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Abstract

Three studies conducted as part of this thesis investigated the relationship between Christian group identification and multiple forms of intergroup discrimination (i.e., evaluations, trait ratings, white noise distribution, re-hiring and sacking) against a variety of outgroups (i.e., Atheists, Goths and Homosexuals). One hypothesis was tested in all three studies. This stated that Christian group identification would be positively related to intergroup discrimination in a context where Christian group membership was made salient. In the first study, Christians who were given the opportunity to evaluate ingroup members (i.e., Christians) and outgroup members (i.e., Atheists) evaluated their own group more positively than outgroup members. Such discrimination was positively related to Christian group identity in the salient condition. In the second study, Christians were given the opportunity to rate (positive) ingroup (i.e., Christians) and outgroup members (i.e., Goths), and allocate white noise (negative) to ingroup and outgroup members. Christians rated ingroup members more highly than outgroup members. Such discrimination was positively related to Christian group identity in the salient condition. No intergroup discrimination was shown with regard to white noise allocations. In the third study, Christians who were given the opportunity to re-hire (positive) ingroup members (i.e., Christians) and outgroup members (i.e., Homosexuals) re-hired more ingroup than outgroup members. Such discrimination was not however related to Christian group identity. Christian group members given the opportunity to sack (negative) ingroup members (i.e., Christians) and outgroup members (i.e., Homosexuals) sacked more outgroup than ingroup members. Such discrimination was negatively related to Christian group identity in the salient condition. Across the three studies, Christian group members showed significantly more discrimination in the salient compared to the non-salient condition. The ramifications of these findings are discussed.
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Christian identity and discrimination

A considerable amount of psychological research suggests there is a positive relationship between various measures of Christianity and different measures of intergroup discrimination\(^1\). Consequently, Christianity is often associated with bigotry and prejudice. As Christianity in many forms preaches ‘the God of love’ (Spong, 2005) but is responsible for so much hate, it has proved to be in both practice and in fundamental text, a “grand paradox” (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 433).

The paradoxical relationship between religion and intergroup discrimination is one of the most important psychological issues in religion generating over 70 years of empirical research (see Batson, Shoenrade, & Pych, 1985; Batson, Shoenrade & Ventis, 1993; Batson & Stocks, 2005; Hall, Matz, & Wood, 2010; Hunsberger, 1995; Hunsberger & Jackson 2005; Spilka, Hood, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 2005 for reviews). This body of research is generally concerned with types of religiosity seen to predict discrimination or tolerance. A handful of researchers however challenge the view that individual differences adequately inform us on the relationship between religion and discrimination, and propose that an intergroup approach may provide more informative conclusions (Batson & Stocks, 2005; Greenfield & Marks, 2007; Hall et al., 2010; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). Considering religion can be a powerful source of social identity (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Seul, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Ysseldyk, Matheson & Anisman, 2010) an investigation of Christian intergroup discrimination from a social identity perspective is likely to be highly valuable.

The aim of the present research is to investigate the relationship between religion and intergroup discrimination from the social identity perspective (Turner, 1999; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). The following literature review critically evaluates previous research on religion and discrimination derived from an individual difference perspective. It is argued that such an approach to religion and discrimination is limited, and does not account for the role of social influence on attitude and behaviour. Following on from this argument, the social
identity perspective is outlined in order to introduce a set of three studies looking at Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination in contexts where social identity is salient (compared to when it is non-salient).

Review of literature on religion and intergroup discrimination.

Early research on religion and discrimination shows a positive relationship between discrimination and three indices of ‘religious involvement’ (church membership or attendance, positive attitude toward religion, orthodoxy or conservatism of religious beliefs, Batson et al., 1993, Holtzman, 1956; Kelley, Ferson, & Holtzman, 1958; Young, Benson, & Holtzman, 1960). A general conclusion that religious involvement and discrimination are positively associated has been drawn from such research. Allport and Ross (1967) however revealed that under closer inspection this research shows a curvilinear relationship between attendance and discrimination. Infrequent (moderate) attendance is associated with more discrimination than both frequent (high) attendance and non-attendance (Allport & Ross, 1967). Consequently, researchers have suspected that whether or not somebody is religious, or the degree to which they are religious (indicated by attendance levels) may be less relevant than how individuals are religious (Allport, 1950; Allport & Ross, 1967). In response, particular attention has been given to individual differences amongst religious individuals.

An ‘individual difference’ account of religion and intergroup discrimination.

Research from an individual difference account can be split into two broad sub-groups. The first is religious orientation, and relates to such factors as intrinsic (I), extrinsic (E) and quest (Q) orientations, religious fundamentalism (RF) and Christian orthodoxy (CO). The second relates to personality. A number of personality dimensions, including social dominance orientation (SDO, Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) and empathy (McFarland, 1998) have been explored in attempts to understand discrimination. Amongst
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religious individuals however, right-wing authoritarianism (RWA, Altemeyer, 1988) is argued to have a direct relationship with religion and how it may relate to discrimination (Altemeyer, 1996). Indeed, many items in the RWA scale refer specifically to religious concepts (with references to the ‘Bible’, ‘morality’, ‘Atheists’ and ‘sin’, Altemeyer, 1996).

Intrinsic, extrinsic and quest.

Allport and Ross (1967) postulate that there are distinct ways of being religious, and that these differences are reflected in ‘religious orientation’. Religious orientation is evaluated by two subscales; one measuring an intrinsic religious orientation (I), the other measuring an extrinsic religious orientation (E). According to these authors, extrinsically oriented individuals use religion as a means for their own ends. For these individuals, religion is used to gain social support and achieve extrinsic goals. For intrinsically oriented individuals religion alone is the goal, rather than a means by which to achieve another. Simply put, “the extrinsically motivated person uses [his/her] religion, the intrinsically motivated person lives [his/hers]” (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 434).

Using both direct and indirect measures of racial discrimination, Allport and Ross (1967) found E to be positively related to racial discrimination, while I is negatively related. On the basis of such evidence Allport and Ross argued that, for the extrinsically oriented, discrimination and religion are functionally compatible, in that they both provide security, comfort, status and social support. A life that is dependent on the supports of extrinsic religion is also likely to be dependent on the supports of discrimination. As intrinsic religion does not have the same function, it is unlikely to have the same relationship to discrimination. Unlike claims that religion in general is associated with discrimination, Allport and Ross suggest that extrinsic religiosity is associated with increased discrimination while intrinsic religiosity is not.
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Consistent with Allport and Ross’ (1967) findings, reviews of relevant research between 1949 and 2003 have found that intrinsic individuals are consistently less discriminatory than extrinsic individuals (Batson et al., 1993; Spilka et al., 2003). Therefore, the initial conclusion that religious involvement has a positive relationship with discrimination has been revised to reflect the way in which somebody is religious. This body of research suggests that although the extrinsically religious are high in racial intolerance and discrimination, the intrinsically religious are relatively low.

The reliability of an ‘unprejudiced intrinsic orientation’ has however been questioned. Batson (1976) suspected that rather than legitimately unmaking discrimination, those intrinsically oriented may be more concerned with the appearance of being tolerant. Problematically, the research in this area prior to the 1970s almost exclusively assessed discrimination using overt measures that are largely vulnerable to the influence of social desirability (Batson, 1976). To test whether the previously reported negative relationship of an intrinsic orientation to racial discrimination was an artefact of social desirability, Batson and colleagues (Batson, Flink, Schoenrade, Fultz, & Pych, 1986; Batson, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978) measured the relationship between religious orientation and discrimination while controlling for social desirability. As expected, when social desirability is controlled the negative relationship between I and discrimination is positive. Accordingly, Batson and colleagues’ (1993) conclude that rather than being associated with increased compassionate behaviour or increased tolerance for outgroups, intrinsic religious orientation is in reality only related to the appearance of low discrimination (Batson et al., 1993).

In light of the relationship between intrinsic orientation and socially desirable responses, researchers have hypothesised that although I is related to the appearance of tolerance, this relationship may be reduced or disappear when measuring discrimination that is not clearly proscribed by the religious group. Consistent with this hypothesis, researchers
have found I to be positively correlated with forms of discrimination not clearly proscribed by ones’ religion (e.g., negative attitudes toward homosexuality in North American churches, Herek, 1987; discrimination against non-whites amongst Afrikaners in apartheid South Africa, see Gorsuch, 1988; and discrimination against Rastafarians within groups of Seventh Day Adventists in the Virgin Islands, Griffin, Gorsuch, & Davis, 1987). Correspondingly, Batson et al.’s (1993) review of studies concerned with non-proscribed targets found that in stark contrast with the I-E relationship with proscribed forms of discrimination, I is related positively to discrimination, while E is unrelated (Batson et al., 1993). Such evidence suggests that an intrinsic orientation merely encourages conformity to the appearance of the ‘right’ tolerances as defined by the religious ingroup (Batson et al., 1993).

Almost ten years after Allport and Ross (1967), Batson (1976) introduced a third dimension of religious orientation. This orientation measures the degree to which an individual seeks to face religious issues and is referred to as religion as quest (Q). Q comprises of three components: (a) a readiness to face complex existential questions, (b) self-criticism and religious doubt, and (c) openness to change. Researchers have hypothesised that the ‘open-mindedness’ and ‘flexibility’ associated with Q will be related to increased tolerance for others (Batson et al., 1993). Research has supported this assumption as Q is generally shown to be associated with increased tolerance for a variety of outgroupsii (Batson, Eidelman, Higley & Russel, 2001; Batson, Floyd, Meyer & Winner, 1999; Batson et al., 1993; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005; Tsang & Rowatt, 2007).

As the quest orientation is considered to embrace a general attitude that opposes discrimination (McFarland, 1989), it has been assumed to be unrelated to social desirability. Fittingly, Batson et al., (1978; 1986) found Q remains negatively related to racial discrimination when social desirability is controlled. Understandably, researchers hypothesised Q to be negatively related to both proscribed and non-proscribed forms of
Christian identity and discrimination. Batson et al.’s (1993) review of quest and non-proscribed targets found Q remains negatively related to non-proscribed discrimination. More recent research supports the finding that Q is either negatively related or unrelated to non-proscribed forms of discrimination (Batson et al., 2001, 1999; Tsang & Rowatt, 2007). These results suggest that unlike I, the Q relationship to tolerance and compassion is not limited to the ‘right’ tolerances, but is relatively universal.

*Shortcomings associated with I, E and Q.*

Although research using the I-E-Q framework has become the dominant paradigm in the study of the psychology of religion following Allport (1967), research in this tradition suffers from a number of theoretical and methodological limitations (Hunsberger 1995; Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990). Kirkpatrick and Hood (1990) argued that conceptually, both intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations have been poorly defined. Both I and E orientations have been referred to as ‘motivations’ (Hoge, 1972), ‘personalities’ (Hunt & King, 1971) and ‘cognitive styles’ (Allport & Ross, 1967). Thus, there remains no clear understanding of what religious orientation actually measures (Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990). Furthermore, psychometrically both the I and E scales have been criticised (Hunt & King, 1971), with E showing low internal consistency (Donahue, 1985), and I items scattering across a variety of other religious factors (see King & Hunt, 1969).

Neither has the more recently conceptualised Q orientation escaped criticism. A number of researchers argue that Q actually measures agnosticism, and so propose that it is invalid to refer to Q as a religious orientation (Donahue, 1985; Hall et al., 2010). Indeed, even Batson’s (1976) original writing suggests that somebody high in quest is “not necessarily aligned with any formal religious institution…” (p.32). For this reason, it may be argued that it is the quest oriented individual’s *lack of religion* that is related to tolerance. Indeed, Altemeyer and
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Hunsberger (1992) have revealed that non-religiously affiliated persons have the highest levels of Q.

The aforementioned limitations to the I-E-Q paradigm, in addition to social desirability concerns (already discussed) suggest that perhaps I-E and Q religious orientations have not lived up to their promise to resolve the paradoxical relationship between religion and discrimination (Hunsberger, 1995; Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990). As a result, researchers have looked further to examine other dimensions of religion (Laythe, Finkel, Bringle, & Kirkpatrick, 2002; Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001).

*Christian orthodoxy, religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism.*

Often confused conceptually in early research (Hunsberger, 1995), Christian orthodoxy (CO) and religious fundamentalism (RF) are also implicated in the relationship between religion and discrimination. Christian orthodoxy measures the degree to which people accept orthodox Christian beliefs that emphasise ‘brotherhood’ and ‘love for one’s neighbour’ (Laythe et al., 2002) and clearly proscribe many forms of discrimination. Much like the intrinsic religious orientation, CO is assumed to relate to a set of beliefs that reduce discrimination (Kirkpatrick, 1993). Accordingly, CO is considered a significant negative predictor of racism (Laythe et al., 2001; Rowatt & Franklin, 2004). Like I however, CO is positively related to non-proscribed forms of discrimination (Leak & Finken, 2011; Pargament, Trevino, Mahoney & Silberman, 2007).

Religious fundamentalism is a religious orientation characterised by the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that contain the fundamental truth, and that this truth must be followed according to unchangeable practices (Hunsberger, 1995). For religious fundamentalists, knowledge of the truth is held with a militant closed mindedness, matched with the conviction that one has a special relationship with God (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger & Jackson 2005). Religious fundamentalists are committed to using their
belief system as a guide for understanding the world at large, and this translates into a general
tendency to discriminate against others (Kirkpatrick, Hood, & Hartz, 1991). Thus, much of
the research assessing the link between RF and discrimination has demonstrated a consistently
positive relationship with both proscribed and non-proscribed forms of discrimination
(Altemeyer, 2003; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger 1995; McFarland, 1989;
Spilka et al., 2003; Wylie & Forest, 1992).

Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) is a personality construct often found to be related
to religious intergroup discrimination (Altemeyer, 1988, 1996). RWA is conceptualised as a
composite of three attitudinal clusters: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and
conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1996). Those high in RWA may be drawn to religion, as
submission to religious authority, ‘fear of the Lord’ and the defence of moral norms are all
compatible with scales assessing RWA (Altemeyer, 1988).

RWA and RF have been found to be very highly correlated, with discrimination
associated with RWA often used to explain the relationship between RF and intergroup
discrimination (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Blogowska & Saroglou, 2011; Laythe et al.,
2001). In response to these high correlations, researchers have been motivated to explore each
variable’s unique contribution to discrimination (Laythe et al., 2002, 2001; Wylie & Forest,
1992). In relation to proscribed forms of discrimination, when RF is controlled RWA
becomes a stronger positive predictor of discrimination (Laythe et al., 2001; Wylie & Forest,
1992). When RWA is controlled however, RF loses all predictive power (Laythe et al., 2001).
Conversely however, when discrimination against the target outgroup is non-proscribed, the
unique relationship between RF and discrimination endures (Laythe et al., 2002, 2001).
Therefore, unlike the RF relationship with proscribed discrimination, RF remains positively
related to non-proscribed discrimination when RWA is controlled.
More recently however, Mavor, Louis and Laythe (2011) argued that combining RWA with other measures of religiosity (such as RF) may yield misleading results as a consequence of the empirical and theoretical complexity of the RWA scale. These authors critiqued both RWA and its proposed relationship with RF and discrimination. As noted above, RWA involves three attitudinal clusters. In the study of religion and intergroup discrimination however, RWA has been used as a unitary construct (Laythe et al., 2002, 2001). This is problematic as separate clusters within the RWA scale empirically overlap with religious measures (i.e., RF) and measures of certain forms of discrimination (i.e., anti-homosexuality, see Mavor, Macleod, Boal & Louis, 2009). For this reason, Mavor et al., (2011) suggest that a failure to recognise complexities in the use of RWA in research on religion and intergroup discrimination leads to statistical problems. For example, the suppression of racial discrimination attributed to RF in Laythe et al., (2001) may in fact be a statistical artefact caused by the overlap between these measures and particular ‘clusters’ within RWA (e.g. RF and conventionalism, see Mavor et al., 2009 for a detailed discussion). Consequently, the proposed relationship between RWA and RF suggested by Laythe et al., (2002, 2001) to explain the relationship between religion and discrimination may be inaccurate as the result of the overlapping variance among these variables (Mavor et al., 2011).

Summary of the individual difference account of religion and discrimination.

Religious orientation (I-E-Q and RF-CO) and personality (RWA) accounts infer that those who take the religious teachings of ‘love thy neighbour’ or ‘love the sinner’ seriously, such as CO and I, are unlikely to show discrimination (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). In contrast to this supposition, research reveals that, in some circumstances (when social desirability is controlled, or when discrimination against the target is non-proscribed), I and CO are linked to increased discrimination (Batson et al., 1986; Batson et al., 1978; Herek, 1987; Leak & Finken, 2011). Conceptually, E and RF have been predicted to relate to
increased discrimination (Allport & Ross, 1967; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger 1995; Wylie & Forest 1992). With respect to non-proscribed targets however, E does not positively predict, but is negatively related to discrimination (Batson et al., 1993; Herek, 1987). Although RF has often been positively related to discrimination (Batson et al., 1993; Spilka et al., 2003), recent research suggests this result may actually be a statistical artefact as opposed to a meaningful finding (Mavor et al., 2011). Furthermore, there remains a limited understanding of the role of RWA (and subsequently RF) in the relationship between religion and discrimination. Thus, as Mavor and colleagues have argued, research has measured RWA as a unitary construct which may hide the more informative results pertaining to authoritarian aggression, submission and conventionalism individually (Mavor et al., 2011). Finally, the prediction that Q is related to tolerance has been supported by research (Batson et al., 1993). Quest remains either uncorrelated or negatively correlated with both proscribed and non-proscribed targets (Spilka et al., 2003). Quest has however been considered a measure of agnosticism rather than a religious orientation (Donahue, 1985; Hall et al., 2010), and so it may not be valid to use Q in investigations of religion and discrimination.

*Limitations of an individual difference account.*

A number of researchers have argued that individual level accounts are largely inappropriate for the study of intergroup discrimination (Brown, 2010; Jones, 2003; Turner 1999, Turner & Reynolds, 2001). By its very nature, the individual difference paradigm considers groups as just another context within which *individual* behaviour takes place (Haslam, 2004). This account neglects the real psychological relevance of group membership on the behaviour of group members. By ignoring the importance of social context for behaviour, individual level approaches remain limited in their capacity to explain intergroup discrimination (Brown, 2010; Turner & Reynolds, 2001).
An individual difference account assumes that religious discrimination is likely to remain stable across different outgroups, across different situations or contexts, and over time (Brown, 2010). Contrary to this view, research on religion and discrimination that includes non-proscribed targets reveals different relationships between certain religious orientations and different target outgroups (Batson et al., 1993). The positive relationship between I, RF and discrimination against homosexuals is argued to reflect ingroup tolerance for this form of discrimination (Batson et al., 1993; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). Thus, contrary to proponents of an individual difference approach, the relationship between religion and discrimination appears to be reactive to group norms that proscribe some forms of discrimination, but allow others (non-proscription, Herek, 1987; Griffin et al., 1987; Snook & Gorsuch, 1985). In this sense, personal level approaches do not adequately account for the impact of the immediate social situation on discriminatory behaviour (Brown, 2010).

Furthermore, if discrimination results from stable personality characteristics or disposition, then one would expect intergroup hostility related to individual level constructs to remain stable over time. For this reason, personality based explanations have difficulty accounting for evidence that intergroup discrimination can increase and decrease in relatively short timeframes (e.g. Billig, 1976; Sherif, 1967). Moreover, individual level approaches cannot account for the uniformity of discriminatory attitudes across whole groups of people, as well as the historical specificity of discrimination (e.g. the dramatic rise in anti-Japanese sentiment following Pearl Harbour, Seago, 1947; the rapid growth in anti-Semitism under Hitler, Brown 2010). For example, in their meta-analytic review of religious racism, Hall et al., (2010) observed that the positive correlations between E and RF with racism decreased significantly after 1986. This reflects the influence of broader societal norms, as racism related to these orientations decreased as normative support for (overt) racism in the US decreased (following the civil-rights movement). Therefore, personality approaches
erroneously position discrimination as something that either exists or does not within an individual. The evidence however suggests that discrimination is instead something that is expressed to varying degrees at various times (Brown, 2010).

The assumption of stability has plagued research on religion and discrimination. Researchers in this field have tried to identify those types of individuals who discriminate (theoretically high E, RF, RWA), and those who don’t (theoretically high CO, Q and I). This approach contributes to the misconception of a simplistic, binary world of good people (those who don’t discriminate) and bad people (those who do), and remains ignorant to the large amount of research supporting a ‘situationist perspective’ on the perpetration of malevolence (Staub, 1989; Zimbardo, 2004). Furthermore, this paradigm fails to distinguish description from explanation (Jones, 2002). Revealing that “some people are prejudiced and some aren’t, is merely description” (Jones, 2002, p.127) and does not help to inform us about why, how and when a person will discriminate against others.

Although group level concepts have been applied to a handful of psychological studies on religion (Burris & Jackson, 2000; Greenfield & Marks, 2007), and considered within discussions on the relationship between religion and discrimination (Altemeyer, 2003; Seul, 1999; Ysseldyk, et al., 2010), empirical investigations in this area largely ignore the predominant shift towards a consideration of group level constructs in intergroup discrimination. As researchers in intergroup discrimination shift to a group level of analysis, (particularly social identity and self-categorisation theories) researchers of religion and discrimination remain largely static and limited by an individual level of analysis that may be “less relevant to understanding [religion and] prejudice than are intergroup dynamics” (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999, p. 510).
An intergroup approach to religion and intergroup discrimination.

The movement toward a group level of analysis of discrimination has been a major focus of social psychological literature over the past four decades. Accordingly, Batson and Stocks (2005) claim that advancing the study of religion and discrimination requires us to embrace this level of analysis. An intergroup level of analysis considers the impact of group membership on peoples’ attitudes and behaviours.

Realistic Conflict Theory: Sherif’s ‘summer camps’.

Within social psychology, Campbell’s (1965) formulation of Realistic Conflict Theory (RCT) marks the initial departure from individual difference accounts of discrimination. This approach attempts to explain intergroup behaviour by considering the functional relationships between social groups. Rather than discrimination residing in an individual’s personality or character, RCT theorises that intergroup conflicts arise from real group competition over valued resources. According to Campbell, conflicting interests between groups lead to negative attitudes toward the outgroup, and positive attitudes toward the ingroup. This means that, in contrast to individual differences marking those who will be discriminatory, given the right context (i.e., competition) anybody has the capacity to discriminate (Brown, 2010). This interaction between individuals and their context provides a shift from a focus on who is prejudiced, to when and why intergroup discrimination is likely to occur.

A series of field experiments by Sherif and colleagues (Sherif, 1951; Sherif, 1966; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif, 1961; Sherif, White & Harvey, 1955) provide empirical support for RCT. After introducing boys attending ‘summer camps’ to defined social categories (i.e., ‘Rattlers’ and ‘Eagles’, Sherif et al., 1961) and intergroup competition over resources, Sherif and colleagues observed the development of intergroup hostility, negative intergroup stereotyping and intragroup solidarity (Sherif et al., 1961; Platow & Hunter, in press). Significantly, Sherif et al.’s research demonstrates that the functional
relationships between social groups can have discernible consequences for intergroup attitudes and behaviours (Platow & Hunter, in press). When social groups are placed in direct competition with each other, intergroup hostilities are likely to arise.

Research and theory following Sherif (1966) however, shows evidence that intergroup discrimination also emerges in situations where group competition is absent (Rabbie & Horwitz, 1969; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). In particular, research using the minimal group paradigm (MGP, Tajfel et al., 1971) demonstrates that categorisation into arbitrary and virtually meaningless (minimal) groups can provoke intergroup discrimination (favouritism toward one’s own group). The use of ‘minimal’ groupings allows researchers to remove many of the usual characteristics of group life, such as group interdependence, structure, roles, norms and history (Brown, 2000a). All that remains is social categorisation into one group (the ingroup) as opposed to another (the outgroup). Four decades of research on social categorisation and intergroup discrimination using the MGP consistently demonstrates that people tend to favour the group to which they belong over the relevant or available outgroup (Brewer, 1979; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Messick & Mackie, 1989; Tajfel, 1982; c.f. Mummendey et al., 1992).

Social Identity Theory.

In order to theoretically explain discrimination in the MGP, Henri Tajfel and John Turner developed Social Identity Theory (SIT, Tajfel & Turner, 1979; 1986). SIT focuses on the psychological bases of intergroup relations and social conflict. Consistent with RCT, SIT is an account of intergroup discrimination that rejects the notion that discrimination is individually ‘irrational’ or ‘deviate’ (Sherif et al., 1961; Sherif & Sherif, 1969; Turner, 1999; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). SIT theoretically accounts for intergroup relations in real social contexts, and claims that intergroup discrimination is psychologically meaningful, and an “expression of how people define themselves socially” (Turner & Reynolds, 2001, p. 145).
SIT argues that, in certain conditions, people define who they are in terms of their membership in relevant social categories. This is referred to as ‘social identity’ and is defined by Tajfel (1978) as that part of the self-concept derived from social category membership. Individuals invoke a part of their social identity whenever they think of themselves as belonging to one group (racial, gender, religion etc.) rather than another.

The SIT account of intergroup discrimination incorporates three processes; categorisation, identification and comparison (Turner, 1999). Individuals categorise themselves and others based on perceived memberships in social groupings, and insofar as an individual identifies with the ingroup there is a desire to evaluate that category positively. Finally, in order to gain or maintain positive distinctiveness for the group, group members may engage in intergroup comparisons that favour the ingroup (i.e., intergroup discrimination, Tajfel & Turner 1979). These processes are all assumed to be motivated by the need for positive self-regard and group distinctiveness (Turner 1999). The resulting hypothesis is that “social comparisons between groups which are relevant to an evaluation of one’s social identity produce pressures for intergroup differentiation to achieve positive self-evaluation in terms of that identity” (Turner, 1999, p.8). In this regard, intergroup discrimination can be seen as a meaningful strategy to create and maintain positive group distinctiveness compared to relevant outgroups.

Researchers such as Brown (2000b; Hinkle & Brown, 1990) assert that, according to SIT, the motivation for positive social identity should increase with the strength of ingroup identification (Turner 1999). This means that “the more central the ingroup is to the self-concept (i.e., strength of identification) the more one should differentiate in its favour” (Capozza, Brown, Aharpour, & Falvo, 2006, p. 52). Consequently, a number of researchers hypothesise that those who identify more with the ingroup will engage in greater levels of intergroup discrimination compared to those who have lower identification (Amiot &
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Turner (1999) however, asserts that “Social Identity theory never advanced the hypothesis of a direct causal connection between ingroup identification and ingroup bias” (p. 20). While there are a number of factors that play a part in the relationship between ingroup identification and intergroup discrimination, such as threat (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Grant & Brown, 1995), the relevance of the outgroup (Duckitt et al., 2005; Duckitt & Mpthuthing, 1998; Lalonde, 2002), norms (Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1997) and discrimination valence (Amiot & Bourhis, 2005b; Hodson et al., 2003), Turner has highlighted the fact that ingroup identification and intergroup discrimination was always assumed to be mediated by the salience of the relevant social identity (Turner, 1999). In order to explain the processes by which social identities become relevant to attitude and behaviour Turner and colleagues developed Self-Categorisation Theory (SCT, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherel, 1987). SCT explains when to anticipate a relationship between ingroup identification and intergroup discrimination (Turner, 1999).
Like SIT, SCT posits that people sometimes see themselves as unique individuals (personal identity), and sometimes as group members (social identity). These are not different identities, but different levels of self-categorisation (from the subordinate ‘individual’ to the more superordinate ‘group’, Turner et al., 1987). Self-categorisation at the social group level is most likely to occur within a context where social group membership becomes salient (psychologically operative). SCT argues that factors that enhance the salience of social categories tend to: (a) accentuate the differences between groups, and (b) accentuate similarities within groups and enhance the relevance of identification (Turner et al., 1987). Increased identification with the group leads to depersonalised self-perception, whereby people come to perceive themselves more as an interchangeable exemplar of a social category, as opposed to a unique person defined by their individual differences from others (Turner et al., 1987). Collectively, SIT and SCT can be referred to as the social identity perspective (see Haslam, 2004; Turner & Reynolds, 2001).

The importance of context: Social identity salience.

Much early research on the relationship between identification and intergroup discrimination that ignores social identity salience shows inconsistent correlations (see Hinkle & Brown, 1990 for a review). Such results, according to Turner, were “only to be expected” as “Nothing in the summary of the theory… implies simple positive correlations” (Turner, 1999, p. 21). A number of researchers concur that in a context where social identity is salient behaviour shifts from the interpersonal to the intergroup realm (Haslam, 2004; Hogg, 2000; Reynolds et al., 2007), and that this is a relevant precondition for the relationship between identity and discrimination (McGarty, 2001; Lalonde, 2002; Turner 1999). Based on this view, in the current thesis it is argued that by emphasising the intergroup context (thereby
making social identity salient) we can more reliably investigate the link between identity and discrimination.

The present investigation.

Considerable disregard for the relevance of a social identity perspective has resulted in a significant gap in research on religion and intergroup discrimination. The present investigation is designed to attend to this empirical oversight by examining the extent to which Christian group identification is related to multiple forms of intergroup discrimination against a variety of target outgroups. In accordance with a social identity perspective (Turner, 1999; Turner & Reynolds, 2001), three studies investigate the relationship between Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination in contexts where intergroup relationships are emphasised compared to when they are not. Study 1 examines the relationship between Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination (evaluations) with regard to Atheists within these contexts. Studies 2 and 3 extend this research to consider both positive (trait ratings, re-hiring) and negative (white noise distributions, sacking) forms of discrimination with regard to Goths and Homosexuals.

One hypothesis is tested in Study 1. This states that a positive relationship between Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination (evaluations) will emerge in a context where Christian group membership is made salient. No such relationship is expected in the condition where social identity is non-salient.
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Study 1

Method.

Participants. Eighty two students attending the University of Otago took part in this study. Although gender was not examined as a variable, the sample comprised of approximately equal numbers of men and women. Forty-one were assigned to a condition where intergroup relations were emphasised (the salient condition). Forty-one were assigned to a condition where intergroup relations were not emphasised (the non-salient condition). All participants were members of various campus affiliated Christian organisations and received between $5 and $10 for taking part.

Materials and procedure. The study was introduced in both conditions as being concerned with social perception, judgment and behaviour. All participants were informed that they would complete a short series of questionnaire tasks that would be followed by a brief behavioural exercise.

In order to differentially emphasise the intergroup context we sought to draw attention to ingroup and outgroup membership in one condition (salient) but not the other (non-salient). As a means of achieving this, participants in the salient condition were informed that the study was specifically concerned with groups comprised of ‘Christians’ (ingroup) and ‘Atheists’ (outgroup). It was then explained that the behavioural exercise to be carried out at the end of the study was an intergroup exercise that would involve groups of Christians and groups of Atheists. This (bogus) exercise was described as one in which there would be a 5 minute interaction period spent with Christians and a 5 minute interaction spent with Atheists. Atheists were said to be involved in an identical experiment being carried out concurrently in an adjacent laboratory (see Appendix A).
To underline the reality of this manipulation, a number of additional steps were taken. First, large signs (directing Christians and Atheists to separate rooms) were posted in various positions on the way into the laboratory. Second, when members of the Christian group were seated in the laboratory, one (confederate) outgroup member entered the laboratory and asked if this was the “right room for the Atheist group”. The experimenter then explained that “no, everyone here is Christian” and that “the Atheists are in the lab next door.” Finally, immediately prior to the start of each testing session a confederate entered the laboratory and loudly confirmed to the experimenter that the Atheist group (ostensibly in the adjacent laboratory) was ready to begin. It was explained that both groups had to start at the same time so that the ‘interaction’ period, in which the two groups would meet, would coincide.

Participants were presented with a response booklet, on which group membership (Christian) was specified. No reference to group membership was made in the non-salient condition. To encourage anonymity of responding, participants were identified by code number recorded on their response booklet.

The first section of the response booklet contained Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) importance to identity subscale (Appendix D). The 4-item importance to identity scale is designed to assess the extent to which identity is an important part of the self-concept, and is used as our measure of Christian group identification. According to Ashmore, Deaux and McLaughlin-Vope (2004) this scale encapsulates “the purest definition” of importance to identity (p. 88). The measure has been found to be reliable and valid across a variety of contexts and regardless of whether it is used to assess global or particular identities (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine & Broadnax, 1994; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Major, Quinton & Schmader, 2003). Easily modified to assess any particular identity (Crocker et al., 1994, p. 511), the items comprising the scale were amended to refer to the particular identity in question (i.e., ‘Being a Christian is an important reflection of who I am’, $N = 82$, Cronbach’s
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alpha = .71). Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1-agree strongly, 7-disagree strongly). Higher scores reflect greater levels of identification.

Second, intergroup discrimination was assessed via measures of evaluative ingroup bias. Participants were presented with twelve vignettes. Each vignette was one paragraph long and depicted a situation in which the participant was asked to imagine that an ingroup or an outgroup target actor had behaved either positively or negatively towards them. In keeping with Hunter et al., (2004), actors were identified through name and specific reference to social category membership (e.g., ‘David a Christian’ or ‘Paul an Atheist’). The vignettes, comprised one example each of a target actor who either: (a) offered or refused help to the participant after he or she had fallen off a bicycle (b) was generous or miserly to the participant and (c) offered or refused shelter to the participant when they had been caught in the rain. The vignettes were presented in a single random order. Following the presentation of each vignette, participants were then asked to evaluate the target actor in question (e.g., How would you evaluate David/Paul?). Evaluations were assessed using seven point Likert scales (Appendix E, 1-positive to 7-very positive, see Dovidio & Fazio, 1992, who outline the advantages of this approach).

A final section in the response booklet asked respondents if they considered themselves to be members of the group in question (i.e., do you consider yourself to be a Christian – Yes or No), had taken part in similar studies, had suspicions or guessed the true purpose of the study. Participants were then debriefed and thanked for taking part.

Results.

Manipulation checks. An independent pilot test was conducted in order to compare levels of social identity salience and depersonalization (as defined by Haslam, 2004, p. 280-281) in circumstances that emphasised and did not emphasise the intergroup context (N = 70). In this analysis two questions were taken from Ellemers, Kortekaas and Ouwerkerk (1999)
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‘social self-categorisation subscale’ (Appendix C). The first assessed identity salience (i.e., ‘I identify with the other members of my group’). The second assessed depersonalization (i.e., ‘I am like the other members of my group’). Responses were recorded on 7-point Likert scales (1-strongly disagree, 7-agree strongly). Between subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) found that participants in the salient condition identified more highly ($M = 5.22, SD = 1.13$ vs. $M = 3.02, SD = .95$), $t(68) = 8.75, p < .001, \eta^2 = .53$, and judged themselves as being more like other category members ($M = 5.51, SD = 1.29$ vs. $M = 3.74, SD = 1.29$), $t(68) = 6.39, p < .001, \eta^2 = .38$, than did participants in non-salient condition. These results indicate that the social identity salience manipulation used in Study 1 was likely to be successful.

Christian group identification. Although participants in the salient condition had slightly higher importance to identity scores than participants in the non-salient condition ($M = 24.21, SD = 3.86$ vs. $M = 22.51, SD = 4.84$), a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that this difference did not reach conventional levels of significance, $F(1, 80) = 3.11, p < .08$.

Intergroup discrimination. After the usual methodologies in this area, (see Hewstone, 1990; Hunter et al., 2004) responses to the vignettes were collapsed so that one overall score was computed for each episode of positive and negative ingroup and outgroup behaviour. Evaluations of ingroup and outgroup target actors were then analysed by means of a 2 (condition: salient vs. non-salient) x 2 (target group: ingroup/outgroup) x 2 (behaviour outcome: positive or negative) mixed model ANOVA. The first variable was between subjects. The second and third were within subjects. Cell means and standard deviations for intergroup discrimination in the salient and non-salient conditions are presented in Table 1.

A main effect was found for behaviour outcome, $F(1, 80) = 221.98, p < .001, \eta^2 = .74$. Those who displayed positive behaviours were evaluated more highly than those who displayed negative behaviours ($M = 5.77, SD = .81$ vs. $M = 3.86, SD = 1.29$). An interaction
was found between condition and behaviour outcome, $F(1, 80) = 12.08, p < .02, \eta^2 = .08$. Post hoc comparisons, (using independent t-tests) conducted to assess this effect further revealed one significant effect. Participants in the salient condition evaluated those who displayed positive behaviours more highly than those in the non-salient condition ($M = 6.11$, $SD = .64$ vs. $M = 5.44$, $SD = .55$), $t(80) = 4.99, p < .001, \eta^2 = .36$.

**Table 1**

*Cell Means (SD) for Evaluations of Ingroup and Outgroup Members Following Positive and Negative Behaviours in the Salient and Non-salient Conditions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behaviour</td>
<td>Salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behaviour</td>
<td>Salient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Higher scores indicate more positive evaluations.*

* Significant difference between ingroup and outgroup evaluations at $p < .05$

A further main effect was found for target group, $F(1, 80) = 36.82, p < .001, \eta^2 = .32$. Ingroup members were evaluated more highly than outgroup members ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 1.02$ vs. $M = 4.52$, $SD = 1.08$). The interaction between condition, target group and behaviour outcome failed to reach significance, $F(1, 80) = .34, p > .56$. Planned comparisons using repeated measures t-tests revealed that participants in the salient condition evaluated ingroup members more highly with respect to positive ($M = 6.34$, $SD = .76$ vs. $M = 5.87$, $SD = .73$), $t(40) = 3.94, p < .001, \eta^2 = .28$, and negative behaviours ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.33$, vs. $M = 3.47$, $t(40) = 3.05, p < .005, \eta^2 = .24$).
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SD = 1.33, \( t(40) = 4.11, p < .001, \eta^2 = .30 \). A similar pattern emerged in the non-salient condition. Ingroup members were evaluated more highly than outgroup members with respect to positive (\( M = 5.69, SD = .84 \) vs. \( M = 5.20, SD = .90 \), \( t(40) = 2.29, p < .03, \eta^2 = .12 \), and negative behaviours (\( M = 4.17, SD = 1.14 \) vs. \( M = 3.55, SD = 1.35 \), \( t(40) = 3.24, p < .003, \eta^2 = .21 \). All effects, except that pertaining to the positive behaviours of ingroup and outgroup members in the non-salient condition remained significant when Dunn’s correction was applied (critical alpha value = 2.50, \( p < .05 \)).

Identity and discrimination. Zero order correlations were used to assess the association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. Separate analysis was conducted for each condition. In both cases, an index of discrimination was constructed by subtracting evaluations of outgroup members from evaluations of ingroup members. The index was correlated with the importance to identity scale.

As may be seen in Table 2, identity was positively correlated with discrimination \( (r = .38, p < .02) \) in the salient condition, but not the non-salient condition \( (r = -.10, p = .55) \). Fisher’s test revealed that these correlations were significantly different \( (z(82) = 2.18, p < .02) \).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salient</th>
<th>Non-salient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>+.38*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Higher scores denote more positive evaluations of the ingroup

*Significant at \( p < .02 \)
Discussion Study 1.

One hypothesis was tested in Study 1. This stated that a positive relationship between Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination (evaluations) would emerge in a context where Christian group membership was made salient. No such relationship was expected in the condition where social identity was non-salient. The results supported this hypothesis. Christian group members showed more intergroup discrimination in the salient condition. In this context intergroup discrimination was positively related to Christian group identification. Although these findings indicate that the processes specified by a social identity perspective (i.e., group identification) are associated with intergroup discrimination, this study is nevertheless open to one particular criticism.

Although we found that ingroup favouritism (in the form of more positive evaluations given to the ingroup than the outgroup) was related to identity when intergroup relations are made salient, the relevance of our results may be undermined by an important body of research carried out by Mummendey and colleagues (Mummendey & Otten, 1998; Mummendey et al., 1992; Otten, Mummendey & Blanz, 1996). These researchers demonstrate that although ingroup members readily discriminate with respect to more benign forms (i.e., evaluate ingroup members more positively than outgroup members) this tendency is not sustained for negative forms of discrimination (such as the allocation of more negative resources to the outgroup). For this reason, Brown (2000b) argued that ‘the psychological processes specified by SIT seem to be only applicable to discrimination and favouritism in the positive domain’ (Brown, 2000b, p.756). This ‘positive-negative asymmetry effect’ (PNAE, Mummendey et al., 1992) challenges the applicability of a social identity account of intergroup discrimination, as it is often highly negative forms of discrimination that manifest outside of the laboratory (see Levin & Rabrenovic, 2004; Power, 2003; Staub, 1989). Consistent with Brown’s concerns, studies looking at identification and discrimination have
found that, although identification predicted intergroup discrimination in the allocation of positive stimuli (as was found in Study 1) this was not the case for negative stimuli (Amiot & Bourhis, 2005b; Hodson et al., 2003). These results suggest that our findings may not generalise to negative forms of discrimination.

As has been argued however, the relationship between social identification and intergroup discrimination is dependent on context (Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a). Consistent with this concept, Mummendey and colleagues have documented that there are certain contexts within which intergroup discrimination will occur in the negative domain (Blanz, Mummendey & Otten, 1995; Otten, Mummendey & Blanz, 1996). These ‘aggravating’ conditions include increased social identity salience and increased levels of threat (Mummendey et al., 1992). Under such conditions the PNAE dissipates (Mummendey & Otten, 2001; Mummendey, Otten, Berger & Kessler, 2000; Reynolds, Turner & Haslam, 2000; Branscombe & Wann, 1994) and intergroup discrimination is more likely to be related to identification (Turner, 1999).

In response to literature on the PNAE, Study 2 includes the social category ‘Goth’ in addition to manipulating social identity salience. Goths (individuals who wear entirely black clothing) as the target outgroup are considered to be threatening partly as a consequence of wearing the colour black. Black is globally associated with ‘evil’, ‘death’ and ‘badness’ (Adams & Osgood, 1973; Williams & McMurty, 1970; Williams, Moreland & Underwood, 1970). Indeed, Frank and Gilovich (1988) found that black clothing is considered to look more malevolent than non-black clothing. Consequently, these same researchers found participants were more likely to perceive behaviour as aggressive (threatening), and to give penalties (negative outcomes) when a target was wearing black compared to targets wearing white/non-black (Frank & Gilovich, 1988). Furthermore, the ‘post-Columbine Goth’ identity is considered to incite ‘moral panic’ amongst the general population (Griffiths, 2010). In this
‘moral panic’ the Goth identity has inadvertently taken on a ‘deviant’ status (Cohen, 2002), and is often associated with “self-mutilation”, “criminal activities and antisocial behaviour”, “mass murder… [and] suicide” (Griffiths, 2010, p. 406-8). Following from this research, the likelihood of PNAE is anticipated to decrease significantly as a consequence of the combination of manipulated salience and the threatening nature of the ‘Goth’ identity.

Study 2 examines the role of Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination using both positive (trait ratings) and negative outcomes (the distribution of white noise) in situations where Christian social identity is and is not made salient. The purpose of this study is to: (a) see if findings from Study 1 generalise to other outgroups (Goths), and (b) other forms of discrimination (negative). Study 2 tests one hypothesis. This states that Christian group identification will be positively correlated with both positive (more positive trait ratings given to the ingroup) and negative (more white noise distributed to the outgroup) forms of discrimination in a condition where Christian group membership is made salient. Again, no such relationships are anticipated when social identity salience is not manipulated.
Study 2

Method.

Participants. Eighty-four students (forty-five men, thirty-nine women) attending the University of Otago took part in this study. Thirty-eight were assigned to a condition where intergroup relations were emphasised (i.e., made salient). Forty-six were assigned to a condition where intergroup relations were not emphasised (non-salient). All participants were members of various campus affiliated Christian organisations and received between $5 and $10 for taking part.

Materials and procedure. The study was introduced using the same methods and procedure used in Study 1 (Appendix A), with a number of exceptions. Whilst the ingroup was comprised of ‘Christians’, the outgroup was comprised of ‘Goths’. As in Study 1, the importance to identity scale was modified according to the identity being measured (i.e., ‘Being a Christian is an important reflection of who I am’, N = 82, Cronbach’s alpha = .71). Responses were recorded on 7-point Likert scales (1-strongly disagree, 7-agree strongly) and was used as our measure of Christian group identification (Appendix D). Likewise, confederate outgroup members were dressed all in black, and enquired after the correct room for the “Goth group”. In contrast to our first study, four (as opposed to 1) confederate outgroup members entered the room.

In an attempt to demonstrate differential levels of salience and depersonalisation those assigned to each condition (as described above), were asked two questions. As in the pilot for Study 1, these questions were taken from Ellemers et al., (1999) ‘social self-categorisation subscale’. The first question assessed category salience (i.e., ‘I identify with other Christians’). The second assessed depersonalisation (i.e., ‘I am like other Christians’). Responses were recorded on 7-point Likert scales (1-strongly disagree, 7-agree strongly, Appendix C).
Intergroup discrimination was assessed using both trait ratings (a relatively positive form of discrimination) and the allocation of white noise (a relatively negative form of discrimination). In assessing trait ratings participants were presented with 13 pairs of 9-point rating scales. After Platow, McClintock and Liebrand (1990) these were anchored using the dimensions: cooperative-competitive, helpful-unhelpful, selfish-unselfish, intelligent-unintelligent, strong-weak, warm-cold, flexible-rigid, manipulative-sincere, fair-unfair, friendly-unfriendly, consistent-inconsistent, honest-dishonest, trustworthy-untrustworthy. Half of the items were presented in the reverse order. Using these scales, participants in each condition rated ingroup (i.e., Christians) and outgroup (i.e., Goths) members (Appendix F).

White noise allocations between ingroup and outgroup members were assessed by means of 12, 13 choice distribution matrices. The matrices, were adapted from the B form matrices outlined in Tajfel et al., (1971, p. 157). Rather than use the 14-choice, zero sum format used by these researchers, (for consistency with most other researchers, e.g., Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a) we used 13-choice matrices. In these matrices the joint pay-off was constant through each column. Each matrix allowed participants to give more to the ingroup, more to the outgroup or equal amounts to each. The numerical values typically used to denote ‘points’ in each set of matrices were substituted to represent times (in seconds) that were to be spent listening to white noise (Appendix G). Using these matrices, participants were given the opportunity to allocate white noise to outgroup (Goths) and ingroup members (Christians). To ensure knowledge of the stimulus sound in question, a 10 second sample blast was administered to all participants. This was produced using a Spitfire white noise generator.

A final section in the response booklet asked respondents if they considered themselves to be members of the group in question (i.e., do you consider yourself to be a Christian – Yes or No), had taken part in similar studies, had suspicions or guessed the true purpose of the study. Participants were then debriefed and thanked for taking part.
Results.

Preliminary analysis revealed no gender main or interaction effects, so this variable is not discussed further.

Manipulation checks. Between subjects ANOVA revealed that Christians in the salient condition identified more with other Christians ($M = 6.89, \text{SD} = .31$ vs. $M = 6.37, \text{SD} = 7.01$), $F(1, 81) = 7.01, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08$, and judged themselves as being more like other Christians ($M = 5.53, \text{SD} = 1.17$ vs. $M = 4.65, \text{SD} = 1.12$), $F(1, 81) = 8.25, p < .006, \eta^2 = .09$, than did participants in the non-salient condition.

Christian group identification. Although participants in the salient condition had slightly higher importance to identity scores than participants in the non-salient condition ($M = 24.65, \text{SD} = 3.06$ vs. $M = 22.98, \text{SD} = 4.89$) a between subjects ANOVA revealed that this difference did not reach conventional levels of significance, $F(1, 81) = 3.35, p < .08$.

Intergroup discrimination. Cell means and standard deviations for both positive and negative forms of intergroup discrimination in the salient and non-salient conditions are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

Cell Means (SD) for Trait Ratings and White-noise Distributions to Ingroup and Outgroup Members in the Salient and Non-salient Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Outgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Ratings</td>
<td>Salient</td>
<td>77.86 (5.55)**</td>
<td>59.26 (7.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salient</td>
<td>64.64 (11.67)</td>
<td>65.55 (11.74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Noise</td>
<td>Salient</td>
<td>90.76 (9.57)</td>
<td>84.84 (10.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salient</td>
<td>77.60 (13.22)</td>
<td>80.63 (15.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores for white noise were reversed so higher scores indicate ingroup favouritism. 
*** Significant difference between ingroup and outgroup trait ratings at $p < .0005$

Trait ratings of ingroup and outgroup members were examined using a 2 (condition: salient vs. non-salient) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). The first factor was between subjects. The second factor was within subjects. A main effect was found for target group, $F(1, 81) = 123.91$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .61$. Ingroup members were rated more positively than outgroup members. This effect was, however, qualified by an interaction between condition and target group, $F(1, 82) = 150.73$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .65$. Planned comparisons using repeated measures t-tests revealed that in the salient condition ingroup members were rated more highly than outgroup members ($M = 77.86$, $SD = 5.55$ vs. $M = 59.26$, $SD = 7.96$), $t(37) = 11.21$, $p < .0005$, $\eta^2 = .77$. In the non-salient condition, there was a tendency to rate outgroup members more highly than ingroup members ($M = 64.64$, $SD = 11.67$ vs. $M = 65.55$, $SD = 11.74$), $t(37) = 2.17$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .10$. 
After other researchers (e.g., Hunter et al., 2004; Hunter et al., 2005; Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1996; Platow et al., 1997) we used the difference in the total amount of white noise (allocated to ingroup and outgroup members) to assess levels of intergroup discrimination. White noise allocations to ingroup and outgroup members were examined using a 2 (condition: salient vs. non-salient) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). The first factor was between subjects. The second factor was within subjects. An interaction was found between condition and target group, $F(1, 82) = 7.03, p < .01, \eta^2 = .08$. Participants in the salient condition showed a tendency to allocate more white noise to the ingroup than the outgroup ($M = 90.76, SD = 9.57$ vs. $M = 84.84, SD = 10.71$). Participants in the non-salient condition showed a tendency to allocate more white noise to the outgroup than the ingroup ($M = 77.60, SD = 13.22$ vs. $M = 80.63, SD = 15.15$). Planned comparisons using repeated measures $t$-tests revealed these differences did not reach conventional levels of significance ($t(37) = 1.84, p < .08$ and $t(37) = 1.97, p < .06$ respectively).

*Identity and discrimination.* The link between importance to identity, intergroup trait ratings and white noise allocations was assessed using standard multiple regression. Separate analysis was conducted for each condition. In each case: a) an index of positive intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting trait ratings of outgroup members from trait ratings of ingroup members and, b) an index of negative intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the amount of white noise allocated to the ingroup from the amount allocated to the outgroup. These indexes were entered as the independent variable. Importance to identity was entered as the dependent variable. As may be seen in Table 4, the regression was significant in the salient condition, $R^2 = .17, F(2, 35) = 3.56, p < .05$. Inspection of beta weights revealed a significantly positive association between importance to identity and trait discrimination, $\beta = +.41, p < .05$. No significant relationship was found for
the index of white noise discrimination, $\beta = +.02, p = .30$. In the non-salient condition the regression did not reach significance, $R^2 = .03, F(2, 41) = .62, p = .55$.

**Table 4**

*Standardised Regression Coefficients ($\beta$s) Between Identity and Positive and Negative Discrimination in the Salient Condition.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Positive (trait ratings)                      | $+.41^*$  
| Negative (white noise)                        | $+.02$  

*Note. Higher scores denote ingroup favouritism.*  

*Significant at $p < .05$*

**Discussion Study 2.**

One hypothesis was tested in the present study. This states that Christian group identification would be positively correlated with both positive (more positive trait ratings given to the ingroup) and negative (more white noise distributed to the outgroup) forms of discrimination in a condition where Christian group membership was made salient. Again, no such relationships were anticipated when social identity salience was not manipulated. This hypothesis was supported with respect to trait ratings (a relatively positive form of discrimination) but not white noise (a relatively negative form of discrimination). With regard to trait ratings, Christian group members showed significantly more intergroup discrimination in the salient condition. In this condition Christian group identification was positively related to this form of discrimination. Christian group members with greater levels of identification with their Christian group allocated more positive traits to ingroup members (Christians) than outgroup members (Goths). Contrary to expectations however, there was no significant level of discrimination found with regard to white noise (negative outcomes). These particular
findings are consistent with the PNAE (i.e., intergroup discrimination was found with regard to a positive, but not a negative form of discrimination) in the salient condition. Although participants’ Christian group identification positively predicted evaluative bias this effect was not sustained in the allocation of white noise.

The replication of a positive correlation between identity and intergroup discrimination in the salient condition with regard to trait ratings speaks to the generality of this effect. Christian group members’ discrimination against both Atheists and Goths was positively related to Christian group identification. While it is encouraging to have replicated this relationship in the positive domain, the present results with regard to the negative domain (i.e., no intergroup discrimination with regard to white noise, hence the PNAE) are consistent with Brown’s (2000b) concerns that the processes specified by SIT are only relevant to positive forms of discrimination. A number of methodological criticisms however, allow us to question the reliability of asymmetry effects observed in Study 1.

First, although it was assumed that trait ratings and white noise distributions were suitably comparable to assess (correspondingly) positive and negative forms of discrimination, Struch and Schwartz (1989) have argued that evaluative ratings are completely unrelated to negative forms of discrimination. This indicates that trait ratings and white noise are comparatively different in more ways than just ‘valence’, and that the disparity between distributions of these particular resources could in fact be related to other differences between the two tasks (e.g. evaluative ratings may be more directly related to the social identities of these target actors, see Hunter et al., 2011). Consequently, it cannot be assumed that differences in the allocation of ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ resources unequivocally represent valence effects on discrimination as proposed by the PNAE (Mummendey et al., 1992). A more reliable comparison between positive and negative forms of discrimination
requires greater comparability between tasks identified as ‘positive discrimination’ and ‘negative discrimination’.

Further to the issue of ‘comparability’, the manipulation used in studies 1 and 2 (concerned with differentiating conditions with regard to social category salience and social category ‘non-salience’) suffer from one particular shortcoming. This manipulation is based on the assumption that social identity will be less salient in situations where group membership is not emphasised. A more reliable manipulation differentiating conditions of identity salience should manipulate salience in both conditions (i.e., manipulate salience of social identity in one condition, and manipulate personal identity salience in the other).

Secondly, as we did not find support for our hypothesis in regard to white noise distributions it is important to consider how this result relates to literature explaining the PNAE. Mummendey and Otten (1998) present a number of findings that consider the real differences between the appropriateness of positive and negative forms of discrimination (Mummendey & Otten, 1998). According to these authors, it is far more acceptable to allocate less positive stimuli to outgroup members, than to inflict more negative and aversive stimuli on outgroup members. Indeed, Blanz, Mummendey and Otten (1997) found that while positive ingroup favouritism was mildly disregarded, ingroup favouritism in the allocation of negative stimuli was normatively condemned. This normative constraint means that social discrimination is less likely to occur with negative outcome distributions as it is less justifiable than withholding positive outcomes (Mummendey & Otten, 1998). Although it was anticipated that Goths as the target outgroup would provide ‘aggravating’ conditions, thus alleviating normative constraints on discrimination in the negative domain, this assumption requires some reconsideration.

It is possible that our social identity salience manipulation may have inadvertently increased the strength of normative constraints seen to be responsible for the PNAE.
According to SCT, when social identity is made salient, one's behaviour becomes more consistent with group norms (Turner et al., 1987). A fundamental text within the Christian religion is the Bible. The Bible outlines a number of guiding principles for behaviour and attitude that are meant to characterise those who live according to this text. Passages such as "Love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. 19:18; Mat. 22:39; Gal. 5:14), and "So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you" (Mat. 7:12) may provide clear normative constraints against discrimination which are far more robust when Christian social identity is made salient. Indeed, a recent paper by Malhotra (2010) reported that pro-social behaviour (charity) was far more likely amongst religious participants when religion was assumed to be salient (on Sundays). This ‘Sunday Effect’ suggests that when religious norms are salient, religious individuals are more inclined to behave according to these norms (illustrated in an increase in charitable giving). The so-called ‘Sunday Effect’ suggests that, in a context where Christian social identity is salient, pro-social norms connected to this social category may indeed prohibit discrimination against Atheists and Goths in the negative domain.

Importantly however, an interesting study by Amiot and Bourhis (2003) found that even when ingroup norms proscribe discriminatory behaviour, ingroup members will discriminate using negative outcomes when there is a justifying ideology legitimising such behaviour. Highly relevant to this finding is previous research on religion and discrimination which shows that although there are a number of Christian norms seen to ‘proscribe’ discrimination against certain targets (i.e., racial), these exist alongside other norms seen to ‘scripturally endorse’ discrimination against certain others (Batson et al., 1993; Herek, 1987; Hunsberger & Jackson 2005). To put it another way, this means that although some groups may be normatively protected against discrimination by Biblical ideology, this does not apply to all outgroups.
One particular social category against which discrimination is understood to be ‘scripturally endorsed’ by the Bible is Homosexuals (Herek, 1987). There are six primary passages believed to condemn the act of homosexuality in the Bible (Gen. 19:5; Lev. 18:22; Lev. 20:13; Rom. 1:26; Cor. 6:9; Tim. 1:9). Examples such as “You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination” (Lev. 18:22), and “If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death; their blood be upon them”. (Lev. 20:13) certainly convey negative attitudes toward homosexual activity. Ostensibly, guiding principles for behaviour and attitude outlined by the Bible have been seen to justify the denigration and punishment of Homosexuals.

Taken together, the literature discussed suggests that: (a) normative constraints limiting discrimination against Atheists and Goths in the negative domain is unlikely to extend to the Homosexual outgroup and, (b) scripture denigrating homosexuality may provide a discrimination justifying ideology for negative forms of discrimination against Homosexuals. Therefore, Study 3 will include the social category ‘Homosexual’ in addition to more comparable (by referring to the same resource, ‘jobs’) examples of both negative (sacking) and positive (re-hiring) forms of intergroup discrimination.

Study 3 examines the role of Christian group identification and discrimination against Homosexuals in regard to the allocation of negative (sacking) and positive (re-hiring) outcomes. The purpose of Study 3 is to: (a) see if findings from Study 1 and Study 2 generalise to other outgroups (i.e., Homosexuals) and, (b) are maintained across positive and negative forms of discrimination. This study tests one hypothesis. This states that Christian group identification will be positively correlated with both positive (more re-hiring of ingroup than outgroup members) and negative (more sacking of outgroup than ingroup members) forms of discrimination in a condition where Christian group membership is made salient. Again, no such relationships are anticipated when Christian group membership is not salient.
Study 3

Method.

Participants. One hundred and five Christian group members (sixty-one men and forty-four women) took part in this study. Fifty-five were assigned to a condition where intergroup relations were emphasised (salient condition), fifty were assigned to a condition where interpersonal relations were emphasised (non-salient condition). All participants were members of various campus affiliated Christian organisations and received between $10 and $20 for taking part.

Materials and procedure. The study was introduced using similar methods to studies 1 and 2 with a number of exceptions. Whilst the ingroup was comprised of ‘Christians’, the outgroup comprised of ‘Homosexuals’. In order to differentially emphasise the intergroup context all participants in Study 3 underwent salience manipulations that differed according to condition (Appendix B). These manipulations followed Verkuyten and Hagendoorn (1998) and Haslam, Oakes, Reynolds and Turner (1999). In order to emphasise the intergroup context in the salient condition participants first read Verkuyten and Hagendoorn’s ‘social identity’ instructions (i.e., ‘People belong to all kinds of groups...’) followed by completing Haslam et al., (1999) ‘three things’ manipulation for social identity salience (i.e., list up to 3 things you and other Christians do often; do well; do poorly). In order to emphasise the interpersonal context (thus making social identity non-salient), participants in the non-salient condition first read Verkuyten and Hagendoorns ‘personal identity instructions’ (i.e., ‘People differ from each other in all kinds of ways...’) followed by completing Haslam et al., ‘three things’ manipulation for personal identity salience (i.e., list up to 3 things you do often; do well; do poorly). That participants make compatible responses in both the salient and non-salient conditions is an advantage of this manipulation over those used in the previous two studies (Haslam, 2004).
Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) importance to identity scale was modified according to the identity being measured (i.e., ‘Being a Christian is an important reflection of who I am’, N = 82, Cronbach’s alpha = .71). Responses were recorded on 7-point Likert scales (1-strongly disagree, 7-agree strongly) and were used as our measure of Christian group identification (Appendix D). In an attempt to demonstrate differential levels of salience and depersonalisation those assigned to each condition (as described above), were asked two questions. These questions were taken from Ellemers et al., (1999) ‘social self-categorisation subscale’. The first question assessed category salience (i.e., ‘I identify with other Christians’). The second assessed depersonalisation (i.e., ‘I am like other Christians’). Responses were recorded on 7-point Likert scales (1-strongly disagree, 7-agree strongly, Appendix C).

To assess intergroup discrimination, participants were asked to sack (negative) and re-hire (positive) ingroup (Christians) and outgroup (Homosexuals) members. To facilitate this task, participants were asked to imagine a scenario in which they were a manager in a factory. In the negative discrimination task, ‘managers’ were told that their factory employed 200 people, 100 of whom were Christians, 100 of whom were Homosexuals. Their task was to sack 100 people. Participants were informed that they could sack as many of as few people from each group as they wished so long as the total reached 100. In the positive discrimination task, ‘managers’ were told that their factory sacked 200 people, 100 of whom were Christians, 100 of whom were Homosexuals. Their task was to re-hire 100 people. Participants were informed that they could re-hire as many of as few people from each group as they wished so long as the total reached 100 (Appendix H).

A final section in the response booklet asked respondents if they considered themselves to be members of the group in question (i.e., do you consider yourself to be a Christian – Yes
or No), had taken part in similar studies, had suspicions or guessed the true purpose of the study. Participants were then debriefed and thanked for taking part.

Results.

Gender effects were analysed in response to research indicating that men display more negative affective reactions to homosexuality than women (Herek & Capitanio, 1995, 1996, 1999; Kite & Whitley, 1996). Preliminary analysis revealed no gender main or interaction effects, so this variable is not discussed further.

Manipulation checks. Between subjects ANOVA’s revealed that Christians in the salient condition identified more highly with their Christian group (M = 5.60, SD = 1.11 vs. M = 4.78, SD = 1.21, F(1,104) = 13.10, p < .001, η² = .11) and judged themselves as being more like other Christians (M = 4.09, SD = 1.17 vs. M = 3.57, SD = 1.43, F(1, 104) = 4.20, p < .05, η² = .04) than did participants in the non-salient condition.

Christian group identification. Between subjects ANOVA’s revealed that participants in the salient condition (M = 22.70, SD = 4.38) and the non-salient condition (M = 22.10, SD = 4.09), F(1, 103) = .54, p = .46, did not differ with respect to identity importance.

Intergroup discrimination. Sacking (negative) and re-hiring (positive) of ingroup and outgroup members was examined using a 2 (condition: salient/non-salient) x 2 (target group: ingroup/outgroup) x 2 (valence: sacking/re-hiring) mixed model ANOVA. The first factor was between subjects, the second two factors were within subjects. All cell means and standard deviations are presented in Table 5. A main effect was found for target group F(1, 102) = 14.17, p < .001. There was an overall tendency to favour the ingroup (M = 56.16 SD = 14.75 vs. M = 43.85 SD = 14.46), F(1, 102) = 14.17, p < .001, η² = .12. An interaction was found between target group and salience condition F(1, 102) = 4.53, p < .05, η² = .04. To assess this effect further planned comparisons using repeated measures t-tests were
conducted. Significant levels of discrimination were found in the salient condition \((M = 58.09, SD = 17.31 \text{ vs. } M = 41.91, SD = 17.31), t(54) = 3.63, p < .002, \eta^2 = .20, \) but not the non-salient condition \((M = 52.25, SD = 11.18 \text{ vs. } 47.76, SD = 11.18), t(48) = 1.5, p = .14).\]

To further examine the pattern of discrimination shown by participants in the salient and non-salient conditions with regard to sacking and re-hiring, we conducted further planned comparisons using repeated measures t-tests. Participants in the salient condition showed significant levels of ingroup bias with respect to sacking \((M = 57.09, SD = 16.63 \text{ vs. } M = 42.91, SD = 16.63, t(54) = 3.16, p < .005, \eta^2 = .16)\) and re-hiring \((M = 59.09, SD = 17.98 \text{ vs. } M = 40.91, SD = 17.98, t(54) = 3.75, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21)\). Each of these effects were significant when Dunn’s correction was incorporated (critical alpha value = 2.94, \(p < .01\)). No significant ingroup bias was found in the non-salient condition for sacking \((M = 51.63, SD = 10.28 \text{ vs. } M = 48.37, SD = 10.28, t(49) = 1.11, p = .27)\) or re-hiring \((M = 52.86, SD = 12.08 \text{ vs. } M = 47.14, SD = 12.08, t(49) = 1.66, p = .10)\).

**Table 5**

*Cell Means (SD) for Sacking and Re-hiring of Ingroup and Outgroup Members in the Salient and Non-salient Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Ingroup</th>
<th>Outgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacking</td>
<td>Salient</td>
<td>57.09 (16.63)*</td>
<td>42.91 (16.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salient</td>
<td>51.63 (10.28)</td>
<td>48.37 (10.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-hiring</td>
<td>Salient</td>
<td>59.09 (17.98)**</td>
<td>40.91 (17.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salient</td>
<td>52.86 (12.08)</td>
<td>47.14 (12.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scores for sackings were reversed so higher scores indicate ingroup favouritism.

* Significant difference between ingroup and outgroup sacking at \(p < .005\).
** Significant difference between ingroup and outgroup re-hiring at \(p < .001\).
Identity and discrimination. The link between explicit importance to identity, sacking and re-hiring in the salient condition was assessed using standard multiple regression. An index of negative intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the amount of ingroup sacking from the amount of outgroup sacking. An index of positive intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the amount of outgroup re-hiring from the amount of ingroup re-hiring. These indexes were entered as independent variables. Importance to identity was entered as the dependent variable. Given the potential for multicollinearity amongst these constructs, correlations between these variables are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Correlations (rs) Between Positive Discrimination, Negative Discrimination and Identity in the Salient Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p < .05$

** Significant at $p < .01$

The results of the overall regression were significant, $R^2 = .15$, $F(2,54) = 4.55$, $p < .02$. Inspection of beta weights revealed a significantly negative association between importance to identity and negative discrimination, $\beta = -.45$, $p < .05$. No significant relationship found between identity importance and positive discrimination, $\beta = +.08$, $p = .71$.

The unique association between importance to identity and negative discrimination was confirmed via partial correlation. These correlations are presented in Table 7. Controlling for
the index of positive discrimination, the negative association between identity importance and negative discrimination (sacking) remained significant, \((pr = -0.30, p < .05)\). Similar analysis controlling for negative discrimination revealed that the association between positive discrimination and identity was effectively zero \((pr = +0.01, p = .94)\).

**Table 7**

*Partial Correlations (pr) Between Identity and Positive and Negative Discrimination in the Salient Condition.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Higher scores denote ingroup bias/favouritism

*Significant at \(p < .05\)

**Discussion Study 3.**

The present study tested one hypothesis. This stated that Christian group identification would be positively correlated with both positive (more re-hiring of ingroup than outgroup members) and negative (more sacking of outgroup than ingroup members) forms of discrimination in a condition where Christian group membership was made salient. Again, no such relationships were anticipated when Christian group membership was not salient. Significant levels of both positive and negative discrimination (hence, no PNAE) were found in the salient condition only. When social identity was salient, Christians re-hired more Christians than Homosexuals, and sacked more Homosexuals that Christians. Contrary to expectations, Christian group identification was not associated with positive discrimination in either condition. Furthermore, although Christian group identification was related to the
amount of ingroup and outgroup members sacked in the salient condition, this relationship was *negative* as opposed to positive.
General Discussion

Three studies examined the relationship between Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination in circumstances where intergroup relationships were emphasised (i.e., salient) or not emphasised (i.e., non-salient). Each study incorporated different outgroups (Atheists, Goths, Homosexuals) and different forms of intergroup discrimination (evaluations, trait ratings, white noise, sacking and re-hiring). A single hypothesis was tested in each study. This stated that Christian group identification would be positively related to intergroup discrimination in the salient, but not the non-salient condition.

Summary of findings.

The hypothesis was supported in the first two studies, but not the third. Study 1 revealed that in a situation where intergroup relationships were emphasised, Christians evaluated other Christians more positively than Atheists. This display of evaluative ingroup bias was positively related to Christian group identification. Study 2 revealed that in a situation where intergroup relationships were emphasised Christians gave more positive trait ratings to Christians than Goths. This display of ingroup bias was positively related to Christian group identification. Study 3 revealed that in a situation where intergroup relationships were emphasised Christians re-hired more Christians than Homosexuals, and sacked more Homosexuals than Christians. Ingroup bias with regard to sacking however was negatively related to Christian group identification.

In comparison to Christians in the non-salient condition, Christians in situations where intergroup relationships were emphasised revealed greater awareness of their Christian group membership (social category salience) and inter-changeability with other Christians (depersonalisation). Accordingly, significantly greater levels of intergroup discrimination were displayed in the intergroup emphasis (salient) context compared to the non-salient condition. This ‘salience effect’ was true with regard to four out of five measures of
intergroup discrimination, and in relation to all three outgroups. This finding is consistent with a large body of research supporting SIT’s assumption that “social comparisons between groups which are relevant to an evaluation of one’s social identity produce pressures for intergroup differentiation to achieve positive self-evaluation in terms of that identity” (Turner, 1999, p.8). Thus, from this perspective it might be argued that in order to create or maintain positive identity, Christian group members in the salient condition took the available opportunity (i.e., discrimination tasks) to favour their ingroup compared to the outgroup. Furthermore, this was found with regard to both positive (evaluations, trait ratings and re-hirings) and negative forms (sackings) of discrimination.

Generally speaking, significant relationships between Christian group identification and intergroup discrimination were found across all three studies only in circumstances where intergroup relationships were emphasised. The results from the present investigation reveal relationships between identity and both positive (studies 1 and 2) and negative (Study 3) forms of discrimination. In this sense it might be argued that our findings deviate from much of the contradictory evidence found with regard to these variables (Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a; Dru, 2007; Duckitt et al., 2005; Duckitt & Mpthuthing, 1998; Duckitt & Parra, 2004; Hodson, Dovidio & Esses, 2003; Jackson, 1999; Kinkett & Verkuyten, 1999; Leonardelli & Brewer, 2001; Lipponen, Helkama & Juslin, 2003; Pederson & Walker, 1997; Sassenberg & Weiber, 2005; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001; Verkuyten, 2005). As the present investigation is based on theoretical insights outlined by Turner (1999; Turner & Reynolds, 2001), these results support the criticism that ‘inconsistent’ ‘varied’ and ‘weak’ results are a consequence of an “SIT-lite” interpretation of the theory that neglects the importance of context (McGarty, 2001, p. 174). Such findings are consistent with the argument that social identity processes are more reliably related to intergroup discrimination in contexts where intergroup relations are emphasised (Lalonde, 2002; McGarty, 2001; Reynolds et al., 2007; Turner, 1999).
Although relationships between identification and discrimination were found in all three studies, the nature of these correlations varied in relation to discrimination valence (positive/negative) and target outgroup (Atheist/Goth/Homosexual). Identity-discrimination relationships were positive with regard to positive forms of discrimination against Atheists and Goths (studies 1 and 2), but negative with regard to negative discrimination against Homosexuals (Study 3). These findings are consistent with Turner’s (1999) assertions that “Nothing in the summary of the theory… implies simple positive correlations” (p.21) across all circumstances (see also Bourhis, Turner & Gagnon, 1997; McGarty, 2001; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). One possible conclusion to be drawn from these findings is that while context is important for finding the relationship between identification and discrimination, other factors may be involved in determining the nature of this relationship (be that positive or negative).

Possible explanations for findings.

A number of potential explanations for positive and negative relationships between identity and discrimination can be advanced. With regard to the particular pattern of correlations between identity and discrimination, the effect of valence on discriminatory behaviour is worth some consideration. General findings with regard to positively valenced and negatively valenced forms of discrimination reveal that, although individuals will willingly show discrimination with regard to positive outcomes, they will show significantly less discrimination with regard to negative outcomes (i.e., the PNAE, Buhl, 1999; Mummendey & Otten, 1998). In the present investigation, a similar tendency was observed with regard to correlations between identity and positive (compared to negative) forms of discrimination. When identity was related to positive forms of discrimination (i.e., evaluations and trait ratings), the nature of this relationship was positive. Conversely, when a correlation was observed between identity and a negative form of discrimination (i.e., sacking), the nature
of this relationship was negative. The direction of these correlations mirror general valence effects for discrimination. Although Christians who held their Christian identity as important to their self-concept were more willing to discriminate with regard to positive outcomes, they were less willing to discriminate with regard to negative outcomes.

Such valence effects have been explained in relation to the differential effect of negative resource valence with regard to: (a) more careful and systematic cognitive processing, and (b) greater normative constraints on discriminatory behaviour (i.e., the cognitive-normative explanation of the PNAE, Mummendey, 1995; Mummendey & Otten, 1998). With regard to the present findings, when confronted with the task of sacking group members, the nature of this information (negative) may have been met with more careful and systematic processing (e.g. Fiske, 1980; Pratto & John, 2005) resulting in more attention being given to normative constraints on discrimination in the negative domain (Mummendey & Otten). Such a ‘normative constraint’ against intergroup discrimination might be expected to be consistent with the norms of the particular ingroup (Christian). There is certainly potential for Christian group members’ behaviour to reflect ‘pro-social’ Christian norms (such as ‘love thy neighbour’, see Malhotra, 2010) the more they identify with this particular group (Terry & Hogg, 1996; Turner et al., 1987). From this perspective, it can be argued that negative valence may have influenced a reduction in intergroup discrimination for those who identified more with their Christian group. That identification held a different relationship (i.e., positive) with positive forms of discrimination may have been due to positive discrimination not having the same cognitive-normative consequences for processing and normative constraints.

Further to the direction of relationships between identity and discrimination with regard to valence, when identification was related to discrimination against Atheists and Goths, the nature of this relationship was positive. Conversely, when identification was related to discrimination against Homosexuals, the nature of this relationship was negative. In response
to this pattern with regard to particular outgroups, the nature of the target outgroup (i.e., values, ideology, intergroup history) is worth consideration.

Socio-politically and historically, Christianity has held quite different relationships with Homosexuals compared to Atheists and Goths. The different socio-political relationships may explain the different correlations between identity and discrimination in relation to each group. For example, challenges to the rights given to those in same-sex partnerships by Christian affiliated groups is well documented within New Zealand and across the world. Often, Christian ideals have been used to limit rights to marriage and family to those in heterosexual relationships (Buss & Herman, 2003; New Zealand House of Representatives, 2004). Furthermore, therapies to “cure” homosexuality have been supported by Christian ideals, and administered by Christian groups (Smith, Bartlett, & King, 2004). Arguably, such a history between these two groups is a record of the morally objectionable treatment of homosexuals by those aligned with the Christian faith. Importantly, Doosje, Branscombe and colleagues (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears & Manstead, 1998; Branscombe & Doosje, 2004) have found that such ‘morally objectionable’ intergroup histories are associated with less intergroup discrimination (compensatory behaviour) in response to feelings of ‘collective guilt’. Furthermore, greater identification with a group responsible for morally objectionable behaviour has been associated with greater levels of collective guilt (Roccas, Klar & Liviatan, 2006). ‘Compensatory behaviour’ could potentially explain why the more participants held their Christian group membership as important to their sense of self, the less discrimination they showed toward Homosexuals. As a Christian identity is unlikely to hold the same socio-political relationship with Atheists and Goths, this could explain why the relationship between identity and discrimination was different with regard to these two outgroups (i.e., positive).

In addition to valence and collective guilt, there are undoubtedly a number of other socio-psychological factors that may contribute to the nature of relationships between
Christian identity and discrimination. Such factors include norms (Terry & Hogg, 1996), the legitimacy and stability of status relationships between groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner & Brown, 1978) threat or conflict (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999; Sherif, 1966; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Indeed, SIT never rejected the role of threat, conflicting group interests and other social realities in intergroup processes (Turner & Reynolds, 2001), but predicted “correlations between ingroup identification and ingroup bias, not as a main effect, but as an interactive outcome of several factors” (McGarty 2001, p.174). Therefore, although beyond the scope of the present investigation, these factors certainly warrant future investigation (see Verkuyten, 2005; Lalonde, 2002). Importantly however, these intergroup factors are more likely to operate within contexts where group membership is salient, a proposition supported by the findings from the present investigation. Crucially, future studies should involve an appreciation for the role of context in observing potential relationships.

Limitations.

Although there was strong support for the importance of context in the relationship between identification and various forms of discrimination, the present research is open to three particular methodological criticisms. The present findings may be limited by: (a) its focus on only one domain of social identity, (b) the variation in discrimination tasks between studies, and (c) the particular recruitment process used to obtain participants for Study 3.

In each of the three studies conducted as part of this research, Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) importance to identity subscale was used to measure Christian group identification. A growing number of researchers now however accept the proposition that social identity is multi-dimensional (Ashmore et al., 2004; Duckitt et al., 2005; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Phinney 1990; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton & Smith, 1997). For this reason, a relationship between intergroup discrimination and identity might hold with respect to some
dimensions of social identity, but not for others. Moreover, different components of identity may relate differently to different forms of discrimination against different target outgroups (Duckitt et al., 2005; Ellemers et al., 1999). With regard to the present investigation, although no relationship was found between importance to identity and positive forms of discrimination in relation to the Homosexual outgroup, this does not eliminate the possibility for a correlation with other dimensions of social identity (such as self-categorisation, attachment/interdependance, social embeddedness, behavioural involvement, content and meaning, Ashmore et al., 2004). While future research may consider the inclusion of additional dimensions of social identity, the present investigation can be considered an early and tentative step toward future explorations of the relative contribution of different forms of identity within intergroup discrimination.

A second limitation within the present investigation is the use of different discrimination tasks between studies. Discrimination tasks in the positive domain changed from evaluations (studies 1 and 2) to re-hiring (Study 3). Similarly, negative discrimination tasks changed from white noise distribution (Study 2) to the removal of jobs (sacking, Study 3). Problematically, some discrimination tasks (and not others) may have been more highly related to particular intergroup variables. For example, variables relating to realistic conflict (i.e., relative deprivation relationships between groups) may be more strongly related to the distribution of valued resources (i.e., giving group members back their jobs), but unrelated to intergroup evaluations (which may, in turn, be more strongly related to identity, see Hunter et al., 2011). The potentially confounding nature of these relationships mean we must be cautious when drawing conclusions from the present results. For example, possible interpretations of the differing relationship between identification and discrimination with regard to Atheists/Goths and Homosexuals must acknowledge that discrimination tasks used in relation to the Homosexual outgroup were particular to that outgroup.
Thirdly, the recruitment strategy used to obtain participants for Study 3 differed from studies 1 and 2, as finding participants for the latter study became increasingly difficult. The later strategy involved meeting with leaders of Christian groups and delivering a full explanation of the purpose of the study (i.e., looking at discrimination with regard to homosexuals). The aim of this strategy was to advocate for the study, encouraging the group leader to recruit participants blind to the purposes of the research. Particularly relevant to this point is the fact that one of the declining groups explicitly stated their concern for being seen to discriminate against Homosexuals (see Cripps, 2011). It is very possible that the nature of this strategy may have led to the inclusion of Christians with more tolerant attitudes toward Homosexuals than those who declined, reducing the representative nature of the sample.

*Strengths.*

Regardless of the limitations outlined above, the present research can be commended on certain strengths. The present investigation provides an important point of departure from previous examinations of religion and discrimination. The present set of studies are the first to examine the role of context and Christian group identification in relation to intergroup discrimination. Although some researchers of religion and discrimination have referred to intergroup constructs (including identity), these variables have been measured in relation to individual difference constructs (religious orientations) with no consideration for the importance of an intergroup context (Hall et al., 2010; Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). Therefore, the present study brings research on religion and intergroup discrimination in line with the strong body of research attempting to understand the effects of group membership on intergroup behaviour.

Furthermore, that relationships observed between identity and discrimination found in the salient condition were replicated across different outgroups and with regard to different forms of discrimination speaks to the generalisability of this ‘salience effect’. This suggests
that future investigations emphasising the intergroup context may well observe relationships between social identity and discrimination with any number of different target outgroups and with regard to both positive and negative forms of discrimination.

Implications.

There are a number of theoretical implications that can be derived from the present investigation. As has been previously discussed, inconsistent findings with regard to identity and discrimination have fuelled controversy over the acuity of social identity theory (Brown, 2000; McGarty, 2001; Mummendey, Klink & Brown, 2001; Turner 1999; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). By showing that social identity was associated with intergroup discrimination only in contexts where intergroup relations were emphasised (salient), our results provide some clarity to a field otherwise marred with contradiction. Furthermore, that relationships between identity and discrimination were found with regard to both positive and negative forms of discrimination contradicts Brown’s (2000a) claim that SIT is a theory of positive, but not negative forms of discrimination. Finally, the present results underline the merit of an empirical shift toward an investigation of religion and intergroup discrimination from the social identity perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1986; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). Our results stress the importance of establishing a context in which behaviour associated with a religious group is more likely to be in action (Turner, 1999) in order to observe the behavioural consequences associated with that group membership.

Conclusion.

A large body of research from an individual difference perspective resulted in the general conclusion that religious people are more discriminatory than non-religious people (when social desirability is controlled, Batson et al., 1993; Spilka et al., 2003). Contrary to this argument, the findings from the present research demonstrate the importance of social context for Christian intergroup behaviour. In a context where group memberships were
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emphasised, intergroup discrimination increased. These results indicate that Christians are neither categorically prejudiced nor especially tolerant. In some contexts (e.g., when intergroup relations are emphasised) they tend to show more discrimination. In other contexts, they do not.

The present findings stand in contrast to an individual difference perspective that entirely discounts the role of religious group membership in intergroup discrimination (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). These findings demonstrate that religious group membership functions as a source of social identity in much the same way as any other group membership (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999; Ysseldyk et al., 2010). The present findings demonstrate that Christians can respond to people based on their identification with their Christian group. Furthermore, such intergroup identification processes were, as a function of context (i.e., the specific outgroup and valence of discrimination) related to both intergroup antagonism (Atheists/Goths) and tolerance (Homosexuals)
Endnotes

i Research on religion and discrimination has taken place primarily in North America, England and Australia, and has focussed on Christianity as the religious group in question (Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005).

ii Two studies (Griffin, Gorsuch, & Davis 1987; Ponton & Gorsuch, 1988) failed to find a negative relationship between Q and intergroup discrimination. However, these authors used an earlier and psychometrically weaker version of the Q scale (Hunsberger, 1995).

iii Sherif (1966; Sherif & Sherif, 1969) note that the boys involved in their ‘summer camps’ did in fact show ingroup favouritism prior the formal introduction of competition. Sherif’s theorising did not however include the significance of this observation.

iv An independent pilot test was conducted to examine whether the trait-rating task used in this investigation (e.g., trustworthy, aggressive, confident, straightforward) would constitute a less negative form of intergroup discrimination than the allocation of white noise used. Here participants \((N = 37)\) were presented with 2 separate tasks. The first required the allocation of white noise to two anonymous individuals. The second required the evaluation of two anonymous individuals using trait-rating scales (e.g., trustworthy, aggressive, confident, straightforward). To ensure familiarity with the sound in question, participants were presented with a ten second blast of white noise. This was administered using a Spitfire white noise generator. A series of questions were then asked about each task. These were answered on 9-point Likert scales (9-very much to 1-very little). Compared to the white noise allocation task, repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA’s) revealed that, the rating task was judged to cause less personal distress \((M = 8.00, SD = 1.56, vs. M = 5.95, SD = 2.09)\), \(F(1, 36) = 34.29, p < .001, \eta^2 = .49\), be less unpleasant \((M = 8.61, SD = .72, vs. M = 6.63, SD = 1.87)\), \(F(1, 36) = 37.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .51\), elicit lower levels of negative affect \((M = 8.00, SD = 1.56, vs. M = 5.95, SD = 2.09)\), \(F(1, 36) = 34.29, p < .001, \eta^2 = .49\), and be less unpleasant \((M = 8.61, SD = .72, vs. M = 6.63, SD = 1.87)\), \(F(1, 36) = 37.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .51\).
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= 8.43, SD = 1.01, vs. M = 6.95, SD = 1.77), F(1, 36) = 30.27, p < .001, η² = .46, and have less adverse effects on recipients (M = 8.37, SD = .95, vs. M = 6.27, SD = 2.73), F(1, 36) = 27.46, p < .001, η² = .43.

In order to examine whether Christians would allocate more white noise to outgroup (Homosexuals) as opposed to ingroup members (Christians) a pilot test was conducted. Using the same matrices as described in Study 2, Christians (N = 38) belonging to a campus Christian organisation were given the opportunity to allocate more white noise to ingroup members, outgroup members or equal amounts to each. All participants were given a 10 second sample blast. A repeated measures ANOVA failed to revealed any significant differences (Christian, M = 83.78, SD = 9.06 vs. Homosexual, M = 86.35, SD = 8.92), F(1, 37) = .57, p = .46. For this reason we decided not to include white noise allocations in Study 3.

To demonstrate that re-hiring sacked workers was a more positive outcome than sacking workers would constitute a less negative form of intergroup discrimination an independent pilot test was conducted. Here participants (N = 30) were presented with two sets of allocation tasks. One set required participants to sack workers. The other set required participants to rehire workers who had previously been sacked. A series of questions about the tasks were then asked. These were answered on 7-point Likert scales (7-very much to 1-very little). Compared to re-hiring, the sacking task was judged to cause more personal distress (M = 5.86, SD = 1.38 vs. M = 2.28, SD = 1.43), F(1, 30) = 43.11, p < .001, η² = .59, be more unpleasant (M = 6.45, SD = .85 vs. M = 2.45, SD =1.36), F(1, 30) = 181.46, p < .001, η² = .86, elicit higher levels of negative affect (M = 5.09, SD = 1.81 vs. M = 3.06, SD = 1.56), F(1, 30) = 15.55, p < .001, η² = .34, and have more adverse effects on recipients (M = 5.35, SD = 1.19 vs. 2.74, SD = 1.45), F(1, 30) = 41.95, p < .001, η² = .58.
Indeed, ideologically defined attitudes toward ‘others’ differ greatly between denominations (e.g., homosexual and female clergy etc.). Such ideological diversity is likely to be reflected in attitude and behaviour related to this social identity. For instance, Christians who perceive their religious group teaches ‘love the sinner’ report more tolerant attitudes toward homosexual people than those who perceive their group to teach otherwise (i.e., ‘hate the sin’, Veenvleit, 2008).
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Appendix A

Salience Manipulation Studies 1 and 2

Salient Condition

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of the present experiment is threefold. We will be investigating individual self-perceptions, social judgements and behaviours. To this end you will be presented with a series of short questionnaire based tasks. When these have been completed there will be a brief intergroup exercise. During this period you will have the chance to interact with members of your own group (Christians) and members of another group (Atheists). This interaction period will be approximately ten minutes long and will involve five minute exercise spent with members of your own group and a five minute exercise spent with members of another group.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU DO NOT COMMUNICATE WITH ONE ANOTHER UNTIL ASKED TO DO SO. ALSO, PLEASE ANSWER ONE QUESTION BEFORE MOVING ON TO ANOTHER.

Although people belong to many different kinds of groups, the groups that we are interested in are people who are and are not religious. In particular, we are interested in groups comprised of Christians and Atheists. As you may (or may not) know, everyone in this room is a Christian. An identical experiment to that being carried out here is also now being carried out in another adjacent room. In that room the participants are all Atheists. It is this group (of Atheists) that you will be interacting with when the questionnaire tasks have been completed.
Appendix B
Salience Manipulation Study 3

Social Identity Instructions (salient condition)

People belong to all sorts of groups, such as sports clubs, religious, ethnic, gender and sexuality groups. These groups differ from each other and can also compare themselves with each other. For example, Christian vs. Christian, Irish vs. English, Christian vs. Homosexual

In the present study, we are particularly concerned with people who belong to Christian groups.

List up to 3 things you and other Christians do relatively often.

1.
2.
3.

List up to 3 things you and other Christians do well.

1.
2.
3.

List up to 3 things you and other Christians do poorly.

1.
2.
3.
People differ from each other in all kinds of ways, and every person is a unique individual. One person loves music, another likes to go for a walk. Another person likes to read whereas somebody else likes to go out.

In the present study, we are particularly concerned with how particular individuals differ from one another.

List up to 3 things you do relatively often.

1. 

2. 

3. 

List up to 3 things you do well.

1. 

2. 

3. 

List up to 3 things you do poorly.

1. 

2. 

3. 
Appendix C

Salience and Depersonalisation Items: Social Self-categorisation Subscale

Please respond on the basis of how you feel about yourself as a Christian right now (even if you have felt differently at other times). Use the scale below to record your answers in the space provided.

Strongly disagree = 1
Disagree = 2
Disagree somewhat = 3
Neutral = 4
Agree somewhat = 5
Agree = 6
Strongly agree = 7

I identify with other Christians.

I am like other Christians.
Appendix D

Importance to Identity Subscale

Please respond on the basis of how you feel about yourself as a Christian right now (even if you have felt differently at other times). Use the scale below to record your answers in the space provided.

Strongly disagree = 1
Disagree = 2
Disagree somewhat = 3
Neutral = 4
Agree somewhat = 5
Agree = 6
Strongly agree = 7

Being a Christian has very little to do with how I feel about myself. __

Being a Christian is an important reflection of who I am. __

Being a Christian is unimportant to my sense of who I am. __

Being a Christian is an important part of my self-image. __
Appendix E

Intergroup Evaluations Salient Condition

In the enclosed booklet you will see a number of separate paragraphs. Each of these describe an imaginary character. What we want you to do is read the paragraph and then imagine that the person involved is directing their behaviour towards you. Following each paragraph you are asked to answer a question. Answer this question by circling one number from each question.

THIS IS NOT A TEST

There are no right and wrong answers in this section of the experiment so please do not spend too much time thinking about your reply. Neither should you check to see what you have written on a previous page. Just give those responses which you think are the most appropriate. Also, please do not ask your neighbour how they are responding, it is your own answer that we are interested in.
Imagine yourself cycling home from School one day when it is raining. Turning a corner close to where you live you misjudge your speed. Because you are going so fast and it is wet, you crash and fall off, hitting your head and scraping your knees. Now, although you are not seriously hurt, there is a little blood coming from your knees and you are slightly dishevelled. You decide to sit on the ground and get your breath back. Just as this happens David Ayers comes around the corner. David is a Christian. Glancing in your direction he sees you sitting on the ground. David immediately turns and comes over to offer his help.

How would you rate David?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive

Imagine that one afternoon you are waiting for a bus. It is cold and wet and you are feeling miserable. After waiting for about fifteen to twenty minutes, you accept that you have likely missed it. Since the next one is not due for some time, you begin to walk. After a few minutes, however, a van pulls up beside you. The driver opens the door, and asks if you need a lift. Chilled to the bone, you accept. As you drive along, the driver introduces himself as Todd Reid. As it turns out, Todd is a Christian.

How would you rate Todd?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive

Try to imagine yourself cycling home from school one afternoon. Turning a corner close to where you live you misjudge your speed. Because you are going so fast, you crash and fall off knocking your head and cutting your knees. Now, although you are not really hurt, there is blood oozing from your knees and you are a little shaken. You decide to sit on the ground and get your breath back. As you are doing this, Martin Kelly walks around the corner. Martin is a Christian. Although he looks over in your direction he doesn’t say anything. He just walks on.

How would you rate Martin?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive
Imagine that one evening you are on your way home. It is cold and wet. Ahead, you see David Brown, a Christian student in your class who is just about to get into his car. Although, you don’t really know him all that well, you know that David lives close to you. On the spur of the moment, you ask him for a lift. He, however, refuses.

How would you rate David?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive

Imagine that one Saturday morning you are out for a drive in the country with a friend. On the way back you see a petrol station and decide to pull in and get some petrol. The attendant (Michael Mills, a Christian) is a student at your school. He comes out and asks you how much petrol you want. You ask for twenty-five dollars worth and he begins to fill the tank. When he is finished you pay with two twenty dollar bills ($40.00). When he brings your change, you find that he has only given you change out of thirty dollars. You tell him his mistake. Michael, however, claims that you only gave him a ten dollar bill and a twenty dollar bill ($30.00). As you begin to argue, the assistant manager arrives.

How would you rate Michael?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive

Try to imagine the following. One wet morning, as you are cycling into University, on your mountain bike, you have an accident. Turning a corner close to the school you misjudge your speed. Because you are going so quickly you skid and crash. Falling off your bicycle you scrape your hands and legs. You also give your head a knock. Now, although you are not seriously hurt, there is a little blood seeping from your knees and you are slightly shaken. You decide to sit on the ground and get yourself together for a moment. Just as this happens Eric Connolly comes around the corner. Eric is an Atheist. Glancing in your direction he sees you sitting on the ground. Right away, Eric comes over and offers his help.

How would you rate Eric?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive
Imagine that one lunchtime you go into a fish and chip shop in the town where you live. After ordering your meal of burger and chips you pay and leave. Walking up the road you begin to unwrap your food. You discover that you have been given an extra helping of chips and a king sized burger. You think back to the person who served you, Colin Davies. Colin is a Christian, who you know from Uni.

How would you rate Colin?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive

John White is a student at Uni. Like many of his classmates, John, an Atheist, works part-time. Imagine that one evening you go into the shop where John works. You buy what you want and pay using a twenty dollar bill. When John gives you your change you realise that he has only given you change out of ten dollars. Somewhat embarrassed you tell him his mistake. He, however, claims that you only gave him a ten dollar bill. As you begin to argue, the shop owner arrives.

How would you rate John?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive

Imagine that one evening you are waiting for a friend to pick you up in his car. It is raining quite heavily and you are cold. After waiting for about twenty minutes you assume that you have probably missed him. You decide to walk. When you get about a hundred yards up the road, however, a car stops beside you. As the driver opens the door, you see a student you know vaguely. Although you didn’t know it, his name is Mark Nolan an Atheist who goes to your Uni. He offers you a lift.

How would you rate Mark?
Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Positive
Imagine that one Saturday evening you go into a fish and chip shop near the varsity. After ordering your favourite carry-out of fish and chips you pay and leave. Walking up the road you begin to unwrap your meal. You discover that you have been given an extra helping of chips and a double portion of fish. You think back to the person who served you, Paul Ellis. Paul, is an Atheist, who goes to Uni.

How would you rate Paul?
Positive 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 Very Positive

Imagine that one Thursday afternoon you are on your way home from varsity. It is raining and very cold. Walking just in front of you, is Michael Howes an Atheist. Michael, a student in your class, lives close to you. He walks up to his car and takes out his keys and begins to open the door. Although, you don’t really know him that well, on impulse, you ask him for a lift. Michael, however, refuses.

How would you rate Michael?
Positive 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 Very Positive

Try to imagine yourself cycling home from varsity one afternoon. Turning a corner close to where you live you misjudge your speed. Because you are going so fast, you crash and fall off, bumping your head and cutting your knees. Now, although you are not seriously hurt, there is blood oozing from your knees and you are slightly stunned. You decide to sit on the ground and get your breath back. Whilst you are doing this, Mark Brown walks around the corner. Mark is a student and an Atheist. He looks over in your direction but doesn’t stop or speak to you. He just walks on.

How would you rate Mark?
Positive 1  2  3  4  5  6  7 Very Positive
### Appendix F

**Trait Ratings**

On the whole, how would you rate Christians on the following dimensions (please circle)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the whole, how would you rate Goths on the following dimensions (please circle)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulative</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

White-noise Distribution Matrices

Instructions: On the following page there are a number of matrices. Each matrix consists of 13 columns. Each column contains 2 sets of numbers (one set is on top of the other). Imagine that the numbers represent time spent listening (in seconds) to white noise. Your task is to allocate listening times to 2 different people. The times on the top row are given to one person. The times on the bottom row are given to another person.

You can only choose from numbers in the same column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person H from the Christian group. The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person Y from the Christian group.

Time to person H (Christian group)  
Time to Person Y (Goth group)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person R from the Christian group. The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person V from the Christian group.

Time to person R (Christian group)  
Time to Person V (Goth group)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person L from the Christian group. The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person X from the Christian group.

Time to person L (Christian group)  
Time to Person X (Goth group)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person A from the Christian group. The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person Q from the Christian group.

Time to person A (Christian group)  
Time to Person Q (Goth group)
Imagine that you are the manager in a factory. Your workforce is comprised of 200 people. 100 are Christians. 100 are Homosexuals. Unfortunately, you have to sack 100 people. You can sack as many people from either group as you want – but you must sack 100 people all together.

How many would you sack from the Homosexual group?  

How many would you sack from the Christian group?  

Imagine that you are the manager in a factory which has just had to sack 200 people. 100 were Christians. 100 were Homosexuals. You have just found out that you can give 100 people their jobs back. You can re-hire as many people from either group as you want – but you must re-hire 100 people all together.

How many would you re-hire from the Homosexual group?  

How many would you re-hire from the Christian group?  