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Political protest and terrorism


Collective action occurs when a member acts in terms of his or her group identity and engage in actions designed to improve the status of the ingroup (Wright, 2001).

Examples:

Political protest

Terrorism
Political protest and terrorism

Political protest
relative deprivation
rational choice
identification

Terrorism
Relative deprivation

"... A is relatively deprived of x when
(i) He does not have X
(ii) He sees some other person or persons, which may include himself at some previous or expected time, as having X ...
(iii) He wants X and
(iv) He sees it as feasible that he should have X.
(Runciman, 1966, 10)

Concept of Reference Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relatively deprived because of own position as member of group.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relatively deprived because of group’s position in society.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2

B: individual RD  C: group / collective RD  D: double RD
(Runciman, 1966, 33)
Relative deprivation and social protest (Dube & Guimond, 1986)
Study 3

Ss: 146 Montreal university students, interviewed 3 month after an intensive period of protest

**Individual discontent:** to what extend did you experience discontent in relation to „your own personal situation“?

**Group discontent:** to what extend did you experience discontent in relation to „the collective situation of students in Quebec“?

DV: Extent of participation in 10 different protest actions (meet the administration, class boycott, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Discontent</th>
<th>Personal Discontent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 51)</td>
<td>(n = 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 30)</td>
<td>(n = 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Entries are means on the activism scale ranging from 10 (not at all active) to 90 (frequently active in various protest actions).
A rational choice perspective

Expectancy that participation will help to achieve the goal of action
- Participation is necessary for the success of action.
- Expectancy that others will participate.
- Expectancy that the goal will be achieved by successful action.

Expected reactions of significant others to participation and non-participation $\times$ Value of reactions of significant others

Expected costs and benefits of participation and non-participation $\times$ Value of risks and rewards

Willingness to act

Identification and social protest (Stürmer & Simon, 2004)

Ss: 199 registered members of the German gay association (Schwulenverband Deutschland), interviewed two times one year apart

- **Identification with gay men**: e.g., “I feel strong ties with other gay men”
- **Identification with social movement organization** (Schwulenverband): e.g., “I feel strong ties with other members of the SVB”
- **Collective motive**: values associated with the SVD (e.g., legal recognition of gay marriage) x perceived likelihood of realization
- **Normative motive**: others expected reaction to S’s participation x motivation to comply
- **Reward motive**: expected personal outcome (e.g., learning about politics) x subjective value

DV: Participation in collective protest activities, such as public marches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Subsequent Participation in Collective Protest or Organizational Participation Reported at Time 2 (October 1998)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictors Measured at Time 1 (1997)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with gay men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with the SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward motive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: SMO = social movement organization. Predicting participation in collective protest, $R^2 = 0.13$, $R^2_{adj} = 0.11$, $F(5, 193) = 5.87$, $p < .0001$; predicting organizational participation, $R^2 = 0.13$, $R^2_{adj} = 0.11$, $F(5, 193) = 5.72$, $p = .0001$. 

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001, two-tailed.
Politicized collective identity (Simon & Klandermans, 2001)

Power: degree of control over own and og (material rewards and punishments, information, expert knowledge, status/reputation) resources

Intergroup struggle: ig- and og-stereotyping, ig-conformity, prejudice, discrimination, violence

Power asymmetry $\rightarrow$ intergroup struggle $\rightarrow$ political protest

awareness of shared grievances $\rightarrow$ collective (social) identification

intentional incorporation of third party / third og public / society (= politicized collective identity / identification)
Politicized collective identity (Simon & Klandermans, 2001)

Power asymmetry → protest → intergroup struggle → political

awareness of shared grievances → collective (social) identification → intentional incorporation of third party / third party of public / society (= politicized collective identity / identification)

prototypical assimilation
society position → dissociation

ig → struggle → og
Terrorist groups emerge where a group has little power and where severe economic conditions, political conflict, threats to vital national interests, and rapid social change are paramount.  
cf. Taylor & Louis, 2004, 170

Terrorism is viewed as
a. Use of force and violence  
b. By individuals or groups  
c. That is directed toward civilian populations / noncombatants  
d. And intended to install fear  
e. As means of coercing the audiences (individuals or groups) to change their political positions.  
cf. Marsella, 2004, p. 16

But members of established armed forces of a duly constituted nation committing acts of violence usually are not called terrorists.
political protest
  e.g. student (ig) protest against governmental (og)

intrastate terrorism
  e.g. RAF (ig) against state representatives (og)

international / interethnic terrorism
  e.g. al-Qaeda against US citizens / symbols

prototypical society position

assimilation

---

struggle

violence

dissociation

prototypical society position

assimilation

prototypical society position

assimilation

prototypical og society position

sending a message

violence
The emergence of terrorist groups (Moghaddam, 2004)

- Isolated groups, often through deliberate withdrawal (-> ethnic centrism, group conformity and cohesion, solidification of leadership)
- A categorical “good vs. evil” view
- A perception of the present society as illegitimate and unjust (<- e.g., absence of religious foundation)
- A perceived need for radical social change (no normative avenues to achieve social change)
- A belief that an ideal society is an end that justifies any means (even killing and sacrifice of own lives)
- A view that acts of terror are effective means to destabilize existing society
- A perception that one has a virtual duty to bring about societal change
- A belief in self improvement through one or more acts of terror
- The experience of the self in inflated, fragile, and protected terms (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998)
- A perception that it is easier to stay rather than to exit the terrorist group.

It is not the least advantaged, but those who are relatively privileged members of disadvantaged groups, who emerge as leaders and prime candidates not only to engage in, but also to organize and lead terrorist activities (Taylor & Louis, 2004, 177)
The staircase to terrorism (Moghaddam, 2005)

**Fifth floor**
Categorization of civilians as part of og; psychological distance to og

**Fourth floor**
Recruitment for small cells (4-5 persons) or violent act; categorical us vs them viewpoint; belief in justice of terrorist attack

**Third floor**
Isolation, affiliation with terrorist ig members, commitment to morality of terrorist organizations

**Second floor**
Displacement of aggression onto og/the USA through political propaganda, movements, the education system

**First floor**
No contextualized democracy, i.e. no possibility of individual mobility, no participation in political decisions, no procedural justice

**Ground floor**
Perceived injustice and group relative deprivation

---

**Political context**
*Spread of Western (American) values, threat to cultural values/identities; growing economic and political frustration in non-Western societies*
Attribution of responsibility for terrorist attacks (Doosje et al., 2007)

Respondents: Islamic and non-Islamic people living in The Netherlands

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, sample sizes (n), and beta values between variable and victim identification for study 1, and ingroup identification for studies 2 and 3, for Islamic and non-Islamic people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Islamic People</th>
<th>Non-Islamic People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution perpetrator #</td>
<td>3.51a</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution friends/family</td>
<td>2.36b</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution victim #</td>
<td>2.82b</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Islamic world #</td>
<td>1.55c</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution non-Islamic world</td>
<td>1.73c</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typicality perpetrator #</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution perpetrator</td>
<td>4.18a</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution al Qaeda #</td>
<td>2.66c</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Islamic world #</td>
<td>1.77d</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution non-Islamic world</td>
<td>3.45b</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: Islamic perpetrator condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Islamic world</td>
<td>1.90a</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution non-Islamic world #</td>
<td>3.75b</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typicality perpetrator #</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study 3: Non-Islamic perpetrator condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Islamic world</td>
<td>3.13b</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution non-Islamic world #</td>
<td>3.96a</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typicality perpetrator #</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Islamic and non-Islamic people differ on this variable (p<.05).

* B-values p<.05; within columns, attributions of responsibility with different subscripts within each study differ from each other (p<.05).