

RACIAL SOLIDARITY AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Dennis Chong and Reuel Rogers

Studies conducted in the 1960s and 1970s generally confirmed that racial group solidarity boosted rates of participation among African Americans. But since the 1980s, research has tended to conclude that the effect of solidarity on voter turnout among blacks and other minorities has moderated if not faded entirely.

We hypothesize that part of this observed decline is explained by a dilution of measures of group solidarity in recent studies. We argue that a fair test of racial solidarity requires using a comprehensive measure that incorporates both psychological “identification” and the ideological beliefs that comprise “consciousness.” Moreover, we hypothesize that the effects of solidarity, will vary across forms of participation and be greatest on political activities that require group coordination.

Our re-analysis of the 1984 NBES using separate measures of identification and consciousness indicates that the more narrowly circumscribed measures of these concepts used in recent studies are likely to have underestimated its influence on political participation. We show that racial identification and consciousness had a modest effect on voting turnout in 1984, but a significant influence on participation in several traditional campaign activities, petitioning government officials, and especially participation in protests and boycotts.

Key words: racial solidarity; racial identification; group consciousness; political participation; minority politics; racial and ethnic politics.

The impact of group solidarity on political behavior first began to draw serious attention from political scientists in the mid-1960s and early 1970s in studies that showed blacks participating in politics at *higher* rates than whites of similar socioeconomic background (e.g., Orum, 1966; Verba and Nie, 1972). Researchers hypothesized that pronounced racial group solidarity

Dennis Chong, Department of Political Science and Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, 601 University Place, Evanston, IL, 60208-10006, USA; Reuel Rogers, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, 601 University Place, Evanston, IL, 60208-10006, USA. (r-rogers@northwestern.edu).

among African Americans accounted for this surprising finding. Group solidarity seemed to give African Americans an additional source of motivation, beyond the standard socioeconomic resources, to engage in political activity (Olsen, 1970; Shingles, 1981; Verba and Nie, 1972). It appeared to be a proxy for membership in a community that exerted normative pressure on individuals to think in group terms and contribute to collective goals through political action. Solidarity thus came to be viewed as a key resource for political engagement, especially among African Americans and other racial minorities.

More recent studies, however, have not found the same positive correlation between group solidarity and participation. Beginning in the early 1980s, empirical tests of the impact of racial solidarity on African-American political behavior began to turn up weak or insignificant effects (e.g., Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999; Marschall, 2001; Tate, 1991, 1993; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady, 1995). Using data from the 1984 National Black Election Study (NBES), Tate for instance, finds that feelings of solidarity are only modestly related to voting and campaign activism. She concludes that solidarity is a “soft” resource whose influence is secondary to more substantial organizational resources such as church membership.

In their 1989 analysis of political participation, Verba et al. tested the effect of group solidarity in a model that included indicators of individual skills and organizational resources and several other measures of psychological engagement, such as political interest, awareness, and efficacy (pp. 343–344). They find that of the four psychological elements, political interest is the most powerful determinant of participation followed by political awareness. Solidarity, in contrast, has a surprisingly negligible influence on participation.¹

Recent studies of the effects of group solidarity on the political behavior of Latinos and Asians also have yielded weak or insignificant results. Researchers focusing on these minority populations have taken their cues for understanding solidarity from the existing scholarship on African Americans. Their models of the concept and the items used to measure it typically have been borrowed from previous work on African Americans. Although it is perhaps still too early to draw any definitive conclusions about general patterns in the research findings, the extant studies have yet to turn up consistent evidence of a relationship between group solidarity and participation for Asians and Latinos.

A number of studies—using simple measures of solidarity—have concluded that there is no reliable positive correlation between the concept and political participation (e.g., Leighley and Vedlitz, 1999; Lien, 1994; Uhlaner, Cain, and Kiewiet, 1989; Verba et al., 1995). Several of the authors are puzzled by this result. The assumption is that group solidarity ought to have the same positive impact on political engagement and participation among these minority groups as it had in earlier studies of African Ameri-

cans. Nonetheless, these findings are consistent with the more recent research on black political behavior, which likewise has found weak or insignificant effects for racial solidarity.²

These uneven findings might be interpreted as a signal that group solidarity is no longer a powerful predictor of political behavior in the United States. After all, the relevance or currency of the concept among minority groups may be diminishing with the improvements in their economic status over the last quarter-century. If group solidarity is mostly applicable to subordinate minority populations, some researchers speculate that it is bound to lose its political significance as these groups overcome their disadvantages and improve their lot (Bobo and Gilliam, 1990; Verba et al., 1995). Others suggest that class has replaced race as a source of group identification, especially among upwardly mobile minorities (Wilson, 1980).

Neither of these conclusions is altogether convincing. First, racism remains a serious problem in the United States. Most surveys find that racial minorities—especially blacks, but Asians and Latinos as well—remain acutely aware of their vulnerability to continuing discrimination. Second, although the middle class ranks of minority populations have increased considerably over the last several decades, there is no conclusive evidence that individual upward mobility or class divisions have vitiated feelings of racial group solidarity. Among African Americans, in fact, surveys show that the middle class express stronger feelings of racial solidarity than their lower status counterparts (e.g., Dawson, 1994; Hochschild, 1995). Further, feelings of racial solidarity and class interest are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although they are often posed as such in the literature, there may be instances where these two sources of identification reinforce each other.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

We offer several alternative hypotheses for the recent pattern of weak or negligible effects for group solidarity on participation. Our interest is not so much in whether feelings of racial solidarity have waned among African Americans or other minorities. Rather, we focus on whether the recent weak findings for the effects of group solidarity are due to issues of conceptualization or measurement. One possibility is that these studies have not taken adequate account of the heterogeneity of group-centered ideological beliefs and feelings of solidarity in a minority population that might foster psychological engagement with politics. A second possibility is that some of the disparate results can be explained by variations in the conceptualization and operationalization of group solidarity. Finally, the connection between solidarity and political activity may not be equally manifest across political activities, but may for theoretical reasons be stronger for certain forms of participation than for others.

Measures of Group Identification and Consciousness

Recent models in the literature have not taken full account of the complexity of group solidarity. Feelings of group solidarity have been associated mostly with African Americans and other racial minorities in the political science research. The emphasis on relative deprivation in early psychological models of the concept perhaps encouraged the thinking that it was relevant only to subordinate minority populations. But in principle this form of identity would seem generalizable to all social groups. Group solidarity can be conceptualized either narrowly or broadly, depending on whether we are testing the effect of basic psychological *identification* with a group or the influence of ideological beliefs and evaluations that comprise a more expansive *consciousness*. Identification refers to an individual's sense of belonging or attachment to a social group (e.g., Gibson and Gouws, 2000; Tajfel, 1978). Consciousness, in contrast, combines basic in-group identification with a set of ideas about the group's status and strategies for improving it.³

The political science literature has not always differentiated between the components of identification and consciousness. Some researchers have used the terms interchangeably or inconsistently, with the result that solidarity sometimes refers to a narrow form of group identification and other times to a complex belief system.

Early studies showed that the effects of identification and consciousness increase the more we take account of the intervening beliefs that connect identification to political action⁴ (Miller, Gurin, Gurin, and Malanchuk, 1981; Shingles, 1981). Consciousness potentially heightens awareness and interest in politics, bolsters group pride and political efficacy, alters interpretations of group problems, and promotes support for collective action. Acquiring a group identity and a sense of common fate is therefore just the first step toward a fully developed group consciousness. Accordingly, early analyses of the political effects of this concept relied on complex measures that tapped into identification as well as the collectivist beliefs that comprise consciousness.

Most recent studies of group solidarity among African Americans, Latinos, and Asians, however, have drifted away from the comprehensive measures used in earlier research. Verba et al. (1995) are perhaps the notable exception to this trend. They employ a more complex measure, combining multiple items that tap into feelings of closeness to the group, perceptions of common problems, experiences with discrimination, and support for government programs to help the group. But most current models often focus strictly on group identification rather than on the cognitive elements of consciousness (e.g., de la Garza, DeSipio, Chris Garcia, and Falcon, 1992; Jones-Correa and Leal, 1996; Lien, 2001; Lien, Margaret Conway, Lee, Wong, and Boonyarak, 2001; Tate, 1991, 1993). They typically rely on one or more of three items to measure group solidarity: (1) self-identification with

one's racial or ethnic group; (2) a feeling of closeness to one's group; and (3) a belief that one's fate is linked to that of the group.

Tate (1991, 1993), for example, builds a measure of solidarity using only two items from the 1984 NBES, asking respondents whether they are affected by what happens to blacks in this country, and the degree to which they think consciously about being black. Leighley and Vedlitz construct a model of group solidarity utilizing the closeness item and an inter-group distance scale. Others have used a simple item asking whether a respondent identifies as a member of a particular group (Jones-Correa and Leal, 1996).⁵

Although most of these items are reasonable probes of group identification, only the measure of linked fate begins to capture the more complex political or ideological elements of group consciousness. We believe that a fair test of the effects of group solidarity on political participation requires comprehensive measures that tap into the multidimensional elements of both identification and consciousness.

Multiple Forms of Group Solidarity

Insofar as group solidarity is multidimensional, its different elements may have varying effects on political participation. The assumption in this area of research is that feelings of group solidarity lead to higher levels of political participation by individuals on behalf of the group. But not all forms of group solidarity necessarily promote political participation to the same degree; some may even direct individuals away from political activities. Ethnic group identification, for example, can hinder participation rates by slowing rates of acculturation and thereby reducing interest and participation in political affairs (Greeley, 1974). Even more intriguing, there may be instances of competing group-based ideologies circulating within a population. When there is no ideological consensus, the various forms of group solidarity may tend to influence individual behavior in different directions.

Among African Americans, for example, there has been a long history of debate over the wisdom of engagement with the mainstream culture versus withdrawal into separatist institutions. These two strains of group solidarity were labeled "militancy" and "black nationalism" in Gary Marx's 1967 study of black attitudes. Black nationalists participated in different social and political activities than militants. Militancy was correlated with membership in civil rights organizations such as NAACP and CORE, likelihood of voting in the 1960 election, intention to vote in 1964, and support for civil rights demonstrations. In contrast, nationalists were less likely than militants to participate in organizations or to vote. But nationalists were still *more likely* to participate than blacks who showed neither form of racial solidarity.

We believe that different kinds of group solidarity continue to exist among African Americans and are likely to have varying effects on political

participation.⁶ For example, Brown and Shaw (2002) recently identified two distinct forms of black nationalism among African Americans surveyed in the 1993 National Black Politics Study (NBPS).⁷ Although the authors do not explore what impact these group-based ideologies have on political participation, we suspect that each may have its own distinct effects, just as “militancy” and “nationalism” did in Marx’s classic study.

Conventional and Unconventional Forms of Participation

Researchers usually differentiate among types of political participation (e.g., Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; Verba et al., 1995). Group solidarity may not influence each form of political participation to the same extent. Instead, it may have its greatest impact on those kinds of activities that require solidarity over and above political interest and civic skills. It is no coincidence that studies of costly or risky forms of social protest are more likely to reserve a place for the role of group solidarity than studies of conventional political participation (e.g., McAdam, 1982). Protest is a difficult activity that requires more sacrifice of individual interests than does voting or contacting a government official about a personal problem. Many conventional political activities are sufficiently motivated by personal or normative considerations, and thus do not require group solidarity.

In sum, we offer the following three conjectures: the effects of group solidarity need to be gauged with comprehensive measures of identification and consciousness, following the models established in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Complementary or competing forms of group solidarity in the black community may offer additional psychological resources that foster participation. Finally, the greatest effects of solidarity may not occur at the polling place but in the street in the form of demonstrations, pickets, and protests. We offer some evidence for these points in the empirical analysis that follows.

EMPIRICAL TESTS USING THE 1984 NBES

We use the 1984 NBES to test these ideas. Returning to this mid-1980s dataset means that we cannot draw any conclusions about the effects of group solidarity on African-American political behavior today. But recall that our focus here is on issues of conceptualization and measurement. To that end, the 1984 NBES has two key analytic advantages that hold despite the age of the survey. First, in contrast to more recent surveys, the NBES contains a rich array of measures of racial group identification and consciousness, in addition to a full complement of questions about participating in political activities ranging from voting to protest. Many of the more recent surveys do not permit a comparison of alternative measures of iden-

tification and consciousness, nor do they allow us to study the effects of these alternative measures against such a broad array of participatory acts.

Recent surveys that over-sampled minority group respondents, such as the Kaiser/Washington Post/Harvard Survey (2001) or the Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality (1992–1994), feature a number of questions about racial attitudes, but do not include detailed probes of group identification and consciousness. The 1993 National Black Politics Study (NBPS) and the 1996 NBES contain a greater number of questions on group identification, many of them replicated from the 1984 NBES. But the range of the items related to group consciousness is greater in the 1984 NBES than in the more recent surveys.

Second, the 1984 survey dates back to the period when researchers first began to observe that group solidarity among racial minorities no longer appeared to provide a significant stimulus to vote. Tate's analysis of the 1984 NBES survey found that solidarity had only a modest influence on African-American participation rates. This conclusion was especially surprising in light of the political times. Jesse Jackson's 1984 presidential run created a political context in which the influence of group solidarity on black participation rates should have been enhanced by media and campaign messages aimed at mobilizing the black population.

The impact of group solidarity on black political behavior, in theory, should be strongest in elections involving black candidates, civil rights initiatives, or other activities that potentially affect the status of blacks. If anything, the effects of group identification and consciousness ought to have been more pronounced in the 1984 NBES. Yet Tate found that group identification, *narrowly defined*, only weakly influenced African-American voting turnout in her analysis of data from this survey.⁸

We return to the same dataset to investigate whether a more comprehensive measure of identification and consciousness has any greater impact on voting and whether the effects of identification and consciousness vary systematically according to the type of participation. If alternative measures of identification and consciousness produce more powerful effects on participation in the *same* 1984 survey in which racial group solidarity was previously shown to be relatively ineffectual, then perhaps the influence of racial identification and consciousness in that presidential campaign was actually in line with our theoretical expectations. To the extent that racial identification and consciousness have continued to be measured narrowly in subsequent studies, we may have systematically underestimated their effects on political participation in studies since the mid-1980s.

Operationalization of Group Identification and Consciousness

Our operationalization of the components of group identification and consciousness are guided by the conceptual distinctions established by Gurin, Hatchett, and Jackson (1989) in their original design and analysis of the NBES. The items in this survey allow us to build measures of two broad forms of identification: a group identity based on acceptance of a common fate with other blacks; and a more exclusive black identity based on a preference for racial autonomy rather than integration. Those who endorse the notion of a common fate are conscious of sharing an interest with other blacks and acknowledge that the civil rights movement affected them personally. Support for black autonomy, on the other hand, is reflected in a tendency to think of oneself as being black as opposed to being an American (or to being both black *and* American) and in a preference for separation between blacks and other groups in social and economic relations (e.g., a preference for shopping in stores owned by black entrepreneurs and avoiding contact with whites).

The measures of identification have varying levels of reliability, indicating the need for further testing and refinement of items. The average inter-item correlation for the common fate identity items is .28 ($\alpha=.53$); the four black autonomy items have an average inter-item correlation of .13 ($\alpha=.37$). Although the autonomy items are only moderately correlated, we chose to combine them because each one taps into a preference for black separation, whether psychological, social, or economic. Feelings of common fate are empirically distinguishable from support for black autonomy, as the average inter-item correlation across the two sets of items is a meager .06.

Group consciousness augments group identification by articulating collective discontents and strategies for improving the status of blacks. We examine four components of consciousness:

- (1) discontent with the amount of influence enjoyed by blacks and other disadvantaged groups;⁹
- (2) a belief that group disparities are produced by discrimination and are illegitimate;
- (3) support for collective strategies to correct group inequalities; and
- (4) belief in the political efficacy of group action.

Of the four components of consciousness, three are measured with multiple-item scales. The five items measuring discontent with group status have an average inter-item correlation of .26 ($\alpha = .63$). The three items in the group efficacy scale have an average inter-item correlation of .33 ($\alpha = .58$). The correlation between the two items measuring perception of discrimination is .12. In the following multivariate analysis, we treat the four components of consciousness separately, except in one test where we

combine the four dimensions of consciousness into a single scale in order to estimate its aggregate effects.¹⁰ All dimensions of consciousness are positively correlated with one another and with the two forms of identity (see Table 1), although several correlations are lower than we would anticipate owing to the modest reliabilities of some component scales. (See Appendix for the full text of the items used to construct the measures of identification and consciousness.)

The correlations in Table 1 reveal a distinction between the two forms of identification. A common fate identity is significantly associated with higher socioeconomic status, while black autonomy is not significantly related to either education or income. In this sense, the former is the more “mainstream” identity, whereas the latter is the more radical orientation, a contrast that we expect will be manifest in the kinds of political activity that each is likely to promote. In particular, we anticipate that the more intense beliefs associated with black nationalism will lend themselves more readily to direct action such as protests and demonstrations while the more moderate common fate identity will bear a stronger connection to conventional acts of political participation.

There is generally no relationship between identification and consciousness and age and gender, although older individuals tend to be more supportive of black autonomy and women tend to have a stronger sense of sharing a common fate with other blacks. Membership in a black community organization is much more strongly correlated with the elements of identification and consciousness than is church attendance.

Of the psychological correlates, those who express greater interest in politics generally or in black politics are more likely to feel they share a common fate and to believe in the efficacy of group action. Personal political efficacy is significantly correlated with a sense of common fate. Trust in government tends to be inversely related to several dimensions of identification and consciousness. Although strength of partisanship is not highly correlated with identification and consciousness, Democrats are stronger racial identifiers than Republicans. Likewise, liberals are more racially conscious than conservatives.

EXPLAINING PARTICIPATION

Our strategy in the following tests will be first to estimate the aggregate effect of identification and consciousness on different acts of political participation. For shorthand, we will continue to use the term “racial solidarity” when referring to the combined elements of identification and consciousness. Then we will focus on the influence of the various components of identification and consciousness. The purpose of this sequence of tests is to offer a synopsis of the overall impact of solidarity on participation, then to

TABLE 1. Correlates of Group Identification and Consciousness

	Common Fate	Black Autonomy	Discontent with Status	Discrimination	Collective Strategies	Group Efficacy
<i>Individual Skills and Resources</i>						
Education	.24	(.00)	.12	.14	.10	.11
Income	.18	(-.03)	.12	.13	.11	.08
Age	(-.02)	.08	(.00)	(.00)	(-.06)	(.03)
Gender (Female)	.14	(-.01)	(.05)	(.03)	(.00)	(-.04)
<i>Organizational Resources</i>						
Church attendance	(-.03)	(-.01)	(-.02)	(-.02)	(-.04)	(.03)
Organizational membership	.21	.08	.08	.11	(.04)	.12
<i>Psychological Engagement</i>						
General political interest	.24	(.03)	.16	.09	(.05)	.25
Interest in black politics	.17	.07	.10	.09	.08	.21
Personal political efficacy	.15	-.06	(-.01)	(.02)	(.05)	.08
Trust in government	-.13	-.10	-.24	-.24	(-.06)	-.15
Partisan Strength	(.03)	(.00)	(.02)	(-.01)	(.04)	.08
Party Identification (Republican)	-.16	(-.01)	-.13	-.14	(-.05)	-.14
Ideology (Conservative)	-.15	(-.05)	-.13	-.15	-.09	-.08
<i>Group Identification and Consciousness</i>						
Common fate identity	1.00					
Black autonomy	.14	1.00				
Discontent with group status	.18	.10	1.00			
Perceive discrimination	.27	.10	.24	1.00		
Support collective strategies	.13	.09	.09	.08	1.00	
Belief in group efficacy	.20	.07	.17	(.06)	.07	1.00

Source: 1984 NBES.

Note: Entries are Pearson's r . All coefficients except those in parentheses are significant at .05 level. See the Appendix for items in the group identification and consciousness scales.

identify the specific components of solidarity that are providing the major impetus. In the process, we test the effects of both forms of racial identity to see if they are mutually reinforcing or produce contrasting effects on participation; plus we examine whether the additional dimensions of consciousness included in the model make a difference. Finally, we test whether group identification and consciousness are more strongly connected to certain acts of participation, such as political protest, that place a premium on cooperation and coordination with other group members.

All of the dependent variables in the analysis are dichotomously coded (yes-no) participatory acts that can be grouped into four categories:

(i) *voting* in the primaries and presidential election; (ii) *traditional campaign activities* (influencing how others vote, attending political meetings, donating money, campaigning for black candidates, working for a party, and assisting with voter registration); (iii) *petitioning* (signing a petition and contacting a public official); and (iv) *direct action* (attending a protest and picketing or boycotting).

The explanatory variables in the model are also grouped into four categories: (1) *individual resources and characteristics* (education, income, age, gender); (2) *organizational resources* (church attendance, membership in a black community organization); and (3) *psychological engagement* (general political interest, interest in black politics, personal political efficacy, political trust, strength of partisanship, direction of partisanship, and ideology); and (4) *group identity and consciousness*.

The probit model we estimate is similar in structure to the participation model constructed by Verba et al. (1995) and others, and is based on the assumption that people are more likely to participate if they have the civic skills to participate, the psychological motivation to participate, or if they are recruited to participate by social and political organizations.¹¹ However, in contrast to that model, we incorporate several dimensions of identity and consciousness, and we examine the racial solidarity-participation connection across a broader range of political activities.

The Added Value of Racial Identification and Consciousness

We first test whether racial solidarity provides additional explanatory power beyond the individual characteristics, organizational resources, and psychological motives included in the standard participation model. To address this question, we use probit regressions to compare the standard 'baseline' model against the 'augmented' model that combines the base variables and racial solidarity. The appropriate statistical test of the null hypothesis that identity and consciousness are irrelevant is the increment in the log likelihood between the two models that is attributable to the additional explanatory variables. The difference in the log likelihoods (multiplied by two) is

distributed according to a chi-square distribution with three degrees of freedom. There are only three degrees of freedom because we have, for the purpose of this test, aggregated the four components of consciousness into a single measure. This test gives priority to the full set of baseline variables in explaining participation before apportioning credit to the solidarity variables. Therefore, if the components of racial solidarity that influence participation are adequately captured by individual skills, psychological engagement, and organizational membership, we will find that solidarity adds nothing 'extra' to the explanation of participation.

We report in Table 2 the summaries of the likelihood ratio tests contrasting the baseline and augmented models for each act of participation. The pattern that emerges from this series of tests generally supports our expectations about the conditional effects of solidarity. The addition of racial solidarity does not contribute significantly to the explanation of presidential voting or to several of the traditional campaign activities, such as voter registration, attending political meetings, and campaigning for a black candidate. Identification and consciousness however do promote voting in the primary, making an effort to influence how others vote ($p = .06$) and giving money to candidates ($p = .10$). But the greatest value added by identification and consciousness occurs in conjunction with petitioning and direct action. The likelihood of engaging in petitioning and both forms of direct action is given a substantial boost by the addition of racial solidarity.

Base Model Factors

A detailed examination of the probit coefficients for the individual elements of racial solidarity provides further insight into their contingent relationship to political activities. Tables 3–6 summarize the effect of the full set of individual, organizational, and psychological factors on all four classes of political participation: voting, campaign activities, petitioning, and direct action. To help gauge the relative impact of different factors, we also calculate the first differences for each explanatory variable. The first difference represents the change in the probability of engaging in each act of participation that accompanies a movement from the lowest to highest values of each explanatory variable, holding constant all other explanatory variables at their mean values.

Consider first the general influence of the base model factors across the array of participatory acts. Organizational membership and general political interest are the most consistently powerful influences. This reflects the close proximity between being interested in politics, joining an organization, and taking an active political role. Being a member of an organization increases the probability of participation in most campaign and petitioning activities by more than .25, but exerts a weaker influence on direct action, especially picketing and boycotting. Similarly, general political interest has a whopping

TABLE 2. Log Likelihood Ratio Test Comparing Baseline and Baseline + Solidarity Models

	LL Baseline Model+Solidarity ^a	LL Baseline Model	Chi-Square (3 d.f.)	Probability	N
<i>Voting</i>					
Voted in primary	-150.87	-155.82	9.90	.02	315
Voted for President	-181.23	-182.72	2.98	.39	507
<i>Campaign Activities</i>					
Influenced vote choice	-229.40	-303.11	7.42	.06	505
Helped voter registration	-236.95	-238.87	3.85	.28	506
Went to political meeting	-252.80	-253.16	.72	.87	506
Gave money to candidate	-227.86	-231.03	6.34	.10	504
Campaigned for black candidate	-200.12	-201.27	2.31	.51	504
Worked for a party	-236.93	-239.93	5.99	.11	463
<i>Petitioning</i>					
Contacted a public official	-257.21	-261.38	8.33	.04	505
Signed a petition	-289.50	-294.61	10.23	.02	505
<i>Direct Action</i>					
Attended a demonstration	-195.65	-202.83	14.37	.00	505
Picketed, boycotted	-130.90	-136.08	10.35	.02	505

Source: 1984 NBES.

^aThe baseline model includes: (1) individual skills and resources (education, income, age, gender); (2) organizational resources (church attendance, membership in a black community organization); and (3) psychological engagement (general political interest, interest in black politics, partisanship, personal political efficacy, and political trust). The augmented model includes the baseline variables plus “solidarity” (two forms of group identity—“common fate” and “black autonomy” and an aggregated measure of consciousness).

effect on primary and presidential voting (the first differences are .71 and .43 respectively), moderate to strong influences on most campaign activities and petitioning, but a weak influence on direct action. As an organizational resource, membership in an organization routinely outweighs the effect of church attendance. Church attendance is the stronger influence on presidential voting, which is consistent with Tate’s analysis, but this is the exception to the rule that church going is typically weakly related to political participation. In contrast to general political interest, specific interest in black politics is hardly a factor, boosting participation in voter registration efforts but lowering the likelihood of contacting public officials and signing petitions.

The direct effects of education and income are occasionally significant, but in general the effects of socioeconomic status are mediated through the organizational and psychological factors in the model. Age is positively associated with voting, but older individuals are predictably less inclined to engage in direct action. Gender is a consistently insignificant predictor of participation.

Strength of partisanship has a modest effect on presidential voting, but a negligible influence on other forms of participation. Party identification

TABLE 3. Explaining Voting Participation

	Voted in Primary		Voted for President	
	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ
<i>Individual Skills and Resources</i>				
Education	-.06 (.40)	-.02	.40 (.35)	.08
Income	.94*** (.30)	.33	.22 (.29)	.04
Age	.03*** (.00)	.57	.01** (.01)	.13
Gender (Female)	.17 (.19)	.06	-.04 (.16)	-.01
<i>Organizational Resources</i>				
Church attendance	.14 (.28)	.05	.50** (.25)	.10
Organizational membership	.53** (.25)	.20	.31 (.28)	.05
<i>Psychological Engagement</i>				
General political interest	2.30*** (.47)	.71	1.59*** (.32)	.43
Interest in black politics	-.11 (.41)	-.03	.07 (.37)	.02
Personal political efficacy	.19 (.30)	.07	.16 (.25)	.03
Trust in government	.47* (.35)	.17	.26 (.30)	.04
Partisan Strength	.34 (.46)	.14	.43 (.35)	.12
Partisan Identification (Rep.)	-.24 (.39)	-.09	-1.25*** (.30)	-.36
Ideology (Conservative)	-.04 (.25)	-.01	.17 (.23)	.03
<i>Group Identification and Consciousness</i>				
Common fate identity	-.20 (.36)	-.07	-.00 (.31)	.00
Black autonomy	.90** (.52)	.29	.27 (.47)	.04
Discontent with group status	.97** (.55)	.36	.23 (.42)	.06
Perceive discrimination	.38 (.33)	.15	.31 (.28)	.07
Support collective strategies	-.16 (.18)	-.07	-.19 (.16)	-.04
Belief in group efficacy	1.13*** (.48)	.40	.71** (.34)	.19
Likelihood Ratio χ^2	128.78***		119.87***	
Pseudo R^2	.30		.25	
N	315		507	

Source: 1984 NBES.

Note: Entries are probit regression coefficients, standard errors in parentheses..

Δ represents the first differences for each independent variable, with the value of all other independent variables held at their mean.

* $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$ (one tail test).

however affects several forms of participation. Democrats are significantly more likely to vote for President and to sign a petition; they are also somewhat more likely to engage in direct action, although the first differences are small. Ideology, the other major political predisposition in the model, is not significantly related to any type of participation.

Previous studies (especially Shingles, 1981) have hypothesized that low trust and high efficacy work in concert with group identification to spur political participation. In our analysis, neither trust nor personal efficacy has a strong effect on the likelihood of voting. Distrust in government, however, is significantly related to attempts to influence how others vote and to petitioning; low trust also has a small influence on the probability of picketing

and joining boycotts. Personal efficacy, on the other hand, is among the more consistently significant influences on political participation, increasing engagement in several campaign activities, petitioning, and direct action.

The Elements of Identification and Consciousness

Our analysis of the NBES corroborates recent studies that have found a weak connection between racial identification and voting. As reported in Table 3, neither belief in a common fate nor support for black autonomy makes a difference in the likelihood of voting in the general election, although support for black autonomy significantly boosts voting in the primaries. *Consciousness* however does further promote voting. Of the four elements of consciousness, *group* efficacy (in contrast to *personal* political efficacy) has a sizable influence on voting in the primary—trailing in magnitude only age and political interest—and influences voting in the presidential election roughly on a par with age and partisanship. A second element of consciousness, discontent with group status, is also significantly related to voting in the primary elections.

Once we move beyond voting to different forms of political participation, we uncover generally stronger effects for identification and consciousness. With respect to the campaign activities reported in Table 4, advocacy of black autonomy has a powerful influence on the propensity to influence people to vote; the first difference of .37 associated with this dimension of identity is second only to the first difference of .49 for general political interest. Support for black autonomy also appears to foster participation in the campaign of a black candidate (the first difference is .13, although the probit coefficient does not reach the .05 level of significance).

The other form of racial identification—belief in a common fate—is among four primary factors (along with age, organizational membership, and income) that significantly increase the likelihood of contributing money to a candidate. The two forms of identification therefore seem to provide independent sources of motivation to participate and tend to encourage different forms of political activity.

Of the four elements of consciousness, there is suggestive though modest evidence that racial consciousness can bolster participation in campaign activities after controlling for other relevant factors. Those who are dissatisfied with the amount of influence enjoyed by blacks are more likely to have worked for a political party. Those who endorse collective strategies are more likely to try to influence others' votes and to campaign for a black candidate. There are also a couple of anomalies in the findings on consciousness: group efficacy and perception of discrimination are negatively related to the likelihood of helping with voter registration; and group efficacy is also inversely related to giving money to candidates.

TABLE 4. Explaining Participation in Campaign Activities

	Influence How People Vote		Helped with Voter Registration		Went to Political Meeting		Gave Money to Candidate		Campaigned for Black Candidate		Worked for a Party	
	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ
<i>Individual Skills and Resources</i>												
Education	.16 (.27)	.06	-.76*** (.32)	-.22	.18 (.30)	.05	.44* (.31)	.12	.07 (.33)	.01	.91*** (.30)	.28
Income	.01 (.22)	.01	.67*** (.24)	.19	.24 (.23)	.08	.60*** (.24)	.18	.40* (.25)	.10	.44** (.24)	.15
Age	.00 (.00)	.01	-.01*** (.00)	-.22	.00 (.00)	.05	.01** (.00)	.21	.00 (.01)	.00	.01** (.00)	.24
Gender (Female)	-.12 (.13)	-.04	.04 (.15)	.01	-.01 (.14)	.00	.11 (.15)	.03	.00 (.16)	.00	.13 (.15)	.04
<i>Organizational Resources</i>												
Church attendance	.07 (.20)	.03	.34* (.23)	.09	.01 (.21)	.00	-.10 (.23)	-.03	-.19 (.25)	-.05	-.39** (.23)	-.13
Organizational membership	.38** (.19)	.15	.65*** (.20)	.20	.77*** (.19)	.27	.85*** (.19)	.28	1.00*** (.20)	.30	.52*** (.20)	.19
<i>Psychological Engagement</i>												
General political interest	1.50*** (.30)	.49	1.34*** (.36)	.26	.95*** (.33)	.23	.38 (.32)	.09	1.36*** (.41)	.21	.67** (.34)	.19
Interest in black politics	.28 (.29)	.11	.70** (.32)	.16	.04 (.32)	.01	-.10 (.32)	-.03	-.19 (.35)	-.05	-.26 (.32)	-.09
Personal political efficacy	.18 (.20)	.08	.03 (.22)	.01	.39** (.22)	.12	.36* (.23)	.10	-.04 (.24)	-.01	.62*** (.22)	.19
Trust in government	-.64*** (.33)	-.24	.19 (.26)	.05	-.04 (.26)	-.01	-.31 (.28)	-.08	.31 (.29)	.07	-.23 (.27)	-.07

Partisan Strength	-.72** (.33)	-.27	.14 (.37)	.02	.13 (.38)	.03	-.37 (.34)	-.13	-.34 (.38)	-.11	-.20 (.43)	-.08
Partisan Identification (Rep.)	-.48* (.28)	-.18	.00 (.31)	.00	-.33 (.31)	-.08	-.14 (.33)	-.03	-.34 (.35)	-.06	-.11 (.33)	-.03
Ideology (Conservative)	-.07 (.17)	-.03	.24 (.19)	.07	.11 (.18)	.03	.09 (.20)	.02	-.03 (.21)	-.01	.18 (.20)	.06
<i>Group Identification and Consciousness</i>												
Common fate Identity	.02 (.25)	.00	.01 (.28)	.00	.08 (.27)	.03	.73*** (.30)	.19	.22 (.32)	.04	.23 (.28)	.07
Black autonomy	.98*** (.38)	.37	.44 (.41)	.13	.30 (.40)	.10	.22 (.43)	.06	.50 (.44)	.13	.08 (.43)	.04
Discontent with group status	-.04 (.37)	-.02	.24 (.41)	.05	.13 (.40)	.03	.20 (.43)	.04	.31 (.46)	.06	.81** (.44)	.23
Perceive discrimination	-.16 (.23)	-.06	-.49** (.25)	-.15	.00 (.24)	.00	-.26 (.26)	-.08	-.18 (.28)	-.05	-.04 (.26)	-.01
Support collective strategies	.18* (.13)	.07	.00 (.14)	.00	-.11 (.14)	-.03	.11 (.14)	.03	.23* (.15)	.05	.15 (.14)	.05
Belief in group efficacy	-.01 (.32)	-.01	-.78** (.34)	-.26	-.16 (.34)	-.06	-.42 (.35)	-.13	-.42 (.38)	-.12	.23 (.40)	.06
Likelihood Ratio χ^2	100.82***		62.32***		71.89***		98.07***		86.06***		99.91***	
Pseudo R^2	.14		.12		.12		.18		.18		.17	
N	505		506		506		504		504		463	

Source: 1984 NBES.

Note: Entries are probit regression coefficients, standard errors in parentheses.

Δ represents the first differences for each independent variable, with the value of all other independent variables held at their mean. * $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$ (one tail test).

Most impressive are the powerful influences of racial solidarity on petitioning and direct action. Solidarity, socioeconomic status, general political interest, and organizational membership are the four dominant influences on petitioning public officials (see Table 5). Three of the six components of identification and consciousness exert a significant influence on petitioning. Those who believe in a common fate and who are unhappy with the status of minorities are significantly more likely to have contacted public officials and signed a petition. A belief in group efficacy has a moderate effect on the probability of contacting a public official. By contrast, support for black autonomy is related to neither form of petitioning.

As we hypothesized would be the case, the dominant influence of racial identification and consciousness is manifest in participation in protests, demonstrations, and boycotts (see Table 6). Support for black autonomy dwarfs all other influences on participation in a demonstration. The first difference for black autonomy is .42; organizational membership, education and personal political efficacy are the next most influential factors and have first differences of .20, .15, and .11 respectively. Likewise, support for black autonomy exerts the single largest influence on the likelihood of joining pickets and boycotts, increasing the probability of participation by .15.

These results give further evidence of the different effects of the two forms of racial identification. Whereas belief in a common fate was the only form of identification significantly related to petitioning, support for black autonomy wields much greater influence over participation in political activities that bypass conventional channels.

Belief in a common fate and group efficacy have modest but still statistically significant first difference effects of .07 apiece on participating in pickets and boycotts, which makes their influence roughly comparable in magnitude to income and age. In a departure from the pattern associated with conventional political activities, younger respondents are more likely to join pickets and boycotts than older respondents. Personal political efficacy is the only other psychological resource that significantly increases involvement in demonstrations and boycotts and pickets.

These tests reveal the effects of identification and consciousness fluctuate across the range of participatory acts, but show evidence of the patterns we hypothesized. Our analysis, like Tate's (1993) earlier study, confirms that the effect of group identification alone on voting is modest after controlling for other individual and organizational factors. Group consciousness, however, does bolster the propensity to vote by a sizable margin. More generally, a comprehensive measure of racial solidarity combining multiple elements of identification and consciousness had a significant influence on an array of conventional and unconventional political activities ranging from

TABLE 5. Explaining Petitioning

	Contacted a Public Official		Signed a Petition	
	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ
<i>Individual Skills and Resources</i>				
Education	.57** (.29)	.18	.31 (.27)	.13
Income	.11 (.23)	.04	.74*** (.23)	.27
Age	.00 (.00)	.03	-.01*** (.00)	-.35
Gender (Female)	.00 (.13)	.00	.08 (.13)	.03
<i>Organizational Resources</i>				
Church attendance	-.06 (.21)	-.02	-.24 (.20)	-.09
Organizational membership	.78*** (.19)	.29	.83*** (.21)	.28
<i>Psychological Engagement</i>				
General political interest	.97*** (.31)	.28	.24 (.27)	.10
Interest in black politics	-1.04*** (.31)	-.38	-.58** (.30)	-.21
Personal political efficacy	.64*** (.22)	.22	.34** (.20)	.13
Trust in government	-.51** (.26)	-.16	-.49** (.25)	-.19
Partisan Strength	-.34 (.33)	-.13	.00 (.32)	.00
Party Identification (Rep.)	-.08 (.31)	-.02	-.59** (.29)	-.23
Ideology (Conservative)	-.03 (.19)	-.01	.09 (.18)	.04
<i>Group Identification and Consciousness</i>				
Common fate identity	.47** (.27)	.15	.47** (.25)	.18
Black autonomy	-.34 (.41)	-.10	-.49 (.38)	-.18
Discontent with group status	.77** (.41)	.23	.63** (.37)	.24
Perceive discrimination	-.20 (.25)	-.07	.06 (.23)	.03
Support collective strategies	.09 (.13)	.03	.05 (.13)	.02
Belief in group efficacy	.50* (.35)	.14	.27 (.31)	.10
Likelihood Ratio χ^2	126.90***		109.86***	
Pseudo R^2	.20		.16	
N	505		505	

Source: 1984 NBES.

Note: Entries are probit regression coefficients, standard errors in parentheses.

Δ represents the first differences for each independent variable, with the value of all other independent variables held at their mean.

* $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$ (one tail test).

donating money and working in electoral campaigns to joining petitions and protests.

Second, the influence of racial solidarity varies with the type of political activity. Racial solidarity is most effective, relative to other explanatory factors, in generating participation in group activities that call for teamwork, cooperation, and coordination with others, such as joining petitions or engaging in boycotts and political protests. The influence of racial solidarity on protest behavior outweighs all other factors.

Third, there are different forms of racial identification, each of which may constitute an added psychological resource for blacks. The results reaffirm

TABLE 6. Explaining Collective Action

	Attended a Demonstration		Picketed, Boycotted	
	<i>b</i>	Δ	<i>b</i>	Δ
<i>Individual Skills and Resources</i>				
Education	.77** (.33)	.15	.27 (.43)	.03
Income	-.29 (.27)	-.05	.59** (.31)	.08
Age	.00 (.00)	.01	-.01** (.01)	-.08
Gender (Female)	-.12 (.16)	-.03	.20 (.19)	.02
<i>Organizational Resources</i>				
Church attendance	.15 (.24)	.03	-.35 (.30)	-.04
Organizational membership	.73*** (.20)	.20	.33 (.25)	.05
<i>Psychological Engagement</i>				
General political interest	.00 (.35)	.00	.42 (.45)	.03
Interest in black politics	-.16 (.35)	-.05	-.51 (.45)	-.08
Personal political efficacy	.54** (.24)	.11	.49* (.30)	.06
Trust in government	-.32 (.30)	-.06	-.53* (.40)	-.05
Partisan Strength	-.02 (.40)	-.02	-.15 (.48)	-.04
Party Identification (Rep.)	-.57* (.39)	-.09	-.76* (.52)	-.05
Ideology (Conservative)	.16 (.21)	.03	-.10 (.25)	-.01
<i>Group Identification and Consciousness</i>				
Common fate identity	.41 (.31)	.08	.70** (.41)	.07
Black autonomy	1.52*** (.45)	.42	.91** (.55)	.15
Discontent with group status	-.36 (.45)	-.09	.21 (.60)	.00
Perceive discrimination	-.33 (.28)	-.08	.21 (.35)	.02
Support collective strategies	-.14 (.15)	-.03	-.13 (.18)	-.01
Belief in group efficacy	-.12 (.39)	-.04	1.11** (.61)	.07
Likelihood Ratio χ^2	66.99***		67.69***	
Pseudo R^2	.15		.21	
N	505		505	

Source: 1984 NBES.

Note: Entries are probit regression coefficients, standard errors in parentheses.

Δ represents the first differences for each independent variable, with the value of all other independent variables held at their mean.

* $p < .10$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$ (one tail test).

the distinction between a black nationalist orientation and a non-separatist group identity. The two forms of identification appeal to different segments of the black population and exert significant independent influences on participation. Although both forms of racial identity are conducive to direct action, the more radical separatist identity is a much stronger predictor of participation in boycotts and demonstrations and support for black political candidates, whereas the common fate identification is more likely to promote conventional political activities such as contacting government officials, signing petitions, and contributing money to political candidates.

Among the cluster of elements that comprise group consciousness, the two components that make the greatest difference are a conviction that the group can make a difference if it acts together—in short, group efficacy—and dissatisfaction with the status of the group. Support for collective strategies occasionally had a modest impact on participation.

It is perhaps no coincidence that the group efficacy and group status measures were also the two most reliable consciousness scales. The item measuring support for collective action may have been compromised because respondents were asked to choose between either blacks' joining organizations *or* working hard as individuals as the best way to improve group status. Many respondents may not have viewed these alternatives as mutually exclusive and may have been reluctant to renounce personal diligence in favor of collective strategies. One of the items measuring perceptions of discrimination is ambiguously worded. Respondents were asked to explain why blacks might fare poorly in American society. One alternative provided is "blacks are kept back because of their race." Although this choice was offered to allow respondents to attribute poor group outcomes to discrimination, some may have interpreted it as saying blacks as a group have certain deficiencies that limit their achievement.

Given the low reliability of the items measuring perceptions of discrimination and support for collective strategies, we suspect improved measures would provide stronger evidence of the relationship between these facets of racial consciousness and political participation. As we discuss below, the task of developing better measures of identification and consciousness specific to the groups under consideration should be a priority of future studies of racial and ethnic solidarity.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

"Consciousness-raising" is a term that was popularized during the tumultuous social movements of the 1960s. It refers to the diffusion of an ideology that bolsters group pride and identification, diagnoses group problems, offers prescriptive solutions, and encourages group members to act in solidarity to achieve common ends. It thus can be a powerful source of motivation for political action. But the current empirical literature lacks both consensus on the conceptualization and measurement of group solidarity and specificity about the conditions under which it will influence political behavior.

The "effect" of group solidarity on political participation depends on which components of identification and consciousness are measured and tested, as well as on which acts of participation are examined. We have argued that a fair test of solidarity requires using a comprehensive measure that captures its multiple dimensions. Our analysis of the 1984 NBES indicates the more narrowly circumscribed measures used in most studies of

racial group solidarity since the mid-1980s are likely to have underestimated the influence of identification and consciousness on political participation.

We found that two kinds of racial identification have a modest impact on voting turnout, but a significant influence on participation in several traditional campaign activities, petitioning government officials, and especially joining protests and boycotts.¹² The two forms of racial identification bolster participation in somewhat different venues. Those who believe in a common fate are more likely to express their demands through conventional political channels, whereas those who endorse the more radical notion of racial autonomy favor protests and other forms of direct action. The independent influence of these two forms of racial identification—common fate and black autonomy—confirms that minority populations can have multiple identities and ideologies, each of which may constitute a source of political engagement for different sectors of the group.

In contrast to group identification, consciousness exerted its largest effect on voting. But it also had moderate effects on working for a party and a black candidate, trying to influence others' votes, contacting public officials, and signing a petition. As we hypothesized, the largest effects of identification and consciousness are manifest in the realm of collective political activism. All told, racial identification and consciousness were more powerful influences on political participation in the 1984 presidential election campaign than was previously believed.

If a similar study were conducted today, we undoubtedly would observe changes in the magnitude of the relationship between different participatory acts and the various components of identification and consciousness. The degree of the correlation would depend considerably on the nature and intensity of group-specific messages circulating in the political environment at any given moment. Nonetheless, holding constant these environmental factors, we expect that the effects of racial identification and consciousness would vary systematically with the depth and breadth of our measures of this concept.

Our analysis confirms the need for a more detailed measure of group identification and consciousness. When measured comprehensively in 1984, group identification and consciousness display far-reaching and often substantial influences (relative to other conventional factors) on both electoral and non-electoral acts of political participation. We therefore suspect that more recent research on the effects of racial solidarity using simple measures of group identification may have underestimated the influence of identification and consciousness on the participation rates of African Americans and other minorities.

At the same time, this analysis suggests reasons to be cautious in applying the same measures of racial solidarity used in studies of African Americans to the emerging research on Latinos, Asians, and other minority groups. There are intuitive grounds for looking to the research on African Ameri-

cans for guideposts to studying the political behavior and attitudes of these groups. Many Latinos and Asians share obvious commonalities with African Americans: racial minority status, non-European backgrounds, vulnerability to discrimination, and in some cases, socioeconomic disadvantage. These shared predicaments naturally invite comparisons between blacks and other minority groups.

Nevertheless, researchers should exercise caution before transferring wholesale the measures used in studies of African Americans to their analyses of Latino and Asian group solidarity. Although some of these items may be a good starting point, others may not be appropriate for measuring solidarity among these groups. If solidarity varies over time, it surely varies across racial and ethnic groups. There is no reason then, to expect that items used to capture group solidarity among African Americans will apply necessarily to Asians and Latinos.

Solidarity consists of group identification as well as interpretive and prescriptive group-based ideologies transmitted through elite messages, contact among group members, and exposure to a common culture or history (Dawson, 1994; Hardin, 1995; Herring, Jankowski, and Brown, 1999; Laitin, 1998; Rogers, 2001; Smith, 1986; Turner, 1999). To the extent that Asians and Latinos can be distinguished from African Americans on any of these dimensions, it is likely that group solidarity will have a different form and content among these groups than it has among their black American counterparts. To devise measures that capture the forms of solidarity that prevail among these groups, researchers will first need to undertake studies that catalogue the kinds of political values, beliefs, and ideologies that circulate within Latino and Asian populations. Likewise those who study group solidarity among African Americans will need to update their measures periodically to reflect ideological shifts in that population (see e.g., Dawson, 2001).

Acknowledgments. We thank Dukhong Kim, Jean-Francois Godbout, Demelza Baer-Bositis, and Dale Vieregge for their research assistance. We are also grateful for the helpful comments provided by the editors and anonymous reviewers of the journal.

APPENDIX

Items from the 1984 NBES used to construct the measures of group identification, group consciousness, and political participation:

(1) Group Identity

(i) *Common Fate: Cronbach's Alpha=.53*

V1105. Do you think what happens generally to black people in this country will have something to do with what happens in your life? [Yes, No] Will it affect you a lot, some, or not very much?

V1107. Do you think that the movement for black rights has affected you personally? [Yes, No]

V1108. People differ in whether they think about being black—what they have in common with blacks. What about you—do you think about this a lot, fairly often, once in a while, or hardly ever?

(ii) *Black autonomy: Cronbach's Alpha=.37*

V2142. Which is more important, being: black, both black and American, American?

V2145. Black children should learn an African language. [Agree strongly, Agree somewhat, Disagree somewhat, Disagree strongly]

V2147. Black people should shop in black-owned stores.

V2148. Blacks should not have anything to do with whites.

(2) Group Consciousness

(i) *Discontent with Group Status: Cronbach's Alpha=.63*

V1099. Do blacks as a group have too much influence, just about the right amount of influence, or too little influence [in American life and politics]?

V1087. Do poor people as a group have too much influence, just about the right amount of influence, or too little influence [in American life and politics]?

V1091. Do young people as a group have too much influence, just about the right amount of influence, or too little influence [in American life and politics]?

V1093. Do women as a group have too much influence, just about the right amount of influence, or too little influence [in American life and politics]?

V1101. Do people on welfare as a group have too much influence, just about the right amount of influence, or too little influence [in American life and politics]?

(ii) Perception of Discrimination: Pairwise $r=.12$

V2143. If black people don't do well in life, it is because: they are kept back because of their race; or they don't work hard enough to get ahead.
 V2093. Discrimination against blacks is no longer a problem in this country.
 [Agree strongly, Agree somewhat, Disagree somewhat, Disagree strongly]

(iii) Support for Collective Strategies

V2144. To have power and improve their position in the United States: Black people should be more active in black organizations; or Each black person should work hard to improve his or her own personal situation.

(iv) Group Political Efficacy: Cronbach's Alpha=.58

V1081. If enough blacks vote, they can make a difference in who gets elected President. [Agree strongly, Agree somewhat, Disagree somewhat, Disagree strongly]
 V1082. Black people can make a difference in who gets elected in local elections.
 V1084. If blacks, other minorities, the poor, and women pulled together, they could decide how this country is run.

(3) Political Participation

(i) Voting

V1043. Voted in primary
 V2062. Voted in presidential election

(ii) Traditional Campaign Activities

V2086. Influenced people to vote for/against party/candidate
 V2087. Went to political meetings in support of candidate
 V2089. Gave money for candidate
 V2090. Campaigned for a black candidate
 V2088. Helped with voter registration; got people to polls
 V2179. Worked for a party

(iii) Petitioning

V2173. Contacted a public official
 V2174. Signed a petition

(iv) Direct Action

V2175. Attended a protest meeting or demonstration

V2176. Picketed; boycotted

NOTES

1. Dawson (1994), however, finds racial group solidarity, expressed as feelings of linked fate, continues to shape African American policy preferences. But he does not investigate the influence of solidarity on political participation.
2. To be fair, a few studies have found a positive relationship between group solidarity and some types of civic engagement (Jones-Correa and Leal, 1996; Marschall, 2001). But there are some curious inconsistencies in these findings. Jones-Correa and Leal find paradoxically that the positive relationship between panethnic solidarity and participation disappears for individuals who subscribe to this form of identity exclusively; in other words, the correlation holds only for those who choose a panethnic identity in conjunction with other forms of self-identification. Marschall, on the other hand, finds that the mobilizing effect of group solidarity does not extend to activities like voting and contacting community officials.
3. This article does not explicitly consider how group identification and consciousness develop. Scholars across a number of fields have explored this question, offering explanations that emphasize a mix of social and psychological factors (e.g., Hardin, 1995; Horowitz, 1995; Laitin, 1998; Turner, 1999).
4. Shingles provides empirical support for several psychological links: consciousness promotes development of political efficacy, but reduction of political trust, a potent combination that contributes to greater political activism especially among lower income blacks (77). Miller et al. (1981) similarly argue that there is a multiple-step progression from identification and consciousness to political activity. They present a general model of group consciousness and political participation that combines group identification with beliefs about the group's status in society. In their model, there is no necessary direct relationship between simple identification and participation; instead, the relationship is mediated by several intervening cognitive factors.
5. Marschall (2001), taking her cues from Shingles, uses a combined measure of low political trust and high political efficacy as a proxy for group consciousness. But most recent studies demonstrate these two psychological orientations together do not boost participation as Shingles hypothesized in his early formulation.
6. Likewise, we suspect that different forms of group solidarity may exist among Latinos and Asians, a point that awaits study and on which we elaborate in the conclusion.
7. See Davis and Brown (2002) for a different view.
8. Tate (1991, 1993) does not explain why she elected not to use the additional 1984 NBES items related to group identification and consciousness. She concedes her measure is less complex than the one employed by Miller et al. (1981). But she believes it is nonetheless better than others in the literature, such as the group closeness item, because hers captures perceptions of shared group interest.
9. In addition to discontent with the influence enjoyed by blacks, we also included items measuring discontent with the influence enjoyed by women, the poor, and youth. These groups were nominally represented in the "Rainbow Coalition" invoked by the Reverend Jackson in his presidential campaign and therefore became insinuated in the racial consciousness of African Americans. Assessments of the influence of these groups are significantly correlated; therefore the results presented later in the paper are not altered if only the single item pertaining to the influence of blacks is used in the analysis in place of the multi-item scale.

10. The aggregated 11-item consciousness scale has a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .55.
11. Our model of participation includes measures of organizational membership, but does not contain direct measures of political mobilization by these or other organizations (cf. Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993; Verba et al., 1995).
12. See Wong, Lien, and Conway (forthcoming) for similar findings for group identification among Asian Americans. The authors find group solidarity has its most potent influence on participation in political activities beyond voting.

REFERENCES

- Bobo, Lawrence, and Gilliam, Frank Jr. (1990). Race, socio-political participation, and black empowerment. *American Political Science Review* 84: 377–393.
- Brown, Robert A., and Shaw, Todd C. (2002). Separate nations: two attitudinal dimensions of black nationalism. *Journal of Politics* 64: 22–44.
- Davis, Darren, and Brown, Ronald (2002). The antipathy of black nationalism: behavioral and attitudinal implications of african american ideology. *American Journal of Political Science* 46: 239–253.
- Dawson, Michael (1994). *Behind the Mule: Race and Class in African-American Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dawson, Michael (2001). *Black Visions: The Roots of Contemporary African-American Political Ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de la Garza, Rodolfo, DeSipio, Louis, Chris Garcia, F., and Falcon, Angelo (1992). *Latino Voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican and Cuban Perspectives on American Politics*. Boulder: Westview.
- Gibson, James, and Gouws, Amanda (2000). Social identities and political intolerance: linkages within the south african mass public. *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 272–286.
- Greeley, A. M. (1974). Political participation among ethnic groups in the united states: a preliminary reconnaissance. *American Journal of Sociology* 80: 170–204.
- Gurin, Patricia, Hatchett, Shirley, and Jackson, James S. (1989). *Hope and Independence: Blacks' Response to Electoral and Party Politics*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hardin, Russell (1995). *One for All: The Logic of Group Conflict*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Herring, Mary, Jankowski, Thomas B., and Brown, Ronald E. (1999). Pro-black doesn't mean anti-white: the structure of African-American group identity. *Journal of Politics* 61: 363–381.
- Hochschild, Jennifer (1995). *Facing Up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jones-Correa, Michael, and Leal, David L. (1996). Becoming 'hispanic': secondary panethnic identification among latin American-origin populations in the united States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18: 214–253.
- Laitin, David (1998). *Identity Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Leighley, Jan E., and Vedlitz, Arnold (1999). Race, ethnicity, and political participation: competing models and contrasting explanations. *Journal of Politics* 61: 1092–1114.
- Lien, Pei-te (1994). Ethnicity and political participation: a comparison between Asians and Mexican Americans. *Political Behavior* 19: 237–264.

- Lien, Pei-te (2001). *The Making of Asian America through Political Participation*. Temple Philadelphia: University Press.
- Lien, Pei-te, Conway, Margaret M., Lee, Taeku, Wong, Janelle, and Boonyarak, Pitima (2001). "The mosaic of Asian American politics: preliminary results from the five-city post-election study." Paper present at the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Marschall, Melissa (2001). Does the shoe fit? testing models of participation for African-American and latino involvement in local politics. *Urban Affairs Review* 37: 227–248.
- Marx, Gary T. (1967). *Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community*. New York: Harper and Row.
- McAdam, Doug (1982). *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, Arthur, Gurin, Patrica, Gurin, Gerald, and Malanchuk, Oksana (1981). Group consciousness and political participation. *American Journal of Political Science* 25: 494–511.
- Olsen, Marvin (1970). Social and political participation of blacks. *American Sociological Review* 35: 682–697.
- Orum, Anthony (1966). A reappraisal of the social and political Participation of negroes. *American Journal of Sociology* 72: 32–46.
- Rogers, Reuel (2001). Black like who? Afro-Caribbean immigrants, African Americans and the politics of group identity. In Nancy Foner (ed.), *Islands in The City: West Indian Migration to New York*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rosenstone, Steven, and Hansen, John (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Shingles, Richard D. (1981). Black consciousness and political participation: the missing link. *American Political Science Review* 75: 76–91.
- Smith, Anthony (1986). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Tajfel, Henri (1978). Social categorization, social identity, and social comparison. In Henri (ed.), *Differentiation between Social Groups, Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, New York: Academic Press.
- Tate, Katherine (1991). Black political participation in the 1984 and 1988 presidential elections. *American Political Science Review* 85: 1160–1176.
- Tate, Katherine (1993). *From Protest to Politics: The New Black Voters in American Elections*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Turner, John (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In Naomi Elmers, Russell Spears, and Bertjan Doosje (eds.), *Social Identity*. Blackwell Cambridge.
- Uhlner, Carol, Cain, B., and Kiewiet, D. (1989). Political participation and ethnic minorities in the 1980s. *Political Behavior* 11: 195–231.
- Verba, Sidney and Norman Nie (1972). *Participation in America*, New York: Harper.
- Verba, Sidney, Schlozman, Kay, and Brady, Henry (1993). Race, ethnicity, and political resources: participation in the united states. *British Journal of Political Science* 23: 453–497.
- Verba, Sidney, Schlozman, Kay, and Brady, Henry (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, William J. (1980). *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions*, 2nd edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wong, Janelle, Lien, Pei-Te, and Conway, Margaret (n.d.). Group based resources and political participation among Asian Americans. American Politics Research (forthcoming).