

Special Thematic Section on "The Social Psychology of Citizenship, Participation and Social Exclusion"

The Social Psychology of Citizenship: Engagement With Citizenship Studies and Future Research

Clifford Stevenson^{*a}, Nick Hopkins^b, Russell Luyt^a, John Dixon^c

[a] Department of Psychology, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, United Kingdom. [b] School of Psychology, University of Dundee, Dundee, United Kingdom. [c] Department of Psychology, The Open University, Milton Keynes, United Kingdom.

Abstract

In this article we review the argument outlined in the opening article in this special thematic section: that the current social psychology of citizenship can be understood as the development of longstanding conceptualisations of the concept within the discipline. These conceptualisations have contributed to the current social psychological study of the constructive, active and collective (but often exclusive) understandings of citizenship in people's everyday lives, as evidenced by contributions to this thematic section. We consider how this emerging body of work might fit with current citizenship studies and in particular how it may contribute to the current trend towards conceiving citizenship as an active practice embedded in everyday social life. Specifically, we highlight three areas of future research that we think are particularly promising: citizenship and recognition; displays and enactments of citizenship in public space; citizenship and lived coexistence. Although this is far from an exhaustive list of possibilities, we propose that research in these areas could enable the way for social psychology to articulate a distinct, recognisable and valuable contribution to citizenship studies.

Keywords: social psychology, citizenship, social identity, social representations, discursive psychology, citizenship studies

Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 2015, Vol. 3(2), 192–210, doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.581

Received: 2015-09-18. Accepted: 2015-09-18. Published (VoR): 2015-10-26.

Handling Editors: J. Christopher Cohrs, Jacobs University Bremen, Bremen, Germany; Johanna Ray Vollhardt, Department of Psychology, Clark University, Worcester, MA, USA

*Corresponding author at: Department of Psychology, Anglia Ruskin University, East Road, Cambridge, CB1 1PT, United Kingdom. E-mail: clifford.stevenson@anglia.ac.uk



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

As outlined in the opening paper to this special thematic section (Stevenson, Dixon, Hopkins, & Luyt, 2015, this section), the social psychology of citizenship is in its infancy. Topics such as national identity, prosocial behaviour and collective action may be extensively studied in the mainstream of our discipline; yet citizenship is seldom directly and explicitly addressed. As a result, previous generations of social psychologists have largely ignored the concept or studied it within the confines of organisational or community contexts. However, over the past fifteen years there has been increasing interest in citizenship across social psychology with several position pieces, special issues and edited volumes having been published on the topic (e.g., Borgida, Federico, & Sullivan, 2009; Condor, 2011; Haste, 2004; Pancer, 2014; Sanchez-Mazas & Klein, 2003). Though initially piecemeal and frag-

mentary, this work has proven seminal and is now being consolidated into a diverse but distinct body of research and theory.

The aim of this special thematic section has been to bring together some of this recent research with a view to identifying progress in the area, and to outline some directions for future research. In particular, we wanted to trace the roots of the study of citizenship within previous traditions of psychological research on the topic as well as to identify emerging trends within the field. In order to help focus this endeavour, we invited authors to submit contributions that explicitly considered several key psychological aspects of citizenship recognisable from earlier approaches to the topic within psychology: a focus on the active, participatory aspects of citizenship; a consideration of the everyday understandings and practices of citizenship; and an examination of the exclusive as well as inclusive nature of citizenship. In doing so, we wished to trace the continuity of these ideas in current research and use them to cultivate a distinctive and recognisable social psychology of citizenship.

The contributions to this special thematic section allow us to develop this approach. Eight papers spanning diverse theoretical traditions including social identity, social representations and discursive approaches are included. These apply an array of methods, both qualitative and quantitative, in order to consider different aspects of citizenship across a variety of cultural and national contexts. Some focus on the perception and endorsement of formal definitions and models of citizenship, others examine 'lay' understandings. Some examine citizenship in relation to national identity; others consider citizenship in relation to more locality- and spatially-based identities. Some examine the role of the state and social institutions in the regulation and transmission of citizenship, others examine everyday practices. Still others examine the interaction and opposition between these two levels. Most reveal how citizenship can serve to exclude social groups, though some suggest a role for citizenship in the inclusion and reintegration of marginalised communities.

In terms of commonalities, all contributions share a core concern with understanding citizenship from the perspective of the citizen. All conceptualise citizenship as an active and reflective process occurring between members of a community, and all highlight the irreducibly social and collective nature of the experience and practice of citizenship in everyday life. Finally, all the papers endorse the values of inclusivity, egalitarianism and collective empowerment, while respecting the cultural and contextual specificities of the ways in which these values are manifested. As we have argued in the opening paper to this thematic section, these elements of convergence provide a basis upon which a social psychology of citizenship can contribute to citizenship studies particularly by analysing the constructive, active and collective (but often exclusive) understandings of citizenship in people's everyday lives.

Contextualizing Social Psychology Within Citizenship Studies

With these common aims and values in mind, we can now begin to think about how psychology can orient itself within contemporary citizenship studies with a view to outlining future contributions to this area. As the opening article to this thematic section highlighted (Stevenson, Dixon, et al., 2015, this section), the study of citizenship in organisational and community psychology has fitted loosely within the modern 'liberal communitarian' models of citizenship. It is concerned centrally with participation and cohesion and - within some variants of community psychology and the social identity approach at least - with equality, collective action and social change. As Isin

and Turner (2002) point out, though, the field of citizenship studies has transformed considerably since those formal models of citizenship held currency. Initial consideration of the relationship between citizenship and redistribution as articulated by T. H. Marshall (1950) has given way to considering the politics of recognition, characterised by debates concerning minority rights and multiculturalism. These debates, in turn, have been superseded by an understanding of citizenship as experienced in a wide variety of ways from different economic, gender, ethnic and religious viewpoints and as embedded in the micro-politics of daily life.

Accordingly, across citizenship studies in the past two decades there has been a general movement away from research focused exclusively on the legal status, rules and regulations of citizenship towards research focused more broadly on citizenship as constituted in the routines and practices of daily life, in the meanings of interactions and the dynamics of identities (e.g., Isin, Brodie, Juteau, & Stasiulis 2008; Isin & Nielsen, 2008; Lewis, 2004; Lister, 2003). From this perspective, citizenship is reconceived as a form of expression and performance that is located in particular places and environments. It is viewed as being manifest at multiple levels, though different media and across national boundaries, rather than being located solely at the level of the nation state. As Isin (2008) describes it, citizenship is “the art of being with others, negotiating different situations and identities and articulating ourselves as distinct yet similar to others in our everyday lives, and asking questions of justice” (p. 6).

This move, Isin (2008) argues, represents a reversal of the classic T. H. Marshall assumption of an historical progression – from civil to political to social rights – by foregrounding the social as the point of origin and negotiation of all rights. Citizenship is reconceived as bringing together three interrelated domains: the boundaries of the polity (content of citizenship); the rights and duties associated with citizenship status (the extent of citizenship); and the processes whereby identities are recognised and understood (the depth of citizenship). Through focusing on how citizenship is accomplished in these domains across different social arenas, citizenship studies can begin to delineate how these new fluid forms and understandings of citizenship shape people’s lives and how people can act to shape and challenge their social worlds.

Isin et al. (2008) outline how these more recent developments within citizenship studies can be marshalled to systematically study social citizenship. Focusing on the everyday social relations that underpin the formation of different social groups, this approach to citizenship reconceives the fundamental issues of social inequality and political recognition as mutually implicative: Marginalised groups are denied access to economic as well as symbolic resources on a day-to-day basis; meaningful political recognition involves addressing inequality at a micro as well as macro level. On this basis, the concept of citizenship can be used to interrogate how groups are socially constructed in interactions; how inequality is sustained and reproduced in the mundane routines of everyday life; how the definition of rights is bound up with social inclusion and exclusion; and how differentiated citizenship can be used to achieve equality without surrendering to sameness (Isin et al., 2008).

This, we feel, is an ideal point of entry for the social psychology of citizenship. Social psychology offers a methodological toolkit, a range of levels of analysis and a focus on social change that fits well with such an agenda. As outlined previously, the study of citizenship in social psychology has moved to the lived environment. As is evident from the contributions to the thematic section, citizenship is now understood as located: within the interpersonal conversations and in public performances of everyday life; in the streets as well as the schools; and in the politics of the playground as well as the politics of the state. Moreover, current social psychological approaches to citizenship are relational and collective in nature. They are focused on how shared understandings of citizenship are negotiated between people and reproduced through participation and also how collective action can challenge and transform

regimes of citizenship from within and outside of society. Additionally, social psychology is finely attuned to the darker, exclusive side of citizenship: from the subtle exclusions of everyday conversation to the prejudice and discrimination inscribed in national and international political rhetoric and policy.

Below we identify three areas of investigation within social psychology that we feel fit with such an agenda and which can make a substantial contribution to citizenship studies: citizenship and recognition; displays and enactment of citizenship in public space; and citizenship and coexistence in everyday life.

Citizenship and Recognition

Traditionally, much social science research has explored how immigrants are received and treated as members of the community. Social psychology has contributed to the exploration of such issues through studying various proximal processes shaping people's reception of immigrants. In particular, studies have explored how representations of immigrants as community-threatening aliens are actively constructed (Verkuyten, 2013) and can be consequential (van Rijswijk, Hopkins, & Johnston, 2009). Moreover, social psychological research has investigated how these constructions and consequences are bound up with the representation of the immigration process (Verkuyten, 2005) and with political nostalgia for the national community (Smeekes, Verkuyten, & Martinovic, 2015).

Inevitably, the experience of migration has forced the rethinking of many traditional assumptions about citizenship (Castles & Davidson, 2000). As noted above, conceptualisations of citizenship (and the rights associated with citizenship status) have undergone significant historical change. Initial conceptions of citizenship that foregrounded civil rights (e.g., the right to hold property) were followed by conceptions that emphasised political rights (e.g., the right to vote), and then (with the rise of Keynesian approaches to wealth redistribution) by still other conceptions, which included reference to the various social rights (e.g., access to education, welfare, etc.) that were judged necessary for individuals to realise their formal political rights (Marshall, 1950). Such developments have been accompanied by critical analyses of the social and political visibility of women and minorities (especially sexual, religious, and ethnic minorities) within the public sphere. Deliberations on which identities could and should feature in the public sphere are now prominent features of political debate and can crystalize around all manner of identity symbols (such as the Muslim headscarf; see Bowen, 2007). Yet, if immigration from previously colonized countries and more recent developments in mass travel have made these deliberations more familiar and pressing, it is important to remember that the relationship between group identities has always featured (often implicitly) in the conceptualisation of who 'deserves' the rights associated with citizenship. For example, de Tocqueville's nineteenth century analysis of democracy in North America (de Tocqueville, 2000) excluded its aboriginal population because, as Turner (2001) explains, de Tocqueville believed Christian monotheism was "the necessary glue which pulled together the territorial basis of the nation-state as a unified but exclusionary community" (p. 13).

One of the most obvious points to note concerning such accounts of who belongs (and the rights that they may claim) is that they have become the stuff of struggle and contestation with minorities actively claiming their place in the public sphere. The bases for these challenges are diverse. They can entail reference to supra-national (indeed 'post-national' and 'de-nationalised') discourses of universal human rights that valorize the right to have one's various identities (e.g., one's sexual identity, one's religious identity) respected and accorded social recognition (Edmunds, 2012). However, the nation continues to be a basis for rights-claiming with many minorities claiming their place in the national community through asserting the compatibility between their minority identity and the wider national community. For example, British Muslims (born and raised in Britain) have responded to exclusionary

and Islamophobic characterisations of themselves as an alien and threatening presence (Runnymede Trust, 1997) through asserting both the distinctive value of their Muslim identities and their own Britishness. These developments illustrate well the way citizenship has undergone reconceptualisation. As Modood (2005) observes, we have moved from

“an understanding of equality in terms of individualism and cultural assimilation to a politics of recognition, to equality as encompassing public ethnicity, that is to say, equality as not having to hide or apologize for one’s origins, family or community, but requiring others to show respect for them and adapt public attitudes and arrangements so that the heritage they represent is encouraged rather than ignored or expected to wither away” (p. 134).

Future research could usefully explore how these theories of recognition are themselves influential and shape public opinion about the degree to which various group identities (whether gender, sexual, religious, or whatever) ‘deserve’ public expression (and if so how and where).

As these developments put the issue of identity centre-stage, they invite social psychological analysis. Consider first the most basic question of all – the nature of identity. As several analysts note, it is all too easy to assume that identity can be conceptualised in reified and essentialised terms with individuals presumed to have a single coherent identity that they are motivated to express across diverse contexts (Sen, 2006). In this context, the social psychological insight that people have multiple group identities and that their contents, boundaries and social relevance are socially constructed and debated is significant (Finlay, 2014; Hopkins & Kahani-Hopkins, 2004; Hopkins, Reicher, & Kahani-Hopkins, 2003). That is, our discipline’s questioning of the reification of identity makes it clear that when we talk of the recognition of identity we must take into account the (multiple) self-categories that the individuals involved actually value and invest in. Moreover, it becomes important to consider how the combination of social identifications (e.g., as a Muslim and as member of the national community) combine to predict activism, claims-making, and demands for expressive rights (Martinovic & Verkuyten, 2014; Simon & Ruhs, 2008).

The concept of recognition is arguably inherent in all psychological models of citizenship. Whether in organisational psychology, community psychology or discursive psychology, the effects of having one’s citizenship status and behaviour recognised by others has been fundamental to the understanding of dynamics of participation and engagement. Social psychological research also helps explain just why the recognition of one’s various social identities is so important. Some of the reasons relate to the subjective experience of identity. Social scientific theory (e.g., Barth, 1969; Goffman, 1969) argues that there is more to identity than subjective self-definition and that if we are to speak of a person as ‘having an identity’ it is important that others treat that person as having that identity (Jenkins, 1996). Social psychological analysis contributes to such insights through emphasising the importance of being able to enact one’s identity. Research shows that there is enormous pleasure to be had in being able to express and enact one’s social identifications (Hopkins, Reicher, Khan, et al., 2015). So too research suggests that such enactments are dependent on having others that are willing and able to support such enactments (Chen, Chen, & Shaw, 2004; Swann, 1987). Indeed, this is one reason why participation in collective events with one’s fellows is so meaningful and consequential (Khan et al., in press). Future research could more directly address this element of the process of recognition. That is, research could address people’s understandings of recognition, what it requires from others and how the giving or withholding of recognition is consequential. The interplay between the individual’s psychological ‘needs’ for recognition and wider social and political processes have been addressed by numerous political theorists (Honneth, 1995; Taylor, 1994) and resulted in the ongoing theorisation of ‘multiculturalism’ (Modood, 1998). Social psychological research has complemented these developments in

normative theory with investigations addressing the implications of recognition for social relations. For example, one new line of research inspired by social psychological approaches to recognition shows that respect received from an outgroup source encourages a process of re-categorization of the original ingroup and outgroup as members of a common superordinate group membership (Simon, Mommert, & Renger, 2015). That is, the respect for one's group membership does not simply validate that identity but can help forge perceptions of higher-order commonalities that are typically regarded as important for citizenship to become a practical reality.

Research could also usefully address the ways in which identities are performed to signal one's identifications and how such performances are choreographed in light of individuals' beliefs about how they are regarded. We know that minorities judged as 'alien' may seek to perform (and thus affirm) their membership of the national community (Cheryan & Monin, 2005; Hopkins & Greenwood, 2013). Indeed, with these thoughts in mind it follows that there may be much to gain through conceptualizing social identity in terms of an identity claims-making process in which people actively lay claim to group membership and invite others to recognize such claims (Hopkins, Reicher, & van Rijswijk, 2015). However, social psychology's sensitivity to the multiplicity of any one individual's identities means that we need to consider how the performance of any one identity (e.g., one's Muslim identity) may be shaped by the performance of other valued identities (e.g., one's Britishness: Hopkins & Greenwood, 2013) and how the misrecognition of any one identity can have implications for these other identities. For example, Hopkins (2011) found that for some British Muslims, others' denial of their Britishness in everyday encounters was not only hurtful because it questioned their national belonging but was doubly hurtful because it questioned their understanding of the religious identity as being able to accommodate itself to national particularities (such that one could be Muslim in a British way). Future research could explore such implications across a range of identities and audiences. For example, in some contexts the recognition of a particular identity may be of key importance and psychologically consequential for one's experience of the degree to which one feels valued, and this may be significant for the experience of a range of one's other identities. Moreover, the identity of the audience may be consequential in a variety of ways. If recognition from outgroup members can promote perceptions of a higher-order commonality (Simon et al., 2015), misrecognition, particularly when it comes from authority figures (such as the police) who are often regarded as prototypical representatives of the wider community, may have particular significance for minority group members in signalling who belongs and on what terms (Blackwood, Hopkins, & Reicher, 2013a, 2013b).

In addition to addressing the psychological significance of the recognition of one's identities, social psychological research highlights the practical consequences of misrecognition for individuals' everyday abilities to participate and exercise the rights associated with citizenship. Although one may identify with a community and wish to participate in that community's deliberations as to how it could and should be improved, such identity claims may receive only lukewarm acceptance or be rejected with clear implications for the degree to which one can be heard as a group member (Hopkins, Reicher, & van Rijswijk, 2015; Wakefield et al., 2011) or retreat from the interactions that constitute 'active' citizenship in the public sphere (Blackwood, Hopkins, & Reicher, 2015, this section). Yet, research needs to consider a fuller range of practical outcomes commensurate with the wide variety of behaviours associated with citizenship (e.g., those associated with organisational citizenship behaviours; Stevenson, Dixon, et al., 2015).

Needless to say, minorities do not only seek to win recognition for their various identities in everyday interpersonal encounters, they also seek to win a collective space in the public sphere through forms of collective action. This may take the form of mobilising one's fellow minority group members to participate in the public sphere as national

citizens through exercising the rights of citizenship (e.g. through voting). However, citizenship rights can also be claimed through other means. Thus, whereas some activists have encouraged the British Muslim community to assert their Muslim and British identities through voting, others have encouraged a boycott of voting arguing that this could illustrate the power of the community and enable the community to negotiate the public recognition of the Muslim community from a position of power (Hopkins & Kahani-Hopkins, 2004). It therefore follows that one cannot simply assume that not voting signals a lack of interest in citizenship and politics. On the contrary, the act of not voting may be understood as representing another strategy to social inclusion and future research addressing minority group activism should be attuned to these community members' own understandings of their behaviour and what it is designed to achieve. Moreover, future research could usefully look at majority group members' interpretation of minority group activism. Often this is misunderstood – most obviously, Muslim activism is often depicted as problematic (Dobbernack, Meer, & Modood, 2015), and regardless of its meaning for the activists (e.g., as confirming one's membership of the national community) it can be mis-construed as evidence of Muslims' ostensible 'alien' nature. How such reactions may impact upon those seeking engagement is unclear. However, such reactions are likely to feed arguments within the Muslim community that question political engagement (Finlay, 2014) and establish oppositional identifications.

The Place and Performance of Citizenship

Following on from the everyday nature of the performance and recognition of citizenship, the study of the locatedness of citizenship is a second broad area with potential to contribute to citizenship studies. Elsewhere in social psychology, the 'spatial turn' has emphasised the locatedness of social psychological processes (Hopkins & Dixon, 2006) and in particular the close relationship between place and identity in the assertion of group rights as well as the negotiation of coexistence within divided communities (Abell, Condor, & Stevenson, 2006; Dixon, Levine, & McAuley, 2006; Durrheim & Dixon, 2005; Gray & Manning, 2014; Hopkins, Reicher, & Harrison, 2006). By grounding citizenship within the experiences and practices of everyday life, the papers in the present thematic section build upon this work to both implicitly and explicitly invoke a spatial dimension to citizenship. From this perspective, social psychology aligns with the broader movement within citizenship studies to consider citizenship as the informal embodied and material performances of everyday civic life (Isin, 2002; Isin & Nielsen, 2008). Indeed, social psychology is conceptually and methodologically well-placed to understand the nature of these performances from the perspective of the participants and their audiences.

The physicality of citizenship as engrained in the practices of everyday life is highlighted in this thematic section by both Di Masso (2015, this section) and Blackwood and colleagues (2015, this section) in their elucidation of how participants understand their rights as located and enacted within public space. For Di Masso's participants, access and control of space is inherently political and bound up with contested understandings of who can claim to belong to the area. For residents in particular, the identity of the community is politically expressed through control of their locale. As Di Masso points out, this reflects the mutually constitutive nature of the relationship between citizenship and public space, especially within urban environments (see also Gray & Manning, 2014). In a very different context, Blackwood et al. (2015, this section) illustrate that the scrutiny of identity in a public space becomes a site of struggle for the right to display citizenship status and have this status recognised and accepted. The secure, state-controlled space of the airport is both a place for the enforcement of citizenship legislation and the location of the symbolic display and recognition of identity. For Muslims though, it becomes a place of heightened self-consciousness and anxiety as their identity is routinely and publically queried.

Taken together, these two papers reveal a tension lying at the very heart of the concept of 'public space' (cf. [Dixon et al., 2006](#)). On the one hand, it is a space not only of but also *for* enactment of everyday citizenship, as expressed both through small acts of political resistance and identity performance as well as through the larger scale events of collective protest. On the other hand, it is a space of social control and exclusion, where some political ideals, values and identities are given prominence at the expense of others. As [Mitchell \(1995\)](#) notes, public space involves: ". . . competing ideas about what constitutes that space - social control or free, and perhaps dangerous, interaction—and about who constitutes "the public" (p. 115).

Other papers in this thematic section invoke space in a less direct, but no less significant way. [Gibson \(2015, this section\)](#) points to the grounding of lay theories of citizenship in territorial units other than the nation: the young people in his sample use a sense of belonging to their local area to rhetorically deny rights and entitlements to outsiders. This shows constructions of space and place may provide the 'grounds of identity' ([Dixon & Durrheim, 2000](#)), discursively locating and warranting a particular set of person-place relations. Likewise, [Antonini, Hogg, Mannetti, Barbieri, and Wagoner \(2015, this section\)](#) point to the geographical contexts of citizenship, drawing on data from two different regions of the United States and Italy to argue that citizens' identities in these areas are demonstrably territorially bound. More implicitly, those papers that report studies located within schools ([Gibson, 2015, this section](#); [Roebroek & Guimond, 2015, this section](#)) investigate a particular physical context and one that is instrumental in the dissemination, rehearsal and enactment of official and unofficial understandings of citizenship. Though understandings of how institutions, and specifically the institutions of the state, shape psychological processes have been slow to filter into social psychology, this focus on the school (as with the airport above) is a useful starting point in considering the different sites in which individuals and groups encounter the state and how these encounters serve to shape experiences and understandings of citizenship.

These approaches have either analysed the spatial dimensions of talk about citizenship or quantitatively captured understandings of citizenship within significant spatial locations. The next step for this tradition is to venture beyond textual or survey analyses to capture the actual experiences and actions of citizens in their situated identity expressions and struggles. Talking about place or space is not the same as inhabiting space, traversing space or performing identity within space (see also [Di Masso & Dixon, 2015](#)). Moreover, processes of civic inclusion and exclusion are enacted not merely through talk and behaviour, but also through the material design and architecture of urban life. This idea is dramatically illustrated by the material geography of historically divided cities in societies such as South Africa ([Christopher, 1994](#)) and the US ([Massey & Denton, 1993](#)). It is illustrated less dramatically via host of urban design features that serve to marginalize certain groups (e.g.). Studying how such features are implemented, understood and resisted requires a further set of concepts, methods and analytic tools that are not widely employed by social psychologists.

One area in which this has been accomplished is in the study of crowd behaviour, where ethnographic approaches have captured how co-present crowd members embody, represent and transform the identity of the group (e.g., [Drury & Reicher, 2005](#); [Reicher, 1984, 1996](#)). Extensive use and development of ethnographic methods, including the integration of multimedia data as well as long-term participant observation, provides a range of tools and conceptual approaches to enable the systematic analysis of situated collective action ([Drury & Stott, 2001](#)). However, in that literature the physical environment is considered either as providing the physical backdrop to crowd events or as a symbolic landscape within which the actors operate. On occasion, the ethnographic accounts of events involve a detailed account of the places where major elements of the events occur and comments about how the physical environment constrains or facilitates group behaviour. Alternatively, the geographical features

involved in the events, such as the boundaries of the local community (Reicher, 1984), the parliament buildings at Westminster (Reicher, 1996), or the trees defended by ecological protestors (Drury & Reicher, 2005), are considered in terms of their symbolic significance for the group members themselves.

Absent from this literature on crowds is an examination of how the collective understanding of public spaces themselves becomes constitutive of collective thought and action. A fully spatialized analysis of political action in public space could take cognisance of the role of coordinated movement and situated performance in the display of identity; the changing spatial relations between groups in conflict (and in solidarity) in public space; and how the physical and psychological boundaries demarcating public space operate to regulate or facilitate different forms of behaviour. To be sure, these approaches and topics are familiar within other social scientific approaches to urban life, but the social psychology of citizenship can bring to bear both the understanding of the identity processes underpinning public acts of citizenship and the transformative potential of collective behaviour upon broader societal relations.

Conversely, crowd psychology is also well placed to consider how place and space shape the affirmation and reproduction of social relations through the routinization and ritualization of crowd behaviour. Arguably commemorative, celebratory and triumphalist crowd behaviour can play a conservative role in the reproduction of social structure, but only if it is performed 'in place' and 'in time' (Connerton, 1989; Jarman, 1997; Morrison, 2008). In contrast, political protest, carnival and new forms of collective action such as flashmobs lend themselves towards 'acts of citizenship' (Isin & Nielsen, 2008; Saunders, 2008), but only if they are contesting space and disrupting routines. The understanding of the significance of specific forms of crowd within particular civic spaces can shed light on how group inequality is sustained as well as transformed through public collective expression.

Furthermore, an additional challenge is to investigate how space can be reconstructed as shared and inclusive so as to facilitate political expression as well as positive and constructive co-existence between the different groups that make up an urban environment city (Durrheim & Dixon, 2013; Graham & Nash, 2006). While research elsewhere in the social sciences has investigated the negative impact of the overt territorialisation of residential areas as well as the effects of attempts to neutralise public space, less attention has been paid to the active design and development of shared space as accommodating, facilitating and encouraging inclusion (but see Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2015). Changing public space requires changing subjective perceptions of the ownership and rights of access to space as well as what behaviour is normatively appropriate there. Accordingly, a social psychology of citizenship is well positioned to examine processes of consensualisation as well as conflict over public space.

Theories of Citizenship and Coexistence in Everyday Life

If one challenge for the study of citizenship in everyday life is to examine the locatedness and spatiality of identity performance and contest, then another is to examine how difference and diversity are accommodated within the public sphere. At the broadest level, the merits of different normative theories of multiculturalism have been debated extensively across the social sciences (Kymlicka, 1995; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; see also Joppke, 2002). Moreover, as Favell (1998) points out, each society has been found to have an established and institutionalised 'philosophy of integration' through which official understandings of citizenship act to shape the boundaries of the citizenry and their interactions with incomers and sub-national minority groups. For example, the recently introduced British Citizenship Test implies and conveys particular visions of citizenship "as a collectively defined identity, as a superordinate and nationally located identity, and as both a cognitive and a practical accomplishment" (Gray & Griffin, 2014, p. 310). These formal philosophies are also accompanied by lay theories of citizenship among the

population, whereby new or potential citizens are evaluated in terms of their cultural similarity, civility or willingness to abide by local law and custom (Andreouli & Howarth, 2013; Gibson & Hamilton, 2011). In other words, at the point of entry into the citizenry, acceptance and integration of incomers are informed by multiple theories of citizenship and coexistence.

The examination of formal and lay theories of citizenship, as well as the tension between them, has much potential application beyond issues of immigration. In terms of coexistence of ethnic groups, Verkuyten (2005) has illustrated that arguments supporting multiculturalism have specific patterns of content, with support for pluralism being focused on the benefits for both majority and minority groups, including an enhancement of their citizenship through self-improvement, equality and increased tolerance and understanding. In contrast, arguments against multiculturalism focus on the threats posed to society by minorities: instability, insecurity and disunity as well as the explicit depiction of minorities as lacking necessary citizenship attributes for integration, such as tolerance. In terms of economic differences, McNamara and colleagues (McNamara, Muldoon, Stevenson, & Slattery, 2011; Stevenson, McNamara, & Muldoon, 2014) illustrated that residents of deprived communities were rated as poorer citizens in terms of their levels of 'responsibility' and 'caring for others' and experienced discrimination on this basis. Similarly, political and lay constructions of citizenship that are based upon 'effort' and 'deservingness' can serve to marginalise and exclude welfare recipients and the unemployed from local communities and services (Gibson, 2009; McNamara, Stevenson, & Muldoon, 2013; Stevenson et al., 2014). Likewise, Barnes and colleagues showed how lay constructions of citizenship based on belonging and place identity were used to petition local council authorities to formally exclude new travellers as well as to deny them their social rights (Barnes, Auburn, & Lea, 2004). However less attention has been paid to the ways in which lay theories of citizenship affect actual intergroup encounters (Durrheim & Dixon, 2013) and how they could potentially be used to accommodate difference and foster positive co-existence.

A first potential approach to examining theories of citizenship shape coexistence in everyday life is to consider how the understandings of one's right to express an identity can lead either to harmonious coexistence or to conflict in real world contexts. In essence, those whose self-definitions of citizenship involve strong forms of identity maintenance and display will not live comfortably beside those who believe that coexistence is best facilitated by the display of political neutrality or a single common identity. Taking the example of St Patrick's Day in Dublin, Joyce and colleagues (Joyce, Stevenson, & Muldoon, 2013) showed that Irish Travellers were keen to assert their rights as members of the national category through overt and explicit public displays of their Irishness. However such enactments of Irishness were considered to be inauthentic by a comparable sample of Irish students, who characterised excessive displays of Irishness as indicating outgroup membership. Similarly, Pehrson and colleagues (Pehrson, Stevenson, Muldoon, & Reicher, 2014) interviewed people taking part in the St Patrick's Day parade in the same location, showing that how identity was displayed during the parade affected the experience of groups in different ways. For white Irish participants and the parade organisers, the event entailed the display and enactment of a relatively homogenous Irish identity. However, ethnic minority group members taking part felt that the event should display the diversity of identities within Irish society and were disappointed and disheartened when it did not. As these studies show, lay theories of citizenship can vary across contexts as well as groups and that this divergence of theories can contribute to experiences of marginalisation and exclusion among minorities. Future research in this vein could explore how greater understanding of the diversity of identity displays as well as event-management policy can encourage greater inclusivity in similar public events.

This first approach depends heavily on the self-reflection of citizens upon their own understandings of citizenship rather than an examination of their practices in everyday life. A second approach to the understanding of coexistence

would be to study how theories of citizenship are also ingrained in the routines and encounters of daily life (see [Durrheim & Dixon, 2005](#)). Taking as a starting point the mundane realities of everyday existence, few people spend much time thinking about or trying to improve relations with other groups. Most have other responsibilities, duties, worries and cares as well as relationships and recreations that make up their daily routines. Where they live, who they work with, who their friends are, where their children go to school and where they shop and spend their leisure time will structure their lives and (often incidentally and unintentionally) will affect the amount of contact they have with others. These mundane realities, rather than ideological convictions, will determine the extent and nature of their interactions with outgroup members ([Durrheim & Dixon, 2013](#)). At the same time, their lives are constrained and shaped by the official policies of rights and obligations which shape how different groups are treated and perceived as well as how they interact.

One example of this is the routine experiences group members have of encounters with the range of government agencies in their locales. Such mundane encounters are typically overlooked by social psychologists, but on a daily basis in all societies, members of different groups interact with government agencies in ways which shape both their understandings of the government and of their own groups ([Campbell & Jovchelovitch, 2000](#); [Tyler & Blader, 2003](#)). For those groups who occupy a dominant or privileged place within society, these encounters are often unnoticed as they simply involve an affirmation of their rights and entitlements. For those from deprived or stigmatised communities, these encounters often reflect the wide gap between their own group members and those in the outgroups of police, health or education workers who deliver their services. Additionally, the stigmatisation associated with poverty, unemployment or minority ethnic status can work to undermine these residents' sense of citizenship (e.g., [Renedo & Marston, 2011](#); [Stevenson et al., 2014](#)), especially where this stigma is reinforced by political rhetoric or by institutional practices. For vulnerable groups, service use encounters can therefore be experienced as sites of aversive intergroup encounters and the reproduction of marginalisation and alienation as well as disadvantage. Investigating the lived experience of routine encounters with government agencies is therefore fundamental to understanding and challenging exclusion at the intersection between official and lay theories of citizenship in everyday life.

A third approach is to examine how concerns and routines of everyday life can be actively harnessed and transformed in order to promote better coexistence. This is particularly relevant in divided societies with a history of intergroup conflict. Contact interventions in such societies that are based within local communities, and which tap into existing activities, prove more effective than those which take place outside of these communities ([Trew, 1986](#)). For example, one community relations initiative based on positive parenting allowed members of opposing communities to come together to share their common parenting experiences and acted to harness their parental investment in the future of the community for their children. This initiative worked because of the profound ways in which the rights and duties of parenting articulate with community citizenship ([Stevenson, O'Dwyer, & McNeill, 2015](#)). In other words, by understanding community-members' lay theories of citizenship and investigating how these are embedded in the realities of their everyday existence, contact interventions can improve lives as well as fostering better community relations.

However such initiatives typically occur against a background of formal policies of coexistence which may support or undermine local efforts. An example of this is the occurrence of socially-engineered residential mixing in divided societies. Residential integration is typically conceived of as a 'gateway' form of intergroup mixing as it opens up many other opportunities for contact ([Easterbrook & Vignoles, 2015](#)). It is often viewed as an indicator of good intergroup relations by governments, even when its occurrence demonstrably obscures forms of micro-segregation

at local level (e.g., Clack, Dixon, & Tredoux, 2005; Dixon, Tredoux, Durrheim, Finchilescu, & Clack, 2008; Durrheim & Dixon, 2005; McKeown, Cairns, Stringer, & Rae, 2012). However, while living in mixed areas generally predicts political moderation and more positive intergroup attitudes (e.g. Christ et al., 2014; Schmid, Hewstone, Hughes, Jenkins, & Cairns, 2009; Schmid, Tausch, Hewstone, Hughes, & Cairns, 2008; Schmid et al., 2010), poorly planned residential mixing can also result in resistance, negative contact, and intergroup conflict. Government policies promoting residential mixing therefore require an evidence base of research to understand where and under what conditions mixing leads to better relations. This necessitates an in-depth investigation of the lay theories of citizenship within local communities as well as the spatial and spatial organisation of daily social interaction so as to understand the impact of official policies of mixing on daily life.

Overall then, the study of theories of citizenship can be fruitfully extended from an examination of immigration and citizenship testing to examine the broader range of issues affecting co-existence in the public sphere. The local politics of identity display, mundane service-use encounters and the impact of social policies of integration upon local community life are all sites at which lay and formal theories of citizenship interact. By attending to citizens' understandings of their social worlds and how this relates to their social interactions, the social psychology of citizenship is well-placed to understand and to improve the lived experience of co-existence in everyday life.

Conclusion

In this article, we have attempted to use the understanding of the social psychology of citizenship – as developed in the opening contribution to the thematic section (Stevenson, Dixon, et al., 2015, this section) – to make a case for the relevance of our work to citizenship studies. Our review of a range of psychological approaches to citizenship in that article suggested that this area is best characterised by *the study of the constructive, active and collective (but often exclusive) understandings of citizenship in people's everyday lives*. In this article we have gone on to outline some recent trends within citizenship studies, which we believe afford a convergence with our approach and we make a case for the relevance of current social psychological research to this interdisciplinary arena.

Specifically, we have identified three broad inter-related areas of research to develop this engagement: the study of citizenship in relation to recognition; citizenship in public space; and citizenship and coexistence in everyday life. These areas draw upon long and established traditions of research within social psychology on identity, place and discourse respectively, but also enrich these traditions with more critical ideas from the social psychology of citizenship. Although these avenues of exploration represent a small fraction of potential future research within this area, they provide examples of how a distinctive and recognisable social psychological approach to citizenship could be articulated to a broader audience of colleagues in other disciplines.

In doing so, we have tried to show that social psychology in general has much to gain from this engagement. Indeed, our review of some early history of the psychology of citizenship in the introductory paper to this special thematic section revealed that much has been lost in our own discipline through a neglect of this topic: a consideration of the relationship between social psychological processes and the political structures and institutions of society; a will to enhance and improve the fabric of society through the active engagement of individuals and groups in social, economic and political life; an appreciation of how the moral and political concerns of social psychology reflect and enact those of the society in which it is conducted. These are considerations that the contemporary social psychology of citizenship is gradually recovering. However, the field of citizenship studies has moved beyond

these early modernist concerns and now also offers a rich pool of ideas and approaches which reconceptualise the place of the citizen within the historical, spatial, political and everyday contexts of the contemporary world. For social psychologists, this affords an opportunity to disrupt the routines of our disciplinary thought and to reimagine citizenship across disciplinary frontiers.

Funding

The idea for this thematic section was developed in a Research Seminar Series funded by the British Psychological Society entitled "The Social Psychology of Citizenship". The authors would like to express their gratitude to the BPS Research Committee for their support.

Competing Interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Acknowledgments

The authors have no support to report.

References

- Abell, J., Condor, S., & Stevenson, C. (2006). "We are an island": Geographical imagery in accounts of citizenship, civil society, and national identity in Scotland and in England. *Political Psychology*, 27(2), 207-226. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00003.x
- Andreouli, E., & Howarth, C. (2013). National identity, citizenship and immigration: Putting identity in context. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 43(3), 361-382. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.2012.00501.x
- Antonini, M., Hogg, M. A., Mannetti, L., Barbieri, B., & Wagoner, J. A. (2015). Motivating citizens to participate in public policymaking: Identification, trust and cost-benefit analyses. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3, 131-147. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.408
- Barnes, R., Auburn, T., & Lea, S. (2004). Citizenship in practice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(2), 187-206. doi:10.1348/0144666041501705
- Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of culture difference*. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. D. (2013a). I know who I am, but who do they think I am? Muslim perspectives on encounters with airport authorities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36, 1090-1108. doi:10.1080/01419870.2011.645845
- Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. D. (2013b). Turning the analytic gaze on "us": The role of authorities in the alienation of minorities. *European Psychologist*, 18, 245-252. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000151
- Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. D. (2015). 'Flying while Muslim': Citizenship and misrecognition in the airport. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3, 148-170. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.375
- Borgida, E., Federico, C. M., & Sullivan, J. L. (Eds.). (2009). *The political psychology of democratic citizenship*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Bowen, J. R. (2007). *Why the French don't like headscarves: Islam, the state and public space*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press.

- Campbell, C., & Jovchelovitch, S. (2000). Health, community and development: Towards a social psychology of participation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 10*(4), 255-270. doi:10.1002/1099-1298(200007/08)10:4<255::AID-CASP582>3.0.CO;2-M
- Castles, S., & Davidson, D. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. London, United Kingdom: Palgrave.
- Chen, S., Chen, K. Y., & Shaw, L. (2004). Self-verification motives at the collective level of self-definition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 77-94. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.1.77
- Cheryan, S., & Monin, B. (2005). 'Where are you really from?': Asian Americans and identity denial. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*, 717-730. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.89.5.717
- Christ, O., Schmid, K., Lollot, S., Swart, H., Stolle, D., Tausch, N., . . . Hewstone, M. (2014). Contextual effect of positive intergroup contact on outgroup prejudice. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111*(11), 3996-4000. doi:10.1073/pnas.1320901111
- Christopher, A. J. (1994). *The atlas of apartheid*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Clack, B., Dixon, J., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Eating together apart: Patterns of segregation in a multi-ethnic cafeteria. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 15*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1002/casp.787
- Condor, S. (2011). Towards a social psychology of citizenship? Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*(3), 193-201. doi:10.1002/casp.1089
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- de Tocqueville, A. (2000). *Democracy in America*. Chicago, IL, USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Di Masso, A. (2015). Micropolitics of public space: On the contested limits of citizenship as a locational practice. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*, 63-83. doi:10.5964/jsp.v3i2.322
- Di Masso, A., & Dixon, J. (2015). More than words: Place, discourse and the struggle over public space in Barcelona. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 12*, 45-60. doi:10.1080/14780887.2014.958387
- Dixon, J., & Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(1), 27-44. doi:10.1348/014466600164318
- Dixon, J., Levine, M., & McAuley, R. (2006). Locating impropriety: Street drinking, moral order, and the ideological dilemma of public space. *Political Psychology, 27*(2), 187-206. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00002.x
- Dixon, J., Tredoux, C., Durrheim, K., Finchilescu, G., & Clack, B. (2008). 'The inner citadels of the color line': Mapping the micro-ecology of racial segregation in everyday life spaces. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 1547-1569. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00123.x
- Dobbernack, J., Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2015). Misrecognition and political agency: The case of Muslim organisation in a General Election. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 17*, 189-206. doi:10.1111/1467-856X.12033
- Drury, J., & Reicher, S. D. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: A comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*(1), 35-58. doi:10.1002/ejsp.231
- Drury, J., & Stott, C. (2001). Bias as a research strategy in participant observation: The case of intergroup conflict. *Field Methods, 13*(1), 47-67. doi:10.1177/1525822X0101300103

- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2005). Studying talk and embodied practices: Toward a psychology of materiality of 'race relations'. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 15*(6), 446-460. doi:10.1002/casp.839
- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2013). *Racial encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Easterbrook, M. J., & Vignoles, V. L. (2015). When friendship formation goes down the toilet: Design features of shared accommodation influence interpersonal bonds and well-being. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 54*(1), 125-139. doi:10.1111/bjso.12062
- Edmunds, J. (2012). The limits of post-national citizenship: European Muslims, human rights and the hijab. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 35*, 1181-1199. doi:10.1080/01419870.2011.593640
- Favell, A. (1998). *Philosophies of integration: Immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain*. Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Macmillan/Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.
- Finlay, W. M. L. (2014). Denunciation and the construction of norms in group conflict: Examples from an Al-Qaeda-supporting group. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*, 691-710. doi:10.1111/bjso.12052
- Gibson, S. (2009). The effortful citizen: Discursive social psychology and welfare reform. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19*(6), 393-410. doi:10.1002/casp.1003
- Gibson, S. (2015). Constructions of 'the Polish' in northern England: Findings from a qualitative interview study. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*, 43-62. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.414
- Gibson, S., & Hamilton, L. (2011). The rhetorical construction of polity membership: Identity, culture and citizenship in young people's discussions of immigration in northern England. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*(3), 228-242. doi:10.1002/casp.1087
- Goffman, E. (1969). *Strategic interaction*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Graham, B., & Nash, C. (2006). A shared future: Territoriality, pluralism and public policy in Northern Ireland. *Political Geography, 25*(3), 253-278. doi:10.1016/j.polgeo.2005.12.006
- Gray, D., & Griffin, C. (2014). A journey to citizenship: Constructions of citizenship and identity in the British Citizenship Test. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*(2), 299-314. doi:10.1111/bjso.12042
- Gray, D., & Manning, R. (2014). "Oh my god, we're not doing nothing": Young people's experiences of spatial regulation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*(4), 640-655. doi:10.1111/bjso.12055
- Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. *Political Psychology, 25*(3), 413-439. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00378.x
- Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press.
- Hopkins, N. (2011). Dual identities and their recognition: Minority group members' perspectives. *Political Psychology, 32*, 251-270. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00804.x
- Hopkins, N., & Dixon, J. (2006). Space, place, and identity: Issues for political psychology. *Political Psychology, 27*(2), 173-185. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00001.x
- Hopkins, N., & Greenwood, R. M. (2013). Hijab, visibility and the performance of identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(5), 438-447. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1955
- Hopkins, N., & Kahani-Hopkins, V. (2004). Identity construction and political activity: Beyond rational actor theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 339-356. doi:10.1348/0144666042037935

- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. D., & Harrison, K. (2006). Young people's deliberations on geographic mobility: Identity and cross-border relocation. *Political Psychology, 27*, 227-245. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00004.x
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. D., & Kahani-Hopkins, V. (2003). Citizenship, participation and identity construction: Political mobilization amongst British Muslims. *Psychologica Belgica, 43*, 33-54.
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. D., Khan, S. S., Tewari, S., Srinivasan, N., & Stevenson, C. (2015). Explaining effervescence: Investigating the relationship between shared social identity and positive experience in crowds. *Cognition and Emotion*; Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/02699931.2015.1015969
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. D., & van Rijswijk, W. (2015). Everyday citizenship: Identity claims and their reception. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*, 84-106. doi:10.5964/jpspp.v3i2.380
- Isin, E. F. (2002). City, democracy and citizenship: Historical images, contemporary practices. In E. Isin & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 305-316). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Isin, E. F. (Ed.) (2008). *Recasting the social in citizenship*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Isin, E. F., Brodie, J., Juteau, J., & Stasiulis, D. (2008). Recasting the social in citizenship. In E. Isin (Ed.), *Recasting the social in citizenship* (pp. 1-19). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Isin, E. F., & Nielsen, G. M. (2008). Introduction: Acts of citizenship. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 1-14). London, United Kingdom: Zed Books.
- Isin, E. F., & Turner, B. S. (2002). Citizenship studies: An introduction. In E. Isin & B. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 1-10). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Jarman, N. (1997). *Material conflicts: Parades and visual displays in Northern Ireland*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Berg Publishers.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Joppke, C. (2002). Multicultural citizenship. In E. Isin & B. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of citizenship studies* (pp. 245-258). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Joyce, C., Stevenson, C., & Muldoon, O. (2013). Claiming and displaying national identity: Irish Travellers' and students' strategic use of 'banal' and 'hot' national identity in talk. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 52*(3), 450-468. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2012.02097.x
- Khan, S. S., Hopkins, N., Reicher, S. D., Tewari, S., Srinivasan, N., & Stevenson, C. (in press). Collective participation impacts social identification and behaviour: A longitudinal study of participation in a large-scale Hindu religious event. *Political Psychology*.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics, 104*, 352-381. doi:10.1086/293605
- Lewis, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Citizenship: Personal lives and social policy*. Bristol, United Kingdom: The Policy Press.
- Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. New York, NY, USA: New York University Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Martinovic, B., & Verkuyten, M. (2014). The political downside of dual identity: Group identifications and religious political mobilization of Muslim minorities. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*, 711-730. doi:10.1111/bjso.12065

- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press.
- McKeown, S., Cairns, E., Stringer, M., & Rae, G. (2012). Micro-ecological behavior and intergroup contact. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 152*(3), 340-358. doi:10.1080/00224545.2011.614647
- McNamara, N., Stevenson, C., & Muldoon, O. T. (2013). Community identity as resource and context: A mixed method investigation of coping and collective action in a disadvantaged community. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(5), 393-403. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1953
- McNamara, N., Muldoon, O., Stevenson, C., & Slattery, E. (2011). Citizenship attributes as the basis for intergroup differentiation: Implicit and explicit intergroup evaluations. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*(3), 243-254. doi:10.1002/casp.1090
- Mitchell, D. (1995). The end of public space? People's park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 85*(1), 108-133.
- Modood, T. (1998). Anti-essentialism, multiculturalism and the 'recognition' of religious groups. *The Journal of Political Philosophy, 6*(4), 378-399. doi:10.1111/1467-9760.00060
- Modood, T. (2005). *Multicultural politics: Racism, ethnicity and Muslims in Britain*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: Edinburgh University Press.
- Morrison, I. (2008). Acts of commemoration. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 289-291). London, United Kingdom: Zed Books.
- Pancer, S. M. (2014). *The psychology of citizenship and civic engagement*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Pehrson, S., Stevenson, C., Muldoon, O. T., & Reicher, S. D. (2014). Is everyone Irish on St Patrick's Day? Divergent expectations and experiences of collective self-objectification at a multicultural parade. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*(2), 249-264. doi:10.1111/bjso.12029
- Reicher, S. D. (1984). The St. Pauls' riot: An explanation of the limits of crowd action in terms of a social identity model. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 14*(1), 1-21. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420140102
- Reicher, S. D. (1996). 'The battle of Westminster': Developing the social identity model of crowd behaviour in order to explain the initiation and development of collective conflict. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*(1), 115-134. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199601)26:1<115::AID-EJSP740>3.0.CO;2-Z
- Renedo, A., & Marston, C. (2011). Healthcare professionals' representations of 'patient and public involvement' and creation of 'public participant' identities: Implications for the development of inclusive and bottom-up community participation initiatives. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*(3), 268-280. doi:10.1002/casp.1092
- Roebroek, E., & Guimond, S. (2015). Schooling, citizen-making, and anti-immigrant prejudice in France. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 3*, 20-42. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.391
- Runnymede Trust. (1997). *Islamophobia: A challenge for us all*. London, United Kingdom: Runnymede Trust.
- Sanchez-Mazas, M., & Klein, O. (2003). Social identity and citizenship: Introduction to the special issue. *Psychologica Belgica, 43*(1-2), 1-8.
- Saunders, J. (2008). Flash mobs. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 295-296). London, United Kingdom: Zed Books.

- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Hughes, J., Jenkins, R., & Cairns, E. (2009). Residential segregation and intergroup contact: Consequences for intergroup relations, social capital and social identity. In M. Wetherell (Ed.), *Identity in the Twenty First Century* (pp. 177-197). London, United Kingdom: Palgrave.
- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Jenkins, R., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Identities, groups and communities: The case of Northern Ireland. In M. Wetherell & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of identities* (pp. 455-475). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Schmid, K., Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2008). The effects of living in segregated vs. mixed areas in Northern Ireland: A simultaneous analysis of contact and threat effects in the context of micro-level neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 2(1), 56-71.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. London, United Kingdom: Penguin.
- Simon, B., Mommert, A., & Renger, D. (2015). Reaching across group boundaries: Respect from outgroup members facilitates recategorization as a common group. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1111/bjso.12112
- Simon, B., & Ruhs, D. (2008). Identity and politicization among Turkish migrants in Germany: The role of dual identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(6), 1354-1366. doi:10.1037/a0012630
- Smeeke, A., Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2015). Longing for the country's good old days: National nostalgia, autochthony beliefs, and opposition to Muslim expressive rights. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54(3), 561-580. doi:10.1111/bjso.12097
- Stevenson, C., Dixon, J., Hopkins, N., & Luyt, R. (2015). The social psychology of citizenship, participation and social exclusion: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3, 1-19. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.579
- Stevenson, C., McNamara, N., & Muldoon, O. (2014). Stigmatised identity and service usage in disadvantaged communities: Residents', community workers' and service providers' perspectives. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 24(6), 453-466. doi:10.1002/casp.2184
- Stevenson, C., O'Dwyer, E., & McNeill, A. (2015). *Applying the 'social cure' to intergroup contact: Intragroup identity processes and intergroup contact in a parenting reconciliation initiative in Northern Ireland*. Manuscript under review.
- Swann, W. B. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1038-1051. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1038
- Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Guttman (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25-74). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Trew, K. (1986). Catholic-Protestant contact in Northern Ireland. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 93-106). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Turner, B. (2001). Outline of a general theory of cultural citizenship. In N. Stevenson (Ed.), *Culture and citizenship* (pp. 11-32). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2003). The group engagement model: Procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 349-361. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_07
- van Rijswijk, W., Hopkins, N., & Johnston, H. (2009). The role of social categorization and identity threat in the perception of migrants. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 515-520. doi:10.1002/casp.1011

- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: A discursive and experimental study. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 223-240. doi:10.1348/014466604X23482
- Verkuyten, M. (2013). Justifying discrimination against Muslim immigrants: Out-group ideology and the five-step social identity model. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 52*, 345-360. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02081.x
- Wakefield, J. R. H., Hopkins, N., Cockburn, C., Shek, K. M., Muirhead, A., Reicher, S. D., & van Rijswijk, W. (2011). The impact of adopting ethnic or civic conceptions of national belonging for others' treatment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 1599-1610. doi:10.1177/0146167211416131