Chapter I
Social Psychological Debates about Identity

Rusi Jaspal
De Montfort University

We live in an ever-changing social world, which constantly calls forth changes to our identities and actions. Advances in science, technology and medicine, political upheaval, and economic development are just some examples of social change that can impact upon how we live our lives, how we view ourselves and each other, and how we communicate. Social change can result in the salience and visibility of particular social categories, changes in the assimilation, accommodation and evaluation of these categories, and new patterns of action. Similarly, individual psychological change – getting a new job, being diagnosed with a life-changing illness, growing old - can dramatically affect our sense of self, potentially forcing us to re-think who we are, our relationships with others and how we ought to behave in particular contexts. What social change and psychological change have in common is their power to radically affect our identities and actions.

This volume is about identity, change and action. The contributors to this volume address this tripartite relationship in diverse and complex social psychological contexts. The chapters endeavor to explore the antecedents of changes in identity and action, and their developmental trajectory. It is easy to see why the important task of examining the tripartite relationship between identity, change and action has generally been neglected by social psychologists. Core debates in the field have focused on questions about the "correct" unit of analysis (psychological or sociological); competition between the quantitative and qualitative paradigms; and epistemology. These divides have, to a large extent, impeded theoretical integration. Identity Process Theory sits within this matrix of debate because of its integrative focus on the intrapsychic, interpersonal and intergroup levels, its methodological diversity and epistemological eclecticism. The theory constitutes a valuable explanatory tool for addressing pressing social psychological problems of the 21st century, and aspires to acquire predictive power as it is refined and developed in empirical work. We decided to edit this volume amid a growing body of diverse empirical research based on the theory since the early 1980s. It has been used by social psychologists in particular but has broader appeal in the social sciences and among practitioners. Thus, Identity Process Theory has an important role to play in shaping the social psychology of identity, change and action.

As evidenced by the chapters in this volume, Identity Process Theory research has addressed a wide range of pressing real-world issues – national identity, post-conflict societies, sexual behavior, risk, place and environment, and prejudice. Furthermore, unlike many Western social psychological theories, Identity Process Theory has been used as a heuristic tool in diverse geographical and cultural settings – the UK, Spain, Canada, India, Israel, and others. Yet, the diversity that characterizes the theory can also make it difficult to delineate conceptually. This volume provides a summary of the development of Identity Process Theory and contextualizes the theory in the social psychology of identity, change and action.

IDENTITY PROCESS THEORY

Identity Process Theory (Breakwell, 1986, 1988, 1992, 1993, 2001; Vignoles, Chryssochoou & Breakwell, 2002a, 2002b) proposes that the structure of self-identity

should be conceptualised in terms of its content and value/affect dimensions and that this structure is regulated by two universal processes, namely *assimilation–accommodation* and *evaluation*. The assimilation–accommodation process refers to the absorption of new information in the identity structure (e.g. coming out as gay) and the adjustment which takes place in order for it to become part of the structure (e.g. self-definition as gay and downplaying one's religion). The evaluation process confers meaning and value on the contents of identity (e.g. viewing one's sexual identity as a positive thing but one's religious identity negatively).

Breakwell (1986, 1992, 2001) originally identified four identity principles which guide these universal processes: (i) continuity across time and situation (*continuity*); (ii) uniqueness or distinctiveness from others (*distinctiveness*); (iii) feeling confident and in control of one's life (*self-efficacy*); and (iv) feelings of personal worth (*self-esteem*). There has been some debate about the number of identity principles - some Identity Process Theory researchers have suggested additional principles although they have not met with universal approval (Breakwell, this volume; Vignoles, 2011). For instance, Vignoles, Chryssochoou and Breakwell (2002) proposed two additional identity "motives," namely *belonging*, which refers to the need to maintain feelings of closeness to and acceptance by other people, and *meaning*, which refers to the need to find significance and purpose in one's life. More recently, Jaspal and Cinnirella (2010) proposed the psychological coherence principle, which refers to the motivation to establish feelings of compatibility between their (interconnected) identities.

A core prediction of Identity Process Theory is that if the universal processes cannot comply with the motivational principles of identity, for whatever reason, identity is threatened and the individual will engage in strategies for coping with the threat. A coping strategy is defined as "any activity, in thought or deed, which has as its goal the removal or modification of a threat to identity" (Breakwell, 1986, p. 78). Coping strategies can function at three levels: intrapsychic (e.g. denial, re-conceptualization), interpersonal (e.g. isolation), or intergroup (e.g. social mobilisation). Some forms of threat may induce coping at multiple levels in order to optimise identity processes (Jaspal & Sitaridou, 2013).

Identity Process Theory provides a holistic model of (i) the structure of identity, namely its content and value dimensions, and the centrality and salience of identity components; (ii) the interaction of social and psychological factors in the production of identity content; (iii) the inter-relations between identity and action. A key assumption of the theory is that, in order to understand the processes that drive identity construction, it is necessary to examine how individuals react when identity is threatened (Breakwell, 2010).

According to the theory, identity is the product of social and psychological processes. Breakwell (1986, 2001, 2004, 2010) has repeatedly acknowledged the role of social representations in determining the content of identity and the value of its components. Social representations determine how individuals assimilate, accommodate and evaluate identity components, what is threatening for identity and how individuals subsequently cope with threat. In formally allying Identity Process Theory with Social Representations Theory, Breakwell (1993, 2001, this volume) sought to provide greater insight into the *social* contexts in which individual identities are constructed and the social resources (images, notions, language) employed by individuals in constructing their identities. Crucially, the theory recognises that individuals have agency in the construction and management of identity. In interaction with relevant social contexts, individuals construct systems of meaning for

making sense of their lives, experiences and identities. To this extent, IPT can be described as a *social constructivist* model of identity processes (see von Glasersfeld, 1982).

DEBATES IN THE SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF IDENTITY

In order to understand the contribution of Identity Process Theory to the social psychology of identity, it is necessary to contextualize the theory historically. In many respects, the theory was ahead of its time – ambitiously seeking to articulate the intersections between the intrapsychic, interpersonal and societal levels of analysis, and to provide a holistic framework within which identity, change and action could be collectively examined. With the exception of Tajfel's (1978, 1982) Social Identity Theory, social psychology seemed to have become more concerned with piece-meal theorizing, than with presenting integrative, holistic theoretical frameworks incorporating multiple layers of analysis. When Breakwell (1983, 1986, 1988) first began to articulate what subsequently became known as Identity Process Theory, there were already a number of social psychological models of identity. Yet, none seemed able to explain the micro and macro processes underlying the construction of identity, that is, the total identity of the individual. While it is necessary to be explicitly selective in discussing social psychological approaches to identity, some dominant approaches can be identified. In thinking about how these approaches relate to one another, a number of "divides" surface – US versus European; psychological social psychology versus sociological social psychology; realism versus social constructionism; qualitative versus quantitative.

Psychological Social Psychology

In general, US social psychological approaches to identity have consistently focused upon the individual level of cognition, viewing the individual as the primary unit of analysis. These approaches are positioned in what is often referred to as "psychological social psychology." Within this paradigm, Hazel Markus (1977) developed the concept of the "self-schema," which she described as a cognitive representation of the self used to organize information regarding the self and to guide the cognitive processing of self-relevant information. The concept of self-schema provided a purely cognitive account of selfhood, suggesting that cognitive abilities such as memory drove the construction of identity. Quite unlike Identity Process Theory, the self-schema model did not view selfhood as an agentive process on the part of the individual (as a social being) but rather as a process driven and constrained primarily by cognitive functioning.

The development of Identity Process Theory coincided with the publication of Markus and Nurius' (1986) paper "Possible Selves" in the *American Psychologist*. *Prima facie*, this concept seemed to begin to address the social dimension of selfhood. However, the primary concern lay in integrating cognitive (i.e. self-schemas) and emotional (i.e. fear) elements of the self by examining individuals' perceptions of (1) what they might become, (2) what they would like to become, and (3) what they were afraid of becoming in the future. Crucially, these "possible selves" were regarded as noteworthy since they could motivate particular patterns of action. In their articulation of the concept of "possible selves," Markus and Nurius were now drawing attention to the agency of the current identity of the individual in shaping future identities. Moreover, the concept of possible selves initiated a debate on the link between identity and action (Oyserman & Markus, 1990; Riff, 1991). Yet, this line of research seemed to underestimate the importance of examining the social dimension of

selfhood – that is, how social structure, the ideological milieu and, most importantly, social change could actively shape and constrain cognitive functioning in relation to the self. Moreover, the concept of possible selves did not fully articulate the social circumstances in which particular "selves" might be desired, resisted or adopted. Conversely, these were all concerns which underlay the development of Identity Process Theory, and researchers who subsequently integrated the Possible Selves Concept and Identity Process Theory sought to address this very question (Vignoles, Manzi, Regalia, Jemmolo & Scabini, 2008; see also Breakwell, 1986)

   Identity Process Theory was clearly influenced by Bandura's (1977) Self-Efficacy Model. Bandura (1995, p. 2) defined self-efficacy as "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations." While dominant social psychological theories tended to view self-efficacy as a component of self-esteem, Bandura argued that they should be considered two distinct facets of the self. Breakwell (1986) initially drew on Bandura's ideas concerning self-efficacy in describing self-protection at the intrapsychic level, that is, how individuals cope with threats to identity. More specifically, it was argued that "the individual may engage in the exercise of self-efficacy" in order to regain appropriate levels of the identity principles (Breakwell, 1986, p. 102). Although Bandura's Self-Efficacy Model suggested that self-efficacy was central to cognition, affect and behavior, its role in relation to identity construction remained underexplored. On the basis of extensive research into identity among young adults (Breakwell, Fife-Schaw and Devereux, 1989; Fife-Schaw & Breakwell, 1990, 1991), self-efficacy was later incorporated into Identity Process Theory as a fourth principle of identity (Breakwell, 1992). This established greater linkage between identity and action partly by showing how the processes of identity could function to provide the individual with feelings of control and competence.

   Identity Process Theory and the Self-Efficacy Model overlap in some of their core assumptions. Bandura was one of the first social psychologists to stress that one's sense of self-efficacy was dependent on one's *perceived* success in a given situation, rather than on one's actual success. Crucially, self-efficacy beliefs were dependent upon both social *and* psychological factors. Bandura stressed that self-efficacy should by no means be viewed as a personality trait but rather as "a differentiated set of self-beliefs linked to distinct realms of functioning" (Bandura, 2006, p. 307). Therefore, in his writings, Bandura consistently called for context-specific research which examined the specific situations and contexts in which self-efficacy beliefs might acquire salience. This ethos was echoed in Identity Process Theory. Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory was concerned primarily with human agency in self-regulation – indeed, he argued that "[a]mong the mechanisms of agency, none is more central or pervasive than people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives" (Bandura, 1993, p. 118). Similarly, the self-agency of the individual in constructing and regulating identity has always been a core assumption in Identity Process Theory.

Sociological Social Psychology
The 1980s also marked significant developments in the more sociologically oriented branch of social psychology. Drawing extensively on the Symbolic Interactionist Framework, Sheldon Stryker (1980; Stryker & Serpe, 1982, 1994) developed Identity Theory within this paradigm. The theory essentially argued that identities arose from role positions, that an individual could have many roles/identities, that these were

arranged hierarchically in the self-concept and that they differed in salience. Unlike the mainstream approaches in US psychological social psychology, a key tenet of Stryker's Identity Theory was that social structure did indeed play an important role in dictating one's level of commitment to particular roles and, consequently, in rendering salient or latent particular identities in the self-concept. This partly laid the foundations for theory and research on the concept of "multiple identities," which was to become a buzzword in the social psychology of identity (Howard, 2000; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010; Roccas & Brewer, 2002). Furthermore, partly as a consequence of this debate, the *structure* of identity, which accommodated these identities, needed to be adequately theorized. In articulating the "black-box" of identity, Identity Process Theory was concerned partly with explaining the structure of identity – the value and content dimensions. Moreover, the model theorized the content of identity - its multiple elements, interactions between these elements and their relative salience and centrality (Breakwell, 1986).

Identity Theory and Identity Process Theory diverged in some of their assumptions regarding the social antecedents of identity development. While Identity Theory referred to "interactional possibilities," viewing symbolic interaction as the primary means of understanding identity development (Stryker & Burke, 2000), Identity Process Theory drew upon Moscovici's (1988, 2000) Social Representations Theory. The synthesis of these theories served to elucidate the *reciprocal* inter-relations between the social and the individual – how social representations impacted identity processes and how identity processes in turn shaped social representational processes. Indeed, Breakwell (this volume) argues that "individual identities are developed in the context of an abundance of social representations."

Since the mid-1970s, British social psychological theory and research on identity had come to be dominated by the Social Identity Approach, consisting initially of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1974, 1978, 1981) and subsequently of Self-Categorization Theory (Turner et al., 1987). Both theories have of course been elaborately discussed elsewhere (Brown, 2000; Hornsey, 2008; Reicher, Spears & Haslam, 2010). However, it is worth remembering and reiterating that Tajfel's Social Identity Theory was concerned primarily with explaining intergroup relations, and therefore focused on that part of "an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1978, p. 63). Tajfel never attempted to address individual identity in Social Identity Theory (Breakwell, this volume). Conversely, Identity Process Theory was designed to examine the "blackbox" of the total identity of the individual, that is, "the social, cognitive, conative and oretic processes that comprised identity" (Breakwell, 2010, p. 2). Although Identity Process Theory was, to some extent, inspired by the Social Identity Approach which argued that individuals sought self-esteem from their group memberships (Breakwell, 1978, 1979), it set out to explain and predict a distinct set of psychological phenomena.

Following Tajfel's death in 1982, John Turner and his colleagues (1987) developed Self-Categorization Theory, which was intended to complement, rather than replace or merge with, Social Identity Theory. Self-Categorization Theory set out to elaborate Social Identity Theory partly by addressing issues pertinent to individual identity, in addition to the intergroup level of human interdependence. The theory explicitly acknowledged the various levels of self-categorization: individual, group and superordinate/human. It proposed that these distinct levels of self-categorization could all shape intergroup behavior – thus, the focus of the theory remained on the

intergroup level of analysis. Conversely, Identity Process Theory deliberately abandoned the distinction between personal and social identity, because "seen across the biography, social identity is seen to become personal identity: the dichotomy is purely a temporal artefact" (Breakwell, 2001, p. 277). In Identity Process Theory, identity elements include traits, experiences, and group memberships, all of which comprise the hierarchical structure of identity. This is not to suggest that Identity Process Theory cannot be used to shed light on intergroup issues – in fact, the theory has been used for this very purpose (Breakwell, 2004; Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2012; Jaspal & Yampolsky, 2011; Lyons, 1996; Oren & Bar-Tal, this volume). Despite the duality of both the Social Identity Approach and Identity Process Theory, both seeking to address the individual and social levels of analysis, their assumptions and foci are distinct – the models set out to explain quite different social psychological phenomena (Pehrson & Reicher, this volume).

Epistemological Debates in Identity Research
Coping with Threatened Identities was published in an era of emerging debates around epistemology. Growing dissatisfaction with positivist, empiricist and laboratory-based approaches to social psychology led some social psychologists to advocate an alternative epistemological approach, namely social constructionism. Kenneth Gergen was possibly the most important intellectual leader in this movement. In 1973, Gergen's ground-breaking article "Social Psychology as History" appeared in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. The article argued that, like all knowledge, psychological knowledge was culturally and historically specific and that psychological explanations therefore needed to incorporate the social, historical political and economic aspects of everyday life. In short, social constructionism problematized the "take-for-grantedness" of social psychological knowledge (Gergen, 2001). Gergen was one of a growing number of social psychologists who were concerned about the potential ideological and oppressive uses of social psychology and who believed that the discipline was implicitly promoting the agenda and values of dominant and powerful groups in society to the disadvantage of marginalized groups. In the UK context, Harré and Secord (1972) voiced similar concerns and emphasized the agency of individuals as "conscious social actors" rather than as passive subjects. Like Gergen, they viewed language as a social resource for constructing particular versions of the world, events and other phenomena and, thus, as central to understanding human agency.

With the publication of *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour* by Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell in 1987, social constructionism re-emerged with a greater impact on British social psychology than ever before. Their critique of mainstream experimental and attitudinal research questioned the fundamental assumptions of "legitimate" psychological research and thereby initiated what is now referred to as the "turn to discourse" in British social psychology (Parker, 1989). Adopting a social constructionist epistemological position, some social psychologists began to refer to identity as a social discourse, itself constructed out of culturally available discourses (or linguistic resources), rather than as a socio-cognitive phenomenon (Burr, 2003; Coyle, 2007). Suddenly, politics and ideology, rather than cognition and psychological processes, became driving forces in identity construction, since they governed the production of discourses in any given culture. In short, it became necessary to look at socio-political contexts and ideological milieus of identity, rather than at the minds of individuals. Social constructionists dismissed personality traits as a meaningful way of conceptualizing

identity and rejected socio-cognitive approaches to examining identity construction. Rather, the new emphasis was on the social constructedness of identities (plural) in talk and text. Crucially, these identities were viewed as being "socially bestowed identities rather than essences of the person" (Burr, 2003, p. 106).

It is noteworthy that the "turn to discourse" engendered a deep suspicion of socio-cognitive approaches to identity. It was assumed by some social constructionists that "there is nothing beyond the text" (e.g. Edwards, Ashmore & Potter, 1995), and thus approaches that appeared to look "beyond the text" were often seen as misguided, fruitless attempts at understanding cognition. Identity Process Theory was itself developed in the era of the cognitive paradigm in social psychology and its partial focus on cognitive functioning, indicated by the theory's discussion of universal identity processes (i.e. assimilation-accommodation and evaluation) seemed to position it unequivocally within the cognitive psychological camp and outside of the social constructionist camp. However, as Coyle and Murtagh (this volume) show, branding Identity Process Theory a cognitive theory of identity constitutes an inaccurate simplification of the theory, which ignores its conceptual, methodological and epistemological breadth. Indeed, the allying of Identity Process Theory with Social Representations Theory meant that Identity Process Theory remained open to forms of social constructionism, albeit within a pluralist epistemological framework (Coyle, 2010; Jaspal & Coyle, 2010).

Methodological Diversity in Identity Research
Contemporary social psychology is characterised by a methodological divide, which arose largely as a result of the growing acceptance of qualitative research methods in the 1980s (Harré & Moghaddam, 2012). As Coyle (2007) reflects, social psychologists viewed quantitative research methods as the only legitimate means of deriving social psychological knowledge, whereas qualitative methods were not viewed as sufficiently "rigorous" or "scientific" and were frequently regarded as the domain of sociologists. This methodological divide has had widespread implications for the social psychological research community – with some quantitative researchers refusing to take qualitative work seriously, and some qualitative researchers defensively safeguarding a "pure" variant of their preferred methodological approach. This has been referred to as "methodolatry," that is "a slavish attachment and devotion to method" (Coyle, 2007, p. 26). This can have an analytically immobilising effect for the research product since the analyst is discouraged from engaging in any methodological innovation and creativity. In these cases, there is little attention to what should in fact be a priority for the analyst, namely the research question.

Conversely, Identity Process Theory research has defied this methodological divide. Breakwell (1983, 1986, 1993, 2001) repeatedly asserted that a multi-methodological research programme, comprising both quantitative and qualitative approaches, was necessary for understanding the complex processes that drive identity construction and development. Accordingly, Identity Process Theory researchers have employed a diverse range of quantitative methods, such as multi-level modelling (Vignoles, Chyssochoou & Breakwell, 2002a, 2002b), multiple regression (Jaspal, 2011; Murtagh, Gatersleben & Uzzell, this volume) and path analysis (Breakwell, Fife-Schaw & Clayden, 1991), as well as qualitative methods, such as interpretative phenomenological analysis (Timotijevic & Breakwell, 2000; Turner & Coyle, 2000; Vignoles, Chryssochoou & Breakwell, 2004), thematic analysis (Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2010, 2012) and even discourse analysis (Coyle, this volume). More recently, Identity Process Theory research has cut across

epistemological boundaries in pluralist research (Jaspal & Coyle, 2010). The contributions to this volume explicitly reiterate the need for methodologically and epistemologically pluralist approaches to the complex social psychological problems of today.

This concise overview of some of the dominant social psychological approaches to identity over the last three decades suggests that social psychology has become a somewhat fragmented discipline, fraught with disagreement and division. Yet, it is clear that, although many of the theoretical approaches described above have clearly made important contributions to understanding the social psychology of identity, both group and individual, they have said relatively little about the *processes* underlying the formation, development and maintenance of identity. In formulating the theoretical framework that subsequently became known as Identity Process Theory, Breakwell was attempting to understand these very processes – the "blackbox" of identity. Breakwell (2010) believed that one means of exploring the processes that drive identity construction, development and maintenance was to examine how individuals responded when identity was threatened. Moreover, in order to tap into complex social psychological processes concerning identity construction, threat and coping, it was always acknowledged that a diverse range of methodological approaches would be necessary. This volume provides a summary of the diverse research that has been conducted in this tradition over the last three decades.

IDENTITY, SOCIAL ACTION AND SOCIAL CHANGE
There is a diverse range of theoretical approaches on either side of the "divides" in social psychology. In addition to summarizing the development of Identity Process Theory research, this volume focuses on two debates that have dominated contemporary social psychological approaches to identity. The chapters in this volume suggest that these debates feed back into our understanding of the inter-relations between identity, social action and social change.

Firstly, this volume acknowledges the distinction between individual and group-level theories of identity, which are associated with the US and European traditions of social psychology, respectively. Given that Identity Process Theory explicitly seeks to integrate these levels of analysis, contributors to this volume ask whether such integration is at all necessary and, if so, discuss the heuristic, theoretical and empirical advantages of a multi-level analysis.

Secondly, social psychology has typically concerned itself with the treatment of pressing societal issues - understanding the social and psychological circumstances that led to unthinkable atrocities, such as the Holocaust; explaining why people lay down their lives in the name of nation or religion; and predicting behavior change in the contexts of environmental and health issues, to provide just three examples. In many cases, social psychologists have developed convincing theories to account for these problems. Accordingly, the contributors to this volume ask how Identity Process Theory can provide unique and distinctive explanations and, in some cases, predictions for social psychological problems that have commonly been examined from other theoretical perspectives. As a holistic, integrative theory, Identity Process Theory can open novel avenues that allow researchers to explain and potentially predict relevant beliefs, attitudes and behaviors, shedding new light on key social psychological concerns.

OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK

Over the last three decades, Identity Process Theory has been passionately debated by social psychologists. In part I of the volume, Glynis M. Breakwell reflects on some of the major debates in Identity Process Theory research, and clarifies and elaborates aspects of the theory.

Part II provides a detailed account of the various methodological approaches to Identity Process Theory research. Both chapters acknowledge the merits and limitations of quantitative and qualitative research methods. In chapter III, Adrian Coyle and Niamh Murtagh discuss qualitative methods in relation to Identity Process Theory and argue for a pluralist methodological and epistemological approach. In chapter IV, Vivian L. Vignoles reviews the plethora of quantitative approaches employed in identity research and reflects upon the implications for Identity Process Theory. His chapter discusses the utility of particular quantitative methods at distinct levels of Identity Process Theory, with a particular focus on the value of multi-level modeling.

Part III of the volume is entitled "Integrating Theoretical Frameworks." Contributors to this section of the volume examine linkage between Identity Process Theory and their own theoretical frameworks. In chapter V, Samuel Pehrson and Stephen Reicher provide a Social Identity Approach perspective on Identity Process Theory, arguing in favor of a distinction between personal and social identity. In chapter VI, Glynis M. Breakwell elaborates the inter-relations between Identity Process Theory and Social Representations Theory. In her chapter on identity processes in culturally diverse societies, Xenia Chryssochoou bridges Identity Process Theory and models of acculturation, focusing upon how acculturation can be "customized" at a micro-individual level. In chapter VIII, Catherine Amiot and Rusi Jaspal compare and contrast their respective theoretical approaches to identity integration, and use Identity Process Theory to explain how the self-concept may be potentially affected at various stages of identity integration. In the final chapter of this section, Anat Bardi, Rusi Jaspal, Ela Polek and Shalom Schwartz provide an individual differences perspective on Identity Process Theory in their theoretical and empirical integration of Identity Process Theory and the Schwartz Value Theory.

Part IV of the volume uses Identity Process Theory as a heuristic lens for examining identity processes and their relationship to social change in a variety of empirical, cultural and geographical contexts. The contributors to part IV apply tenets of Identity Process Theory to pressing contemporary social psychological phenomena. In chapter X, Roxanne de la Sablonnière and Esther Usborne highlight the important role of Identity Process Theory in developing a systematic social psychology of social change. Next, in their chapter on intractable conflict and collective identity, Neta Oren and Bar-Tal examine how the coping dimension of Identity Process Theory can provide important insights into our understanding of the eruption, persistence and potential changes in intractable conflicts. In chapter XII, Marco Cinnirella discusses the social psychological antecedents of Islamophobia and thereby highlights the utility of Identity Process Theory in understanding and predicting prejudice towards outgroups. In chapter XIII, John Dixon, Kevin Durrheim and Andrés Di Masso examine prejudice in a distinct context. They explore the strengths and limitations of Identity Process Theory in addressing place identity, geopolitical change and "white" resistance to de-segregation in South Africa. The next chapter by Dario Spini and Daniela Jopp examines the challenges to identity in old-age, and the contribution of Identity Process Theory to understanding these developmental challenges. In chapter XV, Kate Loewenthal explores religion, identity and mental health from the perspective of Identity Process Theory. More specifically, it is argued that identity

and identity-related processes may mediate and explain the relationship between religion and mental health outcomes. In their chapter on transport-related behavior, Niamh Murtagh, Birgitta Gatersleben and David Uzzell argue that identity threat can induce resistance to change in travel behavior and reflect upon the practical implications of an Identity Process Theory approach. In the final chapter of this section, Julie Barnett and Konstantina Vasileiou explore the applicability of Identity Process Theory and Social Representations Theory to understanding publics' appreciations of risk, and reflect upon the implications of this for risk communication in a changing social world.

Our goal in producing this volume has been to summarize the development of Identity Process Theory over the last three decades, and to demonstrate how the theory can provide unique explanations and predictions regarding beliefs, attitudes and behaviors that are crucially relevant to social psychological problems. The chapters in this volume provide resounding evidence that Identity Process Theory research is concerned primarily with the application of social psychology to real-world problems. This volume provides insightful responses to some of the core questions in the social psychology of identity, but there remain some unanswered questions. In editing this volume, we hope to initiate a debate about how Identity Process Theory can continue to shed light on some of these unanswered questions and thereby contribute to our understanding of important contemporary social and psychological issues.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 191-215.

Bandura A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*, 117–48

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self efficacy in Changing Societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307–337). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Breakwell, G.M. (1978) Some Effects of Marginal Social Identity. In H. Tajfel (ed.), *Differentiation Between Social Groups* (pp.301-336). London: Academic Press.

Breakwell, G.M. (1979) Illegitimate group membership and inter-group differentiation. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *18*, 141-149.

Breakwell, G.M. (1983) Identities and Conflicts. In G.M. Breakwell (ed.) *Threatened Identities* (pp.189-214). Chichester: Wiley.

Breakwell, G.M. (1986). *Coping with threatened identities*. London: Methuen.

Breakwell, G.M. (1988). Strategies adopted when identity is threatened. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, *1*, 189-204.

Breakwell, G.M. (1992). Processes of Self-Evaluation: Efficacy and Estrangement. In G.M. Breakwell (ed), *Social Psychology of Identity and the Self Concept* (pp.33-55). London: Academic Press/Surrey University Press.

Breakwell, G.M. (1993). Social representations and social identity. *Papers on Social Representations*, *2*(3), 1-20.

Breakwell, G.M. (2001). Social representational constraints upon identity processes. In K. Deaux & G. Philogene (eds), *Representations of the Social: Bridging Theoretical Traditions* (pp.271-84). Oxford: Blackwell.

Breakwell, G.M. (2004). Identity Change in the Context of the Growing Influence of European Union Institutions. In R. Hermann, T. Risse & M. B. Brewer (Eds), *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU* (pp.25-39). New York: Rowman and Littlefield

Breakwell, G.M. (2010). Resisting representations and identity processes. *Papers on Social Representations*, *19*, 6.1-6.11.

Breakwell, G.M., Fife-Schaw, C.R. & Devereux, J. (1989) Political activity and political attitudes in teenagers: Is there any correspondence ? P*olitical Psychology, 10*, 745-755.

Breakwell, G.M., Fife-Schaw, C.R., and Clayden, K. (1991) Risk-Taking, Control over Partner Choice and Intended Use of Condoms by Virgins. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 1, 173-187.

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

Burr, V. (2003). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.

Coyle, A. (2007). Introduction to qualitative psychological research. In E. Lyons & A. Coyle (Eds.), *Analysing qualitative data in psychology* (pp. 9-30). London: Sage.

Coyle, A. (2010). Qualitative research and anomalous experience: A call for interpretative pluralism [Commentary]. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 7*,79-83.

Edwards, D., Ashmore, M. and Potter, J., (1995). Death and furniture: The rhetoric, politics and theology of bottom line arguments against relativism, *History of the Human Sciences*, *8*, 25-49.

Fife-Schaw, C.R. & Breakwell, G.M. (1991). The class basis of late teenage voting preferences. *European Sociological Review, 7*, 135-147.

Fife-Schaw, C.R. & Breakwell, G.M. (1990) Predicting the intention not to vote in late teenage: A U.K. study of 17- and 18-year olds. *Political Psychology, 11*, 739-755.

Gergen, K.J (1973). Social psychology as history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *26*(2), 309–320.

Harré, R. & Moghaddam, F.M. (2012). *Psychology for the Third Millennium: Integrating Cultural and Neuroscience Perspectives*. London: Sage.

Harré, R. & Secord, P.F. (1972). *The Explanation of Social Behaviour*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

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

Howard, J.A. (2000). Social psychology of identities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*, 367-393.

Jaspal, R. (2011). *The construction and management of national and ethnic identities among British South Asians: an identity process theory approach*. Ph.D. dissertation, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK.

Jaspal, R. & Cinnirella, M. (2010). Coping with potentially incompatible identities: accounts of religious, ethnic and sexual identities from British Pakistani men who identify as Muslim and gay. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *49*(4), 849-870.

Jaspal, R. & Cinnirella, M. (2012). The construction of ethnic identity: insights from identity process theory. *Ethnicities*, *12*(5), 503-530.

Jaspal, R., & Coyle, A. (2010). 'My language, my people': Language and ethnic identity among British-born South Asians. *South Asian Diaspora*, *2*, 201-218.

Jaspal, R. & Sitaridou, I. (2013). Coping with Stigmatised Linguistic Identities: Identity Threat and Ethnolinguistic Vitality among Andalusians. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 13*(1), 1-26

Jaspal, R. & Yampolsky, M. (2011). Social representations of the Holocaust and Jewish Israeli identity construction: insights from identity process theory. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, *17*(2), 201-224.

Lyons, E. (1996). Coping with social change: processes of social memory in the reconstruction of identities. In G.M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (eds.), *Changing European identities: socio-psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 31-40). Oxford: Butterworth- Heinemann.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 63-78.

Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 954-969.

Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psycholog*y, *18*, 211-50.

Moscovici, S. (2000) *Social Representations. Explorations in Social Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Oyserman, D. & Markus, H.R. (1990). Possible selves and delinquency. Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(1), 112-125.

Parker, I. (1989). *The Crisis in Modern Social Psychology, and how to end it*. London and New York: Routledge.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: beyond attitudes and behavior*. London: Sage.

Reicher, S. D., Spears, R., & Haslam, S. A. (2010). *The social identity approach in social psychology.* In M. S. Wetherell & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.), *Sage Identities Handbook* (pp.45-62). London: Sage.

Riff, C.D. (1991). Possible selves in adulthood and old age: A tale of shifting horizons. *Psychology and Aging*, *6*(2), 286-295.

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

Stryker, S. 1980. *Symbolic Interactionism: A Social Structural Version.* Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Stryker, S. & Burke P. J. (2000). The past, present and future of identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*, 284–97.

Stryker, S. & Serpe, R.T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience and role behavior: A theory and research example. In W. Ickes & Eric S Knowles (eds.), *Personality, Roles and Social Behavior* (pp.199–218). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Stryker, S. & Serpe, R. T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *57*, 16-35.

Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information, 13*, 65-93.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.

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

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*, 1-39.

Timotijevic, L. & Breakwell, G.M. (2000). Migration and Threats to Identity. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *10*, 355-372.

Turner, A.J. & Coyle, A. (2000). What does it mean to be a donor offspring? The identity experiences of adults conceived by donor insemination and the implications for counselling and therapy. *Human Reproduction, 15*, 2041-2051.

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

von Glasersfeld, E. (1982). An interpretation of Piaget's constructivism. *Revue Internationale de Philosophie*, 36(4), 612-35.

Vignoles, V.L. (2011). Identity motives. In S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx & V.L. Vignoles (eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp.403-32). New York: Springer.

Vignoles, V.L., Chryssochoou, X. & Breakwell, G.M. (2002). Evaluating models of identity motivation: Self-esteem is not the whole story. *Self and Identity*, 1(3), 201-218.

Vignoles, Vivian L, Chryssochoou, X. & Breakwell, G.M. (2002). Sources of distinctiveness: Position, difference and separateness in the identities of Anglican parish priests. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*(6), 761-780.

Vignoles, V.L, Chryssochoou, X. & Breakwell, G.M. (2004). Combining individuality and relatedness: Representations of the person among the Anglican clergy. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(1), 113-132.

Vignoles, V.L., Manzi, C., Regalia, C., Jemmolo, S. & Scabini, E. (2008). Identity motives underlying desired and feared possible future selves. *Journal of Personality*, *76*(5), 1165-1200.