

Democratic Deliberation and Political Identity: Enhancing Citizenship

ABSTRACT: Theorists hypothesize that democratic deliberation can shape better citizens, ones that are more community-minded, empathic, and motivated. This paper examines a mechanism by which political deliberation could create such improved citizens. According to self-regulation theory, action and cognition are regulated by high-level self-concepts or "identities." It is proposed that democratic deliberation calls participants' attention to their "citizen identity," thereby strengthening that identity and its behavioral effects. This paper examines data from a representative sample of 568 Pittsburgh residents. These residents came to a deliberation experiment at Carnegie Mellon University. Participants were divided into small-group deliberation and control conditions. Multivariate OLS analysis with robust standard errors shows that deliberation significantly increased "citizen identity." This identity is related to voting, contacting officials, community collaboration, and political internalization—a deep concern for politics that refines the concept of political interest. Prior research shows that internalization leads to active political information seeking, less dependence on others for political choices, less susceptibility to persuasion, and more differentiated attitudes.

AUTHOR: Peter Muhlberger, Carnegie Mellon University; peterm@cmu.edu

CONFERENCE: Paper prepared for the International Society of Political Psychology, 28th Annual Scientific Meeting, July 2005, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

KEYWORDS: Political identity, democratic deliberation, political participation, political discussion, citizenship, political development **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:** This research is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. EIA-0205502.

Introduction

Liberal democracy is in crisis. Liberal democratic theory rests the well-being of the polity on the capacity of citizens to pursue their welfare through reasonably intelligent political choices and actions. A wealth of political science research, however, suggests that the preponderance of citizens are breathtakingly uninformed and unsophisticated with respect to politics and policy issues (Kinder 2002; Neuman 1986). Even slight amounts of information can radically change the public's choices over consequential issues such as crime and foreign aid (Gilens 2000). Politicians have armed themselves with ever more refined methods of exploiting public ignorance and confusion. Belated public awareness of such manipulation breeds distrust in government, reducing the political capital to address policy problems. Intractable issues such as global warming, the balance between civil liberties and counter-terrorism, and the looming energy and health care crises remain largely unaddressed because actually fixing these problems would require widespread sacrifices that only an engaged and community-minded public can muster the consensus to undertake. Liberal democracy needs better citizens.

Social scientists, citizen groups, journalists, political leaders, and even federal agencies have come to embrace a variety of citizen deliberation practices to help create more informed publics to address difficult issues. For instance, James Fishkin and Robert Luskin have held over 20 substantial "Deliberative Polls™" around the world, in which a representative sample of a population are provided policy information and come together to deliberate in small groups, question experts, and vote on policy questions. They have held events representing the population of Texas, the United States, Britain, Australia, and other countries to address such issues as energy policy, public health care

rationing, crime and punishment, and whether Australia should become a republic (McLean et al. 2000; Park, Jowell, and McPherson 1998). In the case of energy policy, citizen deliberations persuaded the Texas utility commission to develop more extensive wind power generation. In Puerto Alegre, Brazil, the city's budget is set through citizen deliberations. In British Columbia, a deliberative citizen's assembly weighed in on the issue of what type of representation system the Province should adopt for the future. In the American context, organizations such as Public Agenda, America Speaks, Study Circles, the Kettering Foundation, Viewpoint Learning, Web Lab, e-thePeople, Information Renaissance, and many others have held hundreds of deliberative discussions, face-to-face and online.

The focus of Fishkin and Luskin's research has been whether Deliberative Polls™ enhance policy-relevant knowledge and changes opinions (Fishkin, Iyengar, and Luskin 2005), something they have found to be the case in the majority of deliberations. The possibility that deliberation might create a more informed public one issue and one small batch of citizens at a time is reassuring, but issues remain. Unless institutionally empowered, a small number of informed deliberators will not have the broad impact on public opinion needed to address difficult issues. Many had hoped that the possibilities for dialog inherent in the Internet would create a revitalized and flourishing public sphere with a substantial, politically-engaged public (Rheingold 2000; Schwartz 1996), much like historical public spheres enticingly described by Habermas (1989). This revitalized public sphere has not come to pass on any substantial scale (Katz, Rice, and Aspden 2001; Muhlberger 2004), thus raising the question of how the public's motivation to engage politically might be enhanced. In addition, a more informed public need not choose wisely if it does not have clear and reasonable political values and a concern for

the public good. Better citizens, then, need not only be more informed but also more motivated and community-minded.

Theorists such as Mill, Mead, and Habermas contend that deliberation will create citizens that are more community-minded and motivated, not merely better informed. If so, deliberation may be a useful context in which political researchers could examine what mechanisms create better citizens, perhaps asking how these mechanisms might be enhanced. Also, if deliberation has longer-lasting effects on citizenship, advancing engagement through deliberative processes would happen more than one issue at a time. Researchers may furthermore benefit from examining the mechanisms theorists believe enhance political motivation and community-mindedness during deliberation. As elaborated below, these theorists believe that a key mechanism is the growth of participants' identification with the wider society in the course of public deliberation. This intensification of individuals' sense of collective identity, stimulated by consideration of social issues and needs during discussion, motivates concern for social problems.

Past social research and theory encourages further examination of such claims, though much remains to be done. Qualitative research on the development of political identity among adolescents finds evidence for the concurrent development of civic engagement, social and political reflection, the growth of collective identities, and motivation to pursue future civic involvement (Yates and Youniss 1998). This research does not, however, adequately specify the nature of the relationships between these constructs nor does it establish these relationships rigorously.

A small but growing body of research on political identity, reviewed in Huddy (2001), helps to establish the political importance of identity. But, as Huddy explains, the

study of political identity faces the difficulty of departing from key assumptions of the most developed literature on identity—the literature on social identity theory. Social identity theory assumes that people fluidly adopt identities in response to the demands of context and that these identities are all or nothing. In contrast, research on political identities, such as feminism or partisanship, indicates that identities vary in strength and can be quite unresponsive to context. The thin identities of social identity theory, conjured up by minimalistic experimental manipulations, have little history or content, while political identities are fraught with both. There is no widely accepted theory for understanding and researching these thick political identities. The political identities under consideration in this paper fall readily into neither the thin nor thick types of identity investigated by past research. What is needed to understand such identities is a theoretical framework that can explain how thinner identities proceed to become thick. The approach, then, must be social cognitive, like social identity theory, yet applicable to truly political identities.

This paper will seek to show that democratic deliberation does enhance the salience of a particular collective identity—citizen identity—and that this identity is related to various dimensions of political motivation and community-mindedness. Citizen identity is characterized by an intermediate level of political motivation, intermediate between two other collective identities—being a Pittsburgher and being politically conscious. Citizen identity appears to be a stepping stone toward political consciousness. To establish that citizen identity and political consciousness identity affect political engagement, the analyses examine their influence on a range of political behaviors, from voting to working with civic groups. Citizen identity significantly affects several forms of engagement, particularly voting, even controlling for standard

political variables such as political interest, efficacy, and partisanship. This paper also introduces a theoretical framework, based in self-regulation theory, that helps clarify how deliberation enhances citizen identity, how this identity can affect behavior, and, more generally, how identities can transition from thin to thick.

Democratic Theorists' Views on The Effects of Deliberation on Citizenship and Political Identity

Democratic theorists such as Mill, Bowles and Gintis, Mead, and Habermas believe there are relationships between the reasoning capacities of citizens, the identification of citizens with the polity, and political engagement. These theorists hypothesize that political engagement, particularly discourse with fellow citizens, improves the citizenship of participators by enhancing their mental capacities and their identification with the community. Engagement exercises people's reasoning to take into account wider interests than their own. They become better able to understand the common good and more willing to pursue it. Somewhat less well recognized, however, is that these theorists implicate not only reasoning capacities but also collective identity in the process of creating better citizens. In some accounts, the exercise of mental capacities in the context of political engagement results in citizens developing their identification with the community. In others, political involvement directly enhances identification. In turn, identification with the community can motivate people to act more virtuously, helps legitimize the authority of the community, and may enhance citizens' empathy. These theorists do not elaborate much on the nature and function of identity, no doubt because they are not psychologists. Nevertheless, political identity plays an important role in their analysis and becomes a useful point from which to launch a social

science investigation of citizenship. An examination of identity opens wider research possibilities than research on reasoning capacities alone.

Among 19th century political theorists, John Stuart Mill particularly emphasizes the role of government in enhancing citizenship. Mill (1996) writes that the merit of political institutions, "...consists partly of the degree in which they promote the general mental advancement of the community, including under that phrase advancement in intellect, in virtue, and in practical activity and efficiency..." (Chapter 2) Mill makes the influence of government on "the human mind" equal in importance to its functions in executing public business. A participatory public, Mill suggests, will develop its "moral capacities" (Chapter 3), in particular their care for their country and its citizens. Participation, especially in public functions, exercises the capacity to weigh others' interests, to apply principles related to the common good, and exposes the actor to minds more familiar with such principles.

Mill goes on to suggest that participators develop a sense of identification with the public: "He is made to feel himself one of the public, and whatever is for their benefit to be for his benefit." (Chapter 3) This feeling might, in more modern terms, be understood as a collective political identity. It is to such identification that Mill attributes the desire to act on behalf of the common good. Collective identification motivates unselfish duty to society.

Importantly, Mill credits public discussion with improving the public mentality and enhancing collective identification: "...it is from political discussion, and collective political action, that one whose daily occupations concentrate his interests in a small circle round himself, learns to feel for and with his fellow citizens, and becomes consciously a member of a great community." (Chapter 8) Mill at various points

indicates a preference for direct involvement in decision making to mere discussion and thought. Nevertheless, he also credits discussion, including public meetings (Chapter 15).

Bowles and Gintis's (1986) discourse theory of democracy suggests that political engagement establishes a political identity and that such an identity is important for the capacities of citizenship. They stress (pp. 150-1) that people achieve and maintain their identities through action because it is through action that people recognize themselves and others recognize them. As in other deliberative theories, the self is assumed to be thoroughly social and hence requires social action to establish its identity. Voting, Bowles and Gintis note, "constitutes and reaffirms" a person as a "good citizen" (pp. 138-139). In addition, they believe that, "...because a democratic politics relies on voluntary compromise and empathy, it requires at least a minimal identification of the citizen with public life, and with some notion of collective interest." This suggests that the reasoning capacities of citizens depend on some notion of self as a member of a polity—that is, a political identity. Thus, political actions help constitute notions of political identity, such as being a good citizen, and simultaneously these notions help promote political capacities.

Mead's (1962) communicative theory of mind, self, and society develops a notion of a "generalized other" that both grounds political identity and the general capacities of citizens. Mead's discussion of the generalized other starts with an analysis of games, such as a baseball game. In order for a player to successfully play a game, that player must simultaneously consider the perspectives ("attitude") of all the other players in the game to the player and to each other. The player's integration of these perspectives constitutes a generalized other for the game. Mead elaborates this concept in socio-

political contexts by suggesting that developing an adequate generalized other in these contexts involves taking the perspective of "an organized society or social group" to the "various aspects of the common social activity or set of social undertakings" of which they are a part (pp.154-5). Rather than simply being aware of the perspective of each participant to each other and to the observer, the observer must take into account and generalize their perspective on the "social project" and "social whole" in which they are participating. A broad generalized other perspective might be thought of as akin to viewing society from behind a veil of ignorance—simultaneously seeing and integrating the perspectives of its various actors toward the social project. Thus, moral reasoning, one of the key capacities of citizenship, resides in the capacity for taking the perspective of a broad, societal generalized other.

Mead also grounds political identity in the construction of a generalized other. Thus, he describes identification with a political party as taking the perspective of the entire party toward the problems facing the party and to the rest of the community (p. 156). Mead suggests that membership, even in abstract social groupings, stimulates conceptualization of a generalized other. According to Mead, constructing this broad social perspective is a pragmatic necessity for the unity and self-development of the individual. The self is constituted through the various perspectives it internalizes. Thus, the broader the generalized other that a person internalizes, the greater unity that generalized other perspective can bring by defining a common end that defines the individual's role in a society (p. 159). Because the self is constituted by the perspectives it internalizes, it likewise should be constituted by the collective, and hence political, identities implied in a generalized other. For Mead, then, identification with the

community emerges quite directly from the perspective taking involved in moral reasoning about the common good.

Finally, according to Mead, communicative interaction stimulates perspective taking, and a universal deliberation stimulates the widest perspective taking of all. Deliberative political engagement involves considering the perspectives of many other members of a society. Therefore, it should facilitate the building of a generalized other that both constitutes moral reasoning and attaches an individual to a collective identity.

Habermas's (1984, pp. 77-111) analysis of identity closely follows parts of Mead, but Habermas's elaboration dispenses with the generalized other and focuses on the role of societal and individual development in the formation of identity. Nevertheless, Habermas also succeeds in linking deliberation, moral reasoning, and identity. Habermas understands the evolution of society as a progression from traditional society, which founds social solidarity on an unreflexive (unconsidered) value consensus (p. 84), to a post-traditional society, which founds solidarity on a communicatively established common will (p. 81). The best means of achieving this communicatively established common will is the "ideal communication community"—deliberation under ideal conditions. Following Mead, Habermas suggests the common will reflects universal moral judgments, and he indicates that the authority of moral norms stems from the fact that "the unity of the collective is at stake" in the general interest embodied in these moral norms (p. 93). People rise to the defense of the collective because they are constituted as social creatures. This is not a sacrifice, but a matter of becoming "a larger self," as Mead suggests.

Habermas depicts two types of collective identity. One is "conventional identity" (p. 105) which is tied to specific roles and norms absorbed uncritically from society and

characteristic of collective identity in traditional society. The second is a universalizing ego-identity shaped by deliberative processes that connect the person to the community through universal moral judgments concerning the general interest of the collectivity. In addition, it is possible to imagine a collective side to a third form of identity Habermas discusses. This third type is the particularizing ego-identity which involves the subjectivity and singularity of the person. Habermas believes that this type of ego-identity also develops through universalistic, moral-practical deliberation because in such discussion people question the social roles and conventions they inherited from society, thus freeing themselves to pursue their individuality. People may construct their individuality in terms of various collective endeavors—such as people who join artist communes or gaming societies—thus embracing a collective identity. Habermas is aware that the types of identity he describes are idealizations rather than descriptions of concrete psychological categories. The types of political identities described here may mix all three aspects of Habermas's identity types.

Identity, Self-Regulation, and Agency

While political theorists have indicated that collective identity matters for citizenship, they have generally not taken advantage of research in social cognition regarding the processes by which identity is created, maintained, and has its effects. Elsewhere (Muhlberger 2005), I have sketched a theory of human agency that explains the key role identity plays in action and choice. The theory juxtaposes a variety of existing theory and research, including Mead's (1962) philosophical psychology, Carver and Scheier's (1981; 1999) work on self-regulation, Vallacher and Wegner's (2000) action identification research, and Koestner's (1996) and Ryan's (1989) work on self-determination and internalization. Here, I will sketch and elaborate those aspects of these

theories that bear on the effects of deliberation on political identity, drawing most heavily from self-regulation theory.

I define agency as the capacity to choose and execute actions consistent with a coherent and reflexively-determined identity. Identity consists of those cognitive structures and contents that give rise to a sense of continuity of the person over time. Such continuity requires much effort to create and maintain given the many often conflicting roles, activities, and experiences of an individual and the indirect access people have to many contents that make up the self. Habermas (1984, p. 98 and p. 101) also defines identity in terms of continuity in time and suggests two aspects of persons that help create such continuity: unique qualities that help identify the self (perhaps traits, dispositions, principles, values, and roles) and the capacity to organize one's life, including past and future identities, into a unified life history. I would add that a unified life history helps create a unifying identity that pulls together the common threads of a person's more particular, context-driven identities. A broad generalized other and universal moral reasoning, both developed in deliberative interaction, should be helpful in constructing this unifying identity for reasons discussed earlier.

Self-regulation theory (Carver and Scheier 1999) explains action in terms of a hierarchy of evaluative standards for behavioral feedback, the top-most standard of which is identity. Action is controlled by feedback loops. When people focus conscious attention on an action, they compare the action to evaluative standards or goals, and then correct their behavior to better meet these goals. At the lowest level, motor control goals embody such rules as "keep the car between the white lines." Programs, the next level, constitute more complex schema of action such as "drive the car to the community meeting." Finally, "be goals", identities and identity elements, such as "be a good

citizen" reside at the top of the hierarchy. Higher levels serve to define goals for lower levels. The process is quite messy with competing goals and identities continuously vying for conscious attention, which activates pursuit of these goals and identities. Also, as action identification theory and research suggests, problems encountered at a given level of regulation will draw attention to that level and away from others. A mechanical problem will thoroughly redirect a driver's attention from the goal of being a good citizen.

I would like to add, as a proposition of agency theory, that identity has two meanings: "conceptual identity" and "agency-identity." Identity in the first sense sits on top of the feedback hierarchy and includes an array of concepts academics think of as identity—labels such as "citizen," principles of action, responsibilities, dispositions, goals, values, notions of traits, and so forth. Agency-identity includes the capacity to execute conceptual identity. Unless the programs and motor control regimes are in place to behaviorally enact a given conceptual identity, that identity will only with difficulty be translated into action. Pursuing action based on an unelaborated conceptual identity will help to build programs and motor control regimes, in addition to helping to elaborate conceptual identity when this identity proves inadequate for various actions.

The construction of identity depends heavily on an interplay between "self-organized" and "linguistic" mental structures. Carver and Scheier (1999) suggest that the mind can be divided into non-verbal, unconscious, and self-organized mental structures on the one hand and verbal, conscious structures on the other. For instance, when people learn a complex dance, they do not consciously learn which muscle groups to fire and when—something that could not be mastered by the slow, serial processes of consciousness. Rather, they practice until they have built a self-organized mental

structure that can execute the necessary responses. Self-organizing processes do not, however, possess high-level unity of purpose or the capacity for reasoned correction. A parallel processing device like the brain requires a serial guiding force, and that force is conscious attention and verbal mental processes. Learning to dance involves both. Conscious attention directs the dancer to practice dancing, and it is also involved in building consciously-accessible verbal structures that seek to model the dancing. These verbal structures are accessible to symbolic manipulation, which allows dancers to reason about and thereby consciously correct specific problems in their dance execution. The correction does not take the form of directly altering the self-organized structure, which is not accessible, but in consciously intervening in action execution, thereby reprogramming the self-organized structure.

Identity similarly involves a "conversation" between self-organized and linguistic structures, mediated by conscious attention. In a reflexive person (someone who can take themselves as an object of critical reflection), conceptual identity can arise from reasoning and choice. Conceptual identity might also arise less reflexively by being suggested in social communications or even by inference from patterns of behavior or perspective taking a person has picked up through socially-structured interactions. Agency-identity may also be socially programmed, but is most effectively elaborated in a conscious effort to build self-organized processes consistent with a linguistic identity. These self-organized processes include programs and motor control regimes and perhaps may even extend to developing non-verbal heuristics that automate consideration of such matters as responsibilities, principles of action, and so forth. People need not be verbally aware of all the rules they bring to bear on their behavior as they bring them to bear.

A final important aspect of identity is its internalization. Drawing on and extending self-determination theory (Ryan and Connell 1989), an identity is internalized to the degree that it forms an important conceptual identity, has a developed agency-identity that automates and eases pursuit of the conceptual identity, and does not conflict with other identities possessed by the person. A particular motive, such as political motivation, is internalized to the degree that it stems from an internalized identity that places importance on this motive.

Political Identity, Deliberation, and Political Action—Hypotheses

The above theoretical ruminations suggest sophisticated ways of studying political identity. This paper, however, is meant as a simple starting point for understanding political identity and its relationship to deliberation and political action. More sophisticated analysis awaits future papers. This section will bring agency and related theories to bear on a simple operationalization of identity and suggest some hypotheses to be tested regarding determinants and consequences of this aspect of identity.

Political identity was measured by questions such as, "Being a citizen is important to who I am." Two other political identities besides "being a citizen" are also considered: being politically conscious and being a Pittsburgher. These terms are identity labels under which people may have associated a variety of contents including notions of typical values, responsibilities, and goals as well as programs of action. The questions asked are about the importance of the value label for sense of identity—in other words, the conceptually-understood importance of the identity.

These three political identities appear to vary along several dimensions—inclusiveness, reflexivity, internalization, and, more generally, development. Being a

citizen certainly includes a broader collectivity than being a Pittsburgher.

Being politically conscious might include a broader public than the national focus of being a citizen. These identities also appear to vary by reflexivity. The "citizen" and "Pittsburgher" identities are ascribed identities a person possesses by virtue of simply living in a certain place. An identity of being "politically conscious," in contrast, is something a person chooses, suggesting it has been consciously considered and individually adopted, hence more reflexively considered. In addition, people who consider their citizen identity important to who they are likely to have reflected on that identity more than people who say that being a Pittsburgher is important, because citizen identity is more abstract and less likely to be drummed into a person's makeup by the structure of everyday interactions such as going to a Pirates game or local festivities or concerts.

In part by virtue of the greater reflexivity of the political consciousness identity followed by citizen identity, it is plausible these identities are more elaborated, and hence internalized. This assumes that these collective identities are not internalized by non-reflexive means, such as structuration through social interaction. Given the minimal political awareness and engagement of most Americans, I would venture that American culture does not go to lengths to structure interactions to imbue people with collective identities. A particularly important form of internalization is the internalization of the motivation to be politically engaged. Even if the three identities each depended equally on political motivation, the greater internalization of some of these identities would mean greater internalization of this motivation in the more internalized identities. In addition, however, it seems that political motivation should be more central to "political consciousness" than to the other identities. Being a citizen may involve some minimal

political activity, such as voting, but people can understand citizenship in terms of patriotism and loyalty, rather than serious political engagement. Being a Pittsburgher could involve no political content at all.

If these speculations are correct, a number of possibilities follow. Those possessing greater political consciousness identity should show higher levels of political interest, political efficacy, and stronger personal responsibilities to engage in political life. Citizen identity may also show significant, but lesser effects. In addition, because political motivation should be more internalized in political consciousness identity and because this internalization is built on reflexivity, this identity should also house greater reflexivity with respect to contemplating politics—people are more likely to hold themselves responsible for their own political views.

The greater inclusiveness, reflexivity, internalization, and political-mindedness of political consciousness identity to citizen identity and of citizen to Pittsburgher identity suggests that these three identities may form a developmental sequence. There may be no logical necessity to first considering oneself a citizen before becoming politically conscious. Nevertheless, for many people being a member of a local town, then expanding out to citizenship, and finally contemplating political consciousness may be a typical path toward greater political engagement. Each of these can be viewed as steps in the development of a broader and more elaborated generalized other, one that takes into account a broader societal perspective. If so, it may be the case that later identities in this sequence will involve greater humanitarianism and greater willingness to take the perspectives of other social groups.

What effect might a several hour deliberation on an issue of local concern have on these collective identities? By focusing attention on and exercising participants' identities

as members of a political collective, it seems plausible that such a deliberation would exercise a collective identity, making it more salient. Because identity serves as a guide to action, a given context is apt to activate primarily one identity. An argument could be made for deliberation activating any of the three collective identities, though the citizen identity may be the most likely. On average, more people have higher levels of salience for citizen identity, making it the identity most likely to be activated. The Pittsburgher identity might be too apolitical to have been activated in the deliberation. Political consciousness identity may imply a connection to a community of politically likeminded people, rather than a representative slice of the public as in this deliberation. People should experience the deliberation as a coming together of citizens.

The current study also involves an experiment in which participants either received or did not receive reminders of their collective identities, such as a message exhorting them to deliberate about the effects of their decisions on others. This manipulation was crossed with a "media" manipulation in which participants deliberated online, face-to-face (f2f), or not at all. What effect might f2f discussion have relative to online discussion? Also, should there be interactions between the collective identity reminders and the media manipulation? Prior work by Spears et al. (1990) suggests that group identities may be most strongly activated by the combination of online discussion with reminders of group identity. The effect, however, depends on "deindividuation"—a lack of reminders and hence awareness of individual identity induced by online environments. Without awareness of individuality, people much more thoroughly embrace suggested group identities. This interaction effect, however, is due to lack of conscious awareness. Conscious contemplation, however, may be needed to enhance the verbally-held identity salience measured here. Thus, I speculate that there will be no

interaction between reminder and media manipulations. Further, f2f deliberation may be more effective than online deliberation in enhancing verbally-held identity precisely because it draws conscious attention to identity.

A final matter concerns causal direction. Self-regulation theory suggests bidirectional effects between action and identity. With good time-series data, these relationships might be teased out. For purposes of this paper, which seeks to be a relatively simple first installment of a research program, I will assume that regressions that explain behavior in terms of political identity will be meaningful. In agency theory, identity serves to accumulate the implications of past actions and mediates the effects of past actions on future action. A simple regression of past action on identity will somewhat overstate the role of identity, but it should less exaggerate the role of identity relative to similar future actions. In addition, the effect of identity should not be much overstated if the identity summarizes a lengthy stream of past actions, as is likely the case with a lifetime of political activity. Finally, the key question in upcoming analyses will be whether identity explains something not explained by such standard political variables as political interest and efficacy, which are themselves as likely as identity to be in a bidirectional relationship with action. Political scientists have long been aware of bidirectional effects for political efficacy and party identification (Finkel 1985), but in most analyses they reasonably take these variables as directional rather than bidirectional causes of behavior.

The above considerations suggest a number of hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Deliberation should activate a collective identity, and the activated identity should become more salient. Of the three identities

considered here, the "citizen" identity may be the most likely to be activated.

Hypothesis 2: Specific reminders of collective identities in the deliberation context, such as instructions to consider what is best for the community, should make the active collective identity more salient.

Hypothesis 3: Face-to-face deliberation should be more effective at enhancing collective identity than online deliberation. Also, there should be no interaction between reminders and media.

Hypothesis 4: Higher levels of the political consciousness identity should involve greater political reflexivity, internalization of political motivation, and stronger personal responsibility to be politically engaged. These relationships should be stronger than for citizen identity and stronger still than for the Pittsburgher identity.

Hypothesis 5: Because of its political internalization and connection with political engagement responsibility, political consciousness identity should be significantly associated with political interest and political efficacy. Citizen identity should be less associated with these variables, while the Pittsburgher identity should be the least associated.

Hypothesis 6: Political consciousness identity should be more strongly related to political perspective taking and humanitarianism than citizen identity, and citizen identity should be more strongly related than Pittsburgher identity.

Hypothesis 7: The centrality of the political to political consciousness identity and its relation to political interest and efficacy should mean that

it will have the widest and strongest effects on political engagement.

Citizen identity should follow political consciousness in its effects.

Voting, which is a central ritual of citizenship, may be particularly affected by citizen identity.

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Knowledge Networks, an outside firm noted for its sampling work on academic deliberation projects, conducted the recruitment for this study. Of a sample of 6,935 Pittsburgh city residents (defined by zip code area) who could be reached via random digit dialing (RDD), 22% agreed to participate in this research and took a phone survey. Sampling differed from the typical methodology on other substantial deliberation projects conducted by Knowledge Networks in that it did not utilize quota sampling to make demographic statistics more representative of the population as a whole. Thus, the sample accurately reflects who would come to this deliberation without demographic oversampling. This has two advantages. First, the sample better reflects what it would be if longer-term deliberations were a more widely used process in government because in this case quota sampling would likely be too expensive and contrary to legal equality requirements. Also, although quota sampling may result in demographics matching the population in certain crude categories, those who come to a deliberation after extensive oversampling of their demographic are most likely not typical of their demographic, yielding misleading results.

Of recruits who agreed to participate, 37% or 568 people showed for the Phase 1 on-campus deliberation. A modest response rate was expected because recruits were

asked to participate in a series of online deliberations that would take most participants eight-months to complete and which they could join only by coming to an initial on-campus, all-day deliberation. The final participation percentages are not, however, incomparable to that of another substantial long-term deliberation study, Vincent Price's Electronic Dialogue Project at the Annenberg School of Communication (Price and Cappella 2002; Price and David 2005). This project started with an effective sample of the population from which its discussants were drawn of about 3,686 (Price and David 2005). The number of people who ever participated in any discussion over the course of the year is 543, and the average number of people who participated in a given discussion was 305 (Price and Cappella 2002). Ultimately, the response rates are modest. Comfort can be drawn from several considerations: a fair similarity to population demographics, the fact that the sample represents people who might be expected to participate in longer-term deliberations, and the objective of this research which is experimental and focused on psychological processes that should be universal.

Despite a strict RDD sample and modest response rate, the participants in the Virtual Agora Project reasonably matched the Pittsburgh city population on most demographic criteria. The sample was 77% Caucasian and 18% African-American, compared with CPS population benchmarks for the relevant zip codes of 75% and 20%, respectively. Fifty-six percent of the sample was female, compared with 53% for the population. Twelve percent of the sample was 18-29 years old, 22% 30-44 years old, 26% 45-59, and 27% 60+. This compares with population values of 26%, 20%, 26%, and 27%. The elderly and thirty-somethings are accurately represented, the young are underrepresented, while mid-life adults are overrepresented. Average age, however, is the same as for the population. Perhaps the greatest departure from population values is for education, which, as expected, is greater than for the population. Median education is

"Some College" for both the sample and the population. Lower educational categories, however, are underrepresented, with 10% of the sample having less than a high school education and 14% having just a high school education, compared with 16% and 31% for the population. Nevertheless, the sample does contain the full range of educational levels.

Pittsburgh is an ethnically and class diverse community with a city population of 334,583 and over one million including surrounding areas, according to the 2000 Census. Neighborhoods range from suburb-like residential areas to areas of urban poverty. Although Pittsburgh is known to have a moderately high quality of life for a city its size, people intimately involved with public life in the city do not believe this leads to either an especially high level of political involvement or non-contentious public dialogue.

MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES

Knowledge Networks obtained phone numbers for households in the City of Pittsburgh from a random digit dial (RDD) sample. Where numbers appeared in a reverse directory, the household was sent an advance letter on Carnegie Mellon University stationery describing the study and indicating that the household would be contacted shortly. A Knowledge Networks phone center called households in the RDD sample and requested the household member with the most recent birth date. Both the letter and the call center indicated that in exchange for participation in the study, participants would have a four out of five chance of receiving a Windows computer and eight months of ISP service. The remainder would receive \$100. Those who received a computer would be expected to participate in a longer-term online deliberation from home that would require six hours of discussion over eight months. People who agreed to participate were given a short phone-based survey of their demographics and a few

policy attitudes, and they were scheduled for a one-day, eight hour on-campus deliberation. Participants were asked to come to a randomly-chosen day from the deliberation schedule, which spanned three weeks in July, including many weekends and weekdays.

Deliberations were held with up to 60 participants daily. After informed consent and a brief training session, participants took a web-based pre-survey. Next, they were given a 40 minute "library session" to learn more about the four policy topics, a break, 90 minutes for "deliberation" (face-to-face, online, or individual contemplation, depending on condition), and lunch. The library session, break, and deliberation (same condition as before) were repeated in the afternoon, and this was followed by the second survey. In addition to the experiment with type of deliberation, another experimental condition involved either receiving or not receiving reminders of citizenship. In the citizenship condition, participants were reminded to think like citizens in a brief "talking-head" ahead of their deliberations (the non-citizen condition involved a different talking-head), their rooms had an American flag, and they were given name tags with American flags and the word "Citizen" preceding their names.

MEASURES

All question responses were measured on 7-point Likert scales, unless otherwise noted. Generally, one sample question per question scale is provided below. Please contact the author for full question scale items.

Identity: "Being a citizen is important to who I am." Also, "Being a Pittsburgher..." and "Being politically conscious...." *Political Reflexivity*: A set of questions such as: "I feel personally responsible for my own political views."

Internalized Political Motivation: A set of questions such as: "I follow politics because I

think it's important." *Engagement Responsibility*: A set of dichotomous choice questions that ask respondents to indicate whether such statements as these are true or false: "A good citizen should allow others to challenge their political beliefs." and "A good citizen should join a community group." *Political Interest*: Questions from the American Citizen Participation Study, 1990 (ICPSR 6635). *Internal and External Political Efficacy*: Questions from the American National Election Study, 2000. *Political Perspective Taking*: This measure involved rewriting the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) questions pertaining to empathic perspective taking (Davis 1996) so that they focused on politically-relevant rather than interpersonal perspective taking. These include questions such as: "I sometimes find it difficult to see political issues from the point of view of people in other social classes."

Humanitarianism: Questions from the American National Election Study, 1996: Pre-And Post-Election Survey. *Political Social Network*: Questions from Lake et al. (1998). *Public Speaking Skill*: "I speak well enough to make an effective statement in public at a community meeting." This question is reworded to a Likert format from a question in Verba et al. (1995). *Campaign Participation Index*: Questions about trying to persuade others to change their votes, working for or donating to a party or candidate, and attending political meetings and rallies. These questions are from the Political Participation in America study as described in Brady (1999). Brady is also the source for *Contacting Local Officials* and *Community Collaboration* (collaboration includes forming a group and working with others to solve community problems). *Voting*: the count of number of votes from a set of three questions asking respondents to indicate whether they had voted in the last two national elections, the last two school board elections, and the last mayoral election. *Political Organization Membership*:

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had taken part in "any sort of activity" in any of a set of types of groups. After indicating which groups they had participated in, participants were asked "Of the organizations you selected, how many took any action for social or political reform in the past 12 months?"

Results

The results seek to establish three key points: a) The Virtual Agora Project experiment shows that deliberation enhances the salience of citizen identity. b) Citizen identity is positively related to political motivation and indeed may be an intermediate step in the development of a highly engaged political identity. Political consciousness identity forms the culminating step. And, c), citizen identity, controlling for political interest and efficacy, results in higher levels of political engagement. The following sections take up each of these points in order.

DELIBERATION EFFECTS ON POLITICAL IDENTITY

This research focuses on an experiment to determine whether democratic deliberation enhances political identity. The regressions in Table 1 indicate that deliberation affects the salience of citizen identity in the short run and that this increase shows no sign of rolling back in the longer-run. Column 2 shows that face-to-face (f2f) deliberation and reminders of political identity (flag in participant's room, etc.) significantly influence self-reported importance of "being a citizen" at the end of the day of deliberation. Online discussion shows a trend relationship, but its coefficient is significantly smaller than for f2f deliberation, according to a one-sided post-hoc test ($p=.048$). The effect of f2f discussion is substantial, both as a raw coefficient and as a beta coefficient. Only the effect of age is noticeably more substantial. The effect of age

is consistent with research in political socialization showing that people become more politically engaged as they age. African-Americans also show higher levels of citizen identity, perhaps consistent with the observation that African-Americans are more engaged relative to comparable Caucasians. Interestingly, education does not enhance citizen identity, though it does substantially enhance political consciousness identity (analysis not shown). It makes sense that higher education, which represents much of the difference in education in this sample, does not instill general affiliations such as citizen identity but instead affects political consciousness. One additional issue is that Column 2 might also have incorporated interaction terms between the political identity reminders and f2f and online discussion. As previously discussed, significant interaction effects were not expected. When interaction terms are added to the regression, they prove quite insignificant ($p=.93$ and $.80$). They were not included in the table because they divide up the cells of the main effects and thereby cause these effects to be understated.

Table 1: OLS Regressions of Citizen Identity Salience on Deliberation, Identity Reminders, and Past Citizen (Discussion Group-Robust Standard Errors)

Dependent Variable:	Citizen Identity Phase 1	Citizen Identity Phase 2
Independent Variables	Coef. (s.e.; Beta Coef.)	Coef. (s.e.; Beta Coef.)
Citizen Identity Phase 1		.43*** (.08; .42)
Face-to-Face Discussion	.26** (.10; .12)	.09 (.21; .05)
Online Discussion	.11† (.09; .05)	.03 (.17; .02)
Political Identity Reminders	.17* (.08; .08)	.08 (.14; .04)
Education	-.03† (.02; -.07)	-.004 (.02; -.01)
Income (7-pt Scale)	.06† (.03; .09)	-.04 (.05; -.07)
Age	.01*** (.002; .18)	.01 (.004; .10)
African-American	.33** (.11; .12)	.06 (.15; .02)

Male	.04 (.09; .02)	.02 (.10; .01)
Constant	1.58*** (.34; NA)	1.19** (.43; NA)
Joint F-test Exper. Manips; R ² ;N	F=3.5, p=.02; R ² =.07; N=558	F=.13, p=.94; R ² =.22; N=217
	Bayes factors indicate that the probability that citizen identity gains were rolled back by Phase 2 is .005.	

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05; † p<.15; p-values and std. errors are robust taking into account possible covariation within discussion groups. p-values for experimental conditions are reported as one-sided because of directional hypotheses. All others are two-sided. Beta coefficients are reported from non-robust analysis.

Column 3 of Table 1 addresses the question of whether the citizen identity gains in Phase 1 roll back in Phase 2. Citizen identity in Phase 2, for those who were invited to participate in online discussions in that phase, was measured several months after the end of Phase 1. Column 3 represents an indirect test of whether the deliberation positively affects citizen identity in Phase 2. A *direct* test to see whether the deliberation increases reported citizen identity in Phase 2 turns up nothing significant. This is not surprising given that this test has low statistical power: the number of respondents drops 61% in Phase 2 and the effect of the experimental variables is a crude between-groups effect in a regression that does nothing to account for individual differences. Column 3 instead reports a test with greater statistical power. Citizen identity from Phase 1 is included, thus accounting for individual differences, which should increase the chances of seeing any changes due to experimental condition. If citizen identity gains from phase one are rolled back by Phase 2, there should be significant *negative* coefficients for f2f discussion and the political identity reminder. Instead, the coefficients are positive, though insignificant. (The .43 coefficient of Phase 1 citizen identity might seem to imply an overall rollback of citizen identity, but coefficients below 1.0 are an artifact of random change in any variable that is bounded at the extremes. A t-test of the difference between

Phase 1 and 2 citizen identity indicates that the Phase 2 identity is significantly larger [difference=.15, $t=2.32$, $p=.02$ two-sided].)

This evidence in Column 3 of the absence of significantly negative coefficients that would indicate a rollback of citizen identity inverts the logic of classical hypothesis testing by asking for a rejection of the alternative hypothesis. A more evenhanded approach would simply ask how much more probable the alternative hypothesis is than the null hypothesis given this data. A Bayes factors test indicates that a model in which f2f discussion and identity reminders are present (and constrained to zero or less) is 217 times less probable than a model that omits these variables on the assumption they have no effect. Put another way, the probability of encountering the current data if f2f discussion and identity in fact have negative effects is .005 (or 1/217).

THE CONSTITUENTS OF THREE POLITICAL IDENTITIES

If deliberation enhances citizen identity, then it will be important to know whether this identity has consequences for political engagement. To understand its role in engagement, however, the role and character of citizen identity as a collective identity needs to be further clarified. The theoretical analysis suggests that citizen identity may be an intermediately-developed political identity, a step before political consciousness identity. If so, then part of the engagement effects of citizen identity may be mediated through political consciousness identity. Also, part of these effects may be mediated through various attributes associated with citizen identity, such as the engagement effects of political reflexivity and internalization.

Table 2: Pearson Correlations of Three Political Identity Variables and Various Constituent Variables, with Significance of Coefficient Differences In Superscripts

	Pittsburgher ID	Citizen ID	Political Conscious ID
--	-----------------	------------	------------------------

Constituent Variable			
Citizen ID (Identity)	.41***		
Political Conscious ID	.21***	.43***	
Political Reflexivity	.02	.21*** ^{as}	.27*** ^b
Internalized Pol. Motiv.	.12**	.33*** ^{as}	.56*** ^{bc}
Engagement Responsib.	.10*	.14***	.25*** ^{bc}
Political Interest	.23***	.29***	.55*** ^{bc}
Internal Politel Efficacy	-.07†	.15*** ^a	.47*** ^{bc}
External Politel Efficacy	.02	.11***	.20*** ^b
Pol. Perspective Taking	.07†	.18*** ^{as}	.19*** ^b
Humanitarianism	.09*	.16***	.21*** ^b

Notes: N between 558 and 560.

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05; † p<.15; all p-values are two-sided

^a In an OLS regression of the "Constituent Variable" on all three identity variables, the citizen identity coefficient is significantly different (p<.05, two-sided) from Pittsburgher identity.

^b Political conscious identity coefficient is sig. different than Pittsburgher identity.

^c Political conscious identity coefficient is sig. different than citizen identity.

^s Citizen identity coefficient is sig. in multiple regression of constituent on all three identities.

Table 2 shows Pearson correlations for the three political identities. The first noteworthy finding is the simplex pattern of correlations among the identity variables themselves—namely, each identity is strongly correlated with the identity developmentally adjacent to it ($\rho > .40$ for Pittsburgher and citizen or for citizen and conscious), but much more weakly associated with the identity two steps removed ($\rho = .21$). In multiple regressions of each identity on the other two, the identity that is two steps removed from the dependent variable always has a non-significant coefficient ($p = .28$, two-sided), while identities one step removed are always highly significant ($p < .001$). This helps support the view that these identities are developmentally sequenced.

Table 2 supports the hypothesis that the three identities are developmentally sequenced with respect to various constituent variables such as political reflexivity and

internalized motivation. In the case of all the constituent variables in the table, Pittsburgher identity has the weakest correlation, followed by citizen identity, and with political identity showing the strongest correlation. Not all the differences between identity variables, however, are statistically significant. To determine statistical significance, I conducted a set of OLS regressions of each constituent variable on all three identity variables. The superscripted letters in Table 2 indicate whether the coefficient of a given column's identity is significantly greater than that of a prior column's identity. For example, the superscripted 'a' in the third column of the internalized motivation row indicates that citizen identity has a significantly greater coefficient in this regression than Pittsburgher identity. Importantly, political consciousness identity always has a significantly greater coefficient than Pittsburgher identity for the full list of constituent variables. Political consciousness identity does not always have coefficients larger than citizen identity, nor does citizen identity always have coefficients larger than Pittsburgher identity, but in many cases the coefficients are significantly different, as expected.

Citizen identity could exercise effects on political engagement through its influence on the constituent variables and on political consciousness. Citizen identity strongly affects political consciousness identity, thus indirectly influencing all that this identity affects. It significantly influences all the constituent variables when these variables are regressed on just citizen and Pittsburgher identity (analysis not shown). Even taking into account political consciousness, citizen identity could still affect outcomes via three of the constituent variables. In the case of political reflexivity, internalized political motivation, and political perspective taking, citizen identity has a significant coefficient in a regression whose independent variables includes political

consciousness identity (the 's' superscript in Table 2). In a future paper, I will show that political reflexivity improves learning of important facts during deliberation, even after accounting for education and need for cognition. Prior research shows that high levels of internalization lead to active political information seeking, less dependence on others for political choices, less susceptibility to persuasion, and more differentiated attitudes (Koestner et al. 1996; Losier and Koestner 1999; Muhlberger 2003). Political perspective taking is significantly correlated with political interest, internal political efficacy, self-reported quantity of everyday political discussion, and political speaking and writing skill ($p < .001$ for all).

Table 2 and related analyses provides evidence regarding stipulations by political theorists that political engagement can enhance empathy, virtuous action, and legitimacy. Deliberation enhances citizen identity and citizen identity significantly correlates with political perspective taking and humanitarianism, which are related to empathy and, presumably, virtuous choices. Political perspective taking is a politically-contextualized version of the perspective taking component of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index, an interpersonal measure of empathy. Humanitarianism has been shown to have substantial pro-social effects, particularly on attitudes toward a range of social welfare policies and feelings toward the poor (Steenbergen 1995). In addition, citizen identity correlates significantly with the perceived legitimacy of this study's citizen deliberation ($\rho = .14$, $p = .001$ two-sided). Legitimacy was ascertained by asking participants to what extent public official's decisions should be decided by the majority opinion from the deliberation. Citizen identity appears to enhance the legitimacy of citizen actions. With respect to the legitimacy of the political system, citizen identity did not significantly correlate with confidence in the political system overall or the school board ($p = .77$, $.39$)

but correlated negatively with confidence in Pittsburgh's mayor ($\rho = -.10$, $p = .02$). The relationship between citizen identity and humanitarianism, political perspective taking, and confidence in the mayor persists even controlling for political consciousness identity in multiple regression analysis.

POLITICAL IDENTITY AND POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

Citizen and political consciousness identity have a number of direct and indirect effects on self-reported political behavior. Indirectly, citizen identity influences political consciousness and both may play an important role in creating political interest and efficacy—standard political science variables known to widely influence political behavior. Because these identities may be causes of political interest and efficacy, a full measure of the behavioral effects of the identities might be revealed by regressing the behaviors on the identities and demographic variables, without the standard political science variables. Such an analysis would, however, encounter the criticism that the political identities may simply be indirect ways of registering political interest and efficacy and that the identities would have no effect beyond these standard variables. A highly conservative estimate of the effects of identity can be achieved by including the standard political science variables, to determine if the identities have any direct effects above and beyond the standard variables. I have taken this approach here, including not only political interest and internal and external efficacy as standard political science explanations of political behavior, but also general political knowledge, party identification strength (the absolute value of party identification), and ideological strength.

Table 3 presents several regressions relevant to assessing the behavioral impact of political identity. Column 2 suggests that citizen identity plays a major role in creating

political consciousness, even controlling for the full set of standard political variables. The sizable effect of citizen identity likely understates its true importance because the standard political variables are more likely the consequence of political consciousness identity than its determinants. In subsequent analyses, wherever political consciousness proves significant, citizen identity plays an indirect role.

Table 3: OLS Regressions of Political Activities on Political Identity, Standard Political Variables, and Demographics (Group-Robust Standard Errors)

Dependent Variable:	Pol. Conscious ID	Political Social Network	Public Speaking Skill	Campaign Participation Index
Independent Variables	Coef. (s.e.)	Coef. (s.e.)	Coef. (s.e.)	Coef. (s.e.)
Pol. Consc. ID		.12* (.05)	.03 (.07)	.13* (.05)
Citizen Identity	.36*** (.07)	-.01 (.06)	.14* (.07)	-.03 (.06)
Pittsburgher ID	.07† (.04)	-.10* (.05)	-.16** (.05)	-.02 (.04)
Pol. Interest	.36*** (.05)	.15** (.05)	.23** (.08)	.33*** (.06)
Internal Efficacy	.26*** (.04)	.10* (.05)	.36*** (.07)	.19*** (.05)
External Efficacy	.02 (.03)	-.08* (.03)	-.02 (.05)	.09** (.03)
Gen. Pol. Knowl.	.05 (.05)	.14** (.06)	.04 (.07)	.11** (.05)
Party ID Strength	.03† (.02)	-.03 (.03)	-.03 (.03)	.06** (.03)
Ideological Strngth	.08** (.03)	.03 (.03)	.02 (.03)	.06* (.03)
Education (7-pt sc)	.06† (.04)	-.04 (.06)	.16* (.07)	-.05 (.06)
Income (7-pt scale)	-.05 (.03)	.07† (.04)	-.003 (.05)	.001 (.04)
Age (7-pt scale)	-.01 (.04)	.01 (.05)	-.10† (.06)	.19*** (.04)
African-Amer.	-.16† (.11)	.13 (.16)	.66*** (.17)	-.02 (.17)
Male	-.03 (.09)	-.33** (.11)	.23† (.14)	-.05 (.10)
R ² ; s.e.; N	.47; 1.00; 558	.15; 1.17; 558	.27; 1.47; 556	.33; 1.22; 556

Notes: Effects here for political identity are conservative (see text). Regressions also contain constant term that is not shown. To facilitate comparison of raw coefficients, all dependent and independent variables, other than dichotomous independent variables, were placed on 7-point scales.

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05; † p<.15; p-values and std. errors are robust taking into account possible covariation within discussion groups. p-values for identity and standard political values reported as one-sided if coefficient is positive. All other p-values are two-sided. Beta coefficients are reported from non-robust analysis.

Columns three through five show that political consciousness and citizen identities significantly and directly affect several behavior-relevant variables, even when all the standard political variables are controlled. Identity matters and is not simply a poor stand-in for the standard political variables. Political consciousness has an effect comparable to political interest on political social network (frequency of political discussion with close friends). Citizen identity has 60% the effect of political interest on self-reported skill at public speaking, a skill important to political participation (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995). And, political consciousness has 40% the effect of political interest on an index of campaign involvement such as persuasion, attending rallies, and so forth. Interestingly, Pittsburgher identity, the least politically oriented of the three collective identities, significantly and *negatively* affects two of the three behavioral indicators. Removing the standard political variables from the three behavioral analyses in Table 3 results in a substantial boost in the effects of the significant citizen and political consciousness identity coefficients, which go from an average coefficient of .13 to an average coefficient of .26 and with t-statistic climbing from an average of 2.20 to 5.33. Political consciousness also becomes significant in the case of public speaking ($\beta=.27$, $t=4.18$).

Table 4: Probit and Ordered Probit Regressions of Political Behaviors on Political Identity, Standard Political Variables, and Demographics (Group-Robust Standard Errors)

Dependent Variable:	Voting	Contacting Local Officials	Community Collaboration	Pol. Organiz. Membership
Independent Variables	Coef. (s.e.)	Coef. (s.e.)	Coef. (s.e.)	Coef. (s.e.)
Pol. Consc. ID	-.02 (.05)	.01 (.05)	.11* (.05)	.15* (.06)
Citizen Identity	.15** (.06)	.11* (.06)	.05 (.06)	-.04 (.06)
Pittsburgher ID	.02 (.03)	-.09* (.05)	-.10** (.04)	-.04 (.04)
Pol. Interest	.07† (.04)	.28*** (.06)	.27*** (.05)	.18*** (.06)
Internal Efficacy	.03 (.04)	.06 (.07)	.04 (.05)	-.02 (.05)
External Efficacy	.06* (.03)	.09* (.04)	.04† (.03)	.02 (.04)
Gen. Pol. Knowl.	.11* (.05)	-.001 (.06)	-.08† (.05)	.01 (.04)
Party ID Strength	.12*** (.02)	-.004 (.03)	-.04† (.02)	-.02 (.02)
Ideological Strngth	-.09** (.03)	.04† (.03)	.04 (.03)	.05* (.03)
Education (7-pt sc)	.06 (.05)	.004 (.06)	.01 (.05)	.08† (.05)
Income (7-pt scale)	.08** (.03)	.06 (.04)	.02 (.04)	.02 (.04)
Age (7-pt scale)	.42*** (.05)	.16** (.05)	.09* (.04)	-.04 (.05)
African-American	-.13 (.12)	-.02 (.15)	.38** (.14)	.26* (.12)
Male	-.17* (.08)	-.32** (.12)	-.07 (.10)	.26* (.12)
Pseudo-R ² ; N	.11; 556	.12; 556	.07; 556	.05; 556

Notes: Effects here for political identity are conservative (see text). Regressions also contain constant or

threshold terms that are not shown. To facilitate comparison of raw coefficients, all dependent and independent variables, other than dichotomous independent variables, were placed on 7-point scales.

*** p<.001; ** p<.01; * p<.05; † p<.15; p-values and std. errors are robust taking into account possible covariation within discussion groups. p-values for identity and standard political values reported as one-sided if coefficient is positive. All other p-values are two-sided. Beta coefficients are reported from non-robust analysis.

Table 4 extends the analysis to four dichotomous or polytomous behavioral variables. The strongest theoretical expectation for citizen identity is that it should especially affect "Voting," a count of voting in five local and national elections. Separate analysis of each of these elections yields substantively the same results as the combined analysis here. Remarkably, citizen identity proves to have more powerful effects on voting than any of the standard political variables, including political interest and party identification strength. Citizen identity also plays a significant role in contacting local officials, with a coefficient larger than for any standard political variable besides political interest. Political consciousness identity likewise outpaces all standard political variables but political interest in the case of community collaboration (collaborating on community problems and creating local groups). Political consciousness plays almost as substantial a role in predicting political organization membership as political interest and a more substantial role than other standard political variables. Pittsburgher identity plays a significant negative role in two of the four behavioral variables. With the standard political variables removed, political consciousness identity proves significant for three of the four behavioral variables, showing an average coefficient size of .21 and average t-statistic of 4.22. Citizen identity remains much as before.

Returning to analysis with the full set of standard political variables, a number of additional results could not be presented in Tables 3 and 4 due to space considerations. Political consciousness significantly and positively affects writing letters to the editor ($p=.02$, one-sided) and the log of reported everyday political discussion ($p=.04$). None of the identity variables proved to have a significant impact on self-reported political writing skill or contacting national officials.

Summary and Discussion

This paper has explored a mechanism by which some political theorists contend political engagement, particularly deliberation, may help create more community-minded and motivated citizens. Mill, Mead, and Habermas believe discursive political engagement can exercise such effects in part by building the collective identities of the participants. This paper offers evidence that deliberation does indeed promote citizen identity (Table 1), that citizen identity is related to various aspects of political motivation and community-mindedness (Table 2), and that citizen identity and its likely product, political consciousness, can explain a range of reported political behaviors even controlling for standard political science explanatory variables (Tables 3 and 4). In addition, a theoretical framework was introduced that helps clarify how identities are built and how they exercise their effects.

This paper posed a number of hypotheses that were generally supported by the findings. Deliberation did enhance the salience of a collective identity, citizen identity (Hypothesis 1, Table 1). Citizen identity was significantly greater (between groups) immediately after the Phase 1 deliberation, and the data indicate that the gains in citizen identity did not reverse themselves during Phase 2. Reminders of collective identity, which included an exhortation to deliberate over what is best for the community, also enhanced citizen identity (Hypothesis 2, Table 1). Providing such reminders may be a simple way to enhance the citizenship impact of the deliberative experience. Face-to-face (f2f) deliberation did prove to have a larger and more significant coefficient than online deliberation (Hypothesis 3, Table 1), perhaps because f2f deliberation may be more likely to result in conscious contemplation of collective identity. No interactions were found between political identity reminders and media (f2f, online, or no discussion).

I hypothesized that the three identities under consideration—Pittsburgher, citizen, and political consciousness identities—may form a developmental sequence with increasing levels of political motivation and community-mindedness (Hypotheses 4-6). Table 2 establishes a consistent pattern of increasing correlations between the three identities and a variety of measures of political motivation (political reflexivity, internalized political motivation, personal responsibility to be politically engaged, political interest, and internal and external political efficacy). It also establishes such a pattern between these political identities and measures of community-mindedness and empathy (political perspective taking, humanitarianism). Political consciousness always proves to have a *significantly* greater relationship with these measures of political motivation and community-mindedness than does Pittsburgher identity. In four of eight cases, citizen identity has a significantly greater relationship than does Pittsburgher identity, while in the remaining four cases the correlation of citizen identity is insignificantly greater than Pittsburgher identity. In another four of eight cases, political consciousness has a significantly greater relationship than does citizen identity. On the whole, the hypothesis of a developmental ordering appears broadly supported, though citizen identity does not always clearly differentiate from Pittsburgher or political consciousness identities. One possibility, that could be investigated in the future, is that citizen identity may be a supercategory that can contain elements of both the other identities.

These findings suggest multiple pathways by which citizen identity can influence political behavior. The evidence of developmental ordering, plus results showing citizen identity is powerfully related to political consciousness, suggest citizen identity may be a stepping stone to political consciousness identity. If so, what enhances citizen identity

may with time enhance political consciousness and thereby indirectly influence all behaviors affected by political consciousness. Citizen identity can also exercise an effect through the several political motivation and community-mindedness variables to which it remains significantly related even with political consciousness controlled. Finally, citizen identity may have its own peculiar contents that bear on political action. For example, voting is a crucial ritual of citizenship and so may be especially influenced by citizen identity.

Citizen and political consciousness identities do prove to significantly explain a range of political behaviors (Hypothesis 7), even after controlling for standard political variables, including political interest, political efficacy, and ideological and party identification strength. These results likely understate the influence of identity because identity probably is involved in shaping such factors as political interest and efficacy. Such conservative analyses do, however, help establish that identity has real behavioral effects and is not simply a round-about way of asking about interest and efficacy. Political consciousness significantly affects frequency of political discussion among close friends (political social network), total amount of political discussion, an index of campaign participation (persuasion, donation, etc.), community collaboration, political interest group membership, and writing letters to the editor. With the standard political variables removed, the effect of political consciousness sees substantial growth. Citizen identity, as anticipated, has an appreciable direct effect on reported voting as well as two other behaviorally-relevant outcomes: contacting local officials and reported skill at public speaking. I hypothesized that political consciousness identity should have wider and stronger effects on political engagement than citizen identity and, in particular Pittsburgher identity. The latter is certainly the case in that Pittsburgher identity in

multiple regressions has a negative effect in four of seven behaviors and no effect on the rest. Political consciousness identity does significantly affect more behaviors than does citizen identity, and its effect sizes are greater, when the standard political variables are removed.

Many avenues for future elaboration of this research suggest themselves. This paper sets aside the issue of the directionality of the relationship between political identity and behavior. I offered reasons why much of the effect probably runs from identity to action. Nevertheless, future work, particularly with good time-series data, should explore reciprocal effects between identity and action as well as between identity and the standard political variables. The issue of how exactly deliberative discussion enhances collective identity needs to be taken up—for example, whether certain kinds of discussion topics make a difference, whether listening or talking matter more, or whether characteristics and choices of the participant matter. The meaning and content of the three political identities should also be further explored by examining what kinds of responsibilities people associate with them. Different approaches to measuring identity could be examined, including approaches that can tap unconscious, non-verbal components of identity. One promising possibility here is to examine reaction times collected as people indicate whether an identity label applies to them or indicate whether a given responsibility applies to a good citizen. Long-term deliberations may also help clarify whether enhanced citizen identity ultimately promotes political consciousness and future political behavior. Long-term data, especially on young adults just entering political life, may reveal the dynamics of identity development and political action. These efforts promise to elucidate the puzzle of participation—why so few are politically engaged while a few are so deeply engaged. They also promise to further develop a

theoretical model that can disclose how to encourage people to become more deeply engaged—a theory of how better citizens are built and how these citizens will sustain and improve their democracy.

Bibliography

- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1986. *Democracy and Capitalism: Property, Community, and the Contradictions of Modern Social Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brady, Henry E. 1999. Political Participation. In *Measures of Political Attitudes*, edited by J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver and L. S. Wrightsman. New York: Academic Press.
- 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.
- Carver, Charles S., and Michael F. Scheier. 1981. *Attention and Self-Regulation: A Control-Theory Approach to Human Behavior*. New York, Heidelberg, Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Carver, Charles S., and Michael F. Scheier. 1999. Themes and Issues in the Self-Regulation of Behavior. In *Perspectives on Behavioral Self-Regulation*, edited by J. Robert S. Wyer. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Davis, Mark. 1996. Interpersonal Reactivity Index.
- Finkel, Steven E. 1985. Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science* 29:891-913.
- Fishkin, James S., Shanto Iyengar, and Robert Luskin. 2005. Deliberative Public Opinion in Presidential Primaries: Evidence From the Online Deliberative Poll. Paper read at International Communication Association Annual Meeting, at New York, NY.
- Gilens, Martin. 2000. Political Ignorance and American Democracy. Paper read at Midwest Political Science Association Meeting, at Chicago, IL.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action—Volume Two, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Translated by T. McCarthy. 2 vols. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by T. Burger and F. Lawrence: Cambridge, MA : MIT Press.
- Huddy, Leonie. 2001. From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory. *Political Psychology* 22 (1):127-156.
- Katz, James E., Ronald E. Rice, and Philip Aspden. 2001. The Internet, 1995-2000: Access, Civic Involvement, and Social Interaction. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (3):405-419.
- Kinder, Donald R. 2002. Pale Democracy: Opinion and Action in Post-War America. In *The Evolution of Political Knowledge: Theory and Inquiry in American Politics*, edited by E. D. Mansfield and R. Sisson: Ohio State University Press.
- Koestner, Richard, Gaëtan F. Losier, Robert J. Vallerand, and Donald Carducci. 1996. Identified and Introjected Forms of Political Internalization: Extending Self-

- Determination Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70 (5):1025-1036.
- Lake, Ronald La Due, and Robert Huckfeldt. 1998. Social Capital, Social Networks, And Political Participation. *Political Psychology* 19 (3):567-584.
- Losier, Gaetan F., and Richard Koestner. 1999. Intrinsic versus identified regulation in distinct political campaigns: The consequences of following politics for pleasure versus personal meaningfulness. *Intrinsic Versus Identified Regulation in Distinct Political Campaigns: The Consequences of Following Politics for Pleasure Versus Personal Meaningfulness* 25 (3).
- McLean, Iain S., Christian List, James S. Fishkin, and Robert C. Luskin. 2000. Does Deliberation Produce Preference Structuration? Evidence From Deliberative Opinion Polls (<http://www.la.utexas.edu/research/delpol/papers/structuration.pdf>). Paper read at American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, at Washington, D.C.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1962. *Mind, Self, and Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1996. *Representative Government*: World Library, <http://www.19.5degs.com/ebook/representative-government/1408/read#list>.
- Muhlberger, Peter. 2003. Beyond Political Interest: Political Internalization in Political Participation. Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, at Philadelphia, PA (also available from <http://communityconnections.heinz.cmu.edu/papers>).
- Muhlberger, Peter. 2004. Access, Skill, and Motivation In Online Political Discussion: Testing Cyber-Realism. In *Democracy Online: The Prospects for Political Renewal Through the Internet*, edited by P. M. Shane. New York (also available from <http://communityconnections.heinz.cmu.edu/papers>): Routledge.
- Muhlberger, Peter. 2005. Human Agency and the Revitalization of the Public Sphere. *Political Communication* 22 (2):163-178.
- Neuman, W. Russell. 1986. *The Paradox of Mass Politics: Knowledge and Opinion in the American Electorate*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Park, Alison, Roger Jowell, and Suzi McPherson. 1998. The Future of the National Health Service: Results from a Deliberative Poll: King's Fund.
- Price, Vincent, and Joseph N. Cappella. 2002. Online Deliberation and its Influence: The Electronic Dialogue Project in Campaign 2000. *IT&Society* 1 (1):303-329.
- Price, Vincent, and Clarissa David. 2005. Talking About Elections: A Study of Patterns in Citizen Deliberation Online. Paper read at International Communication Association Annual Meeting, at New York, NY.
- Rheingold, Howard. 2000. *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*. Rev. , 1st MIT Press ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ryan, Richard M., and James P. Connell. 1989. Perceived Locus of Causality and Internalization: Examining Reasons for Acting in Two Domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 57 (5):749-761.
- Schwartz, Edward A. 1996. *Netactivism: How Citizens Use the Internet*. 1st ed, *Songline guides*. Sebastopol, CA: Songline Studios, Inc.
- Spears, Russell, Martin Lea, and Stephen Lee. 1990. De-individuation and group polarization in computer-mediated communication. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 29 (2):121-134.

- Steenbergen, Marco R. 1995. Compassion and American Public Opinion: An Analysis of the NES Humanitarianism Scale. Ann Arbor, MI: Board of Overseers of the National Election Studies.
- Vallacher, Robin R., and Daniel M. Wegner. 2000. What do people think they are doing? Action identification and human behavior. In *Motivational science: Social and personality perspectives*, edited by E. T. Higgins and A. W. Kruglanski. Philadelphia, PA, US: Psychology Press.
- Verba, Sidney, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Yates, Miranda, and James Youniss. 1998. Community Service and Political Identity Development in Adolescence. *Journal of Social Issues* 54 (3):495-512.