographical availability focus on factors that impede or enhance high risk activism, such as participation in protest marches or demonstrations. Several studies suggest that marriage, employment, children, and other family responsibilities in which the costs of activism are high, i.e. job loss or arrest, deter involvement (McAdam 1986; Wiltfang and McAdam 1991). Factors found to enhance participation include age (those who are older are more inclined to participate) (McAdam 1986), full-time employment (McCarthy and Zald 1973; McAdam 1986), unemployment (students and retirees) and those with job autonomy (flexible hours) (Wiltfang and McAdam 1991), and access to resources (Brady, Verba and Schlozman 1995). The higher the SES, the greater is political participation. Dawson (2001), for example, finds that African Americans with higher levels of income and education have higher levels of collective identity, and political participation.

Although Verba, Burns, and Schlozman (1997) find slight gender differences between men's and women's political engagement, and conclude that women are less interested than men in political engagement, and are less politically informed, other studies contradict these findings (Baxter and Lansing 1983; Verba and Nie 1972:164; Williams 1987; Nepstad and Smith 1999). Studies show that African American women are more likely than are Black men to be actively engaged in politics (Baxter and Lansing 1983; Verba and Nie 1972:164; Williams 1987), and there is some evidence that biographical availability may not always predict who is likely to protest. Those with higher incomes are not always more likely to participate (Nepstad and Smith1999; Martinez 2005).

McAdam's (1986) study of volunteers for high risk activism in the 1964 Freedom Summer Project campaign reveals that "attitudinal affinity" combined with "biographical availability are necessary… causes of participation in high risk/cost activism (87)." This suggests, then, that other factors can mitigate the effects of income and education on unconventional political participation. Given the contradictory results regarding the significance of biographical availability, Model 1 includes income, education, employment status, age, gender, marital status, and number of children to ascertain their relative effects on low- and high-conventional and unconventional political behavior.4

Political Engagement. Generally, the literature on political engagement addresses the extent to which actors are informed about, exhibit an interest in, and express optimism about politics. Individuals who are interested in politics and informed about the issues are more likely to participate in all forms of political activity (Verba, Schlozman and Brady 1995; Putnam 2000). Others find that those with liberal attitudes (Hirsch 1990; Dalton 2002) and feelings of political efficacy, or the belief that one's actions can create change (Craig 1979; Sutherland 1981; Travers 1982; Tyler and McGraw 1983; Bobo and Gilliam 1990; Paulsen 1991), are also inspired to participate. Analyzing data from the late 1960s, Shingles (1981) finds that Black consciousness or the number of times an interviewee spontaneously mentions his/her race and racial problems, leads to stronger feelings of political efficacy and political participation on the part of poor African Americans. Similarly, Guterbock and London (1983), using an identical measure of Black consciousness, argue that it leads to greater distrust of government which inspires increased political participation for both middle- and low-income Blacks. Other studies (Tate 1994, 2003; Gurin, Hatchett, and Jackson 1989) show that race identification is strongly associated with greater political interest and propensity to vote. However, unlike Bobo and Gilliam, Tate (2003:141) finds that collective identity is "unrelated to political knowledge and to political efficacy." Although the relationship between collective identity and political efficacy is contradictory, all of these studies suggest that collective identity serves as a vehicle driving conventional political activity.

In addition to the biographical availability measures, Model 2 includes two measures of political knowledge (reading a metropolitan newspaper, reading a Black newspaper), one measure of political interest (discussion of politics at church), and one measure of political efficacy (a belief that achieving racial equality is possible). Admittedly the last two measures are not optimal, but the survey did not include direct questions such as "How interested are you in politics?" or, "Do you believe that political participation can lead to change?" However, while one may not feel it appropriate to discuss politics in church, the Black church has a long history of inspiring political participation (Morris 1984; Harris 1999; Fitzgerald and Spohn 2005). In this data set, 38.4% attend church at least once a week, and 27.9% attend once or twice a month. 8.7% attend once or twice a year, and only 2.1% never attend church. This suggests that the church remains central in the lives of African Americans. Additionally, a belief that racial equality is attainable certainly indicates optimism and hope, and especially that change is possible. Given that liberals are found to be more likely to protest (Hirsch 1990; Dalton 2002), but in the absence of similar evidence regarding conventional politics, a measure of the respondent's political position (liberal, conservative, or moderate) is included.

Structural Availability. Social ties and networks, or structural availability, are deemed crucial to social movement participation (McAdam 1986; Taylor and Whittier 1992; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995; Klandermans 1997), as almost all protesters are involved with groups, generally organizations, both movement and non-movement, that inspire such activity (Oberschall 1973; McAdam 1986; Paulsen 1991; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). Schussman and Soule (2005) find that "being asked to protest is the strongest predictor of participating in protest, …but that political interest and organizational ties are important predictors of being asked to protest" (1).

Political scientists tend to view organizational affiliation as a resource in which individuals garner leadership skills and knowledge which facilitate political participation. Involvement at work or in unions, churches, political groups or professional organizations provides know-how, organizational skills, and stimulates political interests. Sociologists often expand this notion of resource acquisition to include identity aspects of such involvement that move beyond political efficacy.

Numerous studies highlight the importance of organizational affiliations that cultivate feelings of collective identity and inspire political action (e.g. Morris 1992; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Polletta 1994; Williams 1995; Calhoun 1995; Bernstein 1997). Several scholars demonstrate the role of the Black church as a resource for political activism (i.e. Morris 1984; Harris 1994, 1999; Patillo-McCoy 1998, 1999; Brown and Brown 2003).

There are three measures of structural availability that include measures of the acquisition of civic skills thought to inspire political participation (Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). Such skills are measured through church activity, participation in an organization that helps to promote the status of Black Americans, and helping with community outreach programs. Schussman and Soule (2005) find that being asked to participate is a strong determinant of protest participation. Accordingly, a measure is included in Model 3 that asks respondents whether or not either a member of the clergy or someone in an official position has asked them to take political action. While the authors place this measure outside of structures, it is included as such in this model. Due to the nature of the question, respondents likely have access to or contact with the church or an official in an organization.

Collective Identity. A collective identity scale is developed that includes three measures of feelings of common fate. The questions ask, "Do you think what happens to black people [black men, black women] in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life?"5

Results

Conventional Political Participation

Collective identity is not significant in predicting the likelihood of participating in either high-or low-commitment conventional activities.

Table 1: Predictors of African-American Voting 1993-1994, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression

Independent Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Family Income	.074 (.077)	.007 (.007)	.042 (.043)	.041 (.042)
Education	-.017 (.017)	.108 (.114)*	.140 (.151)*	.123 (.131)
Employment Status	-4.14 (.339)	-.295 (.256)	-.307 (.264)	-.384 (.319)
Age	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)	.001 (.001)
Gender(female)	.323 (.382)	.649 (.914)*	.280 (.323)	.296 (.344)
No. of Children	-.026 (.026)	-.014 (.014)	-.018 (.018)	-.013 (.013)
Marital Status	.729(1.07)***	1.369(2.931)***	1.600(3.951)***	1.584(3.875)***
Political Orientation		.396 (.486)*	.451 (.569)*	.444 (.559)*
Efficacy		.096 (.101)	.115 (.122)	.143 (.154)
Political Interest		.582 (.790)*	.321 (.378)	.358 (.431)
Newspaper		.980 (1.665)***	1.364(2.913)***	1.427(3.165)***
Black Newspaper		.150 (.162)	.112 (.119)	-.028 (.028)
Organization			.127 (.135)	-.024 (.024)
Church Activity			.591 (.805)	.604 (.829)
Community Work			.074 (.077)	.091 (1.035)
Asked to Engage			-.147 (.137)	-.141 (.131)
Collective Identity				.711 (1.035)
Constant	.911	-1.956	-2.748	-3.110
N	712	712	389	376
-2 Log Likelihood	680.955	355.553	258.519	250.652

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios; *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =7 (Model 1); df=12 (Model 2); df =16 (Model 3); df = 17 (Model 4).

Table 2: Predictors of African-Americans Helping with a Voter Registration Drive 1993-1994, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Family Income	.051 (.053)	.057 (.059)	.037 (.037)	.041 (.042)
Education	.027 (.027)	.011 (.012)	-.003 (.003)	-.001 (.001)
Employment Status	-.143 (.133)	-.392 (.324)	-.761 (.533)	-.687 (.497)
Age	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
Gender (female)	-.324 (.277)	-.595 (.449)*	-.590 (.446)*	-.651 (.479)*
No. of Children	.034 (.035)	.075 (.078)	.071 (.073)	.079 (.083)
Marital Status	-.035 (.035)	-.173 (.159)	-.058 (.056)	-.133 (.125)
Political Orientation		.159 (.173)	.212 (.236)	.234 (.264)
Efficacy		.094 (.099)	.024 (.024)	.002 (.002)
Political Interest		1.096 (1.993)***	.967 (1.631)***	.873 (1.393)**
Newspaper		.342 (.408)	.493 (.637)	.451 (.569)
Black Newspaper		.453 (.573)	.249 (.283)	.162 (.176)
Organization			.802 (1.231)**	.737 (1.091)*
Church Activity			.017 (.017)	.108 (.115)
Community Work			.263 (.300)	.250 (.284)
Asked to Engage			.188 (.206)	.196 (.217)
Collective Identity				.411 (.508)
Constant	-1.660	-2.741	-3.062	-3.259
N	711	477	388	376
-2 Log Likelihood	785.314	477.574	376.783	366.205

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios. *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =7 (Model 1); df=12 (Model 2); df =16 (Model 3); df = 17 (Model 4).

As Table 1 indicates, those who are married, read a metropolitan newspaper, and are liberal, are more likely to vote. Individuals are 387.5% (3.875 x 100) more likely to vote if married, 316.5% more likely to vote if they read a metropolitan newspaper, and 55.9% more likely to vote if they are liberal.

The only significant biographical availability measure is "Marital status", and its significance persists after "Political Engagement" (Model 2), "Structural Availability" (Model 3), and "Collective Identity" (Model 4) measures are included. In Model 2 and Model 3 education is significant with every additional year of schooling, increasing the likelihood of voting by 11%-15%. However, this effect is rendered insignificant when the collective identity scale is added, as in Model 4. While there is not an interaction effect between collective identity and education, the finding suggests that feelings of collective identity may mitigate the education effect. In other words, those with little education, but possessing strong collective identities may be more inclined to vote.

None of the structural availability measures are significant predictors of voting. This finding is consistent with that of Tate's (1991) account of African American voting behavior in the 1984 presidential election in which collective identity, organizational membership, and church membership are not significant predictors of voting.

Men, those interested in politics, and members of an organization that helps to promote the status of black Americans are the most likely to help in a voter registration drive. Models 2, 3, and 4 indicate that women are (44.9%, 44.6%, 47.9% respectively) less likely than are men to participate in this activity.

Gender is the only biographical availability predictor of one's likelihood of helping in a voter registration drive although it does not have an effect until political engagement measures are entered in Model 2. Four-fifths of the decline in gender participation is accounted for by these measures (i.e., - .836 = [-.324 + .595]/-.324 Political Engagement). This is consistent with the findings of Verba, Burns, and Schlozman (1997) that men score higher than women on measures of political efficacy, or the feeling that one is "influential and effective in politics" (1062). Among the political engagement measures, political interest is the only significant predictor.

Unconventional Political Participation

There are only two significant predictors, being asked to engage in a political activity and collective identity, of the likelihood of signing a petition in support of something or against something. Biographical availability and political engagement measures are insignificant.

While family income is significant in Models 1 and 2, its effects are rendered insignificant with the addition of structural availability measures in Model 3. Structural availability accounts for three-tenths (i.e., [.118 - .080/.118] Structural Availability) of the decline between Model 2, which includes political engagement, and Model 3 of the family income effect. The significance of political interest decreases structural availability measures and collective identity added to the model resulting in an insignificant effect in Model 4. Being asked to participate and collective identity are equally significant in predicting the likelihood of signing a petition, but collective identity has the greatest predictive strength.

Table 3: Predictors of African-Americans Signing a Petition 1993-1994, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Family Income	.114 (.121)***	.118 (.125)**	.080 (.083)	.073 (.076)
Education	-.004 (.004)	.004 (.004)	.013 (.013)	.003 (.003)
Employment Status	.146 (.158)	-.027 (.026)	.164 (.179)	.017 (.018)
Age	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
Gender (female)	.317 (.372)	.272 (.313)	.380 (.462)	.374 (.454)
No. of Children	-.060 (.058)	-.022 (.022)	.003 (.003)	.014 (.014)
Marital Status	.034 (.034)	-.074 (.071)	-.023 (.023)	.036 (.036)
Political Orientation		.148 (.159)	.121 (.128)	.110 (.116)
Efficacy		-.066 (.064)	.010 (.010)	-.003 (.003)
Political Interest		.824 (1.280)***	.558 (.747)*	.502 (.652)
Newspaper		.110 (.117)	.177 (.194)	.124 (.132)
Black Newspaper		.227 (.254)	.138 (.148)	.118 (.125)
Organization			.540 (.716)	.408 (.504)
Church Activity			.074 (.077)	.058 (.060)
Community Work			-.106 (.101)	-.120 (.113)
Asked to Engage			.837 (1.309)***	.732 (1.080)**
Collective Identity				.945 (1.572)**
Constant	-.046	-.810	-1.505	-1.906
N	711	477	389	376
-2 Log Likelihood	916.219	579.066	448.161	430.499

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios. *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =7 (Model 1); df=12 (Model 2); df =16 (Model 3); df = 17 (Model 4).

Table 4: Predictors of African-Americans Attending a Protest Meeting or Demonstration 1993-1994, Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Family Income	.005 (.005)	-.019 (.018)	-.027 (.026)	-.031 (.030)
Education	.010 (.010)	.038 (.038)	.008 (.008)	.004 (.004)
Employment Status	-.280 (.245)	-.299 (.259)	-.152 (.141)	-.104 (.099)
Age	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
Gender (female)	-.645 (475)***	-.725 (.516)***	-.727 (.517)**	-.715 (.511)**
No. Children	-.046 (.044)	-.001 (.001)	-.014 (.014)	-.014 (.014)
Marital Status	-.182 (.167)	-.092 (.087)	-.059 (.057)	.003 (.003)
Political Orientation		.156 (.169)	-.066 (.068)	-.001 (.001)
Efficacy		.171 (.186)	.257 (.293)	.239 (.271)
Political Interest		.748 (1.114)***	.432 (.541)	.403 (.496)
Newspaper		.360 (.433)	.108 (.114)	.131 (.140)
Black Newspaper		.664 (.943)**	.465 (.592)	.438 (.550)
Organization			1.067(1.906)***	.988 (1.685)***
Church Activity			-.069 (.067)	-.096 (.092)
Community Work			.267 (.307)	.383 (.467)
Asked to Engage			.454 (.574)	.251 (.285)
Collective Identity				.967 (1.631)*
Constant	-.400	-2.131	-2.070	-2.654
N	712	478	389	376
-2 Log Likelihood	883.638	542.334	430.037	409.268

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios. *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =7 (Model 1); df=12 (Model 2); df =16 (Model 3); df = 17 (Model 4).

Those with strong feelings of collective identity are 157.2% more likely to engage in signing a petition, and those who have been asked are 108% more likely to do so than those who have not.

Individuals with strong collective identities, men, and those belonging to an organization to help promote the status of black Americans are more likely to engage in protest. Those with strong collective identities are 163.1% more likely to protest than those without such feelings. Similarly, organization members are 168.5% more likely to protest than nonmembers.

Women are 51.1% less likely to protest than are men. This is contrary to the findings of Schlozman, Burns, and Verba (1994:969-970) who find women in the general U.S. population to be equally likely to attend a protest (See also Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995:255-256). Once again, political engagement measures (political interest and reading a Black newspaper) are rendered insignificant with the introduction of structural availability measures, although only organizational participation is a significant predictor. Unlike Schussman's and Soule's (2005) findings, being asked to engage in political activity does not appear to predict the likelihood of protest among African Americans.

While organizational participation is the most significant and strongest predictor of the likelihood of protest, collective identity holds greater significance and predictive power than political engagement, and most of the biographical availability and structural availability measures.

Comparison of High- and Low- Commitment Conventional and Unconventional Political Participation

Table 5 provides several interesting findings. Those with strong feelings of collective identity are significantly more likely to participate in unconventional political activity regardless of whether or not it entails a low- or high- commitment. In predicting propensity to protest, although gender is a more significant predictor than is collective identity, the likelihood ratio between those with such feelings and those without them is much greater (1.631) than that between men and women (.511), although slightly less than that between those who belong to an organization and those that do not (1.685).

Organizational participation is crucial to high-commitment unconventional and conventional activity. It is the strongest predictor of the likelihood of protest, and is second only to political interest in predicting the likelihood of conventional high-commitment activity.

Political engagement is an important predictor of conventional political activity, but is insignificant in determining who is likely to engage in unconventional political behavior. Among the measures, there are different predictive effects in that political interest is required for engagement in high-commitment conventional activity, but information and political orientation are more important for determining low-commitment conventional activity. This is not surprising as political interest may serve as a stronger motivator than information and political orientation for giving time and expending the effort required to assist in a voter registration drive.

Table 5. Model 5. Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression Effects of Biographical Availability, Political Engagement, Structural Engagement and Collective Identity on African-American Conventional and Unconventional Political Behavior, 1993-1994

	Conventional Low Commitment	Conventional High Commitment	Unconventional Low Commitment	Unconventional High Commitment
Independent Variable	**Voting**	**Help with Registration Drive**	**Sign a Petition**	**Attend a Protest Meeting or Demonstration**
Gender (female)	**.296**	**-.651**	**.374**	**-.715**
	(.344)	**(.479)***	**(.454)**	**(.511)****
Marital Status	**1.584**	**-.133**	**.036**	**.003**
	(3.875)***	**(.125)**	**(.036)**	**(.003)**
Political Orientation	**.444**	**.234**	**.110**	**-.001**
	(.559)*	**(.264)**	**(.116)**	**(.001)**
Political Interest	**.358**	**.873**	**.502**	**.403**
	(.431)	**(1.393)****	**(.652)**	**(.496)**
Newspaper	**1.427**	**.451**	**.124**	**.131**
	(3.165)***	**(.569)**	**(.132)**	**(.140)**
Organization	**-.024**	**.737**	**.408**	**.988**
	(.024)	**(1.091)***	**(.504)**	**(1.685)*****
Asked to Engage	**-.141**	**.196**	**.732**	**.251**
	(.131)	**(.217)**	**(1.080)****	**(.285)**
Collective Identity	**.711**	**.411**	**.945**	**.967**
	(1.035)	**(.508)**	**(1.572)****	**(1.631)***
Constant	**-3.110**	**-3.259**	**-1.906**	**-2.654**
N	**376**	**376**	**376**	**376**
-2 Log Likelihood	**250.652**	**366.205**	**430.499**	**409.268**

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios. *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =17 (Model 4).

Table 6 provides a summary of the categorical measures most likely to stimulate hi- and low-commitment unconventional and conventional behavior. The table shows the ways in which different types of political participation are variously predicted by categorical constellations. Low-commitment conventional politics or an individual's choice to vote is largely determined by marital status and two types of political engagement, liberal beliefs, and the acquisition of knowledge. I know of no study that highlights the importance of marriage as an important predictor of voting, so it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which this finding is generalizable. It likely reflects the accoutrements that accompany marriage including stability, and permanent residency.

Table 6. Comparison of Effects of Biographical Availability, Political Engagement, Structural Engagement and Collective Identity on African-American Conventional and Unconventional Political Behavior, 1993-1994

Commitment	Conventional	Unconventional
Low	Biographical Availability (*Marital Status* (*Married*)) Political Engagement (*Political Orientation, Newspaper*)	Structural Availability (*Asked to Engage*) Collective Identity
High	Biographical Availability (*Gender* (*Male*)) Political Engagement (*Political Interest*) Structural Availability (*Organizational Participation*)	Biographical Availability (*Gender* (*Male*)) Structural Availability (*Organizational Participation*) Collective Identity

The factors influencing high-commitment conventional participation, i.e., helping in a voter registration drive, bear less resemblance to those that stimulate individuals to vote, than to the set of categories that predict the likelihood of protest, or high-commitment unconventional activity. This strongly suggests that the level of commitment is at least as important as is the conventionality of the political act when considering who is likely to participate and why.

Collective Identity vs. a Lack of Collective Identity

Collective identity has a positive effect on both the likelihood of attendance at a protest meeting or demonstration, and the likelihood of helping in a voter registration drive. The results of the logistic regressions designed to tease out the effects of collective identity on each of these high-commitment activities, indicate that those *without strong feelings of collective identity* are more likely to attend a protest meeting or demonstration if they are better educated and more liberal. For every one year increase in education, an individual is 2.216 times as likely to participate as those with less education. Political orientation has a negative effect with those who are more conservative 88.3% less likely to engage in this activity. The results suggest that those with higher educations and who are liberal are more likely to participate even if they feel a weak sense of collective identity with other African Americans. In keeping with the previous analysis, among those with a strong collective identity, women are less likely to participate than are men, and belonging to an organization that promotes the status of black Americans substantially increases the likelihood of protest participation.

Education also appears to mitigate the lack of collective identity on whether or not an individual is likely to sign a petition although it, along with gender, is not significant until Model 3 when structural availability measures (albeit negative) are entered.

In contrast to previous studies that find church participation to have a positive effect on political activity (McAdam 1982; Morris 1984; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Findlay 1993; Higginbotham 1993; Harris 1994, 1999; Mary Patillo-McCoy 1998, 1999), church activity, and helping in a community outreach program through the church decrease the likelihood of signing a petition among those with a weak collective identity. In combination, political interest and increased education increase the likelihood of signing a petition. Political interest, however, is the most important stimulus with those who are interested 58.927 times as likely to participate as those with a lack of interest. However, the inclusion of structural availability measures has a negative effect on women's participation.

Table 7. Model 3. Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression Collective Identity (C.I.) as a Predictor of High- and Low-Unconventional Political Behavior

	Strong C.I. Low Commitment	Weak C.I. Low Commitment	Strong C.I. High Commitment	Weak C.I. High Commitment
Independent Variable	**Sign a Petition**	**Sign a Petition**	**Attend a Protest Meeting or Demonstration**	**Attend a Protest Meeting or Demonstration**
Family Income	.084 (.088)	.311 (.364)	-.012 (.012)	-.041 (.040)
Education	-.009 (.009)	.568 (.765)*	-.009 (.009)	.796 (1.216)*
Employment Status	-.287 (.249)	-.197 (.179)	-.247 (.219)	2.795 (15.355)
Age	.001 (.001)	-.004 (.004)	.001 (.001)	-.002 (.002)
Gender (female)	.403 (.496)	-3.241 (.961)*	-.919 (.601)***	.451 (.570)
No. of Children	.074 (.077)	-.178 (.163)	-.011 (.011)	.263 (.301)
Marital Status	-.318 (.273)	2.898 (17.135)	-.155 (.144)	.548 (.730)
Political Orientation	.101 (.106)	1.695 (4.445)	.138 (.148)	-2.146 (.883)*
Efficacy	.069 (.071)	-1.146 (.682)	.236 (.266)	.509 (.664)
Political Interest	.372 (.451)	4.076 (57.927)*	.314 (.368)	2.952 (18.144)
Newspaper	-.106 (.100)	3.379 (28.353)	.084 (.088)	-2.203 (.890)
Black Newspaper	-.098 (.093)	1.156 (2.177)	.235 (.265)	1.846 (5.335)
Organization	.438 (.550)	3.141 (22.129)	.925 (1.522)**	.757 (1.133)
Church Activity	.397 (.488)	-4.802 (.992)*	.087 (.091)	-1.810 (.836)
Community Work	-.056 (.055)	-3.179 (.958)*	.389 (.476)	.893 (1.443)
Asked to Engage	.842 (1.321)**	2.396 (9.974)	.441 (.554)	.140 (.150)
Constant	-.976	-9.440	-1.675	-12.944
N	308	68	308	68
-2 Log Likelihood	351.351	27.108	352.605	37.633

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios. *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =16 (Model 3).

In contrast, among those with a strong collective identity, as in the earlier analysis, only being asked to engage in political activity predicts the likelihood that an individual will sign a petition. Although, in Model 1, women are more likely to sign a petition than are men, this effect is erased when political engagement measures are added to the model. This suggests that women may be less interested in politics, as has already been discussed. Structural availability has the effect of rendering income insignificant in Model 3. Access to organizations, church activity, and connections to engagement, appear to mitigate the income effect among those with strong collective identities. In sum, this suggests that without a strong collective identity, women and those with less education may depend more heavily on structural availability for involvement in unconventional political behavior. Similarly, Fitzgerald and Spohn (2005) find that church participation stimulates protest only for those with little education and access to organizational involvement.

It is reasonable to surmise that since organizational participation is central to both high-commitment activities, that it is participation itself that is driving the significance of collective identity (Buechler 1990; Hirsch 1990; Jasper 1997; Klandermans 1997:95). Yet, there are no significant interaction effects between organization participation/being asked to participate and collective identity for either of the unconventional behaviors.6 The results of the comparison between those with strong collective identities and those without them indicate that in the absence of a strong collective identity, education combined with either political interest or political orientation, are the only predictors of unconventional political behavior. Belonging to an organization predicts protest, but among those that belong to an organization, collective identity was not predictive of protest.

As you will recall, being asked to engage in a political activity is a strong predictor of signing a petition but, here too, collective identity is an insignificant predictor. Surprisingly, collective identity is a significant predictor among those not asked by clergy to participate in political activity, and among this group, women are more likely than are men to sign a petition.

Taken together, it appears that collective identity is independent of structural availability factors in predicting the likelihood of unconventional high- and low-commitment political activity. Rather, the data indicate that collective identity is more important in stimulating unconventional activity among those less structurally embedded. For high commitment unconventional behavior, collective identity does not appear to be the driving force among those embedded in civic organizational participation. Likewise, it does not have an effect among men who have been solicited by clergy to participate.

Table 8. Model 4. Odds Ratios and Summary Statistics from Logistic Regression Belonging to an Organization and Being Asked to Engage as Predictors of Unconventional High- and Low Commitment Political Behavior

	Belong Hi-Commitment Unconventional	Don't Belong Hi-Commitment Unconventional	Asked Lo-Commitment Unconventional	Not Asked Lo-Commitment UnConventional
Independent Variable	**Protested**	**Protested**	**Signed a Petition**	**Signed a Petition**
Family Income	.004 (.004)	-.026 (.026)	.141 (.151)+	-.019 (.172)
Education	-.014 (.014)	.072 (.074)	-.003 (.003)	-.004 (.004)
Employment Status	-1.110 (.671)	.640 (.897)	.885 (.423)	-.561 (.429)
Age	.001 (.001)	.000 (.000)	.001 (.001)	-.001 (.001)
Gender (female)	-.714 (.510)	-.734 (.520)+	.160 (.174)	.902 (1.463)*
No. of Children	-.011 (.011)	-.028 (.028)	.012 (.012)	.009 (.009)
Marital Status	.184 (.202)	-.081 (.078)	.231 (.260)	-.287 (.250)
Political Orientation	.004 (.004)	.014 (.014)	.104 (.110)	.159 (.173)
Efficacy	.835 (1.304)*	.008 (.008)	-.102 (.096)	.094 (.098)
Political Interest	.759 (1.136)	.189 (.208)	.380 (.462)	.711 (1.035)
Newspaper	-.261 (.230)	.422 (.524)	.125 (.133)	.362 (.436)
Black Newspaper	1.239(2.453)**	.002 (.002)	.266 (.305)	-.112 (.106)
Organization	_____	_____	.227 (.255)	1.010 (1.746)+
Church Activity	-.174 (.160)	-.157 (.145)	.240 (.271)	-.454 (.365)
Community Work	.284 (.329)	.583 (.791)	-.127 (.119)	-.021 (.020)
Asked to Engage	.116 (.123)	.388 (.474)	_____	_____
Collective Identity	.328 (.388)	.960 (1.612)+	.599 (.821)	1.095 (1.988)*
Constant	-2.185	-3.275	-1.158	-1.716
N	146	230	239	137
-2 Log Likelihood	178.625	216.577	257.994	162.426

Source Data: 1993-1994 National Black Politics Survey. Unweighted data.
Notes: Coefficients presented. Numbers in parentheses are odds ratios. P<.1+; *p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 (two tailed test) df =16 (Model 4).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study tests the importance of African American collective identity relative to three theoretical explanations, biographical availability, political engagement, and structural availability, of political participation. The results contribute not only to our understanding of African American political involvement, but to our theoretical understanding of why individuals choose to engage in political activity. Following in the footsteps of Schussman and Soule (2005), who argue for a synthesis of political science and sociology in the study of political protest, this paper calls for a methodological expansion of sociological and political science studies of collective identity. The results demonstrate that the sociological understanding of collective identity adds considerably to the study of who participates in political activities that is generally conducted by political scientists.

Empirically, it is clear that collective identity predicts African American involvement in high-commitment political activity regardless of whether or not it is conventional. It is not, however, statistically significant in predicting low-commitment political behaviors. Consistent with previous literature, black organizational participation (i.e. Meier and Rudwick 1973; Morris 1984; McAdam 1988, 1982; Robnett 1997) increases the probability of active political participation.

This paper makes two important theoretical contributions. First, this study, though not of the general population, provides a stepping off point for scholars interested in delineating the factors that lead to different types of protest. The results highlight the importance of comparing conventional and unconventional political behavior along the dimension of high- and low-commitment.

Second, the findings add to our understanding of the importance of collective identity. Although, its effect is negative on conventional political participation, it is critical in stimulating unconventional political participation. Both low- and high-commitment unconventional involvement require structural availability (albeit different types) ***and*** strong feelings of collective identity. Sociologists and political scientists have long considered organizational involvement as central to protest participation, and, as already discussed, feelings of collective identity are largely subsumed in social movement dynamics. Taken together, the findings clearly indicate the relatively independent effect of collective identity on unconventional political behavior. It leaves open the question of what creates a collective identity, and begs for further systematic analysis that fuses the methods and analyses of political science with the inroads made in sociology.

References

Baxter, S. and Lansing, M. 1983. *Women and Politics: The Visible Majority*. University of Michigan Press.

Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(3): 531-565.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Michael C. Dawson, and Devon Johnson. 2001. "Enduring Two-Ness" *Public Perspective* May/June: 12-16.

Bobo, Lawrence D., and Franklin D. Gilliam, Jr. 1990. " Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment." *American Political Science Review* 84(2): 377-393.

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation."*American Political Science Review* 89(2): 271-294.

Brown, R. Khari, and Ronald E. Brown. 2003. "Faith and Works: Church-Based Social Capital Resources and African American Political Activism." *Social Forces* 82(2):617-641.

Buechler, Steven. 1990. *Women's Movements in the United States*. Rutgers University Press.

Calhoun, Craig. 1995. "'New Social Movements' of the Early Nineteenth Century" Pp. 173-215. *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action.* Mark Traugott, editor. Duke University Press.

Craig, Steven.1979. "Efficacy, Trust and Political Behavior." *American Politics Quarterly* 7(2):225-239.

Dalton, Russell. 2002. *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Third Edition. Chatham House Publishers.

Dawson, Michael. 2001. *Black Visions*:*The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies.* University of Chicago Press.

Dawson, Michael, Ronald Brown, and James S. Jackson. 1993. *National Black Politics Study Codebook*. ICPSR 2018. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Downey, Gary L. 1986. "Ideology and the Clamshell Identity: Organizational Dilemmas in the Anti-Nuclear Power Movement." *Social Problems* 33:357-373.

Fantasia, Rick. 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity*. University of California Press.

Findlay, James, Jr. 1993. *Church People in the Struggle, 1950-1970*. Oxford University Press.

Fitzgerald, Scott T. and Ryan E. Spohn. 2005. "Pulpits and Platforms: The Role of the Church in Determining Protest among Black Americans." *Social Forces* 84(2): 1015-1048.

Gamson, Joshua. 1997. "Messages of exclusion: Gender, movements, and symbolic Boundaries." *Gender & Society* 11(2):178-199.

Gurin, Patricia, Shirley Hatchett, and James S. Jackson. 1989. *Hope and Independence: Blacks' Response to Electoral and Party Politics*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Guterbock, Thomas M. and Bruce London. 1983. "Race, Orientation, and Participation: An Empirical Test of Four Competing Theories." *American Sociological Review* 48 (4): 439-453.

Harris, Frederick. 1999. *Something Within: Religion in African-American Political Activism.* Oxford University Press.

----------. 1994. "Something Within: Religion as a Mobilizer of African-American Political Activism" *The Journal of Politics* 56(1):42-68.

Higginbotham, Elizabeth. 1993. *Righteous Discontent: The Women's Movement in the Black Baptist Church 1880-1920*. Harvard University Press.

----------. 1992. "African-American Women's History and the Metalanguage of Race." *Signs* 17: 251-274.

Hirsch, Eric. 1990. "Sacrifice for the Cause: Group Processes Recruitment and Commitment in a

Student Social Movement." *American Sociological Review* 55: 243-254.
Hunt, Scott A. and Robert D. Benford. 2004. "Collective Identity, Solidarity, and Commitment." Pp.433-457. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements.* David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, editors. Blackwell Publishing.
----------. 1994. "Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities", Pp. 185-208. *From Ideology to Identity*. E. Larana, H. Johnston, and J.R. Gusfield, editors. Temple University Press,
Jasper, James. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest*. University of Chicago Press.
Klandermans, Bert. 2004. "The Demand and Supply of Participation: Social-Psychological Correlates of Participation in Social Movements." Pp. 360-379. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, editors. Blackwell Publishing.
----------. 1997. *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Blackwell.
Lincoln, C. Eric and Lawrence Mamiya. 1990. *The Black Church in the African American Experience*. Duke University Press.
Martinez, Lisa M. 2005. "Yes We Can: Latino Participation in Unconventional Politics." *Social Forces* 84(1): 135-155.
McAdam, Doug. 1992. "Gender as a Mediator of the Activist Experience: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 97(5): 1211-1240.
----------. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. Oxford University Press.
----------. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 64-90.
----------.1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*. University of Chicago Press.
McAdam, Doug, and Ronnelle Paulsen. 1993. "Specifying the Relationship between Social ties and Activism." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:640-667.
McCarthy, John, and Mayer Zald. 1973. *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. General Learning Press.
Meier, August and Elliot Rudwick. 1973. *CORE: A Study of the Civil Rights Movement: 1942-1968*. Oxford University Press.
Melucci, Alberto. 1992. "The Process of Collective Identity." Pp. 41-63.Bert Klandermans and Hank Johnston editors. *Social Movements and Culture.* University of Minnesota Press,.
----------.1988. "Getting Involved: Identity and Mobilization in Social Movements." *International Social Movement Research* 1: 329-348.
Morris, Aldon. 1992. "Political Consciousness and Collective Action." Pp. 351-371. *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* . Aldon Morris and Carol Mueller, editors. Yale University Press.
----------1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement*. Free Press.
Nepstad, Sharon Erickson, and Christian Smith. 1999. "Rethinking Recruitment to High Risk/Cost Activism: the Case of Nicaragua Exchange." *Mobilization* 4: 25-40.
Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Prentice-Hall.
Patillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril Among the Black Middle Class*. The University of Chicago Press.
----------1998. "Church Culture as a Strategy of Action in the Black Community." *American Sociological Review* 63: 767-784.
Paulsen, Ronnelle. 1991. "Education, Social Class, and Participation in Collective Action." *Sociology of Education* 54: 96-110.

Polletta, Francesca. 1998. "'It was Like a Fever': Narrative and Identity in Social Protest."

Social Problems 45: 137-159.
----------. 1994. "Strategy and Identity in 1960s Black Protest." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change* 17:85-114
Polletta, Francesca, and Jasper James M. 2001. "Collective identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 283-310.
Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Touchstone.
Robnett, Belinda.2005. **"**We Don't Agree: Collective Identity Justification Work in Social Movement Organizations." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 26 :201-238 Patrick Coy, editor. Elsevier.
----------1997. *How Long? How Long? African-American Women in the Struggle for Civil Rights, 1954-1965*. OxfordUniversity Press.
Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Nancy Burns, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "Gender and the Pathways to Participation: The Role of Resources." *The Journal of Politics* 56(4):963-90.
Schussman, Alan, and Sarah A. Soule. 2005. "Process and Protest: Accounting for Individual Protest Participation." *Social Forces* 84(2): 1083-1108.
Shingles, Richard. 1981. "Black Consciousness and Political Participation: The Missing Link." *American Political Science Review* 75(1): 76-91.
Snow, David. 2001. "Collective Identity and Expressive Forms." Pp. 2212-2219. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*.Neil Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, editors. Elsevier Science.
Snow, David. A. and McAdam, Doug. 2000. "Identity Work Processes in the Context of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus." Pp. 41-67. *Self, Identity, and Social Movements.* Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White, editors. University of Minnesota Press.
Sutherland, S. L. 1981. *Patterns in Belief and Action: Measurement of Student Political Activism*. University of Toronto Press.
Tate, Katherine. 2003. *Black Faces in the Mirror: African Americans and Their Representatives in the U.S. Congress*. Princeton University Press.
----------. 1994. *From Protest to Politics: The New Black Voters in American Elections*. Harvard University Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
---------- . 1991. "Black Political Participation in the 1984 and 1988 Presidential Elections. *American Political Science Review* 85(4):1159-1176.
Taylor, Verta, and Nancy Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity and Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp.104-129. *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory.* Aldon Morris and Carol Mueller, editors.Yale University Press
Tilly, Charles. 2002. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*. Rowman & Littlefield.
Travers, Eva. F. 1982. "Ideology and Political Participation among High School Students: Changes from 1970-1979." *Youth and Society* 13(3): 327-352.
Tyler, Tom R., and Kathleen McGraw. 1983. "The Threat of Nuclear War: Risk Interpretation and Behavioral Response." *The Journal of Social Issues* 39(1): 25-40.
Verba, Sidney, Nancy Burns, and Kay Lehman Schlozman. 1997. "Knowing and Caring about Politics: Gender and Political Engagement." *The Journal of Politics* 59(4): 1051-1072.
Verba, Sidney and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America*. Harper & Row.
Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Harvard University Press.
Williams, Linda F. 1987. "Black Political Progress in the 1980s: The Electoral Arena." Pp. 97-136. *The New Black Politics*, Second Edition. Michael B. Preston, Lenneal J. Henderson Jr., and Paul L. Puryear, editors. Longman.
Williams, Rhys. 1995. "Constructing the Public Good: Social Movements and Cultural

Resources." *Social Problems* 42(1): 124-144.
Wiltfang, Gregory, and Doug McAdam. 1991. "The Costs and Risks of Social Activism: A Study of Sanctuary Movement Activism." *Social Forces* 69: 987-1010.

Endnotes

1. A density factor of 30% was employed that includes 8,116 tracts or about 6.5 million African American households. This constitutes approximately 65% of all Black households. Complete descriptions of the survey methodology and response rates are available from the author or on the ICPSR website.

2. See the Appendix for Demographic Statistics of the NBPS.

3. For these Models, the collective identity scale is dichotomized and dummy variables are created with those expressing feelings of collective identity on 0-1 question/s coded 0, and those expressing such feelings on 2-3 questions coded 1.

4. Since student status and employment status are in the same measure, each was alternately coded 1 with all other categories coded 0. Student status was not significant.

5. As discussed earlier, Tate (1991, 1994, 2003) employs this variable as well to measure of feelings of common fate.

6. Results of interaction tests are available upon request.

Appendix

Descriptions of the dependent variables from NBPS:

1. Voted: "Did you vote in the past presidential election?" This variable is coded 1 if the respondent voted. (78.6%).
2. Voter registration: "As I read a list of political activities that people sometimes do, please tell me whether or not you have engaged in these activities in the last TWO years? Have you helped in a voter registration drive?" This variable is coded 1 if the respondent helped. (23.4%).
3. Signed a petition: "Now, I'm going to read you a list of things people have done to address such problems as neighborhood crime, drug trafficking, the quality of education or the safety of children. Please tell me if you have done any of these things in the last 2 years." Signed a petition in support of something or against something. This variable is coded 1 if the respondent signed. (60.7%).
4. Attended a protest meeting or demonstration: "Now, I'm going to read you a list of things people have done to address such problems as neighborhood crime, drug trafficking, the quality of education or the safety of children. Please tell me if you have done any of these things in the last 2 years." Attended a protest meeting or demonstration. This variable is coded 1 if the respondent signed. (29.7%).

Descriptions of the Independent Variables from NBPS:

1. Family Income: "Which of the following income groups includes your TOTAL FAMILY INCOME in 1992 before taxes? There are 9 categories. (Mean=$25,000-$30,000)
2. Education: "What is the highest grade of school or year of college you have completed?" The range is 0-26 years of schooling. (Mean= 13.41).
3. Employment Status: "In terms of your main activity are you working full-time, working part-time, temporarily laid off, unemployed, retired, homemaker, a student, or are you permanently disabled?" Working full-time is coded 0, all other categories are coded 1. (Not a full-time worker=5.1%)

4. Age: "What was your age at your last birthday?" This is a continuous variable. (Mean=41.13).
5. Gender: Males coded 0. Females coded 1. (Females = 55.2%).
6. Number of Children: "I also need to know how many people, 17 years and younger, are currently living in your household?" Those with no children are coded 0, those with 1-3 children are coded 3, and those with 4 or more children are coded 10. 51.9% have no children living in their household, 43.2% have 1-3 children living in their household, and 4.7% have 4 or more children living in their household.
7. Marital Status: "Are you currently married, widowed, separated, divorced, have you never been married, or are you living with a significant other?" Married respondents are coded 1, and all others are coded 0. (Married = 35.1%)
8. Political Orientation: Liberal is coded 2, moderate is coded 1, and conservative is coded 0. (Liberal=30.7%; Moderate=34.1%; Conservative=21.5%)
9. Efficacy: "Do you think blacks have achieved racial equality, will soon achieve racial equality, will not achieve racial equality in your lifetime, or will never achieve racial equality?" Achieved racial equality is coded 3, will soon achieve racial equality is coded 2, will not achieve racial equality in your lifetime is coded 1, will never achieve racial equality is coded 0. (3=22.8%; 2=39.5%; 1=29.4%; 0=22.8%)
10. Interest in Politics: "Have you talked to people about political matters at your church or place of worship?" Yes=1, No=0 (Yes=33.9%)
11. Knowledge1 (newspaper): "Have you in the past year: Read a Metropolitan newspaper?" Yes=1, No=0. (Yes=61.8%)
12. Knowledge2 (black newspaper): "Have you in the past year: Read a black newspaper?" Yes=1, No=0. (Yes=55.1%)
13. Civic Involvement (organization participation): "Are you a member of any organization working to improve the status of black Americans?" Yes=1, No=0. (Yes=29.7%)
14. Civic Involvement and Civic skills1 (church activity): "Aside from attending regular services, in the past 12 months have you been an active member of your church or place of worship? I mean, have you served on a committee, given time to a special project, helped to organize a meeting?" Yes=1, No=2 (Yes=35.2%)
15. Civic Involvement and Civic skills2 (community work): "As I read the following list please tell me if your church or place of worship provides community outreach programs such as… A food program and clothing program for the needy, a drug or alcohol abuse program, a day care or nursery, or a senior center outreach program? How active are you in helping to provide these programs? Are you…very active, fairly active, not very active, not at all active?" Very active and fairly active are coded 1, and not very active and not at all active are coded 0. (Very Active/Fairly Active = 38.5%)
16. Asked to Engage: "Has a member of the clergy, or someone in an official position, ever suggested that you take some other action on a political issue—sign a petition, write a letter, go to a meeting, attend a protest, march, or demonstration, or get in touch with a public official? Did this happen in the last two years?" Yes=1, No=0. (Yes=41.6%)
17. Collective Identity: Using SPSS compute command, I develop a scale of the following three questions, 1) Do you think what happens to black people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life? 2) Do you think what generally happens to black men in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life? 3) Do you think what generally happens to black women in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life? Initially, the responses were coded 0=No and 1=Yes. The scale consists of .00 as the respondent answered no to all three questions, .33 as the respondent answered yes to one of the questions, .67 as the respondent answered yes to two questions, and 1.00 as the respondent answered yes to all three questions. 62.9% answered yes to all three questions, 12.2% answered yes to two questions, 6.8%

answered yes to 1 question, and 11.4% responded no to all questions. The Cases are weighted by Weight based on March 1994 CPS data. Mean=.7857, SD=.35106, N=1,126.