

**Group Identity and Intergroup Discrimination: Does
Importance to Identity Play a Special Role?**

Sarah A. Kafka

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Otago, Dunedin,

New Zealand

Date: October 10, 2014

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate the relationship between a specific dimension of collective identity, importance to identity, and intergroup discrimination. Three sets of studies explored this association. The first set (Studies 1a – 1d) assessed whether emphasising vs. de-emphasising the intergroup context affected the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. Findings from Studies 1a – 1d revealed a significant positive relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination when intergroup relations were emphasised. No such association was found when intergroup relations were de-emphasised. When the intergroup context was emphasised, New Zealanders whose national identity was important to them showed more discrimination toward both Americans and Asians, than other New Zealanders. Both men and women whose gender identities were important to them showed more discrimination toward members of the opposite sex than members of their own sex.

The second set of studies (Studies 2a – 2f) evaluated whether 12 potentially overlapping variables explained the relationship found between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. In addition to completing measures of importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, participants in each of the 6 separate studies that comprised Study 2 responded to 2 measures assessing potentially overlapping variables (12 of these variables were assessed altogether, across the 6 studies). These were state (personal) self-esteem, private collective self-esteem (private CSE), public collective self-

esteem (public CSE), membership collective self-esteem (membership CSE), perceived intergroup conflict, quality of social identity, group identification, trait self-esteem, affective commitment, categorisation, social dominance orientation (SDO) and right wing authoritarianism (RWA). Findings from Studies 2a – 2f revealed that importance to identity uniquely predicted intergroup discrimination. Northern Irish individuals whose national identity was important to them showed more discrimination toward Polish immigrants, than other Northern Irish individuals. New Zealanders whose national identity was important to them showed more discrimination toward both Asians and Americans, than other New Zealanders. Both men and women whose gender identities were important to them showed more discrimination toward members of the opposite sex than members of their own sex. None of these associations were explained by any of the 12 potentially overlapping constructs.

The third set of studies (Studies 3a – 3b) investigated whether importance to identity served as a dependent variable, as well as an independent variable, in relation to intergroup discrimination. Findings from Studies 3a – 3b revealed that importance to identity both predicted and was predicted by intergroup discrimination. New Zealanders whose national identity was important to them showed more discrimination toward Americans than other New Zealanders and this discrimination in turn strengthened the importance of their national identity. Women whose gender identity was important to them showed more discrimination toward men than other women and this in turn strengthened the importance of their gender identity.

The findings across all three sets of studies (1a – 1d, 2a – 2f and 3a – 3b) show that when a particular group identity is important to a person, they are

more likely to engage in discrimination against outgroup members. This act of engaging in intergroup discrimination is, in turn, likely to increase the importance a person attaches to that group identity. The implications of these results are discussed and suggestions for future research directions are made.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Dr Jackie Hunter. I am enormously grateful to him for all his guidance and encouragement. It was his introduction to Social Psychology in my first year as a student that ignited my enthusiasm for this field and spurred me on to postgraduate study. His support over the course of my PhD has meant more than I can say. Over the years, I have come to think of him as not just a mentor, but also a family member.

Thanks must also go to Professor Gordon Harold, my co-supervisor, from whom I have learned a great deal. His wisdom and insights have, without a doubt, enriched my work.

I would like to thank my lab group, Jill, Mike, Hayley, Heidi and Kieran. I could not have asked for a more fun, caring bunch of people to share an office with and I really missed our team when I became a distance student part way through completing my thesis.

I would also like to acknowledge all the undergraduate students who were participants in the studies that comprise this thesis. Without their involvement, this work would not be possible.

Finally, thanks to my beloved family and to Matt, for always being there. Special thanks to my mother, for reading and commenting on my drafts.

This thesis is dedicated to my sister, Victoria, who was my biggest cheerleader.

Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	5
Contents.....	6
List of Tables.....	11
Chapter 1: Thesis Overview and Literature Review	13
Intergroup Discrimination	16
Theories of Intergroup Discrimination	23
Group Identity and Intergroup Discrimination.....	31
The Multidimensional Nature of Group Identity	35
Importance to Identity.....	40
Importance to Identity and Intergroup Behaviour.....	40
Importance to Identity and Intergroup Discrimination	41
The Role of Context, the Contribution of Other Variables, and Importance to Identity as Both an Independent and a Dependent Variable.....	46
Summary	48
Aims	51
Chapter 2: Study 1	53
Study 1a	55
Method	55
Participants.....	55
Design and procedure.....	55
Group emphasis manipulations	55
Materials.....	57
Measurement of importance to identity.....	57
Measurement of discrimination.....	57
Manipulation checks.....	58
Results.....	59
Manipulation checks	59
Importance to identity.	59
Intergroup discrimination.	60
Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.....	60
Study 1b.....	61
Method	61
Participants.....	61
Design and procedure.....	61
Group emphasis manipulations.....	61
Materials.....	61
Measurement of importance to identity.....	61
Measurement of discrimination.....	62
Manipulation checks.....	62
Results.....	62
Manipulation checks	62
Importance to identity.	62

Intergroup discrimination.....	63
Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.....	63
Study 1c.....	64
Method.....	64
Participants.....	64
Design and procedure.....	64
Group emphasis manipulations.....	64
Materials.....	64
Measurement of importance to identity.....	64
Measurement of discrimination.....	65
Manipulation checks.....	65
Results.....	66
Manipulation checks.....	66
Importance to identity.....	66
Intergroup discrimination.....	66
Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.....	67
Study 1d.....	67
Method.....	67
Participants.....	67
Design and procedure.....	68
Group emphasis manipulations.....	68
Materials.....	68
Measurement of importance to identity.....	68
Measurement of discrimination.....	68
Manipulation checks.....	68
Results.....	68
Manipulation checks.....	68
Importance to identity.....	69
Intergroup discrimination.....	69
Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.....	70
Discussion of studies 1a to 1d.....	70
Table 1.....	73
Table 2.....	74
Table 3.....	75
Chapter 3: Study 2.....	76
Study 2a.....	79
Method.....	79
Participants.....	79
Design and procedure.....	79
Group emphasis manipulations.....	79
Materials.....	80
Measurement of importance to identity.....	80
Measurement of discrimination.....	80
Measurement of alternative processes (state self-esteem and private collective self-esteem).....	81
Manipulation checks.....	82
Results.....	82
Intergroup discrimination.....	82

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (state self-esteem and private collective self-esteem).....	82
Table 4.....	84
Study 2b.....	85
Method.....	85
Participants.....	85
Design and procedure.....	85
Group emphasis manipulations.....	85
Materials.....	85
Measurement of importance to identity.....	85
Measurement of discrimination.....	85
Measurement of alternative processes (public and membership collective self-esteem).....	86
Manipulation checks.....	86
Results.....	87
Intergroup discrimination.....	87
Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (public and membership collective self-esteem).....	87
Table 5.....	89
Study 2c.....	90
Method.....	90
Participants.....	90
Design and procedure.....	90
Group emphasis manipulations.....	90
Materials.....	90
Measurement of importance to identity.....	90
Measurement of discrimination.....	91
Measurement of alternative processes (perceived intergroup conflict and quality of social identity).....	91
Manipulation checks.....	92
Results.....	92
Intergroup discrimination.....	92
Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (perceived intergroup conflict and quality of social identity).....	93
Table 6.....	94
Study 2d.....	95
Method.....	95
Participants.....	95
Design and procedure.....	95
Group emphasis manipulations.....	95
Materials.....	95
Measurement of importance to identity.....	95
Measurement of discrimination.....	95
Measurement of alternative processes (group identification and trait self-esteem).....	96
Manipulation checks.....	97
Results.....	97
Intergroup discrimination.....	97

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (group identification and trait self-esteem).....	97
Table 7.....	99
Study 2e.....	100
Method.....	100
Participants.....	100
Design and procedure.....	100
Group emphasis manipulations.....	100
Materials.....	100
Measurement of importance to identity.....	100
Measurement of discrimination.....	100
Measurement of alternative processes (affective commitment and categorisation).....	101
Manipulation checks.....	102
Results.....	102
Intergroup discrimination.....	102
Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (affective commitment and categorisation).....	102
Table 8.....	104
Study 2f.....	105
Method.....	105
Participants.....	105
Design and procedure.....	105
Group emphasis manipulations.....	105
Materials.....	105
Measurement of importance to identity.....	105
Measurement of discrimination.....	106
Measurement of alternative processes (social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism).....	106
Manipulation checks.....	107
Results.....	107
Intergroup discrimination.....	107
Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism).....	107
Table 9.....	109
Discussion of studies 2a to 2f.....	110
Table 10.....	113
Chapter 4: Study 3.....	115
Study 3a.....	117
Method.....	117
Participants.....	117
Design and procedure.....	117
Group emphasis manipulations.....	117
Materials.....	118
Measurement of importance to identity.....	118
Measurement of discrimination.....	118
Manipulation checks.....	119
Results.....	120

Importance to identity.	120
Intergroup discrimination.	120
Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.....	120
Study 3b.....	121
Method.....	121
Participants.....	121
Design and procedure.....	121
Group emphasis manipulations.	122
Materials.	122
Measurement of importance to identity.....	122
Measurement of discrimination.....	122
Manipulation checks.....	123
Results.....	124
Importance to identity.	124
Table 11.....	125
Intergroup discrimination.	126
Table 12.....	127
Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.....	128
Discussion of studies 3a and 3b.....	128
Chapter 5: General Discussion.....	130
Summary of Findings.....	130
Study Limitations.....	133
The Contribution of the Present Findings to the Literature.....	137
The Implications of the Present Findings, Beyond the Laboratory.....	138
Future Research Directions.....	140
Conclusion.....	143
References.....	146
Appendixes.....	167

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Means and F-ratios of Identity Salience and Depersonalisation Manipulation Checks Study 1a, b, c and d</i>	73
Table 2. <i>Mean Importance to Identity and Mean Trait Ratings and White Noise Allocations to Ingroup and Outgroup Members Study 1a, b, c and d</i>	74
Table 3. <i>Regression Betas and R²s between Mean Importance to Identity Scores and Mean Intergroup Discrimination Scores Study 1a, b, c and d</i>	75
Table 4. <i>Study 2a Correlations between Importance to Identity, State Self-Esteem, Private CSE and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Women</i>	84
Table 5. <i>Study 2b Correlations between Importance to Identity, Public CSE, Membership CSE and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Men</i>	89
Table 6. <i>Study 2c Correlations between Importance to Identity, Perceived Conflict, Quality of Identity and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Northern Irish Participants</i>	94
Table 7. <i>Study 2d Correlations between Importance to Identity, Group Identity, Trait Self-Esteem and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Northern Irish Participants</i>	99
Table 8. <i>Study 2e Correlations between Importance to Identity, Affective Commitment, Categorisation and Intergroup Discrimination amongst New Zealanders</i>	104
Table 9. <i>Study 2f Correlations between Importance to Identity, RWA, SDO and Intergroup Discrimination amongst New Zealanders</i>	109

Table 10. <i>N</i> 's, Mean Ingroup/Outgroup Discrimination, <i>F</i> -ratios, Regression Betas, <i>R</i> ² s and Semipartial Correlations Study 2a, b, c, d, e and f.....	113
Table 11. <i>Study 3b Mean Importance to Identity Scores for Experimental and Control Participants</i>	125
Table 12. <i>Study 3b Mean Allocation of White Noise to Ingroup and Outgroup Members by Experimental Participants</i>	127

Chapter 1: Thesis Overview and Literature Review

“Prejudice is a burden that confuses the past, threatens the future and renders the present inaccessible” (Maya Angelou, as cited in Kapur, 2010, p. 11).

The deleterious consequences of intergroup discrimination are well established (e.g., Benner & Graham, 2011; Cleeland, Gonin, Baez, Loehrer, & Pandya, 1997; Dwyer & Santikarma, 2003; Eliason, Dibble, & Robertson, 2011; Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2012; Staub, 2011). Vaughan and Hogg (2014) describe discrimination and prejudice as being among the “greatest problems faced by humanity” (p. 323). Unsurprisingly, therefore, a great deal of research has been devoted to explaining how discrimination arises (e.g., Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Alteyemer, 1998; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; see also, Brown, 2010). In the following review of the literature, in Chapter 1, I discuss how the theory that people’s collective identities motivate them to discriminate against outgroup members has, in particular, received considerable support (e.g., Aberson, Healy, & Romero, 2000; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Kelly, 1988; Levin, Henry, Pratto, & Sidanius, 2003; Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 2002; see also Tajfel & Turner, 1986). I go on to outline how a number of studies have failed, however, to find an association between identity and intergroup discrimination (e.g., Hunter & Stringer, 1999; Maass, Ceccarelli, & Rudin, 1996; Smith & Postmes, 2009; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999). I weigh up the evidence concerning why it might be that research assessing the relationship between collective identity and intergroup discrimination has been characterised by

inconsistent and sometimes contradictory findings (e.g., Aberson, et al., 2000; Ellemers, Kortekass, & Ouwerkerk, 1999; Hinkle, Taylor, Lee Fox-Cardamone, & Crook, 1989; Jackson, 1999; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999). I then examine research that suggests that one particular dimension of collective identity, known as importance to identity, is especially associated with intergroup behaviour in general (e.g., Crisp & Beck, 2005; Kenworthy & Jones, 2009; Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, & Eidelson, 2008; Tropp & Wright, 2001). I go on to outline how, despite theory and research indicating that importance to identity may have a particularly potent relationship with intergroup discrimination (see Gómez, Brooks, et al., 2011; Gómez, Morales, Hart, Vázquez, & Swann, 2011; Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, Hart, & Jetten, 2010; Swann, Gómez, Huici, Morales, & Hixon, 2010; Swann, Gómez, Seyle, Morales, & Huici, 2009; Swann, Jetten, Gómez, Whitehouse, & Bastian, 2012; Tajfel, 1981; Turner, 1999; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), only a small number of studies have investigated this association and those that have been carried out, have tended to be flawed (e.g., Aberson, et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999).

I address this gap in the literature, in Chapters 2-4. There I assess the role that importance to identity plays in intergroup discrimination, across three sets of studies. I overcome the limitations of past research examining both the relationship between collective identity in general and intergroup discrimination, and importance to identity specifically and intergroup discrimination. Because research suggests that an association between collective identity and intergroup behaviour is likely to occur when the

intergroup nature of the context is made explicit (Turner, 1999), in Study 1, which is outlined in Chapter 2, I compare the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination in situations in which intergroup relations are emphasised, with situations in which intergroup relations are not emphasised.

In view of research linking a number of other constructs with importance to identity (see Duckitt & Sibley, in press; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and intergroup bias (see Aberson et al., 2000; Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown et al., 1986; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker, Thompson, McGraw, & Ingerman, 1987; Ellemers et al., 1999; Hunter et al., 2004; 2005; 2011; 2012; Kelly, 1988; Long & Spears, 1997; Struch & Schwartz, 1989; Whitley & Kite, 2006), in Study 2, which is outlined in Chapter 3, I examine the role that 12 potentially overlapping variables (state self-esteem, private collective self-esteem, public collective self-esteem, membership collective self-esteem, perceived conflict, quality of identity, group identity, trait self-esteem, affective commitment, categorisation, RWA and SDO) play in explaining the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination.

As a result of findings indicating that collective identity serves as a predictor (e.g., Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Hunter, Platow, Howard, & Stringer, 1996; Hunter, Platow, Bell, Kypri, & Lewis, 1997; Hunter et al., 2005), as well as an outcome of intergroup discrimination, in Study 3, which is outlined in Chapter

4, I evaluate the role of importance to identity as both a dependent and an independent variable in relation to intergroup discrimination.

In Chapter 5, I tie together the findings from all three sets of studies and discuss them in relation to existing theory and research. I then outline the limitations of the current research programme. This is followed by an examination of the implications of the present study's findings for how future research should be conducted and a review of the wider implications for combatting real-world instances of intergroup discrimination.

Intergroup Discrimination

Traditionally, discrimination and prejudice have been defined separately (see Allport, 1954). Prejudice was thought to refer to the *attitudes* that an individual holds about a social group, while discrimination was thought to refer to the *behaviours* that stemmed from those attitudes (see Vaughan & Hogg, 2014). More recently, however, prejudice and discrimination have come to be regarded as so intertwined that definitions of prejudice have been extended to include discrimination. Brown (2010) gives the following, encompassing, definition of prejudice: "any attitude, emotion or behaviour towards members of a group, which directly or indirectly implies some negativity or antipathy towards that group" (p. 7). Given this definition, the terms discrimination and prejudice will be used interchangeably in this thesis.

There are countless examples, both historical and contemporary, of intergroup discrimination and the problems it causes, worldwide. The

genocidal activity of the Nazis during the Holocaust is, for many, the most unforgettable and chilling example of intergroup hostility and the horrendous consequences it can have. The Holocaust was not, however, the first instance of wholesale slaughter of one group at the hands of another, nor was it the last. The mass murder of up to 1.5 million Armenians at the hands of the Turks in the Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1916 (Kévorkian, 2011) was still fresh in people's minds when the lives of five to six million European Jews were taken in the 1930s and 1940s (Friedlander, 2007). Since the Holocaust, up to one million alleged communist party members were massacred in Indonesia in 1965 (Dwyer & Santikarma, 2003) and in Cambodia, between 1975 and 1979, some two million people are believed to have died at the hands of the Khmer Rouge, under the murderous regime of Pol Pot (Jones, 2013). In Bosnia, hostilities between the Bosnian Serbs and Muslims erupted in 1992 and almost four years of ethnic cleansing ensued, resulting in the deaths of an estimated 250,000, most of whom were Bosnian Muslims (Jones, 2013). In Rwanda, in 1994, as the bloodshed was taking place in Bosnia, the Hutus turned on their fellow countrymen, slaughtering an estimated 800,000 Tutsis (Staub, 2011).

Today, little appears to have changed. In Syria, a bitter civil war rages between President Bashar al-Assad loyalists and those opposed to his regime. According to a report commissioned by the UN, the death toll from the conflict stands at just under 60,000 at the beginning of January, 2013 (Price, Klingner, & Ball, 2013). In Darfur, in the western region of Sudan, the Sudanese government and the Arab Janjaweed militias have been embroiled in a deadly conflict with the indigenous African population since 2003. In 2010 it was estimated that the conflict had cost over 400,000 lives (Tatum, 2010) and a

2014 report revealed that over two million people had been displaced in the fighting (United Nations Security Council, 2014). In Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, a battle between Israelis and Palestinians that has been raging since the state of Israel was established in 1948 continues today.

At the heart of all the examples of intergroup conflict outlined above, is intergroup discrimination. Discrimination is not always, however, manifested in such extreme ways. It occurs in many important areas of everyday life, including healthcare, education and employment and affects a wide range of people. A large body of literature has examined various forms of intergroup discrimination, such as bias against the members of ethnic groups. Disparities in the health care received by different races and ethnicities are well documented (see Dovidio et al., 2008; Stone & Moskowitz, 2011). In the United States, Black Americans are less likely than White Americans to receive referrals for cardiovascular procedures (Schulman et al., 1999), Hispanic cancer patients are less likely than non-minority group cancer patients to be given adequate pain relief (Cleeland et al., 1997) and Black female patients are less likely than White female patients to receive diagnostic scans and treatment for osteoporosis (Mikuls, Saag, George, Mudano, & Banerjee, 2005). In Australia, Indigenous Australians admitted to hospital for coronary heart disease are 40% less likely than other Australians to receive angioplasty or stent procedures (Mathur, Moon, & Leigh, 2006). Although it is difficult to establish exactly what causes the disparity in health care received by different races, many researchers have concluded that physician racial bias, whether it be conscious or sub-conscious, is likely to play a role (see Dovidio et al., 2008; Durey & Thompson, 2012; Williams & Rucker, 2000). Bias has also been found in the

helping behaviour of the general public, with a study conducted by Kunstman and Plant (2008) showing that, in a medical emergency, White individuals take, on average, twice as long to come to the assistance of a Black person who has been injured, as they do a White person.

Racial disparities in education also exist, with research showing that teachers are almost four times more likely to discipline African American school students than they are White students (Skiba et al., 2011). Disproportionate use of discipline remains when controlling for socioeconomic status, and this is despite evidence suggesting that African American students are not responsible for more transgressions (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2002). Benner and Graham (2011) showed that discrimination against Latino secondary school students (which included inequitable use of discipline) had a knock on effect for students' academic performance, with the authors finding that intergroup bias led, indirectly, to lower grades and attendance among the minority group students. Steele and Aronson (1995) found that activating African American students' awareness of stereotypes held by majority group members about their academic ability lead African American students to perform more poorly in academic tests. The simple act of writing their race on a test sheet was sufficient to hamper their performance, suggesting that outgroup bias need not be directly experienced in the moment in order to affect academic aptitude.

Like ethnicity bias, gender bias is well documented in the literature and in particular in education (see Spencer, Porche, & Tolman, 2003). Tiedemann (2000) reported that teachers thought primary school age girls with average achievement records in mathematics found the subject harder than boys with the same achievement level. Teachers regarded female students as less logical

than male students, despite the same performance record. They also thought that girls had to work harder than boys to attain equivalent results in mathematics. Finally, teachers put unanticipated poor performance among girls down more to lack of aptitude and less to lack of studying than they did for boys. Mendoza-Denton, Shaw-Taylor, Chen and Chang (2009) found that an awareness of potential gender bias indirectly affected women's academic performance. The study findings revealed that female university students who were worried about being discriminated against and suspected that a male interviewer was gender biased, experienced impaired performance on a test of academic aptitude.

Gender bias in employment is also well established. The number of men with careers in science, mathematics, technology and engineering far outweighs the number of women in these areas, despite the fact that, in some of these fields, just as many women hold qualifications as do men (see Spears Brown & Leaper, 2010). In a study conducted by Moss-Racusin et al. (2012), which sought to explain women's underrepresentation in academic science jobs, the authors found that biology, chemistry and physics professors rated a female job candidate as less employable and less competent than a male candidate who had submitted an identical job application. The professors also offered the female candidate a lower salary and less mentoring than the male candidate. Setting aside the issue of the impact of gender bias in employment on the individuals involved, under utilising women in these important fields has implications for society in general (see Bussey & Bandura, 1999). Zakaria (2008) stresses that failure to capitalise on the skills of all members of the

population in areas that are fundamental to economic growth will eventually impact upon the economy.

Bias against people on the basis of their sexual orientation is also well established. Again, an area that has generated considerable research interest has been employment discrimination. Tilcsik (2011) found that gay males submitting job applications for white-collar positions in the United States were around 40 per cent less likely than heterosexual males to be asked for an interview. Eliason et al. (2011) reported that, of 427 lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) physicians they surveyed about their experiences of discrimination in the workplace, 15 per cent had been harassed by a co-worker because of their sexual orientation, 22 per cent had been ostracised and 27 per cent had seen an LGBT colleague being discriminated against. A further 34 per cent of physicians had observed an LGBT patient receiving discriminatory medical treatment. Colvin's (2009) US study into discrimination in the police force revealed similar findings. Thirty four per cent of police officers who identified as lesbian or gay reported being subject to repeated harassment from their colleagues and a further 51 per cent and 48 per cent reported being treated like an outsider and being socially isolated respectively. Hendren and Blank (2009) found that discrimination against people because of their sexual orientation extended to the general public's helping behaviour. The study findings revealed that members of the public were over three times less likely to help lesbian and gay individuals appealing for assistance than they were heterosexual individuals.

Discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation among adolescents is particularly well documented. In a study of homophobic verbal abuse in

secondary schools, Thurlow (2001) reported that abuse is widespread, particularly severe in nature and regarded by adolescents as much less serious than other forms of verbal derogation, such as racial abuse. Almeida et al. (2009) found that discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and/or transgendered (LGBT) secondary school students had a negative impact on their mental health. The study revealed higher levels of depressive symptoms among LGBT high school students, as well as a heightened risk of self-harm and suicidal ideation.

In a review of the literature assessing the psychiatric health of lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) populations in general, Meyer (2003) concluded that the LGB community is overrepresented in mental health statistics. In particular, the author noted, non-heterosexual individuals are at increased risk for suicide and suicide ideation. Meyer concluded that the stigma and discrimination experienced by LGB individuals leads to increased stress, which, in turn, heightens their risk of psychiatric disorders.

The above overview of some of the areas of everyday life in which group based discrimination can be found, (e.g., the workplace, healthcare and education), is by no means exhaustive. Rather than aiming to provide a comprehensive account of all the situations in which discrimination can be found and the groups it can affect, the above review is intended to give a sense of the prevalence of prejudice in everyday life. Intergroup discrimination can have the most odious of consequences, as we have seen in the case of genocide, as well as less grave effects, such as fewer employment opportunities for outgroup members. Regardless of the form it takes, the result of intergroup

discrimination is, however, indisputably bad, not just for the individuals involved, but for society in general.

Theories of Intergroup Discrimination

Given all the negative effects of intergroup bias, it follows that questions (often stimulated by news coverage of various atrocities around the world) arise as to how such conflict comes about. What causes individuals to discriminate against others? Many theories have been put forward in attempts to explain this. These theories (although overlapping somewhat) can be roughly categorised into three main areas; those that emphasise personality type, those that emphasise the competitive nature of the intergroup context in which people find themselves and those that emphasise the identities of the individuals involved.

Three main theories have been proposed to explain the genesis of prejudice as personality based. These are authoritarian personality theory, right wing authoritarianism (RWA) and social dominance orientation (SDO). Adorno and his colleagues proposed authoritarian personality theory in 1950, to account for the development of prejudice in some individuals, but not others. They believed that individuals with authoritarian personality types tended to be particularly susceptible to prejudicial attitudes in society. In keeping with Freudian theory regarding family relationships, an authoritarian personality developed, Adorno et al. contended, as a result of the environment in which an individual was raised as a child. People who were brought up in particularly

restrictive families, where they were expected to adhere to stringent regulations and received harsh punishments for any deviations from these rules, went on to form authoritarian personalities. Repressive home environments lead children to feel hostile toward their parents but, because they feared the repercussions of showing aggression toward their parents, they redirected their hostility toward less powerful targets.

People who had been raised in authoritarian environments were submissive toward and fearful of authority figures, who they saw as representing their parents. Their anger was instead focused on members of specific groups (e.g., minorities, women, gay people, communists), who they perceived to be inferior to them. Because of their parents' inflexible child rearing style, they came to view the world in a rigid fashion. Anyone who deviated from the ingroup was not tolerated. The targets of their prejudice tended to be minority group members or people who were otherwise devalued by society. In the course of their work, Adorno and his colleagues developed an authoritarian personality inventory called the 'F-scale'. Although there was some support for a relationship between prejudice and this 30-item measure of authoritarianism, including a study conducted by Pettigrew (1958), finding correlations between the F-scale and prejudice toward black people, other research failed to reveal such associations. A study carried out by Siegman (1961), for example, found no significant correlations between Israeli respondents' F-scale scores and their prejudice toward Jewish immigrants from North Africa. Attempts to explain these inconsistent findings revealed that the scale was methodologically flawed in a number of ways (Heaven, 2001). Arguably the most notable criticism was that the F-scale was subject to

potential acquiescence bias. That is, its items were all phrased in such a way that agreement with a statement always denoted authoritarianism (see Brown, 2010).

As a result, research examining the role of authoritarianism in intergroup discrimination all but dried up for more than two decades until, in the 1980s and 1990s, Altemeyer (1988, 1996, 1998) took up the challenge of overcoming some of the methodological weaknesses inherent in the F-scale. The author constructed a new personality inventory to explain prejudice, called the right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) scale, which has since come to replace Adorno's F-scale (Brown, 2010). Perhaps the most important feature of the new 30-item scale was that the direction of the wording of the statements that comprised the inventory was counterbalanced, to avoid the potential acquiescence bias present in the F-scale. The items were similar, in many other ways, to those that made up the original F-scale. Altemeyer (1988, 1996) believed that the authoritarian personality was made up of three main elements. These were deference to authority figures (submission), aggression towards those who did not conform to one's worldview (aggression) and, finally, rigid observance of a strict moral code (conventionalism). The scale was not, however, influenced by Freudian theory, and marked an important departure from this approach. Unlike Adorno and his colleagues (1950), Altemeyer (1996) believed that authoritarianism developed as a result of social learning, rather than because of a strict upbringing. Studies have shown that the RWA scale is correlated with numerous forms of intergroup discrimination. This includes prejudice toward people on the basis of their sexual orientation,

discrimination toward members of ethnic minority groups and prejudice toward homeless people (Altemeyer, 1996; see also Sibley & Duckitt, 2008).

Another personality based theory that has been proposed to explain intergroup discrimination is social dominance theory. Taken up by Sidanius, Pratto and their colleagues (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), the theory rested on the assumption that society is hierarchically structured and those who are socially dominant in the hierarchy show prejudice toward others in order to maintain their position in this hierarchy. The social dominance orientation (SDO) scale was developed in order to assess the extent to which people endorse inequality between groups (see Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Comprised of 16 items, each item in the SDO scale is a statement that either supports or rejects inequality between groups in society. Respondents who are in favour of inequality, and thus high in social dominance, will tend to discriminate against others in order to sustain societal inequality. A person's level of SDO, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) argue, can be influenced by his or her own standing in society, relative to others. A male, for instance, is likely to be higher in SDO than a female (see also Wilson & Liu, 2003). It may also be affected by an individual's upbringing. Finally, SDO can, to a degree, be shaped by the particular context in which a person finds himself or herself. Research has shown that high scores on the SDO scale are correlated with intergroup discrimination. This includes sexism, racism and prejudice toward people on the basis of their sexual orientation (Pratto et al., 1994; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008).

In addition to the studies, outlined above, linking intergroup discrimination with RWA and SDO individually, Altemeyer (1998) argues that

the two personality based theories *together* account for a large amount of the variance in prejudice. According to Altemeyer, RWA explains the intergroup discrimination of followers (or the 'submissive' side of authoritarianism), while social dominance theory explains the prejudice of leaders (or the 'dominant' side of authoritarianism). The point in the preceding paragraph, that social context can play a role in the development of SDO, has been particularly problematic for both theories however. Despite the fact that each theory acknowledges the role of context in shaping personality type, this point has been contentious for two main reasons. The first is that the claim is at odds with the main premise behind RWA and SDO respectively. Personality theories, by definition, refer to stable predispositions. The second is that the role of context in shaping people's prejudices, although acknowledged by RWA and SDO theorists, is not given sufficient attention (see Brown, 2010).

Reynolds and Turner (2006) stress that personality theories fail to properly account for the fact that societal factors can influence intergroup discrimination, citing evidence that people's prejudice and SDO levels can suddenly elevate when a country is under attack. Further support for the claim that social context plays an important role in shaping intergroup behaviour can be found in the work of Pettigrew (1958). In a cross-national study of intergroup discrimination, the author found that both white South Africans and white Americans from the Southern United States expressed strong prejudice toward black people. The average levels of authoritarianism found among the groups high in prejudice were no greater, however, than the levels of authoritarianism found among groups lower in prejudice. This was evidence,

Pettigrew concluded, that intergroup discrimination stemmed more from the social climate, than from participants' personality types.

In addition to wider societal norms influencing intergroup discrimination, research suggests that the immediate social environment can shape people's intergroup attitudes, in a way that cannot be explained by personality. Indeed, Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov and Duarte (2003) found that, although Law students and Psychology students displayed equivalent levels of prejudice toward a range of outgroups in their first years of study, by the time the two groups of students reached their third or fourth years of study, Law students showed significantly more prejudice than their Psychology counterparts. The authors concluded that, over the course of their respective degree programmes, the two groups had been influenced by their immediate environments to such an extent that their attitudes toward members of other groups had changed.

The findings, outlined above, showing that intergroup discrimination can be affected by both the wider and the immediate social context and, as evidenced in Guimond et al.'s (2003) study, in a relatively short space of time, are particularly problematic for personality based explanations of prejudice (see Reynolds & Turner, 2006; Reynolds, Turner, Haslam & Ryan, 2001; Reynolds et al., 2007). Given the failure of personality theories to properly account for the role that social context plays in intergroup discrimination, it is unsurprising that alternative explanations of prejudice have been proposed. One such explanation, called realistic group conflict theory, or RCT, addressed the main criticism that has beset personality-based accounts of prejudice. According to this perspective, prejudice arose as a function of the social context

in which individuals found themselves (Campbell, 1965). Realistic group conflict theory was so named because prejudice tended to surface (sometimes rapidly), Campbell observed, when groups were brought into competition for limited resources (regardless of whether the competing interests were genuine or imagined).

Sherif and his colleagues (Sherif, 1966; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961; Sherif & Sherif, 1953), perhaps the most well known champions of realistic group conflict theory, conducted a series of famous studies examining the influence of group competition for limited resources on intergroup discrimination. Known as the 'summer camp studies', this set of three field experiments introduced competition amongst groups of boys participating in what they believed were summer holiday camps. Competition was designed in such a way that the groups were negatively interdependent with one another. That is, the competition winners received prizes (a trophy for the team and penknives for each of the boys), while the losers came away with nothing. The introduction of competition for the same goal quickly led to intergroup hostility, providing evidence for realistic group conflict theory. This series of studies generated strong support for a move toward explaining the origins of prejudice in terms of the environment in which individuals find themselves, and away from explaining it in terms of people's personalities or their belief systems. The escalation in intergroup conflict, following the introduction of competition in Sherif's series of studies, was too sudden and too fast to be attributed to either of these (Brown, 2010).

Despite the support generated by the summer camp studies (and many other studies since; for a review, see Brown, 2010), realistic group conflict

theory has nevertheless been subject to a number of criticisms (see Platow & Hunter, 2001; Platow & Hunter, 2012; Platow & Hunter, in press, Platow, Hunter, Haslam, & Reicher, in press). In particular, research has shown that intergroup discrimination arises even when there is no competition (real or imagined) present. Evidence of this first emerged in the summer camp studies themselves. When the boys in the third study, conducted at Robbers Cave in Oklahoma (who had previously been unaware of the existence of another group of boys at the camp), first realised that there was another group present, they spontaneously expressed a desire to compete with them (Sherif, 1966). In an attempt to understand the basic conditions necessary for the emergence of discrimination, Tajfel and his colleagues (Billig & Tajfel, 1973; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament 1971) developed the minimal group paradigm (so named because of the minimal conditions required to generate intergroup discrimination). Tajfel et al. found that people assigned to two groups on the basis of their preference for one artist's work over another, discriminated against members of the other group just because they were in the alternative group, with no additional knowledge of the other group members. This phenomenon has since been replicated many times over (see Bourhis, Turner, & Gagnon, 1997; Brewer, 1979; Hunter et al., 2005). The findings demonstrated in the minimal group paradigm undermined the realistic group conflict theory argument that competition between groups was necessary for discrimination to emerge and suggested that other factors were at play when it came to accounting for intergroup discrimination.

In an attempt to explain the minimal group paradigm's findings, in 1979, Tajfel and Turner developed social identity theory (SIT). They argued (1979,

1986) that intergroup comparison arises, even in contexts in which there is no realistic competition between groups, because an important component of people's self-image is tied to their group memberships. This aspect of the self is known as the social identity (the group or the collective self-concept). Social identity theory predicts that in order to maintain a positive view of themselves (something, the authors argue, most of us are driven to do), individuals must maintain a positive view of their group memberships, or social identities (since these memberships make up part of their overall perceptions of themselves). To maintain a positive social identity, people must differentiate their group from other groups. People are motivated, therefore, to compare their own groups with others and judge their own groups more favourably when making these comparisons. The authors described this as an effort to achieve 'positive distinctiveness'. It is this desire for a positive social identity that motivates intergroup discrimination (see Brown, 2010).

Group Identity and Intergroup Discrimination

As noted above, a core assumption of SIT is that intergroup discrimination is (in part) driven by the desire to achieve a positive social identity (see Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This assumption is based on the presupposition that people must first internalise their group identity into their self-concept (i.e., they must identify with their respective group). A direct corollary of this assumption has led to the hypothesis that the more people identify with their respective ingroups, the more intergroup discrimination

they will show (Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; McGarty, 2001). Decades of empirical work has, however, revealed little clear evidence supporting a link between group identity and discrimination.

Studies in which group or collective identity is experimentally manipulated have tended to show that high levels of group identity do result in increased ingroup bias (Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 2002). The findings from correlational studies (which are far more numerous), however, are less consistent. In their review of the literature, Hinkle and Brown (1990) reported that findings from the 14 studies they examined varied a great deal, with correlations ranging from $-.79$ to $+.59$. The overall correlation between identity and ingroup bias across all the studies, however, was close to zero, at $+.08$. The wider literature mirrors Hinkle and Brown's (1990) findings. While a number of studies have reported a relationship between group identity and intergroup bias (see Aberson et al., 2000; Kelly, 1988; Levin et al., 2003), others have struggled to generate support for an association (Hunter & Stringer, 1999; Maass et al., 1996; Smith & Postmes, 2009; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999).

The lack of consistent findings concerning the relationship between identity and intergroup bias has sparked considerable debate, particularly surrounding social identity theory, on which a great deal of the literature is based (see Brown, 2000; McGarty, 2001; Mummendey, Klink, & Brown, 2001; Turner, 1999). Brown (2000) claims that, despite no outright acknowledgement on the part of SIT theorists that there will be a correlation between identity and discrimination, it follows logically that the theory predicts such an association. This, Brown argues, presents a problem for SIT. Turner (1999), who co-developed SIT, maintains, however, that SIT does not state that

there will be a relationship between identity and ingroup bias in every situation (see also Bourhis et al., 1997; McGarty, 2001; Turner & Reynolds, 2001).

McGarty (2001) argues that "SIT predicts a positive correlation between in-group identification and in-group bias, not as a main effect but as an interactive outcome of several factors" (p. 174). This, the author asserts, has been overlooked in the literature, with some researchers prepared to dismiss SIT on the grounds that simple correlations between identity and group bias have not consistently been found. Factors that play a role in the relationship between identity and group bias include how meaningful category memberships are, the particular group norms that are at play, the salience of a given social identity, the relevance of the outgroup in question, the importance of the dimension of comparison, and whether or not there is a belief that alternative outcomes to the existing status relations between groups are possible (Bourhis et al., 1997; Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1997; McGarty, 2001; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1999). Despite an effort to include some of these factors in research examining the relationship between identity and group bias (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005), no study has yet assessed all of the potential influences outlined above. Lalonde (2002), however, examined three of the factors (identity salience, outgroup relevance and dimension of comparison) and found some evidence that they play a role in the relationship between identity and group bias. Other research involving both manipulated laboratory conditions (Otten, Mummendey, & Blanz, 1996) and real social groups, including Catholics and Protestants from Northern Ireland (Hunter & Stringer, 1999), Jewish and Arab students in the United States (Ruttenberg, Zea, & Sigelman, 1996) and Israelis (Struch & Schwartz, 1989), on the other hand, has again yielded contradictory results,

both within and between studies. The inconsistent findings from studies using real social groups are particularly surprising, given that one would expect that a number of the factors, outlined above, should naturally occur among real social groups.

A range of other explanations for the mixed findings regarding the link between identity and group bias have also been proposed. One theory, put forward by Hinkle and Brown (1990), is that identity and ingroup bias are only associated when groups are both collectivist and relational. The authors referred to this as a collectivist-individualist, relational-autonomous taxonomy. While some study findings have provided support for this theory (Brown et al., 1992; Grant & Brown, 1995; Mummendey et al., 2001), other research has struggled to generate consistent evidence for the approach (Capozza, Voci, & Licciardello, 2000; Meeres & Grant, 1999).

Another potential explanation has its roots in both SIT and RCT. This perspective states that a link between identity and intergroup bias tends to arise when an individual's identity is threatened (see Levin et al., 2003; Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1999). While a considerable body of research has supported this theory (e.g., Cairns, Kenworthy, Campbell, & Hewstone, 2006; Jackson, 2002; Schmitt & Maes, 2002; Struch & Schwartz, 1989; Voci, 2006), other studies have failed to produce clear evidence that threat plays an important role in the relationship between group identity and intergroup discrimination (Hunter, Stringer, & Watson, 1992; Karasawa, 1991; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999).

The Multidimensional Nature of Group Identity

An alternative explanation for the inconsistent findings concerning the association between group identity and intergroup bias was explored by Duckitt and his associates (Duckitt, Callaghan, & Wagner, 2005; Duckitt & Parra, 2004). The authors reasoned that, given considerable evidence to suggest that collective identity is multidimensional (see Ashmore et al., 2004; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Leach et al., 2008; Phinney, 1990; Roccas & Brewer, 2002; Tajfel, 1981), intergroup bias might be associated with some dimensions of collective identity, but not others. To test this theory, Duckitt and Parra (2004) examined the relationship between three dimensions of ethnic group identification (evaluation, attachment and involvement) and intergroup bias across a number of New Zealand ethnic groups. Duckitt, Callaghan and Wagner (2005) assessed the link between four dimensions of ethnic identification (the same three as Duckitt & Parra, 2004, with the addition of salience) and intergroup bias, across a number of South African ethnic groups. The findings from both sets of work revealed that each of the dimensions was differentially related to group bias, with the evaluative dimension most consistently associated with bias against outgroup members.

Ellemers et al. (1999) also sought to determine the extent to which various dimensions of identity had different relationships with intergroup discrimination. Their research stemmed from Tajfel's original definition of social identity; "that *part* of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981, p.

255). On the basis of this definition, Ellemers et al. (1999) extracted three distinct components of group identity: cognitive, evaluative and affective. The authors then assessed the relationship between each component and group bias. Findings revealed that they were differentially associated with bias, with the affective component of identity consistently the greatest predictor. Other studies have confirmed this finding (see Hinkle et al., 1989; Jackson, 2002).

An additional body of support for the multidimensional nature of identity was generated by Aberson et al. (2000). The authors conducted a meta-analysis in which they categorised collective identity scales according to whether they assessed collective self-esteem (CSE), which is the evaluative part of collective identity, or ingroup attraction, which is the cognitive part of collective identity. While the authors found a moderately strong effect size for ingroup attraction (0.56), no such effect was found for CSE (0.09).

A final set of support for the proposition that only some dimensions of collective identity are related to group bias, comes from research carried out by Jackson and his colleague (Jackson, 1999; Jackson & Smith, 1999). Jackson (1999) assessed the relationship between four different dimensions of group identity (ingroup attraction, interdependence with the ingroup, intergroup differentiation and perceptions of intergroup context) and intergroup bias. Only interdependence with the ingroup and unfavourable perceptions of the intergroup context showed a consistent association with intergroup bias. Jackson and Smith (1999), in two separate studies of a range of secondary components of collective identity (ingroup attraction, collective self-esteem, allocentrism, secure social identity and insecure social identity), found that only ingroup attraction and insecure social identity were positively associated with

group bias. The results of each of the two studies lead Jackson and his colleague to conclude that collective identity is multidimensional and that distinct measures of collective identity have differential links with intergroup bias.

The sets of findings outlined above suggest that only some dimensions of group identity will be positively associated with intergroup discrimination. There is no consensus across the sets of studies, however, regarding what these dimensions are. The first set of findings points to evaluative dimensions but not attachment, involvement or salience (Duckitt, Callaghan, & Wagner, 2005; Duckitt & Parra, 2004). The second set points to affective but not evaluative or cognitive dimensions of identity (Ellemers et al., 1999; Hinkle et al., 1989; Jackson, 2002). The third set points to ingroup attraction but not CSE (Aberson et al., 2000). Finally, the fourth set points to (a) ingroup interdependence and unfavourable intergroup perceptions but not ingroup attraction and intergroup differentiation (Jackson, 1999) and (b) ingroup attraction and insecure social identity but not CSE, allocentrism or secure social identity (Jackson & Smith, 1999).

In view of these mixed findings, Ashmore and his colleagues (2004) suggest that one way to shed more light on the relationship between group identity and intergroup bias, is to clarify the number and type of dimensions that can be used to measure group identity (see Leach et al., 2008; Roccas et al., 2008 for similar arguments). With regard to the number of dimensions that can be used, in some studies, items have been drawn from a range of different scales to make one unidimensional scale (Perreault & Bourhis, 1999; Verkuyten, 2005). In other studies, the use of different numbers of dimensions to assess identity have been stressed, with the number recommended by various

researchers ranging between two and five (Ellemers et al., 1999; Karasawa, 1991; Leach et al., 2008; Phinney, 1990).

With regard to the type of dimensions that can be used to measure group identity, the same items are sometimes used to measure what are labelled as different dimensions of identity. For instance, the item beginning with the statement "I am glad to be a member/belong..." has been used to examine dimensions of identity variously described as measuring emotion (Hinkle et al., 1989, p. 308), ethnocultural attachment (Duckitt et al., 2005 p. 644), attraction to the ingroup (Jackson, 2002, p. 23), satisfaction (Leach et al., 2008, p. 165), and private CSE (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992, p. 307). Ashmore et al. (2004) also stress that there are inconsistencies in the terminology that is used in this area. Not only do the authors point out, as has been outlined above, that different labels are often used for what are effectively the same dimensions of identity, they also argue that the same labels are frequently used for different dimensions. For example, Stryker and Serpe, (1994) consider salience to be a stable disposition, defining it as "...a readiness to act out an identity..." (p. 17). In contrast, Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley and Chavous (1998), in their multidimensional model of racial identity, consider salience to be a situational variable, defining it as "the extent to which one's race is a relevant part of one's self-concept at a particular moment or in a particular situation" (p. 24).

Because of the lack of consistency concerning the dimensions that can be used to assess group identity, several researchers have proposed models to detail and organise the measures that are available (e.g., Cameron, 2004; Leach et al., 2008; Roccas et al., 2008). Perhaps the most thorough of these is Ashmore et al.'s (2004) organising framework. In it, the authors set out a range

of dimensions of group identity, defining them and discussing similarities and differences between them, in an effort to clear up confusions that have arisen as a result of past research. The authors then detail the best measures to use to assess these dimensions. As a result of Ashmore et al.'s efforts, researchers are now better equipped to select appropriate measures to examine links between collective identity and intergroup discrimination.

One particular dimension of collective identity that Ashmore and his colleagues isolated from the group identity literature and underlined the value of is explicit importance. They define it as "the individual's subjective appraisal of the degree to which a collective identity is important to her or his overall sense of self" (p. 87). The authors distinguish explicit importance from other dimensions of collective identity that are very different in what they assess (i.e., self-categorisation, evaluation, attachment and sense of interdependence, social embeddedness, behavioural involvement, and content and meaning). They also highlight a number of dimensions that bear different names from explicit importance but are similar in what they assess (e.g., significance, strength, centrality, prominence). The authors single out Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) importance to identity subscale (from their collective self-esteem [CSE] scale) as the 'purest' measure of explicit importance, of all the measures of importance to identity that they examined. Use of the importance to identity subscale has been widespread in research examining links between importance to identity and intergroup relations in general (e.g., Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Hunter et al., 2004; Major, Quinton, & Schmader, 2003). Given their endorsement of this particular scale, what Ashmore and his colleagues termed

explicit importance, will be referred to hereafter as importance to identity, in keeping with Luhtanen and Crocker's terminology.

Importance to Identity

Importance to Identity and Intergroup Behaviour

Scientific research into importance to identity dates back a long way (Ashmore et al., 2004). The notion that an individual's various identities differ in their degree of importance to the self is evident in a number of models of the self. Verkuyten (2005) notes that the idea that some identities feature more prominently than others in one's view of oneself has been variously referred to as 'self-schema' (Markus, 1977), 'psychological centrality' (Rosenberg, 1979) and 'identity prominence' (McCall & Simmons, 1978). Viewing social groups as an important part of the self is also a core assumption of those theoretical perspectives whose primary focus has centered on organisational behaviour, nationalism and patriotism, individualism and collectivism and the social identity framework (Roccas et al., 2008).

In light of this, it is unsurprising that a large body of literature has linked importance to identity with a range of intergroup outcomes. Research and theory suggest that when a particular group identity is important to a person, they tend to trust ingroup members more (Kenworthy & Jones, 2009), endorse the ingroup's collective action (Tropp & Wright, 2001), see the ingroup and outgroup as distinct (Roccas et al., 2008), think that the ingroup is being

discriminated against (Sellers & Shelton, 2003), more readily defend the ingroup from threat (Leach et al., 2008) and be less receptive to interventions targeting prejudice (Crisp & Beck, 2005).

The theory and research outlined above suggests that when a group identity is important to a person's overall sense of self, their behaviour toward the ingroup tends to be more positive and their behaviour toward the outgroup more negative. In view of this evidence linking importance to identity with intergroup behaviour, it seems likely that important collective identities will be associated with intergroup discrimination. The notion that importance to identity and intergroup discrimination are related is underpinned by the following widely accepted set of principles: (a) that one has multiple group identities, (b) that these identities vary in importance to one's self-concept and (c) that it is identities that are important to one's self-concept that tend to be associated with intergroup behaviour (see Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1999; Turner, 1999).

Importance to Identity and Intergroup Discrimination

Few studies to date have examined the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup bias and the research that has been conducted has had limited success generating support for an association between the two variables. These studies have, however, been flawed. There are two main practices that have undermined the research. The first is that a number of studies have asked participants to respond to importance to identity scales with

reference to all their social group memberships (e.g., Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Jackson & Smith, 1999) and have then examined the extent to which bias against one particular outgroup is associated with all these group identities. Gramzow and Gaertner (2005), for example, had participants respond to Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale, "at the generic level" (p. 806). That is, participants were not asked to respond with one specific group membership in mind. Items such as "The social groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am" (p. 807) comprised the importance to identity subscale. Bias against one particular outgroup was then assessed. This practice means that it is impossible to draw any definitive conclusions about the relationship between a specific group identity and the intergroup discrimination associated with it. Because a person's various group identities differ in the degree to which they are important to the person (see Ashmore et al., 2004), it is critical that studies tap the importance of the particular group identity that is relevant to the form of intergroup discrimination that is of interest. Given the failure to do this, it is unsurprising that the studies outlined above did not find a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup bias.

The second way in which studies assessing the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup bias have been compromised, is the practice of amalgamating importance to identity subscales with other identity or CSE subscales (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999) and then assessing the association between this composite measure and intergroup bias. Jackson (2002), for example, merged importance to identity measures with cognitive

identity measures and then assessed the association between this composite measure and intergroup bias. The author put items like “My ingroup membership is important to the way I view myself” (p. 23) together with items like “I am a member of the ingroup” (p. 23), to make up a subscale. Although cognitive awareness of one’s group membership is necessary in order for intergroup behaviour to arise, it is distinct from how important one considers that group membership to be to one’s overall self-concept (see Turner, 1999). An individual may be aware, for instance, that she or he is white, without that group membership being important to her or his identity. Again, because of this approach, it is perhaps to be expected that Jackson’s (2002) study findings did not reveal a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup bias.

As outlined above, multiple studies have failed to find reliable evidence of a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. It seems likely that the practices of requiring participants to answer importance to identity items with reference to all of their group memberships and of combining different group identity measures to create one subscale have confounded the research examining the association between importance to identity and intergroup bias.

Despite what has, by and large, been a failure to find an association between importance to identity and discrimination (possibly due to the methodological weaknesses outlined above), there are good reasons, garnered from both theory and research, to believe that there may be a potent relationship between the two dimensions. In their quest to understand the relationship between group identity and intergroup discrimination, social identity theorists have been especially active in emphasising the critical role

played by *important* group identities. Tajfel (1981) states “Our explicit preoccupation is with the effects of the nature and subjective importance of these memberships on those aspects of an individual’s behaviour which are pertinent to intergroup relations...” (p. 255) and Turner, in his discussion of self-categorisation theory (1987, 1999), stressed that the importance, or centrality, of a collective identity plays a critical role in determining whether ingroup bias is displayed. Spears et al. (1999), in their review of the social identity literature, emphasised that social identity and discrimination will only be associated when social identities are considered “important and relevant” (p. 60).

Some researchers have argued that when a group is important to the *whole* self, it has a particularly strong impact on intergroup behaviour. The acknowledgment that group identity *and* personal identity are both important in intergroup contexts is a fundamental tenet of the theory of identity fusion. Proponents of this theory claim that, for individuals who are ‘fused’ with their group, the group is important to who they are as a person. Swann et al. (2009) state that, for fused individuals, “...group membership is intensely personal... they care as much about the outcomes of the group as their own outcomes” (p. 996). Furthermore, they argue, both personal and group identity influence group-based behaviour. It is this *combination* of both forms of identity that potently affects intergroup behaviour.

Social identity theorists claim that interpersonal and intergroup behaviour occurs on a continuum. When the interpersonal-intergroup continuum was first proposed by Tajfel (1974, 1978), some concluded that interpersonal and intergroup identities appeared at opposite ends of the

continuum. That is, it was believed that behaviour could be guided entirely by one's group identity or entirely by one's personal identity (see Turner, 1999). This interpretation has since been amended and it is now recognised that, in any given situation, both can exert influence on behaviour (see Haslam, 2014b, June 23; Long & Spears, 1997; 1998). Tajfel himself, in 1978, emphasised that purely interpersonal or purely intergroup behaviour is unlikely and that behaviour tends to be influenced by both ends of the continuum, to varying degrees. It is the relative salience of each respective form of identity that determines the role each plays in intergroup behaviour (Turner, 1999).

Although there are a number of differences between the social identity approach and the theory of identity fusion, there are also areas of overlap. Identity fusion theorists, for the most part, attempt to explain the behaviour of individuals who commit extreme acts against outgroup members and sacrifice a great deal for their group (see Gómez, Brooks, et al., 2011; Gómez, Morales et al., 2011; Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, et al., 2010; Swann, Gómez, Huici, et al., 2010; Swann et al., 2009; Swann et al., 2012), while the social identity perspective is intended to explain more everyday forms of intergroup behaviour, including discrimination (see Tajfel, 1978). Each theory, however, emphasises that both personal and group identity play a role in intergroup contexts and that each influences group-based behaviour (see Gómez, Brooks, et al., 2011; Gómez, Morales, et al., 2011; Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, et al., 2010; Swann, Gómez, Huici, et al., 2010; Swann et al., 2009; Swann et al., 2012; Tajfel, 1978).

In sum, social identity theorists have emphasised the key role that important group identities play in influencing intergroup behaviour (Tajfel, 1981; Turner, 1999; Turner et al., 1987; see also, Spears et al., 1999). Research

evidence also suggests that when a group identity is important to who an individual is as a person, intergroup behaviour is rendered all the more potent (see Gómez, Brooks, et al., 2011; Gómez, Morales et al., 2011; Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, et al., 2010; Swann, Gómez, Huici, et al., 2010; Swann et al., 2009; Swann et al., 2012). It is expected, therefore, that, by utilising a measure of importance to identity, a relationship between identity and intergroup discrimination will be found. Ashmore et al. (2004) isolate Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) importance to identity subscale as the most effective measure of importance to identity available. The scale, which captures the importance of a group identity to one's whole self-concept (which is comprised of both personal and group identity), was thus selected as the measure of identity to be used in Studies 1 - 3 that follow, in Chapters 2 - 4.

The Role of Context, the Contribution of Other Variables, and Importance to Identity as Both an Independent and a Dependent Variable

As outlined earlier, research suggests that a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination is unlikely to be found in every set of circumstances (see Ashmore et al., 2004; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Lalonde, 2002; McGarty, 2001; Turner, 1999). Self-categorisation theory (SCT) proposes that identity and intergroup behaviour are most likely to be linked when intergroup relations are emphasised. In such contexts, collective identity becomes salient, leading to a sense of depersonalisation. It is this depersonalisation that promotes a relationship between collective identity and

intergroup differentiation (Turner, 1999). It is pertinent, therefore to examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, in contexts in which intergroup relations are emphasised.

A number of other variables have also been associated in the literature with either importance to identity (see Duckitt & Sibley, in press; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) or intergroup discrimination (see Aberson et al., 2000; Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown et al., 1986; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker et al., 1987; Ellemers et al., 1999; Hunter et al., 2004; 2005; 2011; 2012; Kelly, 1988; Long & Spears, 1997; Struch & Schwartz, 1989; Whitley & Kite, 2006). It is possible, therefore, that such constructs might explain any relationships between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination that may be found. As a result, it is necessary to rule out these potentially overlapping constructs as explanations for any associations found between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination (see Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005 for a summary of why it is important to assess the potential role of other variables).

Research suggests that the relationship between collective identity and intergroup discrimination is not unidirectional. Just as group identity can increase intergroup discrimination, so too can intergroup discrimination increase group identity (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Hunter et al., 2005; Hunter et al., 1997; Hunter et al., 1996). In view of these findings, it is important to examine importance to identity not just as a predictor, but also as an outcome of intergroup discrimination.

Summary

There are many examples, both current and historical, of discrimination and the grave consequences it can have (e.g., Friedlander, 2007; Jones, 2013; Kévorkian, 2011; Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Schulman et al., 1999; Skiba et al., 2011; Staub, 2011; Thurlow, 2001; Tiedemann, 2000; Tilcsik, 2011). Researchers have proposed numerous explanations for intergroup prejudice and, although there has been some support for the various theories (e.g., Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1998; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008), each has had its limitations (see Brown, 2010). One explanation for intergroup discrimination that has stood the test of time is SIT. While there has been considerable evidence for the theory that people's motivation to maintain positive group identities leads them to discriminate against outgroup members (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Kelly, 1988; Levin et al., 2003; Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 2002), some research has failed to support these results (e.g., Hunter & Stringer, 1999; Maass et al., 1996; Smith & Postmes, 2009; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999). A number of attempts have been made to explain these inconsistent findings (e.g., Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Levin et al., 2003; McGarty, 2001; Spears et al., 1999), but each has had shortcomings. One explanation that has received considerable support, however, is that group identity is multidimensional in nature (e.g., Duckitt et al., 2005; Duckitt & Parra, 2004). Although most researchers now agree that some dimensions of group identity are associated with intergroup discrimination, while others are not (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Ellemers et al., 1999; Hinkle et al., 1989; Jackson, 1999; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999), there is no consensus as to which

dimensions these are. In their organising framework, Ashmore et al. (2004) delineated the various dimensions of group identity that are available and clarified which are the best measures to use. The authors singled out importance to identity as a particularly valuable dimension of group identity and specified Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) importance to identity subscale as a high quality tool by which to assess this construct. Although research utilising measures of importance to identity has a long history (Ashmore et al., 2004) and a large number of studies have attempted to link importance to identity with various intergroup outcomes (e.g., Crisp & Beck, 2005; Kenworthy & Jones, 2009; Leach et al., 2008; Roccas et al., 2008; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Tropp & Wright, 2001), few have examined the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination specifically. Those that have, have generally been flawed. Some study practices have required participants to respond to importance to identity subscales with regard to all their group memberships (e.g., Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Jackson & Smith, 1999) and then examined the extent to which intergroup bias against one particular outgroup is associated with all these group identities. Others have combined importance to identity subscales with other identity subscales (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999) and then assessed the relationship between this composite measure and intergroup discrimination.

Despite this lack of empirical support for an association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, there is good reason, based on both theory and research, to expect that there will be a relationship

between the two, if past methodological flaws are avoided. Social identity theorists themselves, emphasise that it is *important* identities that drive intergroup behaviour (Tajfel, 1981; Turner, 1999; Turner et al., 1987). There is a large body of research to suggest, furthermore, that it is when a particular group identity is important to the *whole* self-concept that the identity has an especially potent relationship with intergroup behaviour (see Gómez, Brooks, et al., 2011; Gómez, Morales et al., 2011; Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, et al., 2010; Swann, Gómez, Huici, et al., 2010; Swann et al., 2009; Swann et al., 2012). Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) importance to identity subscale assesses just this, evaluating how important a specific group identity is to who an individual is as a person.

Although research showing that there is an association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination is limited, it is expected that, by overcoming past study weaknesses, the present investigation will reveal a relationship between the two. In keeping with Ashmore et al.'s (2004) recommendations, the current research programme will utilise a pure measure of importance to identity, employing Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) subscale. In contrast with past research (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999), this scale will not be merged with any other identity subscales. Unlike other studies (e.g., Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Jackson & Smith, 1999), importance to identity will be assessed in relation to specific group identities, which are relevant to the measures of intergroup discrimination that are used.

Because research suggests that a relationship between identity and intergroup behaviour usually arises when the intergroup context is salient (Turner, 1999), an association between the two variables is only anticipated when intergroup relations are emphasised. It is expected that a number of potentially overlapping constructs (see, for example, Aberson et al., 2000; Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown et al., 1986; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker et al., 1987; Duckitt & Sibley, in press; Ellemers et al., 1999; Hunter et al., 2004; 2005; 2011; 2012; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) will not explain this relationship. Finally, in keeping with past findings (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Hunter et al., 2005; Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 2002), importance to identity is anticipated to serve as both a predictor and an outcome of intergroup discrimination.

Aims

The main aim of the current research programme is to evaluate how one particular dimension of group identity, importance to identity, is associated with intergroup discrimination. Three sets of studies will be reported in the following chapters. The first set of studies (Studies 1a – 1d) will examine the extent to which the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination differs, depending on whether intergroup relations are emphasised or de-emphasised. The second set of studies (Studies 2a – 2f) will assess the degree to which importance to identity is related to intergroup

discrimination when it is examined alongside a number of potentially overlapping variables. These are state self-esteem, private CSE, public CSE, membership CSE, perceived conflict, quality of identity, group identity, trait self-esteem, affective commitment, categorisation, RWA and SDO. The third set of studies (Studies 3a – 3b) will evaluate whether importance to identity serves as an independent, as well as a dependent variable in relation to intergroup discrimination.

Chapter 2: Study 1

The main purpose of the present research programme is to investigate the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. It is widely acknowledged, however, that an association between identity and intergroup differentiation is unlikely to be found in every situation (see Ashmore et al., 2004; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Lalonde, 2002; McGarty, 2001; Turner, 1999). Self-categorisation theory (SCT) suggests that identity and intergroup behaviour tend to be related in circumstances in which intergroup relations are highlighted. According to Turner (1999), in these situations, collective identity is made salient and this leads to depersonalisation which, in turn, makes a link between collective identity and intergroup differentiation much more likely. Given Turner's rationale, the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, in contexts in which intergroup relations were and were not highlighted, was explored in Studies 1a – 1d.

Study 1 was comprised of four independent tests of this idea (Studies 1a – 1d). Each test explored the hypothesis that a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination would only be found in situations in which the intergroup context was emphasised. Findings from research examining the association between collective identity and intergroup discrimination have varied considerably across different social categories and different forms of intergroup discrimination (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; 1999; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999).

As a result, the current set of studies aimed to determine whether a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination could be found across different social groups (based on national and gender identity) and different forms of intergroup discrimination (trait ratings and the distribution of white noise).

In each of the four tests that comprise Study 1, there was a condition in which intergroup relations were emphasised, and a condition in which they were not emphasised. In the emphasis condition, specific ingroups, outgroups and intergroup interactions were repeatedly highlighted. In the non-emphasis condition, no mention was made of ingroups, outgroups or intergroup interactions. The aim of each test was to examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination in contexts in which intergroup relations were and were not emphasised. Studies 1a and 1b assessed intergroup discrimination using trait ratings. These two studies focused on national identity. Study 1a examined New Zealanders' intergroup ratings of ingroup and outgroup members (i.e., New Zealanders and Americans). Study 1b examined New Zealanders' intergroup ratings of ingroup and outgroup members (i.e., New Zealanders and Asians). Studies 1c and 1d assessed intergroup discrimination using a white noise distribution task. These two studies focused on gender identities. Study 1c examined the extent to which men allocated white noise to ingroup and outgroup members (i.e., men and women), while Study 1d examined the extent to which women allocated white noise to ingroup and outgroup members (i.e., women and men).

Study 1a

Method

Participants. Participants were 90 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago.¹ The study was comprised of 22 male and 68 female participants. Forty-five participants were assigned to a group emphasis condition, while the remaining 45 were assigned to a non-emphasis condition.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. Study 1a was comprised of two conditions. Intergroup relations were emphasised in one condition (the emphasis condition). Intergroup relations were not emphasised in the other condition (the non-emphasis condition). In the emphasis condition, repeated reference was made to relevant ingroups, outgroups and intergroup interactions. Participants were informed that the study was concerned with group perception, judgment and behaviour and then presented with a response booklet. Participants were then told that there were two groups participating in the study, New Zealanders and Americans. They were then asked to write down the national group to which they belonged (i.e., New Zealander vs. American) on the front cover of the response booklet. Participants were told that, once they had completed the booklet, they would be asked to participate in

¹ All of the studies conducted as part of this thesis received ethical approval from the University of Otago's Ethics Committee 03/165 (Category A Proposals) or from the Department of Psychology (Category B Proposals).

a behavioural exercise. This (bogus) exercise, it was explained, would involve a five minute period in which they would be required to interact with ingroup members (i.e., New Zealanders) and another five minute period in which they would be required to interact with outgroup members (i.e., Americans). Outgroup members, participants were informed, were undertaking an identical experiment simultaneously, in a laboratory next door. To enhance the plausibility of this manipulation, a series of additional factors were put in place. First, signs that guided New Zealanders and Americans to separate laboratories were put up in several locations in the area leading into the laboratory. Second, once participants had taken their place in the laboratory, a confederate outgroup member (i.e., an American) entered the room and asked (in a loud voice) if this was the *“right room for the American group”*. The experimenter responded by saying *“no, everyone here is a New Zealander”* and *“the Americans are in the lab next door”*. Finally, just before the testing session commenced, a second confederate came into the laboratory and loudly notified the experimenter that *“the American group is ready to begin”*. Participants were then informed that the start times for the experiment had to be coordinated so that the interaction period, where the American and New Zealand groups would meet would coincide.

In the non-emphasis condition, participants were informed that the study was examining individual perception, judgments and decisions. They were issued with identical instructions and followed an identical procedure to those in the emphasis condition, with one exception. The experimenters made no reference to group membership before participants completed their response booklets.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) importance to identity subscale appeared in the first section of the response booklet, in both conditions of this study (see Appendix A). The four-item importance to identity subscale measures how important a group membership is to the self-concept. In their organising framework for understanding the multidimensional nature of collective identity, Ashmore et al. (2004), describe this subscale as the "purest operational definition of explicit importance" (p. 88). It is reliable and valid across a range of situations and when employed to examine general identities or adapted to assess specific identities (Crocker et al., 1994; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Major et al., 2003). In the present study, the subscale was adapted to assess the New Zealand identity (*'Being a New Zealander has very little to do with how I feel about myself, 'Being a New Zealander is an important reflection of who I am', Being a New Zealander is unimportant to my sense of who I am', Being a New Zealander is an important part of my self-image'*, Cronbach's alpha = .86). Participants responded using seven-point Likert scales (1 – *strongly disagree*, 7 – *strongly agree*) and in terms of how they felt "right now", regardless of whether they had felt differently in the past.

Measurement of discrimination. Twenty semantic-differential scales were employed to assess intergroup discrimination. Thirteen of these items were taken from Platow, McClintock and Liebrand's (1990) study (see Appendix B). They were as follows: *cooperative–competitive; helpful–unhelpful; intelligent–unintelligent; strong–weak; warm–cold; flexible–rigid; selfish–unselfish; manipulative–sincere; fair–unfair; honest–dishonest; friendly–*

unfriendly; trustworthy–untrustworthy; consistent–inconsistent. The other seven items (see Appendix C) were based on terms utilised to describe national stereotypes (see Devine & Elliot, 1995; Ehrlich & Rinehart, 1965; Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty, & Hayes, 1992; Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994). They were as follows: *loud–soft-spoken; pushy–reticent; humble–arrogant; confident–shy; aggressive–non-aggressive; ignorant–well-informed; straightforward–hypocritical*. Participants were asked to use these terms to rate New Zealand ingroup and U.S. outgroup members on a nine-point scale.

Manipulation checks. Two manipulation checks were included. In keeping with SCT, the checks were used to monitor levels of identity salience and depersonalisation (see Haslam, 2004; Turner et al., 1987). To assess identity salience, participants were asked to respond to the following item: *'I identify with other members of this group'*. To assess depersonalisation, participants were asked to mark their level of agreement with the following statement: *'I am like other members of my group'*. Participants responded on seven-point Likert scales (*1 – strongly disagree, 7 – strongly agree*). A final set of manipulation checks was also included at the back of the response booklet. Here participants were asked a series of specific questions. Namely, if they (a) had taken part in similar experiments, (b) had guessed the true purpose of the investigation, (c) had suspicions regarding the manipulation, (d) had taken the study seriously, (e) considered themselves to be members of the group in question, or (f) were born in New Zealand. Those who had taken part in similar experiments, guessed the true purpose of the investigation, had suspicions regarding the manipulation, had not taken the study seriously, did not consider

themselves to be New Zealanders, or were not born in New Zealand were omitted from the investigation.

Results

A priori analyses revealed no gender differences across all of the variables tested. They are not, therefore, reported below.

Manipulation checks. To assess whether participants experienced differential levels of identity salience and depersonalisation as a function of being assigned to the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions, separate one-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out (see Table 1). Findings revealed that the emphasis manipulation was effective. Statistically significant differences between the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions were found for both the identity salience measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.76$, $SD = .83$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.38$), $F(1, 88) = 9.89$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2 = .10$, and the depersonalisation measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.29$, $SD = 1.10$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 4.60$, $SD = 1.07$), $F(1, 88) = 9.03$, $p < .004$, $\eta^2 = .09$. Identity salience and depersonalisation were greater in the emphasis condition.

Importance to identity. To compare mean importance to identity in the emphasised and non-emphasised conditions, a one-way between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (See Table 2). No statistically significant difference between the two conditions was found (emphasis

condition, $M = 20.20$, $SD = 5.16$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 19.42$, $SD = 5.03$), $F(1, 88) = .52$, $p = .47$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

Intergroup discrimination. To evaluate the amount of discrimination displayed in each condition, a 2 (condition: group emphasis vs. no emphasis) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model ANOVA was carried out on the trait ratings. The first factor was between participants. The second factor was within participants. Cell means are presented in Table 2. The main effect for target group was significant $F(1, 88) = 252.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .74$. Overall, ingroup members were evaluated more highly than outgroup members ($M = 120.78$, $SD = 14.11$ vs. $M = 93.59$, $SD = 10.32$). This effect was qualified by a significant interaction found between condition and target group $F(1, 88) = 9.76$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2 = .10$. Paired samples t -tests showed significant levels of intergroup discrimination were found in both the emphasis ($M = 125.02$, $SD = 14.16$ vs. $M = 92.49$, $SD = 11.51$), $t(44) = 11.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .75$ and non-emphasis ($M = 116.53$, $SD = 12.85$ vs. $M = 94.69$, $SD = 8.98$), $t(44) = 11.41$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .75$ conditions. However, about 50% more differentiation was found in the emphasis condition ($mean\ diff = 32.53$) than the non-emphasis condition ($mean\ diff = 21.84$). The results are displayed in Table 2.

Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. To examine the relationship between importance to identity and level of intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. For each condition, separate analyses were performed. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting participants' total outgroup trait ratings from their total ingroup trait ratings. The index then served as the dependent variable and importance to identity as the predictor variable. The regression was significant

in the emphasis condition $R^2 = .09$, $F(1, 43) = 4.28$, $p < .05$ but not in the non-emphasis condition $R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 43) = .27$, $p = .61$ (see Table 3).

Study 1b

Method

Participants. Participants were 52 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised of only male participants. Twenty-six participants were placed in a group emphasis condition, while the remaining 26 were placed in a non-emphasis condition.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 1b were the same as those used in Study 1a in all but one way. The groups used differed. Study 1b examined New Zealanders' intergroup discrimination toward Asians.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) importance to identity subscale that was used in Study 1a (see Appendix A). As in Study 1a, the subscale was adapted to assess New Zealand national identity (e.g., '*Being a New Zealander has very little to do with how I feel about myself*', Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using the same 13 semantic-differential scales (see Appendix B) that were used in Study 1a, from Platow et al. (1990), with one important difference. In the present study, the scales were adapted to assess New Zealand ingroup and Asian outgroup members.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Study 1a, were used in this study.

Results

Manipulation checks. To assess whether participants experienced differential levels of identity salience and depersonalisation as a function of being assigned to the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions, separate one-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out (see Table 1). Findings revealed that the emphasis manipulation was effective. Statistically significant differences between the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions were found for both the identity salience measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.71$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 3.27$, $SD = 2.01$), $F(1,50) = 14.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .23$ and the depersonalisation measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.54$, $SD = 1.10$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.72$), $F(1,50) = 21.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .30$. Identity salience and depersonalisation were greater in the emphasis condition.

Importance to identity. To compare mean importance to identity in the emphasised and non-emphasised conditions, a one-way between-subjects

analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (See Table 2). No statistically significant difference between the two conditions was found (emphasis condition, $M = 19.50$, $SD = 5.91$, non-emphasis condition $M = 18.62$, $SD = 4.63$), $F(1, 50) = .36$, $p = .55$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

Intergroup discrimination. To evaluate the amount of discrimination displayed in each condition, a 2 (condition: group emphasis vs. no emphasis) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model ANOVA was carried out on the trait ratings allocated. The first factor was between participants. The second factor was within participants. Cell means are presented in Table 2. The main effect for target group was significant $F(1, 50) = 32.14$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .39$. Overall, ingroup members were evaluated more highly than outgroup members ($M = 85.71$, $SD = 9.56$ vs. $M = 74.21$, $SD = 14.34$). This effect was qualified by a significant interaction found between condition and target group $F(1, 50) = 11.14$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2 = .18$. Paired samples t -tests showed significant intergroup discrimination was found in the emphasis condition ($M = 87.73$, $SD = 9.48$ vs. $M = 69.46$, $SD = 13.58$), $t(25) = 5.95$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .59$ but not in the non-emphasis condition ($M = 83.69$, $SD = 9.39$ vs. $M = 78.96$, $SD = 13.71$), $t(25) = 1.78$, $p = .09$, $\eta^2 = .11$. The results are displayed in Table 2.

Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. To examine the relationship between importance to identity and level of intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed in the same manner as in Study 1a. The regression was significant in the emphasis condition, $R^2 = .16$, $F(1, 24) = 4.39$, $p < .05$, but not in the non-emphasis condition $R^2 = .09$, $F(1, 25) = 2.48$, $p = .13$ (see Table 3).

Study 1c

Method

Participants. Participants were 61 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of men. Thirty-one participants were placed in a group emphasis condition, while the remaining 30 were placed in a non-emphasis condition.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 1c were the same as those used in Study 1a in all but three ways. First, the groups used differed. In this study men served as ingroup members and women served as outgroup members. Second, an outgroup member did not enter the laboratory, asking if they were in the right room. Instead, in an adaption of the procedures outlined by Haslam (2004), immediately before completing the response booklet, participants were asked to write down three things they liked about ingroup members and three things they disliked about outgroup members. Third, in the non-emphasis condition, individuals in Study 1c were asked to write down three things they liked about themselves as 'unique individuals' and three things they disliked about themselves as 'unique individuals'.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) importance to identity

subscale that was used in Studies 1a and 1b (see Appendix A), with one crucial difference. In the present study, the subscale was adapted to assess men's identity (e.g., *'Being a man has very little to do with how I feel about myself'*, Cronbach's alpha = .71).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using six, 13-choice distribution matrices (see Appendix D). The matrices were modified from the type B matrices used by Tajfel et al. (1971, p. 157). The joint payoff was constant in each column of the matrices. Participants could choose to allocate more to the ingroup, more to the outgroup or equal amounts to both groups. The numerical values that appeared in each matrix represented times (in seconds) that were to be spent listening to white noise (a noxious sound). Participants were asked to use the matrices to distribute white noise to ingroup (i.e., men) and outgroup (i.e., women) members. To familiarise participants with the white noise that they were going to allocate, they were presented with a 10 second sample of the sound (using a Spitfire white noise generator), prior to completing the matrices.

Manipulation checks. In Study 1c ($N = 42$), an independent pilot test was used to determine whether the emphasis manipulation was effective. The same manipulation checks that were used in Studies 1a and 1b were used in this study, with one exception. Among the final set of manipulation checks at the back of the response booklet, participants in Study 1c were not asked whether they were born in New Zealand.

Results

Manipulation checks. To assess whether participants experienced differential levels of identity salience and depersonalisation as a function of being assigned to the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions, separate one-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out (see Table 1). The findings revealed that the emphasis manipulation was effective. Statistically significant differences between the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions were found for both the identity salience measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.36$, $SD = .90$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.69$), $F(1,40) = 25.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .39$ and the depersonalisation measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.09$, $SD = .97$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.85$), $F(1,40) = 35.86$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .47$. Identity salience and depersonalisation were higher in the emphasis than in the non-emphasis condition.

Importance to identity. To compare mean importance to identity in the emphasised and non-emphasised conditions, a one-way between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (See Table 2). No statistically significant difference between the two conditions was found (emphasis condition, $M = 20.77$, $SD = 4.25$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 20.07$, $SD = 4.54$), $F(1, 59) = .40$, $p = .53$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

Intergroup discrimination. To evaluate the amount of white noise allocated in each condition, a 2 (condition: group emphasis vs. no emphasis) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model ANOVA was carried out. The first factor was between participants. The second factor was within participants. Cell means are presented in Table 2. The only effect to emerge

was a significant interaction found between condition and target group $F(1, 59) = 4.80, p < .04, \eta^2 = .08$. Paired samples t -tests showed significant intergroup discrimination was found in the emphasis condition ($M = 168.94, SD = 22.98$ vs. $M = 189.35, SD = 23.95$), $t(30) = 2.45, p < .03, \eta^2 = .17$ but not in the non-emphasis condition ($M = 181.93, SD = 20.38$ vs. $M = 177.87, SD = 20.25$), $t(29) = 0.55, p = .59, \eta^2 = .01$. The results are displayed in Table 2.

Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. To examine the relationship between importance to identity and level of intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the total amount of white noise participants distributed to the ingroup from the total amount they distributed to the outgroup. The regression was significant in the emphasis condition, $R^2 = .14, F(1, 29) = 4.53, p < .05$, but not in the non-emphasis condition $R^2 = .01, F(1, 28) = .38, p = .54$ (see Table 3).

Study 1d

Method

Participants. Participants were 74 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of women. Thirty-seven participants were placed in a group emphasis condition, while the remaining 37 were placed in a non-emphasis condition.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 1d were the same as those used in Study 1c in all but one way. In this study women served as ingroup members and men served as outgroup members.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) importance to identity subscale that was used in Studies 1a, 1b and 1c (see Appendix A), with one crucial difference. In the present study, the subscale was adapted to assess women's identity (e.g., '*Being a woman has very little to do with how I feel about myself*', Cronbach's alpha = .75).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using the same six, 13-choice distribution matrices that were used in Study 1c (see Appendix D), with one important difference. In the present study, the matrices were adapted to assess women as ingroup members and men as outgroup members.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Study 1c were used in this study.

Results

Manipulation checks. To assess whether participants experienced identity salience and depersonalisation as a function of emphasis vs. non

emphasis, one-way between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were carried out (see Table 1). Findings revealed that the emphasis manipulation was effective. Statistically significant differences between the emphasis and non-emphasis conditions were found for both the identity salience measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.78$, $SD = 1.03$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.79$), $F(1,72) = 48.02$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .40$ and the depersonalisation measure (emphasis condition, $M = 5.24$, $SD = 1.28$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.77$), $F(1,72) = 38.08$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .35$. Identity salience and depersonalisation were greater in the emphasis condition than in the non-emphasis condition.

Importance to identity. To compare mean importance to identity in the emphasised and non-emphasised conditions, a one-way between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted (See Table 2). No statistically significant difference between the two conditions was found (emphasis condition, $M = 20.16$, $SD = 4.34$, non-emphasis condition, $M = 19.51$, $SD = 4.82$), $F(1, 72) = .37$, $p = .55$, $\eta^2 = .01$.

Intergroup discrimination. To examine the amount of white noise allocated in each condition, a 2 (condition: group emphasis vs. no emphasis) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model ANOVA was carried out. The first factor was between participants. The second factor was within participants. Cell means are presented in Table 2. The main effect for target group was significant $F(1, 72) = 24.80$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .26$. Overall, ingroup members were allocated less white noise than outgroup members ($M = 168.68$, $SD = 20.41$ vs. $M = 191.43$, $SD = 20.70$). This effect was qualified by a significant interaction found between condition and target group $F(1, 72) = 6.62$, $p < .02$, η^2

= .08. Paired samples *t*-tests showed significant intergroup discrimination was found in the emphasis condition ($M = 163.14, SD = 19.84$ vs. $M = 197.65, SD = 19.81$), $t(36) = 5.32, p < .001, \eta^2 = .44$ but not in the non-emphasis condition ($M = 174.22, SD = 19.71$ vs. $M = 185.22, SD = 19.92$), $t(36) = 1.71, p = .09, \eta^2 = .08$). The results are displayed in Table 2.

Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. To examine the relationship between importance to identity and level of intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed in the same manner as in Study 1c. The regression was significant in the emphasis condition $R^2 = .27, F(1, 35) = 12.99, p < .01$, but not in the non-emphasis condition $R^2 = .02, F(1, 35) = .62, p = .44$ (see Table 3).

Discussion of studies 1a to 1d

The hypothesis tested in Studies 1a to 1d was, derived from SCT (Turner, 1999), that there would be an association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination in situations where intergroup relations were emphasised. The results of each study supported this hypothesis. When the intergroup context was emphasised, a significant positive relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination emerged. This association was found both across groups based on different types of identity (national and gender identity) and different forms of discrimination (trait ratings and white noise distribution). With regard to national identity, New

Zealanders rated New Zealanders more favourably than both Americans and Asians. With regard to gender identity, both males and females distributed more white noise to the outgroup than to the ingroup. When the intergroup context was not emphasised, there was no significant association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, irrespective of the type of identity or discrimination being assessed. In the conditions in which intergroup relations were emphasised, manipulation checks, pilot tests and other analyses revealed heightened identity salience, depersonalisation and intergroup discrimination. These findings are consistent with the general thrust of research and theory outlined elsewhere (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992; Turner, 1999). More perplexing is that, although our intergroup manipulation clearly affected identity salience, depersonalisation and intergroup discrimination, it apparently did not impact on overall levels of importance to identity. This outcome, which implies that importance to identity may not be especially sensitive to contextual constraints, is relevant to ongoing debates regarding the state or trait like nature of collective identity (e.g., Ashmore et al. 2004; Brown, 2000; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998; Turner, 1999). For this reason, we will return to this issue in the third part of our investigation (i.e., where we examine importance to identity as both a predictor and consequence of discrimination).

For the moment though, the investigation is more directly focused on evaluating the association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. In this, regard the present study's findings are in line with the claims of a number of researchers, who have suggested that collective identity and intergroup discrimination will not be associated in every situation

(Ashmore et al., 2004; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Lalonde, 2002; McGarty, 2001; Turner, 1999). The current results are specifically consistent with the ideas derived from SCT, which posit that identity and intergroup behaviour are most likely to be associated when the intergroup context is emphasised. In such a situation, collective identity becomes salient and this results in depersonalisation. It is this depersonalisation that promotes a relationship between identity and intergroup differentiation (Turner, 1999). In the present study, when the intergroup context was clearly emphasised, significant (and consistent) relationships between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination were found. When the intergroup context was not emphasised, however, no such association was found.

Table 1

Means and F-ratios of Identity Salience and Depersonalisation Manipulation Checks Study 1a, b, c and d

Study	Intergroup relations emphasised condition		Intergroup relations non-emphasised condition		<i>F</i>	<i>F</i>
	Identity salience	Depersonalisation	Identity salience	Depersonalisation		
1a (NZ vs. U.S.)	5.76 (.83)	5.29 (1.10)	5.00 (1.38)	4.60 (1.07)	9.89**	9.03**
1b (NZ vs. Asians)	5.27 (1.71)	5.54 (1.10)	3.27 (2.01)	3.69 (1.72)	14.92***	21.30***
1c (Men vs. Women)	5.36 (.90)	5.09 (.97)	3.30 (1.69)	2.40 (1.85)	25.03***	35.86***
1d (Women vs. men)	5.78 (1.03)	5.24 (1.28)	3.43 (1.79)	3.03 (1.77)	48.02***	38.08***

Note. Higher identity salience and depersonalisation in the group emphasised condition than in the non-emphasised condition.

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Mean Importance to Identity and Mean Trait Ratings and White Noise Allocations to Ingroup and Outgroup Members Study 1a, b, c and d

Intergroup relations emphasised condition						Intergroup relations non-emphasised condition				
Study	N	Mean importance to identity	Ingroup	Outgroup	<i>t</i>	N	Mean importance to identity	Ingroup	Outgroup	<i>t</i>
1a ^a	45	20.20 (5.16)	125.02 (14.16)	92.49 (11.51)	11.48***	45	19.42 (5.03)	116.53 (12.85)	94.69 (8.98)	11.41***
1b ^a	26	19.50 (5.91)	87.73 (9.48)	69.46 (13.58)	5.95***	26	18.62 (4.63)	83.69 (9.39)	78.96 (13.71)	1.78
1c ^b	31	20.77 (4.25)	168.94 (22.98)	189.35 (23.95)	2.45*	30	20.07 (4.54)	181.93 (20.38)	177.87 (20.25)	0.55
1d ^b	37	20.16 (4.34)	163.14 (19.84)	197.65 (19.81)	5.32***	37	19.51 (4.82)	174.22 (19.71)	185.22 (19.92)	1.71

Note. *T*-values compare ingroup vs. outgroup trait ratings and ingroup vs. outgroup white noise allocations.

^aHigher rating of the ingroup than the outgroup by *t*-test. ^bMore white noise allocations to the outgroup than the ingroup by *t*-test.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3

Regression Betas and R²s between Mean Importance to Identity Scores and Mean Intergroup Discrimination Scores Study 1a, b, c and d

Intergroup relations emphasised condition				Intergroup relations non-emphasised condition		
Study	N	β	R^2	N	β	R^2
1a	45	.30*	.09*	45	.08	.01
1b	26	.39*	.16*	26	-.31	.09
1c	31	.37*	.14*	30	-.12	.01
1d	37	.52**	.27**	37	.13	.02

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Chapter 3: Study 2

The findings from Studies 1a – 1d revealed that, in contexts in which intergroup relations are emphasised, importance to identity is positively associated with intergroup discrimination. Although these findings support the proposed hypothesis, this relationship is correlational. As mentioned earlier, it is therefore necessary to evaluate whether other, potentially overlapping, variables might explain the associations between identity and intergroup discrimination found (see Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005). In view of this, in Studies 2a – 2f, the contribution of a series of other relevant variables was assessed. The variables (Study 2a: state [personal] self-esteem, private collective self-esteem [private CSE]; Study 2b: public collective self-esteem [public CSE], membership collective self-esteem [membership CSE]; Study 2c: perceived conflict, quality of social identity; Study 2d: group identity, trait self-esteem; Study 2e: affective commitment, categorisation; Study 2f: right wing authoritarianism [RWA], social dominance orientation [SDO]) were selected based on previous research linking them with importance to identity (see Duckitt & Sibley, in press; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and various forms of intergroup discrimination (see Aberson et al., 2000; Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown et al., 1986; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker et al., 1987; Ellemers et al., 1999; Hunter et al., 2004; 2005; 2011; 2012; Kelly, 1988; Long & Spears, 1997; Struch & Schwartz, 1989; Whitley & Kite, 2006).

Study 2 was comprised of six independent tests (Studies 2a – 2f). Each test explored the hypothesis that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination would not be explained by the series of potentially overlapping variables. As mentioned in Chapter 2, research assessing the association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination has tended to yield different results, depending on the social groups and types of intergroup discrimination examined (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999). Thus, the present set of studies sought to establish whether a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination could be found across different social groups (based on gender and national identity) and different forms of intergroup discrimination (trait ratings, the distribution of positive resources, the removal of positive resources, the removal of negative resources and the distribution of white noise).

Given the findings from Study 1, which revealed that the association between importance to identity and group-based discrimination only emerged when the intergroup context was emphasised, Study 2 only assessed the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, and the role played by potentially overlapping variables, in contexts in which intergroup relations were emphasised. In each test in Study 2, repeated mention was made of ingroups, outgroups and intergroup interactions. Study 2a assessed intergroup discrimination using trait ratings. This study focused on gender identity. It examined women's ratings of ingroup (i.e., women) and outgroup (i.e., men) members. Study 2b examined intergroup discrimination

using the distribution of positive resources (i.e., money). This study also focused on gender identity. It examined men's allocations of resources to ingroup (i.e., men) and outgroup (i.e., women) members. Study 2c assessed intergroup discrimination using a task involving the removal of positive resources (i.e., jobs). This study focused on national identity. It examined Northern Irish people's decisions to remove positive resources from ingroup (i.e., people from Northern Ireland) and outgroup (i.e., Polish immigrants) members. Study 2d assessed intergroup discrimination using a task involving the removal of negative resources (i.e., the rehiring of workers who had previously been sacked). This study also focused on national identity. It examined Northern Irish people's decisions regarding re-hiring ingroup (i.e., Northern Irish people) and outgroup (i.e., Polish immigrants) members who had previously been sacked. Studies 2e and 2f assessed intergroup discrimination via the distribution of negative resources (i.e., the allocation of white noise). Again, both studies focused on national identity. Both Studies 2e and 2f examined the extent to which New Zealanders (i.e., ingroup members) allocated white noise to ingroup and outgroup members. In Study 2e, the outgroup was Asians. In Study 2f, the outgroup was Americans.

Study 2a

Method

Participants. Participants were 49 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of female participants.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 2a were the same as those used in Study 1a in all but one way. In this study, women served as ingroup members and men served as outgroup members. As part of the emphasis manipulation, repeated reference was made to relevant ingroups, outgroups and intergroup interactions. Participants were informed that the study was concerned with group perception, judgment and behaviour and then presented with a response booklet. Participants were then told that there were two groups participating in the study, men and women. They were then asked to write down the gender group to which they belonged (i.e., women vs. men) on the front cover of the response booklet. Participants were told that, once they had completed the booklet, they would be asked to participate in a behavioural exercise. This (bogus) exercise, it was explained, would involve a five minute period in which they would be required to interact with ingroup members (i.e., women) and another five minute period in which they would be required to interact with outgroup members (i.e., men). Outgroup members, participants were informed, were undertaking an identical experiment simultaneously, in a laboratory next door. To enhance the

plausibility of this manipulation, a series of additional factors were put in place. First, signs that guided women and men to separate laboratories were put up in several locations in the area leading into the laboratory. Second, once participants had taken their place in the laboratory, a confederate outgroup member (i.e., a man) entered the room and asked (in a loud voice) if this was the “*right room for the men*”. The experimenter responded by saying “*no, everyone here is a woman*” and “*the men are in the lab next door*”. Finally, just before the testing session commenced, a second confederate came into the laboratory and loudly notified the experimenter that “*the men are ready to begin*”. Participants were then informed that the start times for the experiment had to be coordinated so that the interaction period, where the men and women would meet, would coincide.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same four-item subscale that was used in Studies 1a – 1d (see Appendix A). In the present study, as in Study 1d, the subscale was adapted to assess the specific identity in question (e.g., *Being a woman has very little to do with how I feel about myself*, Cronbach’s alpha = .71).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using the same 13 semantic-differential scales (see Appendix B) that were used in Study 1b, from Platow et al. (1990), with one important difference. In the present study, the scales were adapted to assess women (ingroup members) and men (outgroup members). The 13 items were as follows: *cooperative–competitive; helpful–unhelpful; intelligent–unintelligent; strong–*

weak; warm–cold; flexible–rigid; selfish–unselfish; manipulative–sincere; fair–unfair; honest–dishonest; friendly–unfriendly; trustworthy–untrustworthy; consistent–inconsistent. Participants were asked to use these terms to rate women (ingroup members) and men (outgroup members) on a nine-point scale.

Measurement of alternative processes (state self-esteem and private collective self-esteem). The potentially overlapping constructs examined were state (personal) self-esteem and private collective self-esteem (private CSE). Previous research has revealed that both constructs are related to importance to identity (see Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and various forms of intergroup discrimination (Aberson et al., 2000; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Hunter et al., 2011; 2012). Marsh and O’Neill’s (1984) general self-esteem subscale of the Self-Description Questionnaire III (SDQ III) was used to assess state self-esteem (see Appendix J). This 12-item subscale was developed on the basis of the Rosenberg (1965) global self-esteem scale (*‘Overall, I have a lot of respect for myself’*, Cronbach’s alpha = .92). Participants responded to the state self-esteem measure using eight-point Likert scales (*1 – definitely false, 8 – definitely true*). Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) private CSE subscale was used to assess private CSE (see Appendix K). This four-item scale was developed to measure how people evaluate the social groups that they are members of. The statements that comprised the private CSE subscale were adapted to fit the specific identity being examined (e.g., *‘I feel good about being a woman’*, Cronbach’s alpha = .72). Participants responded to the private CSE measure using seven-point Likert scales (*1 – strongly disagree, 7 – strongly agree*) and in terms of how they felt “right now”, regardless of whether they had felt differently in the past.

Manipulation checks. A set of manipulation checks was included at the back of the response booklet. Here participants were asked a series of specific questions. Namely, if they (a) had taken part in similar experiments, (b) had guessed the true purpose of the investigation, (c) had suspicions regarding the manipulation, (d) had taken the study seriously, or (e) considered themselves to be members of the group in question. Those who had taken part in similar experiments, guessed the true purpose of the investigation, had suspicions regarding the manipulation, had not taken the study seriously, or did not consider themselves to be members of the group in question were omitted from the investigation.

Results

Intergroup discrimination. To assess the amount of intergroup discrimination displayed toward ingroup and outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out on the trait ratings. Significant discrimination was found, $F(1, 48) = 38.25, p < .001, \eta^2 = .44$. Overall, ingroup members were evaluated more highly than outgroup members ($M = 75.65, SD = 6.12$ vs. $M = 68.86, SD = 7.53$). The results are displayed in Table 10.

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (state self-esteem and private collective self-esteem).

To examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. As in study 1a, an index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting

participants' total outgroup trait ratings from their total ingroup trait ratings. The index then served as the dependent variable in a regression analysis. Importance to identity, as well as state self-esteem and private CSE (the two potentially overlapping variables), served as the predictor variables. Correlations between the variables are presented in Table 4. As may be seen in Table 4, importance to identity was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.41, p < .003$) and private CSE ($r = +.25, p < .05$). Moreover, private CSE was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.46, p < .001$). The result of the overall regression was significant $R^2 = .31, F(3, 45) = 6.78, p < .002$ (see Table 10). Examination of beta weights showed a significant positive effect for importance to identity $\beta = .31, p < .03$, and private CSE $\beta = .37, p < .007$, but not for state self-esteem $\beta = .11, p = .38$. These effects were confirmed through a semipartial correlation, which showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination remained significant when controlling for private CSE and state self-esteem ($sr = +.34, p < .03$, see Table 10). A similar analysis revealed the association between private CSE and intergroup discrimination remained when controlling for each of the other variables ($sr = +.40, p < .007$).

Table 4

Study 2a Correlations between Importance to Identity, State Self-Esteem, Private CSE and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Women

	1	2	3	4
1. Importance to identity	-	+0.03	+0.25*	+0.41**
2. State self-esteem		-	+0.07	+0.15
3. Private CSE			-	+0.46***
4. Intergroup discrimination				-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Study 2b

Method

Participants. Participants were 78 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of male participants.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 2b were the same as those used in Study 2a in all but one way. In this study, men served as ingroup members and women served as outgroup members.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same four-item subscale that was used in Studies 1a – 1d (see Appendix A). In the present study, like in Study 1c, the subscale was adapted to assess male identity (e.g., *Being a man has very little to do with how I feel about myself*, Cronbach's alpha = .74).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using a task in which participants were asked to distribute 100 dollars amongst ingroup (men) and outgroup (women) members (see Appendix E). They could allocate as much or as little money as they wanted to each group. The only requirement was that a total of 100 dollars be distributed. An intergroup discrimination score was obtained by taking the difference between the total amount of money participants distributed to the ingroup and the

amount they distributed to the outgroup (i.e., subtracting the amount given to the outgroup from the amount given to the ingroup).

Measurement of alternative processes (public and membership collective self-esteem). The potentially overlapping variables assessed were public and membership collective self-esteem (public CSE and membership CSE). Both the public CSE and the membership CSE subscale have been found to be related to importance to identity (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) and distinct forms of intergroup discrimination (see Chin & McClintock, 1993; Hunter et al., 2004; Hunter et al., 2005; Long & Spears, 1997). Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) public CSE (see Appendix L) and membership CSE (see Appendix M) subscales were used to assess these constructs. The four-item public CSE subscale was developed to measure how positively ingroup members believe their social group is regarded by outgroup members. The four-item membership CSE subscale was developed to measure how valuable individuals believe they are to their ingroup. The statements that comprised each subscale were adapted to fit the specific identity being examined (e.g., public CSE: '*In general, women respect men*', Cronbach's alpha = .70; membership CSE: '*I am cooperative with other men*', Cronbach's alpha = .72). Participants responded using seven-point Likert scales (1 – *strongly disagree*, 7 – *strongly agree*) and in terms of how they felt "right now", regardless of whether they had felt differently in the past.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Study 2a were used in this study.

Results

Intergroup discrimination. To assess the amount of intergroup discrimination displayed toward ingroup vs. outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out. Significant discrimination was found $F(1, 77) = 12.54, p = < .002, \eta^2 = .14$. Overall, ingroup members were allocated more positive resources than outgroup members ($M = 54.03, SD = 10.04$ vs. $M = 45.97, SD = 10.04$). The results are displayed in Table 10.

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (public and membership collective self-esteem). To examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the total amount of money participants distributed to the outgroup from the total amount they distributed to the ingroup. The index then served as the dependent variable in a regression analysis. Importance to identity, as well as public CSE and membership CSE (the two potentially overlapping variables), served as the predictor variables. Correlations between the variables are presented in Table 5. As may be seen in Table 5, importance to identity was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.28, p < .008$) and membership CSE was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.23, p < .03$). The result of the overall regression was significant $R^2 = .18, F(3, 74) = 5.47, p < .003$ (see Table 10). Examination of beta weights showed significant effects for importance to identity $\beta = .27, p < .02$, public CSE $\beta = -.27, p < .03$, and membership CSE $\beta = .31, p < .009$. These effects were confirmed through a

semipartial correlation, which showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination remained significant when controlling for public CSE and membership CSE ($sr = +.28, p < .02$, see Table 10). Similar analyses (using semipartial correlation) revealed that the relationship between public CSE and intergroup discrimination ($sr = +.30, p < .01$) remained when controlling for each of the other variables.

Table 5

Study 2b Correlations between Importance to Identity, Public CSE, Membership CSE and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Men

	1	2	3	4
1. Importance to identity	-	+0.05	+0.07	+0.28*
2. Public CSE		-	+0.37***	-0.14
3. Membership CSE			-	+0.23*
4. Intergroup discrimination				-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Study 2c

Method

Participants. Participants were 48 Northern Irish undergraduate students attending the University of Ulster. The study was comprised entirely of female participants.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The Study 2c group emphasis manipulation was carried out in a lecture theatre. The lecture was ended early and students were asked if they would like to participate in a study looking into the group perceptions, judgements and decisions of Northern Irish people and Polish immigrants. Those who agreed to take part were informed that they would be asked to complete a brief set of questionnaire-based tasks. Participants were then told that, once they had completed the booklet, they would participate in an intergroup exercise. They were informed that this (bogus) exercise would involve a five minute period in which they were required to interact with ingroup members (i.e., Northern Irish people) and another five minute period in which they were required to interact with outgroup members (i.e., Polish immigrants).

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same four-item subscale that was used in Studies 1a – 1d (see Appendix A), with one crucial difference. In the present study, the subscale

was adapted to assess Northern Irish national identity (e.g., '*Being Northern Irish has very little to do with how I feel about myself*', Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using a task in which participants were asked to take positive resources away from ingroup and outgroup members (see Appendix F). Participants were presented with a hypothetical scenario in which they were the manager of a factory employing 100 Northern Irish people and 100 Polish immigrants. The manager was charged with the responsibility of sacking 100 of the employees. They could sack as many or as few individuals as they wanted from each group. The only requirement was that a total of 100 people's jobs be terminated. An intergroup discrimination score was obtained by taking the difference between the total number of employees sacked from the outgroup and the amount sacked from the ingroup.

Measurement of alternative processes (perceived intergroup conflict and quality of social identity). The additional constructs examined were perceived intergroup conflict and quality of social identity. Research conducted by Brown et al. (1986) and Struch and Schwartz (1989) has revealed that the former is positively associated with intergroup discrimination. Research by Amiot and Bourhis (2005a) shows that the latter is positively associated with intergroup discrimination. Two items, taken from Brown et al. (1986) and Struch and Schwartz (1989), were used to measure perceived intergroup conflict (see Appendix N). The scale items were developed to assess the extent to which participants believed that there were conflicts of interests between the ingroup and an outgroup. Critically, the items measure perceived, as opposed to actual conflict. Three items developed by Amiot and Bourhis (2005b, see p.

588) were utilised to assess quality of social identity (see Appendix O). The scale was designed to measure whether participants liked being a member of their social group and how secure and at ease they felt about this group membership. The statements that comprised each scale were adapted to fit the specific identity being examined (e.g., perceived conflict: *'Northern Irish people compete with Polish Immigrants for jobs'*, Cronbach's alpha = .74; quality of social identity: *'I am at ease being a Northern Irish person'*, Cronbach's alpha = .74). Participants responded using seven-point Likert scales (1 – *strongly disagree*, 7 – *strongly agree*) and in terms of how they felt “right now”, regardless of whether they had felt differently in the past.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Studies 2a and 2b were used in this study, with one exception. Participants in Study 2c were also asked whether they were born in Northern Ireland and those who were not born in Northern Ireland were omitted from the investigation.

Results

Intergroup discrimination. To assess the amount of intergroup discrimination displayed toward ingroup vs. outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out on the positive resources taken away. Significant discrimination was found $F(1, 47) = 22.92, p < .001, \eta^2 = .33$. Overall, fewer ingroup members were sacked than outgroup members ($M = 34.27, SD = 22.76$ vs. $M = 65.73, SD = 22.76$). The results are displayed in Table 10.

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (perceived intergroup conflict and quality of social identity). To examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the total number of employees participants chose to sack from the ingroup from the total number of employees participants chose to sack from the outgroup. The index then served as the dependent variable in a regression analysis. Importance to identity, as well as perceived intergroup conflict and quality of social identity (the two potentially overlapping variables), served as the predictor variables. Correlations between the variables are presented in Table 6. As may be seen in Table 6, importance to identity was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.42, p < .003$) and quality of social identity ($r = +.47, p < .001$). Moreover, both perceived conflict ($r = +.37, p < .006$) and quality of social identity ($r = +.25, p < .05$) were significantly associated with intergroup discrimination. The result of the overall regression was significant $R^2 = .27, F(3, 44) = 5.29, p < .004$ (see Table 10). Examination of beta weights showed a significant positive effect for importance to identity $\beta = .36, p < .02$, and perceived conflict $\beta = .31, p < .03$, but not for quality of social identity $\beta = .01, p = .93$. These effects were confirmed through a semipartial correlation, which showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination remained significant when controlling for perceived conflict and quality of social identity ($sr = +.34, p < .02$, see Table 10). A similar analysis revealed the association between perceived conflict and intergroup discrimination remained when controlling for each of the other variables ($sr = +.33, p < .03$).

Table 6

Study 2c Correlations between Importance to Identity, Perceived Conflict, Quality of Identity and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Northern Irish Participants

	1	2	3	4
1. Importance to identity	-	+0.18	+0.47***	+0.42**
2. Perceived conflict		-	+0.22	+0.37*
3. Quality of identity			-	+0.25*
4. Intergroup discrimination				-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Study 2d

Method

Participants. Participants were 42 Northern Irish undergraduate students attending the University of Ulster. The study was comprised entirely of female participants.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 2d were the same as those used in Study 2c.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same four-item subscale that was used in Study 2c (see Appendix A). In the present study, following Study 2c, the subscale was adapted to assess the Northern Irish national identity (e.g., *'Being Northern Irish has very little to do with how I feel about myself'*, Cronbach's alpha = .73).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using a task in which participants were asked to take negative resources away from ingroup and outgroup members (see Appendix G). Participants were presented with a hypothetical scenario in which they were the manager of a factory where 100 Northern Irish people and 100 Polish immigrants had been made redundant. The manager was charged with the responsibility of rehiring 100 people. They could rehire as many or as few individuals as they wanted from each group. The only requirement was that a

total of 100 people be reemployed. An intergroup discrimination score was obtained by taking the difference between the total number of employees rehired from the outgroup and the amount rehired from the ingroup.

Measurement of alternative processes (group identification and trait self-esteem). The potentially overlapping constructs examined were group identification and trait self-esteem. Research by Jackson and Smith (1999) has revealed that group identification is moderately associated with importance to identity (average $r = .45$, see Jackson & Smith, 1999, Study 1, p. 125). Additional evidence shows that both trait self-esteem (see Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker et al., 1987) and group identification (see Kelly, 1988) are associated with various forms of intergroup discrimination. The group identification measure created by Brown et al. (1986) was used to assess group identity (see Appendix P). This 10-item scale was developed to measure, what the authors argue are, three main components of group identification: an individual's 'awareness' of belonging to a particular group, their 'evaluation' of that group membership and their 'affect' concerning that membership. The statements that comprised the group identification scale were adapted to fit the specific identity being examined (e.g., *'I am a person who feels strong ties with the Northern Irish group'*, Cronbach's alpha = .83). The Single Item Self-Esteem scale (SISE, Robins, Hendin, & Trzesniewski, 2001) was used to assess trait self-esteem (see Appendix Q). The SISE scale was created to measure global self-esteem and is psychometrically similar to the widely validated 10-item Rosenberg (1965) global self-esteem scale (Robins et al., 2001). The SISE scale item was as follows: *'Overall, I have high self-esteem'*. Participants responded to both measures using seven-point Likert scales (1 – *strongly disagree*, 7 –

strongly agree) and in terms of how they felt “right now”, regardless of whether they had felt differently in the past.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Study 2c were used in this study.

Results

Intergroup discrimination. To assess the amount of intergroup discrimination displayed toward ingroup vs. outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out on the negative resources taken away. Significant discrimination was found $F(1, 41) = 8.45, p < .007, \eta^2 = .17$. Overall, more ingroup members were rehired than outgroup members ($M = 61.31, SD = 25.21$ vs. $M = 38.69, SD = 25.21$). The results are displayed in Table 10.

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (group identification and trait self-esteem). To examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. An index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the total number of employees participants chose to rehire from the outgroup from the total number of employees participants chose to rehire from the ingroup. The index then served as the dependent variable in a regression analysis. Importance to identity, as well as group identification and trait self-esteem (the two potentially overlapping variables), served as the predictor variables. Correlations between the variables are presented in Table 7. As may be seen in Table 7, importance to

identity was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.53, p < .001$), group identification ($r = +.44, p < .003$) and low trait self-esteem ($r = -.36, p < .02$). Moreover, group identification ($r = +.48, p < .002$) and low trait self-esteem ($r = -.46, p < .002$) were significantly associated with intergroup discrimination. The result of the overall regression was significant $R^2 = .43, F(3, 38) = 9.63, p < .001$ (see Table 10). Examination of beta weights showed significant effects for importance to identity $\beta = .30, p < .05$, group identification $\beta = .29, p < .05$ and trait self-esteem $\beta = -.30, p < .03$. These effects were confirmed through a semipartial correlation, which showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination remained significant when controlling for group identification and trait self-esteem ($sr = +.32, p < .05$, see Table 10). Similar analyses revealed that the associations between group identification and intergroup discrimination ($sr = +.33, p < .05$) and between low trait self-esteem and intergroup discrimination ($sr = -.35, p < .03$) remained when controlling for each of the other variables.

Table 7

Study 2d Correlations between Importance to Identity, Group Identity, Trait Self-Esteem and Intergroup Discrimination amongst Northern Irish Participants

	1	2	3	4
1. Importance to identity	-	+.44**	-.36*	+.53***
2. Group Identity		-	-.19	+.48**
3. Trait Self-Esteem			-	-.46**
4. Intergroup discrimination				-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Study 2e

Method

Participants. Participants were 44 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised of 11 male and 33 female participants.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 2e were the same as those used in Study 2a in all but one way. In this study, New Zealanders served as ingroup members and Asians served as outgroup members.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same four-item subscale that was used in Studies 1a – 1d (see Appendix A). In the present study, like in Study 1a, the subscale was adapted to assess New Zealand national identity (e.g., *‘Being a New Zealander has very little to do with how I feel about myself’*, Cronbach’s alpha = .81).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using a task in which participants were asked to distribute 100 seconds of white noise listening time amongst ingroup (New Zealanders) and outgroup (Asians) members (see Appendix H). They could allocate as much or as little white noise as they wanted to each group. The only requirement was that a total of 100 seconds of listening time be distributed. To familiarise

participants with the white noise that they were going to allocate, they were presented with a 10 second sample of the sound (using a Spitfire white noise generator), prior to completing the task. An intergroup discrimination score was obtained by taking the difference between the total amount of white noise participants distributed to the outgroup and the amount they distributed to the ingroup (i.e., subtracting the amount given to the ingroup from the amount given to the outgroup).

Measurement of alternative processes (affective commitment and categorisation). The additional constructs examined were affective commitment and categorisation. Research conducted by Ellemers and colleagues (Ellemers et al., 1999) has revealed a positive association between ingroup bias and affective commitment, whilst the results of a meta analysis conducted by Aberson et al. (2000) demonstrates a moderately strong association between categorisation and various forms of intergroup discrimination. Ellemers et al.'s (1999) affective commitment and categorisation identity items were used to assess these constructs. The three affective commitment items were developed to measure how attached an individual is to a group identity (see Appendix R). The three categorisation items were developed to measure the cognitive element of group identity (see Appendix S). The statements that comprised each subscale were adapted to fit the specific identity being examined (e.g., affective commitment: *'I would like to continue working with the New Zealand group'*, Cronbach's alpha = .72; categorisation: *'I identify with other members of the New Zealand group'*, Cronbach's alpha = .82). Participants responded using seven-point Likert scales

(1 – *strongly disagree*, 7 – *strongly agree*) and in terms of how they felt “right now”, regardless of whether they had felt differently in the past.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Studies 2c and 2d were used in this study, with one exception. Participants in Study 2e were asked whether they were born in New Zealand, rather than whether they were born in Northern Ireland, and those who were not born in New Zealand were omitted from the investigation.

Results

A priori analyses revealed no gender differences across all of the variables tested. They are not, therefore, reported below.

Intergroup discrimination. To assess the amount of intergroup discrimination displayed toward ingroup vs. outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out on the white noise distributed. Significant discrimination was found $F(1, 43) = 27.81, p < .001, \eta^2 = .39$. Overall, fewer ingroup members were allocated white noise than outgroup members ($M = 40.23, SD = 12.29$ vs. $M = 59.77, SD = 12.29$). The results are displayed in Table 10.

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (affective commitment and categorisation). To examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. As in studies 1c and 1d, an index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the total amount of white noise participants distributed to the ingroup from the total amount they

distributed to the outgroup. The index then served as the dependent variable in a regression analysis. Importance to identity, as well as affective commitment and categorisation (the two potentially overlapping variables), served as the predictor variables. Correlations between the variables are presented in Table 8. As may be seen in Table 8, importance to identity was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.31, p < .03$) and categorisation ($r = +.40, p < .005$). Moreover, affective commitment was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.36, p < .01$). The result of the overall regression was significant $R^2 = .26, F(3, 39) = 4.45, p < .01$ (see Table 10). Examination of beta weights showed a significant positive effect for importance to identity $\beta = .39, p < .02$, and affective commitment $\beta = .42, p < .008$, but not for categorisation $\beta = -.23, p = .17$. These effects were confirmed through a semipartial correlation, which showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination remained significant when controlling for affective commitment and categorisation ($sr = +.38, p < .02$, see Table 10). A similar analysis revealed that the association between affective commitment and intergroup discrimination remained when controlling for each of the other variables ($sr = +.42, p < .008$).

Table 8

Study 2e Correlations between Importance to Identity, Affective Commitment, Categorisation and Intergroup Discrimination amongst New Zealanders

	1	2	3	4
1. Importance to identity	-	+0.04	+0.40**	+0.31*
2. Affective commitment		-	+0.35*	+0.36**
3. Categorisation			-	+0.08
4. Intergroup discrimination				-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Study 2f

Method

Participants. Participants were 57 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of male participants.

Design and procedure.

Group emphasis manipulations. The group emphasis manipulations used in Study 2f were the same as those used in Study 1c in all but two ways. First, in this study, New Zealanders served as ingroup members and Americans served as outgroup members. Second, in Study 2f, Participants were asked to write down three things about the ingroup (i.e., New Zealanders) and three things about the outgroup (i.e., Americans), rather than three things they liked and disliked about each group respectively. As in Study 1c, an outgroup member did not enter the laboratory, asking if they were in the right room. Instead, in an adaption of the procedures outlined by Haslam (2004), immediately before completing the response booklet, participants were asked to write down the three things about ingroup members and the three things about outgroup members.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was assessed using the same four-item subscale that was used in Study 2e (see Appendix A). In the present study, like in Study 2e, the subscale was adapted to

assess New Zealand national identity (e.g., *'Being a New Zealander has very little to do with how I feel about myself'*, Cronbach's alpha = .76).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was examined using the same task that was used in Study 2e (see Appendix H), with one important difference. In the present study, the scales were adapted to assess New Zealanders (ingroup members) and Americans (outgroup members).

Measurement of alternative processes (social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism). The potentially overlapping constructs examined were social dominance orientation (SDO) and right wing authoritarianism (RWA). Both SDO and RWA have been repeatedly found to be associated with intergroup discrimination (Whitley & Kite, 2006). Moreover, each has been associated with importance to identity, as examined in the current investigation (see Duckitt & Sibley, in press). Social dominance orientation was assessed using Pratto et al.'s (1994) SDO scale (see Appendix T). This 14-item scale was developed to measure the extent to which individuals believe there exists, and endorse, an unequal, hierarchical societal structure (e.g., *'Some people are just inferior to others'*, Cronbach's alpha = .80). Right wing authoritarianism was assessed using Altemeyer's (1988) RWA scale (see Appendix U). This 30-item scale was developed to measure the three main clusters of attitudes concerning others, outlined in the literature review. That is, authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism (e.g., *'Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn'*, Cronbach's alpha = .83). Responses to both measures were given on a nine-point Likert scale (1 – *very strongly disagree*, 9 – *very strongly agree*).

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Studies 2e were used in this study.

Results

Intergroup discrimination. To assess the amount of intergroup discrimination displayed toward ingroup vs. outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was carried out on the white noise distributed. Significant discrimination was found $F(1, 56) = 18.25, p < .001, \eta^2 = .25$. Overall, fewer ingroup members were allocated white noise than outgroup members ($M = 40.46, SD = 16.87$ vs. $M = 59.54, SD = 16.87$). The results are displayed in Table 10.

Importance to identity, intergroup discrimination and alternative processes (social dominance orientation and right wing authoritarianism). To examine the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. As in study 2e, an index of intergroup discrimination was constructed by subtracting the total amount of white noise participants distributed to the ingroup from the total amount they distributed to the outgroup. The index then served as the dependent variable in a regression analysis. Importance to identity, as well as SDO and RWA (the two potentially overlapping variables), served as the predictor variables. Correlations between the variables are presented in Table 9. As may be seen in Table 9, importance to identity was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.41, p < .002$) and

RWA ($r = +.24, p < .04$). Moreover, RWA was significantly associated with intergroup discrimination ($r = +.27, p < .03$). The result of the overall regression was significant $R^2 = .20, F(3, 53) = 4.27, p < .01$ (see Table 10). Examination of beta weights showed a significant positive effect for importance to identity $\beta = .36, p < .007$, but not for SDO $\beta = .02, p = .89$, or RWA $\beta = .17, p = .21$. These effects were confirmed through a semipartial correlation, which showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination remained significant when controlling for SDO and RWA ($sr = +.37, p < .007$, see Table 10).

Table 9

Study 2f Correlations between Importance to Identity, RWA, SDO and Intergroup Discrimination amongst New Zealanders

	1	2	3	4
1. Importance to identity	-	+0.24*	+0.03	+0.41**
2. RWA		-	+0.36*	+0.27*
3. SDO			-	+0.09
4. Intergroup discrimination				-

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Discussion of studies 2a to 2f

Findings from Studies 1a to 1d revealed that when the intergroup context is emphasised, importance to identity is related to intergroup discrimination. Because this association is correlational, Studies 2a to 2f were carried out to determine whether the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination could be attributed to 12 overlapping variables. The variables in question were state self-esteem, private CSE, public CSE, membership CSE, perceived conflict, quality of identity, group identity, trait self-esteem, affective commitment, categorisation, RWA and SDO.

The hypothesis tested in Studies 2a to 2f was that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination would not be explained by the series of potentially overlapping variables. The results of each study supported this hypothesis. No support was found for the possibility that the link between importance to identity and discrimination could be explained by these alternative constructs.

Findings from the regressions carried out revealed that, in each of the studies, a significant amount of the variance in intergroup discrimination was explained. The beta weights showed that the β s for importance to identity were significantly different from zero in Studies 2a to 2f. Additionally, findings revealed significant β s for private CSE (Study 2a), low public CSE and membership CSE (Study 2b), perceived conflict (Study 2c), group identification and low trait self-esteem (Study 2d), and affective commitment (Study 2e). The results of semipartial correlations, which were conducted to control for each of these potentially overlapping constructs, showed that importance to identity

was uniquely associated with intergroup discrimination. This effect remained, regardless of the form of identity being assessed (gender or national) and the type of intergroup discrimination being examined (trait ratings or the distribution and removal of positive and negative resources).

The results of Studies 2a to 2f showed that importance to identity uniquely contributed to discrimination by women, who evaluated women more favourably than men, as well as by men, who distributed more money to other men than to women. Importance to identity also uniquely contributed to discrimination amongst Northern Irish participants, who fired more Polish immigrant staff than Northern Irish staff and reemployed more previously fired Northern Irish staff than Polish immigrant staff. Finally, the present study findings revealed that importance to identity uniquely contributed to discrimination by New Zealand participants, who distributed more of the noxious stimuli, white noise, to Asians and Americans, than to other New Zealanders.

In keeping with Gramzow and Gaertner's (2005) recommendations, in Studies 2a – 2f, the extent to which a range of potentially overlapping variables might account for any associations found between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination was explored. The variables examined, which have been linked in previous studies with either importance to identity (see Duckitt & Sibley, in press; Jackson & Smith, 1999; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) or intergroup discrimination (see Aberson et al., 2000; Amiot & Bourhis, 2005a; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Brown et al., 1986; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker et al., 1987; Ellemers et al., 1999; Hunter et al., 2004; 2005; 2011; 2012; Kelly, 1988; Long & Spears, 1997; Struch &

Schwartz, 1989; Whitley & Kite, 2006) did not explain the relationship found between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination in Studies 2a – 2f.

Table 10

N's, Mean Ingroup/Outgroup Discrimination, *F*-ratios, Regression Betas, *R*²s and Semipartial Correlations Study 2a, b, c, d, e and f

Study	N	Ingroup	Outgroup	<i>F</i>	β Importance to identity	β Alternative Variable 1	β Alternative Variable 2	<i>R</i> ²	<i>Sr</i> semipartial correlation Importance to identity
2a ^{af}	49	75.65 (6.12)	68.86 (7.53)	38.25***	.31*	.11	.37**	.31**	.34*
2b ^{bg}	78	54.03 (10.04)	45.97 (10.04)	12.54**	.27*	-.27*	.31**	.18**	.28*
2c ^{ch}	48	34.27 (22.76)	65.73 (22.76)	22.92***	.36*	.31*	.01	.27**	.34*
2d ^{di}	42	61.31 (25.21)	38.69 (25.21)	8.45 **	.30*	.29*	-.30*	.43***	.32*
2e ^{ej}	44	40.23 (12.29)	59.77 (12.29)	27.81***	.39*	.42**	-.23	.26**	.38*
2f ^{ek}	57	40.46 (16.87)	59.54 (16.87)	18.25***	.36**	.17	.02	.20**	.37**

Note. *F*-ratios compare ingroup vs. outgroup trait ratings, ingroup vs. outgroup money allocations, ingroup vs. outgroup positive and negative resource removal and ingroup vs. outgroup white noise allocations. β 's and R^2 's are the results of regressions between mean importance to identity scores and mean intergroup discrimination scores (attained by determining the difference between allocations to the ingroup vs. allocations to the outgroup). Using semipartial correlation, all significant Beta weights (i.e., for each of the respective alternative variables) remained significant (all sr 's $p < .05$) when importance to identity and each of the other respective alternative variables were controlled for.

^aIntergroup discrimination assessed via ingroup trait ratings minus outgroup trait ratings. ^bIntergroup discrimination assessed via money allocations to ingroup minus money allocations to outgroup. ^cIntergroup discrimination assessed via outgroup members sacked minus ingroup members sacked. ^dIntergroup discrimination assessed via ingroup members rehired minus outgroup members rehired. ^eIntergroup discrimination assessed via white noise allocations to outgroup minus white noise allocations to ingroup. ^fAlternative variable 1 is state self-esteem and alternative variable 2 is private CSE. ^gAlternative variable 1 is public CSE and alternative variable 2 is membership CSE. ^hAlternative variable 1 is perceived conflict and alternative variable 2 is quality of identity. ⁱAlternative variable 1 is group identity and alternative variable 2 is trait self-esteem. ^jAlternative variable 1 is affective commitment and alternative variable 2 is categorisation. ^kAlternative variable 1 is RWA and alternative variable 2 is SDO.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Chapter 4: Study 3

The findings from Studies 1a – 1d revealed that, in contexts in which intergroup relations are emphasised, importance to identity is associated with intergroup discrimination. The results of Studies 2a – 2f replicated this finding and showed that the association between importance to identity and discrimination remained when controlling for 12 other potentially related constructs. The findings from Studies 1 and 2 thus support the present thesis's central argument concerning the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. Despite the promising nature of these findings, a weakness of both studies is that importance to identity has been assessed only as a predictor of discrimination. Some studies have shown that intergroup discrimination can, in fact, predict (Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996) and even increase (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Hunter, et al., 1996; 1997; 2005) various components of collective identity. Given these findings, the aim of Study 3 is to examine the extent to which importance to identity serves as an independent, as well as a dependent variable in relation to intergroup discrimination. The role of group identity as both a predictor and an outcome of intergroup discrimination was explored in Studies 3a – 3b.

Study 3 was comprised of two independent tests (Studies 3a – 3b). Each test explored the hypothesis that importance to identity would be positively associated with intergroup discrimination and that intergroup discrimination

would be positively associated with importance to identity. As outlined in Studies 1 and 2, findings from research assessing the association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination have tended to vary, depending on the types of social groups and forms of intergroup discrimination that are examined (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999). The following two studies therefore aimed to establish if there would be an association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination across different social groups (based on national and gender identity) and different types of intergroup discrimination (trait ratings and the distribution of white noise).

In view of the findings from Study 1 showing that intergroup discrimination was only found in situations in which intergroup relations were emphasised, Study 3, like Study 2, examined the extent to which importance to identity affects intergroup discrimination and the extent to which intergroup discrimination affects importance to identity when the group context was emphasised. In each test in Study 3, repeated reference was made to ingroups, outgroups and intergroup interactions. Study 3a assessed intergroup discrimination using trait ratings. This study focused on national identity. It examined New Zealanders' ratings of ingroup (i.e., New Zealanders) and outgroup (i.e., Americans) members. Study 3b assessed intergroup discrimination using a white noise distribution task. This study focused on gender identity. It examined the extent to which women allocated white noise to ingroup (i.e., women) and outgroup (i.e., men) members.

Study 3a

Method

Participants. Participants were 35 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of female participants.

Design and procedure. A within participants design was used. Importance to identity was examined both before and after participants were given the opportunity to discriminate against outgroup members.

Group emphasis manipulations. Study 3a employed the same group emphasis manipulation that was used in Study 1a. As part of the emphasis manipulation, repeated reference was made to relevant ingroups, outgroups and intergroup interactions. Participants were informed that the study was concerned with group perception, judgment and behaviour and then presented with a response booklet. Participants were then told that there were two groups participating in the study, New Zealanders and Americans. They were then asked to write down the national group to which they belonged (i.e., New Zealander vs. American) on the front cover of the response booklet. Participants were told that, once they had completed the booklet, they would be asked to participate in a behavioural exercise. This (bogus) exercise, it was explained, would involve a five minute period in which they would be required to interact with ingroup members (i.e., New Zealanders) and another five minute period in which they would be required to interact with outgroup

members (i.e., Americans). Outgroup members, participants were informed, were undertaking an identical experiment simultaneously, in a laboratory next door. To enhance the plausibility of this manipulation, a series of additional factors were put in place. First, signs that guided New Zealanders and Americans to separate laboratories were put up in several locations in the area leading into the laboratory. Second, once participants had taken their place in the laboratory, a confederate outgroup member (i.e., an American) entered the room and asked (in a loud voice) if this was the *“right room for the American group”*. The experimenter responded by saying *“no, everyone here is a New Zealander”* and *“the Americans are in the lab next door”*. Finally, just before the testing session commenced, a second confederate came into the laboratory and loudly notified the experimenter that *“the American group is ready to begin”*. Participants were then informed that the start times for the experiment had to be coordinated so that the interaction period, where the American and New Zealand groups would meet would coincide.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was measured using the same four-item subscale that was used in Studies 1 and 2 (see Appendix A). In the present study, like in Study 1a, the subscale was adapted to assess national identity (e.g., *‘Being a New Zealander has very little to do with how I feel about myself’*, Cronbach’s alpha = .81).

Measurement of discrimination. Intergroup discrimination was measured using the same 20 semantic-differential scales that were used in Study 1a. Thirteen of these items were taken from Platow et al.’s (1990) study

(see Appendix B). They were as follows: *cooperative–competitive; helpful–unhelpful; intelligent–unintelligent; strong–weak; warm–cold; flexible–rigid; selfish–unselfish; manipulative–sincere; fair–unfair; honest–dishonest; friendly–unfriendly; trustworthy–untrustworthy; consistent–inconsistent*. The other seven items (see Appendix C) were based on terms utilised to describe national stereotypes (see Devine & Elliot, 1995; Ehrlich & Rinehart, 1965; Haslam et al., 1992; Oakes et al., 1994). They were as follows: *loud–soft-spoken; pushy–reticent; humble–arrogant; confident–shy; aggressive–non-aggressive; ignorant–well-informed; straightforward–hypocritical*. Participants were asked to use these terms to rate New Zealand ingroup and U.S. outgroup members on a nine-point scale.

Manipulation checks. The same set of manipulation checks that were used in Study 2e was included at the back of the response booklet. Here participants were asked a series of specific questions. Namely, if they (a) had taken part in similar experiments, (b) had guessed the true purpose of the investigation, (c) had suspicions regarding the manipulation, (d) had taken the study seriously, (e) considered themselves to be members of the group in question, or (f) were born in New Zealand. Those who had taken part in similar experiments, guessed the true purpose of the investigation, had suspicions regarding the manipulation, had not taken the study seriously, did not consider themselves to be New Zealanders, or were not born in New Zealand were omitted from the investigation.

Results

Importance to identity. To compare importance to identity pre- and post- intergroup discrimination, a repeated measures ANOVA was performed. Findings revealed a significant increase in importance to identity, from pre-discrimination to post-discrimination ($M_{\text{pre-discrimination}} = 19.03, SD = 5.12$ vs. $M_{\text{post-discrimination}} = 20.23, SD = 4.68$), $F(1, 34) = 8.59, p < .007, \eta^2 = .20$.

Intergroup discrimination. To compare evaluations of ingroup and outgroup members, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted. Findings revealed that the ingroup received more favourable evaluations ($M = 119.11, SD = 12.56$) than the outgroup ($M = 93.20, SD = 10.25$), $F(1, 34) = 109.52, p < .001, \eta^2 = .76$.

Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. To examine the relationship between importance to identity and level of intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was used. Separate analyses were performed for pre- and post-discrimination importance to identity scores. Outgroup trait ratings were subtracted from ingroup trait ratings to obtain an index of intergroup discrimination. Pre-discrimination importance to identity served as the independent variable in the first analysis and the index of intergroup discrimination served as the dependent variable. The regression was significant $R^2 = .12, F(1, 33) = 4.57, p < .05$. Examination of beta weights showed a significant positive effect $\beta = .35, p < .05$. Post-discrimination importance to identity served as the dependent variable in the second analysis and the index of intergroup discrimination served as the independent variable. This regression was again significant $R^2 = .25, F(1, 33) = 11.23, p < .003$. The

beta weight again showed a significant positive effect $\beta = .50, p < .003$. Finally, when pre-discrimination importance to identity was controlled for in a partial correlation, findings revealed a significant relationship between the index of intergroup discrimination and post-discrimination importance to identity $r = +.44, p < .01$.

Study 3b

Method

Participants. Participants were 357 New Zealand undergraduate students attending the University of Otago. The study was comprised entirely of female participants.

Design and procedure. Because there is a lack of consensus in the literature as to whether within or between participants designs should be used in studies examining identity as both a predictor and an outcome of intergroup discrimination (see Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Hunter et al., 1996, 1997; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998), a between participants design was used in Study 3b (in contrast to the within participants design used in Study 3a). One hundred and two participants were placed in one of two experimental conditions (1st, $N = 51$; 2nd, $N = 51$) and 255 participants were placed in one of five control conditions (1st, $N = 51$; 2nd, $N = 51$, 3rd, $N = 51$, 4th, $N = 51$, 5th, $N = 51$). Importance to identity was examined as a *dependent variable* (it was measured *after* participants completed measures assessing discrimination) in the first

experimental condition and in the first four control conditions. Importance to identity was examined as an *independent variable* (it was measured *before* participants completed measures assessing discrimination) in the second experimental condition. In the fifth control condition (the baseline), participants were administered with the importance to identity scale only. No discrimination measures were administered and no other mention of group membership was made. This fifth condition was included because there is a possibility that categorisation might threaten (and therefore lower) identity and engaging in intergroup discrimination might simply return it to its original, baseline level, as opposed to genuinely increasing it (see Lemyre & Smith, 1985). In this fifth control condition, participants completed a set of distracter tasks prior to being administered with the importance to identity scale.

Group emphasis manipulations. Study 3b employed the same group emphasis manipulation that was used in Study 3a.

Materials.

Measurement of importance to identity. Importance to identity was measured in Study 3b using the same four-item subscale that was used in Studies 1 and 2 (see Appendix A). In the present study, like in Study 1d, the subscale was adapted to assess gender identity (e.g., *'Being a woman has very little to do with how I feel about myself'*, Cronbach's alpha = .71).

Measurement of discrimination. Discrimination was measured in the experimental conditions of Study 3b using the same 100-second white noise allocation task that was used in Studies 2e and 2f (see Appendix H). In the present study, the task was adapted to assess women (ingroup members) and

men (outgroup members). Intergroup discrimination was examined using a task in which participants were asked to distribute 100 seconds of white noise listening time amongst ingroup (women) and outgroup (men) members. They could allocate as much or as little white noise as they wanted to each group. The only requirement was that a total of 100 seconds of listening time be distributed. To familiarise participants with the white noise that they were going to allocate, they were presented with a 10 second sample of the sound (using a Spitfire white noise generator), prior to completing the task. An intergroup discrimination score was obtained by taking the difference between the total amount of white noise participants distributed to the outgroup and the amount they distributed to the ingroup (i.e., subtracting the amount given to the ingroup from the amount given to the outgroup). The same white noise allocation task was used in control conditions one to four of Study 3b, with the following exceptions. In the first control condition, participants could only distribute *equal* amounts of white noise to ingroup and outgroup members. In the second control condition, participants could only distribute white noise to *ingroup members*. In the third control condition, participants could only distribute white noise to *outgroup members*. In the fourth control condition, participants could only distribute white noise to individuals whose *group memberships were not given*.

Manipulation checks. The same manipulation checks that were used in Study 3a were used in this study, with one exception. Participants were not asked whether they were born in New Zealand.

Results

Importance to identity. To examine whether there was variation in participants' importance to identity scores in the two experimental and five control conditions, a one-way between participants ANOVA was performed. Cell means are displayed in Table 11. Findings revealed a main effect $F(6, 350) = 2.97, p < .009, \eta^2 = .05$. In an effort to explore this result further, planned comparisons (using independent samples t -tests) compared the importance to identity scores of those in the first experimental condition with those in the second experimental condition and each of the control conditions. Findings revealed that importance to identity was greater in the first experimental condition than in the second experimental $t(100) = 3.17, p < .003, \eta^2 = .10$ and 1st $t(100) = 3.34, p < .002, \eta^2 = .10$, 2nd $t(100) = 3.22, p < .003, \eta^2 = .09$, 3rd $t(100) = 3.10, p < .004, \eta^2 = .09$, 4th $t(100) = 3.84, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$ and 5th $t(100) = 3.03, p < .004, \eta^2 = .08$ control conditions. The effects remained significant when Dunn's test (critical alpha value 2.64, $p < .05$) was incorporated.

Table 11

Study 3b Mean Importance to Identity Scores for Experimental and Control Participants

Experimental condition 1	Experimental condition 2	Control condition 1	Control condition 2	Control condition 3	Control condition 4	Control condition 5
22.67 ¹ (3.76)	20.06 (4.51)	20.02 (4.23)	20.33 (3.55)	20.20 (4.28)	19.96 (3.35)	20.29 (4.15)

Note. Higher scores indicate higher levels of importance to identity.

¹ Importance to identity was significantly greater in experimental condition 1 than each of the other six conditions, $p < .05$ by Dunn's test.

Intergroup discrimination. To evaluate the amount of discrimination shown in the two experimental conditions toward the ingroup and the outgroup, a 2 (condition: first experimental condition vs. second experimental condition) x 2 (target group: ingroup vs. outgroup) mixed model ANOVA was carried out. The first factor was between participants. The second factor was within participants. Cell means are displayed in Table 12. Findings revealed a main effect for group membership $F(1, 100) = 21.86, p < .001, \eta^2 = .18$. Outgroup members were allotted more listening time to white noise than were ingroup members. Planned comparisons (using paired samples *t*-tests) revealed that participants in both the first experimental condition $t(50) = 2.49, p < .02, \eta^2 = .11$ and the second experimental condition $t(50) = 4.27, p < .001, \eta^2 = .27$ engaged in a significant amount of intergroup discrimination.

Table 12

Study 3b Mean Allocation of White Noise to Ingroup and Outgroup Members by Experimental Participants

Condition	Ingroup	Outgroup ¹
Experimental condition 1 (<i>N</i> = 51)	46.08 (11.25)	53.92 (11.25)*
Experimental condition 2 (<i>N</i> = 51)	44.20 (9.70)	55.80 (9.70)**
Total	45.14 (10.50)	54.86 (10.50)***

Note. Higher scores indicate more seconds of white noise allocated.

¹Significantly more white noise was allocated to the outgroup than the ingroup.

* $p < .02$, ** $p < .001$ by t-test, *** $p < .001$ by Anova

Importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. To assess the association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, standard multiple regression was conducted. Separate analyses were performed for pre- and post-discrimination importance to identity scores. The amount of white noise given to the ingroup was subtracted from the amount given to the outgroup to obtain an index of intergroup discrimination. Importance to identity served as the independent variable and the intergroup discrimination index as the dependent variable in the first analysis. The regression was significant $R^2 = .09$, $F(1, 49) = 4.73$, $p < .04$. Examination of beta weights showed a significant positive effect $\beta = .30$, $p < .04$. The intergroup discrimination index served as the independent variable and importance to identity as the dependent variable in the second analysis. This regression was again significant $R^2 = .10$, $F(1, 49) = 5.45$, $p < .03$. Finally, the beta weight again showed a significant positive effect $\beta = .32$, $p < .03$.

Discussion of studies 3a and 3b

The findings from Studies 1a – 1d showed that when intergroup relations are highlighted, importance to identity is linked with intergroup discrimination. The results of Studies 2a – 2f replicated this finding and revealed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination was not attributable to 12 potentially overlapping variables. Because importance to identity was assessed just as a predictor of discrimination in Studies 1 and 2, however, Studies 3a and 3b were conducted to determine whether importance to identity serves as not only a predictor, but also an outcome of intergroup discrimination.

The hypothesis tested in Studies 3a and 3b was that importance to identity would be positively related to intergroup discrimination and that intergroup discrimination would also be positively related to an increase in importance to identity. Employing a within participants (Study 3a) and a between participants (Study 3b) design, the findings supported this hypothesis. The results suggest that importance to identity serves both as a predictor and an outcome of intergroup discrimination. This effect endured across the different forms of identity being assessed (national and gender) and the different types of discrimination being examined (trait ratings or the distribution of negative resources).

The results of Study 3a revealed that New Zealanders assigned other New Zealanders (ingroup members) more favourable trait ratings than Americans (outgroup members). The results of Study 3b revealed that women distributed more of the noxious stimuli, white noise, to men (outgroup members) than to other women (ingroup members). For members of both social groups (New Zealanders and women), group identity became more important following discrimination.

In keeping with past research, which has shown that just as group identity can increase intergroup discrimination, so too can intergroup discrimination increase group identity (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Hunter et al., 2005; Hunter et al., 1997; Hunter et al., 1996), the results of Studies 3a and 3b revealed that the relationship between collective identity and intergroup discrimination is not unidirectional. Importance to identity served in Studies 3a and 3b not just as a predictor, but also as an outcome of intergroup discrimination.

Chapter 5: General Discussion

Summary of Findings

In this thesis, I assessed the degree to which importance to identity was associated with intergroup discrimination. I conducted three sets of studies to explore this. In the first set (Studies 1a – 1d), I examined whether the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination varies, depending on whether intergroup relations are emphasised or de-emphasised. In the second set (Studies 2a – 2f), I evaluated the extent to which importance to identity is associated with intergroup discrimination when it is assessed in parallel with a range of other potentially overlapping variables. In the third set (Studies 3a – 3b), I examined the degree to which importance to identity served as an independent, as well as a dependent variable in relation to intergroup discrimination.

In terms of this thesis as a whole, three hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis was that a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination would only emerge in situations in which the intergroup context was emphasised. The second hypothesis was that a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination would not be explained by a number of other potentially overlapping variables. The third hypothesis was that importance to identity would function both as an independent and a dependent variable in relation to intergroup discrimination. All three hypotheses were supported.

The results of the present research programme are consistent with findings from studies linking collective identities in general with intergroup

discrimination (see Aberson et al., 2000; Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Kelly, 1988; Levin et al., 2003; Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 2002) and studies associating important group identities with intergroup behaviour in general (e.g., Crisp & Beck, 2005; Kenworthy & Jones, 2009; Leach et al., 2008; Roccas et al., 2008; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Tropp & Wright, 2001). More specifically, the current findings are in keeping with theory that it is the importance attached to collective identities that is particularly associated with intergroup discrimination (see Tajfel, 1981; Turner, 1999; Turner et al., 1987; for a review, see Spears et al., 1999). The present sets of studies overcame weaknesses in past research, which has tended not to find a relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999), bringing much needed clarity to an area that has largely been characterised by inconsistent and contradictory results. The current findings thus advance this field, showing that not only is there a consistent relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, but that this relationship holds across groups based on different types of identity and different forms of intergroup discrimination.

With regard to the first hypothesis, the findings revealed that importance to identity was only associated with intergroup discrimination when intergroup relations were emphasised. These results are in keeping with research suggesting that a relationship between identity and intergroup bias is not likely to be found in every situation (see Ashmore et al., 2004; Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Lalonde, 2002; McGarty, 2001; Turner, 1999) and with Turner's

(1999) claims that group identities tend to be linked with intergroup discrimination when there is a heightened awareness of the intergroup context.

Results concerning the second hypothesis showed that the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination was not accounted for by a range of potentially overlapping variables. These variables were state self-esteem, private CSE, public CSE, membership CSE, perceived conflict, quality of identity, group identity, trait self-esteem, affective commitment, categorisation, RWA and SDO. Consistent with findings reported by a number of researchers, private CSE (see Aberson et al., 2000; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Hunter et al., 2011; 2012), public CSE and membership CSE (see Chin & McClintock, 1993; Hunter et al., 2004; 2005; Long & Spears, 1997), perceived intergroup conflict (Brown et al., 1986; Struch & Schwartz, 1989), group identification (Kelly, 1988), low trait self-esteem (Crocker & Schwartz, 1985; Crocker et al., 1987), and affective commitment (Ellemers et al., 1999) were all found to be associated with intergroup discrimination.

With regard to the third hypothesis, the findings suggest that importance to identity served not only as an independent variable in relation to intergroup discrimination, but also as a dependent variable. These results are consistent with studies showing that various components of collective identity can be increased by intergroup bias (Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Hunter et al., 1996; Hunter et al., 1997; Hunter et al., 2005).

Study Limitations

Across all three of the sets of studies that comprised the current research programme, the size of the context dependent relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination tended to be modest. When the intergroup context was emphasised in Studies 1a – 1d, the average percentage of variance in discrimination explained was approximately 16.5%. When the role of the potential overlapping constructs was controlled for in Studies 2a – 2f, the average proportion of variance accounted for was approximately 11.5%. In Studies 3a and 3b, the average variance explained was approximately 12.5%. These relationships between importance to identity and intergroup bias are stronger than the overall correlation of $r = .08$ found across the 14 studies reviewed by Hinkle and Brown (1990; see Cohen's, 1988 criteria for comparing the relative magnitude of d , r and r^2). They are, however, more consistent with the medium effect size ($d = 0.56$) reported in Aberson et al.'s (2000) meta-analysis.

Lalonde (2002) suggests that one potential reason for the limited magnitude of such effects is that when group identity is salient, it promotes stereotyping, which leads to a consensus in the way group members view the ingroup and outgroup. As a result of this lack of variability in the way groups are regarded, a strong association between identity and intergroup discrimination is less likely, because there is so much similarity in intergroup evaluations.

Another possible reason for the size of the associations found is that there are other variables that also play a role in intergroup bias. It is crucial to note that neither social psychology in general (see Brown, 2010), nor SIT more

specifically (see Turner & Reynolds, 2001), claim to provide a complete account of intergroup conflict. It is implausible, therefore, that importance to identity, which is but one measure of collective identity used to assess SIT within the broader field of social psychology, could singlehandedly explain why people engage in intergroup discrimination. Indeed, the findings from Study 2 showed that importance to identity only contributed in part to intergroup bias. As outlined earlier, Studies 2c and 2d revealed that both perceived conflict and low trait self-esteem uniquely contributed to intergroup discrimination.

Additionally, importance to identity was not the only dimension of collective identity that was associated with intergroup discrimination. The results of Studies 2a, 2b, 2d and 2e showed that private CSE, low public CSE, membership CSE, group identification and affective commitment each uniquely contributed to intergroup discrimination. Given that there are a number of other dimensions of collective identity (see Ashmore et al., 2004; Hunter et al., 2004, 2005; Leach et al., 2008; Livingstone & Haslam, 2008; Roccas et al., 2008) that were not examined in the current study, one must consider the possibility that they may have played a role in intergroup discrimination, had they been included.

Other variables, beyond the social psychological perspective, that have been shown to play a part in intergroup discrimination, include political and religious ideologies, group norms, threat and history (see Herek, 1987; Jetten et al., 1997; Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2000; Staub, 1989; Turner & Reynolds, 2001). It is unsurprising that factors, such as a country's political ideology, will have some influence on discrimination. It seems reasonable to expect, for example, that citizens of a country that has put a liberal government, with strong legislation against racial discrimination, in power, might show less

discrimination against immigrants than, for instance, a nation of people who have elected a far right government, with a tough stance on refugees and asylum seekers entering the country. Such political backdrops might not just reflect, but also shape a nation's attitudes toward outgroup members.

Although the evidence that there is a range of variables that influence intergroup discrimination is irrefutable, importance to identity emerges, in the studies outlined in this thesis, as one consistent explanation for why individuals are motivated to discriminate against members of other groups. While this finding by no means provides a complete picture of the causes of intergroup bias, the contribution of importance to identity should not be diminished. The fact that one measure of collective identity, against the backdrop of a complex constellation of other influencing factors, accounted for between 11.5% and 16.5% of the discrimination that participants showed in the present set of studies, is not insubstantial.

Both Brown (2010) and Turner and Reynolds (2001) stress that the diverse explanations for intergroup conflict that exist are not necessarily incompatible. They argue that the role that each plays in intergroup discrimination simply differs, depending on the situation. Brown (2010) concludes that "...social psychology, whilst it contains the potential to contribute significantly both to the dissection and to the dissolution of prejudice, can never do more than explain a part... of the phenomenon as a whole" (p. 11). Turner and Reynolds (2001) call for greater efforts within social psychology, however, to develop an account of intergroup discrimination that integrates the diverse range of explanations that exist. This (somewhat daunting) task remains to be tackled in future research.

It is also noteworthy that a number of the potentially overlapping variables examined in Study 2 turned out not to be associated with the measures of intergroup discrimination used in the study. In contrast to findings reported in other studies (see Aberson et al., 2000), no links between state self-esteem and intergroup discrimination or between categorisation and intergroup discrimination were found. Similarly, unlike research conducted by Amiot and Bourhis (2005a), there was no association between quality of social identity and intergroup discrimination. Likewise, contrary to Whitley and Kite's (2006) review, no relationships between SDO and intergroup discrimination or between RWA and intergroup discrimination were found. In the current investigation, only certain types of intergroup discrimination (e.g., the distribution of white noise), outgroups (e.g., New Zealanders vs. Americans) and environments (i.e., where the intergroup context was and was not emphasised) were assessed. It is possible, therefore, that the constructs that were not related to intergroup discrimination in the present study would have been associated with intergroup behaviour, had alternative forms of discrimination, group memberships or contexts been examined. While it is important to acknowledge this limitation, the focus of the current research programme was to assess whether these variables explained the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup behaviour, rather than to investigate the relationship between these variables and discrimination in and of itself.

A somewhat related point is that, although an association between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination was found in the present sets of studies, it is possible that this relationship would not have held, had other forms of group identity been assessed. In addition to the possibility that

other forms of racial and national identities may have yielded different outcomes, there is also a chance that, had *entirely* different group identities been examined, an association with intergroup discrimination might not have been found. It is possible, for example, that for groups such as Christians, nurses or members of collectivist cultures, no such relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination would have emerged. For individuals whose group memberships are bound up with norms of kindness, emphasising the intergroup context might in fact have led to the reverse relationship. Reminding individuals of their group identities might, in such instances, have instead induced them to eschew unfair treatment of outgroup members, in favour of more just behaviour.

The Contribution of the Present Findings to the Literature

The goal of the studies presented in this thesis was to investigate the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. The research programme was successful in this regard. When attention was drawn to the intergroup context, the findings repeatedly revealed an association between importance to identity and intergroup behaviour. This link was found across different measures of intergroup discrimination (e.g., white noise allocation and the distribution and removal of positive and negative resources) and different group memberships (i.e., gender and national).

The current investigation, in contrast with much of the research in this area (e.g., Aberson et al., 2000; Chin & McClintock, 1993; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Gramzow & Gaertner, 2005; Houston & Andreopoulou, 2003; Jackson, 2002; Jackson & Smith, 1999), found a consistent relationship between

importance to identity and several types of intergroup discrimination. These findings suggest that two main factors should be taken into account in future research examining links between collective identity and intergroup discrimination. The first is that, in keeping with recommendations made by Ashmore and colleagues (2004), appropriate measures of collective identity should be selected. The second is that, consistent with Turner's (1999) assertions (see also McGarty, 2001), intergroup relations should be emphasised. It was the insights of these authors that guided the current investigation and enabled it to be successfully demonstrated that the importance associated with a given collective identity is consistently associated with the positive treatment of ingroup members and negative treatment of outgroup members, when the intergroup context is emphasised.

The Implications of the Present Findings, Beyond the Laboratory

The findings from the studies laid out in the current thesis have considerable real-world ramifications. When intergroup relations are emphasised, people for whom a particular collective identity is important tend to discriminate against outgroup members. Although the present study employed manipulations to emphasise the intergroup context, given the widespread nature of intergroup bias in everyday life, it is expected that real-world cues drawing attention to intergroup relations are equally effective at fostering a relationship between identity and intergroup discrimination. Such triggers are presumably everywhere and could include something as commonplace as a news story comparing numbers of new immigrants with numbers of individuals born in one's country. The fact that simply referencing

intergroup relations may prompt people for whom a given group identity is important to engage in intergroup discrimination is concerning.

Possibly more worrying, are the findings from Studies 3a and 3b specifically, showing that the act of engaging in discrimination against outgroups also increases the importance associated with the particular group identity involved. Because importance to identity predicts discrimination and discrimination predicts importance to identity, there is a risk that a cycle will develop, in which group identities become increasingly important and intergroup discrimination escalates. This process gives us some insight into how important collective identities, perhaps particularly when they coincide with some of the psychological and socio-structural factors outlined earlier (see Herek, 1987; Jetten et al., 1997; Solomon et al., 2000; Staub, 1989; Turner & Reynolds, 2001), might be associated with the intergroup discrimination we see in the world today. This may include the sort of negative treatment of outgroup members found in everyday life, such as the kind we see in healthcare, education and employment (e.g., Mikuls et al., 2005; Moss-Racusin et al., 2012; Skiba et al., 2011; Tiedemann, 2000; Tilcsik, 2011). The process might also shed light on how some of the most odious forms of intergroup behaviour can arise, such as the wholesale killing of one group at the hands of another, as seen in the examples of various genocides and intergroup conflicts that have occurred around the world in recent history (e.g., Dwyer & Santikarma, 2003; Friedlander, 2007; Kévorkian, 2011; Price et al., 2013; Staub, 2011).

Future Research Directions

Now that the current findings have shed light on one set of circumstances that leads people to behave negatively toward outgroup members, research can focus on how to disrupt that cycle. This might include an emphasis on norms concerning the positive treatment of others. With regard to the New Zealand national identity, for example, New Zealanders could be encouraged to view themselves as a nation of people who are open and accepting toward other national groups. School social science classes could focus on statistics regarding the number of refugees New Zealand takes in every year and there could be an emphasis on New Zealand as a multicultural society that is enriched by its ethnic make up. Paluck (2009) designed an intervention in post-genocide Rwanda, in which a radio programme, depicting the overlapping lives of people from both Hutu and Tutsi communities, was broadcast to various villages. Compared to a control group, perceptions of norms held by participants in the intervention condition regarding empathy for outgroup members, trust, cooperation and intermarriage had improved by the end of the study. Paluck contrasted these findings with the key role that radio programmes played in fostering group violence during the 1994 Rwanda genocide. It remains to be seen how norms of kindness and acceptance might disrupt the specific relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination. Future research in this area is warranted.

Other attempts to disrupt the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination could involve harnessing people's social identities to reduce intergroup conflict. Haslam (2014a) argues that social identities need not be regarded as threats to society. In fact, he claims, the

connections to others that collective identities afford are fundamental to people's wellbeing. Rather than attempting to overcome any problems caused by conflicting group identities by suppressing them and creating superordinate identities, separate group identities should be acknowledged. A failure to recognise the importance of various groups' identities to them can be counterproductive, leading to resentment. People should be asked about the collective identities that matter to them and to identify their group goals. Efforts should then be made to work together with all groups to accommodate these goals. While Haslam largely focuses on organisational, health and clinical psychology settings, the guidelines he outlines for using people's social identities to improve intergroup relations are just as applicable to racial, national and gender identities. He acknowledges that some group identities are not necessarily of the sort that one would want to encourage. When illustrating the importance of recognising groups' identities, however, he cites an example of football fans' identities and the benefits that would come from the police acknowledging fans' passion for their teams, rather than treating them as hooligans. There is no reason why racial, national and gender identities are in and of themselves negative (on the contrary, such identities can play an important role in people's senses of self-worth, see Brewer, 2003).

Future research should explore how instituting the guidelines detailed above, in response to intergroup discrimination, can attenuate hostility between groups. Studies could examine the efficacy of applying Haslam's (2014a) principals in an attempt to reduce intergroup discrimination between the groups examined in this thesis. For example, In Studies 2c and 2d, Northern Irish people whose national identities were important to their overall sense of self, showed discrimination toward Polish immigrants. They fired more Polish

immigrants than Northern Irish people (Study 2c) and re-hired more Northern Irish people than Polish immigrants (Study 2d). In an attempt to determine how best to reduce this intergroup discrimination (note that in the present thesis only Northern Irish hostility toward Polish immigrants was assessed, not Polish immigrant hostility toward the Northern Irish), and in keeping with Haslam's recommendations, future research could involve asking both Northern Irish people and Polish immigrants in Northern Ireland, who deem their respective group identities to be important to their overall senses of selves, to detail their group-level goals. For the Northern Irish, this might include, for example, the desire to have jobs available for Northern Irish people, rather than having them go to Polish immigrants. In a 2013 annual survey conducted in Northern Ireland, 43 per cent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement 'Migrant workers take jobs away from people who were born in Northern Ireland' (Queen's University Belfast and University of Ulster, 2013, para. 1). For Polish immigrants, goals might include the desire to build their careers. A 2011 research paper put out by the Northern Ireland Assembly revealed that Polish immigrants are typically well-educated and come to Northern Ireland, not because they lack employment in their home country, but to obtain overseas work experience and earn more. According to the paper, Polish immigrants to Northern Ireland have been responsible for significantly boosting the economy. Drawing on Haslam's (2014a) recommendations, efforts could then be made to accommodate both groups' goals. While, on the face of it, the two groups' goals conflict with each other, an intervention could involve working together with both groups to come up with solutions. Indeed, Platow et al. (in press), who, like Haslam, emphasise that social identities can be harnessed for positive change, stress that, by working together, groups can

achieve much more than can be achieved as individuals. In the case of the example outlined above, the Northern Irish nationals and the Polish immigrants may well each see that the other group does not, in fact, present a threat at all to the other. On the contrary, the ultimate goal of each group is economic prosperity and the two groups can achieve this in parallel with each other, with their respective group identities acknowledged and intact.

Finally, a potential direction for future research could involve examining how experimentally manipulated threats to importance to identity might affect intergroup discrimination. Although, as evidenced in Study 1, the group emphasis manipulation used in the present research programme influenced the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination, the manipulation did not affect overall levels of importance to identity. As became apparent in Study 3, however, the act of engaging in intergroup discrimination did influence importance to identity. Future studies might examine whether other manipulations, such as threatening participants' group identities, might affect their levels of importance to identity and whether this might also increase the strength of the relationship between importance to identity and intergroup discrimination (for examples of studies showing that threats to collective identity in general enhance the relationship between identity and intergroup bias, see Cairns et al., 2006; Jackson, 2002; Schmitt & Maes, 2002; Struch & Schwartz, 1989; Voci, 2006).

Conclusion

During the writing of this thesis, news stories concerning various intergroup conflicts around the world were constantly changing and

developing. As a result, I found myself continually fighting the urge to update the opening section of Chapter 1, in which various examples of present day group conflicts are outlined. What I wrote quickly felt out-dated. Death tolls rose. Attention shifted to new crises, elsewhere in the world. The news changed daily, sometimes hourly. As I put the finishing touches to this thesis, Nigerian authorities were no closer to rescuing the more than 200 schoolgirls who had been kidnapped by Boko Haram militants months previously. Attention soon turned to the Middle East, where three Israeli teenagers were suspected to have been murdered by Palestinians. Israel retaliated and a bloody battle between Israel and Hamas ensued in Gaza. The World looked on in horror as the death toll soared daily. At the same time, in Iraq's northwest, Islamic State extremists were advancing on members of the Yazidi religion, who had fled to a mountaintop in a desperate bid to escape slaughter. Days later, a series of videos of Western hostages being beheaded by the militant group began to emerge online. It would have been futile to attempt to represent the ever-shifting examples of intergroup discrimination around the world. What the chilling stories occupying the news sites and television screen emphasised, however, was that developing our understanding of what drives people to harm others is critical and urgent. As stated earlier, social psychology by no means has all the answers. What the present thesis has shown, however, is that while importance to identity does not completely account for how intergroup discrimination arises, it does appear to partially explain it. As such, this particular dimension of collective identity is a valuable piece of the puzzle and should not be overlooked in future investigations into the causes of negative intergroup behaviour. In a field that has been fraught with mixed and sometimes contradictory findings, the results of the present research

programme have provided some much needed clarity. The importance that people attach to their group identities uniquely predicts and is predicted by intergroup discrimination. A step toward better understanding why one group is compelled to treat another unfairly is a step forward for society.

References

- Aberson, C. L., Healy, M., & Romero, V. (2000). Ingroup bias and self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 157-173.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Almeida, J., Johnson, R. M., Corliss, H. L., Molnar, B. E., & Azrael, D. (2009). Emotional distress among LGBT youth: The influence of perceived discrimination based on sexual orientation. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*, 1001–1014.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other “authoritarian personality”. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 47-92.
- Amiot, C. E., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2005a). Discrimination between dominant and subordinate groups: The positive-negative asymmetry effect and normative processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 289-308.
- Amiot, C. E., & Bourhis, R.Y. (2005b). Ideological beliefs as determinants of discrimination in positive and negative outcome distributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 581-598.
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*, 80-114.

- Benner, A. D., & Graham, S. (2011). Latino adolescents' experiences of discrimination across the first 2 years of high school: Correlates and influences on educational outcomes. *Child Development, 82*, 508-519.
- Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 3*, 27-52.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Turner, J. C., & Gagnon, A. (1997). Interdependence, social identity and discrimination. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 273-295). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24*, 641-657.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*, 307-324.
- Brewer, M. B. (2003). Optimal distinctiveness, social identity, and the self. In M. R. Leary, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 480-491). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social Identity Theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 745-778.
- Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice: Its social psychology* (2nd ed.). Chichester, UK: Wiley- Blackwell.
- Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 273-286.
- Brown, R., Hinkle, S., Ely, P. G., Fox-Cardamone, L., Maras, P., & Taylor, L. A.

- (1992). Recognizing group diversity: Individualist-collectivist and autonomous-relational social orientations and their implications for intergroup processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 327-342.
- Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review, 106*, 676-713.
- Cairns, E., Kenworthy, J., Campbell, A., & Hewstone, M. (2006). The role of in-group identification, religious group membership and intergroup conflict in moderating in-group and out-group affect. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 701-716.
- Cameron, J. E. (2004). A three-factor model of social identity. *Self and Identity, 3*, 239-262.
- Campbell, D. T. (1965). Ethnocentric and other altruistic motives. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 283-311). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Capozza, D., Voci, A., & Licciardello, O. (2000). Individualism, collectivism and social identity theory. In D. Capozza, & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 62-80). London: Sage.
- Chin, M. G., & McClintock, C. G. (1993). The effects of intergroup discrimination and social valued on level of self-esteem in the minimal group paradigm. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 23*, 63-75.
- Cleeland, C. S., Gonin, R., Baez, L., Loehrer, P., & Pandya, K. J. (1997). Pain and treatment of pain in minority patients with cancer. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 127*, 813-816.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colvin, R. (2009). Shared perceptions among lesbian and gay police officers:

barriers and opportunities in the law enforcement work environment.

Police Quarterly, 12, 86-101.

Crisp, R. J., & Beck, S. R. (2005). Reducing intergroup bias: The moderating role of ingroup identification. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 8, 173-185.

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 60-67.

Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 503-513.

Crocker, J., & Schwartz, I. (1985). Prejudice and discrimination in a minimal group situation: Effects of self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11, 379-386.

Crocker, J., Thompson, L., McGraw, K. M., & Ingerman, C. (1987). Downwards comparisons threats and evaluations of others: Effects of self-esteem and threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 902-916.

Devine, P. G., & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 1139-1150.

Dovidio, J. F., Penner, L. A., Albrecht, T. L., Norton, W. E., Gaertner, S. L., & Shelton, J. N. (2008). Disparities and distrust: The implications of psychological processes for understanding racial disparities in health and health care. *Social Science and Medicine*, 67, 478-486.

Duckitt, J., Callaghan, J., & Wagner, C. (2005). Group identification and outgroup attitudes in four South African ethnic groups: A multidimensional approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 633-646.

- Duckitt, J., & Mphuthing, T. (1998). Group identification and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal analysis in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 80-85.
- Duckitt, J., & Parra, C. (2004). Dimensions of group identification and out-group attitudes in four ethnic groups in New Zealand. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 237-247.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (in press). Personality, ideological attitudes, and group identity as predictors of political behavior in majority and minority ethnic groups. *Political Psychology*.
- Durey, A., & Thompson, S. C. (2012). Reducing the health disparities of Indigenous Australians: Time to change focus. *BMC Health Services Research, 12*, 1-11.
- Dwyer, L., & Santikarma, D. (2003). When the world turned to chaos: 1965 and its aftermath in Bali, Indonesia. In R. Gellately, & B. Kiernan (Eds.), *The specter of genocide: Mass murder in historical perspective*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrlich, H. J., & Rinehart, J. W. (1965). A brief report on the methodology of stereotype research. *Social Forces, 43*, 564-575.
- Eliason, M. J., Dibble, S. L., & Robertson, M. D. (2011). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) physicians' experiences in the workplace. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58*, 1355-1371.
- Ellemers, N., Kortekaas, P., & Ouwerkerk, J. W. (1999). Self-categorisation, commitment to the group and self-esteem as related but distinct aspects of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 371-389.
- Friedlander, S. (2007). *The years of extermination: Nazi Germany and the Jews 1939-1945*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

- Gagnon, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1996). Discrimination in the minimal group paradigm: Social identity or self-interest? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 1289-1301.
- Gómez, Á., Brooks, M. L., Buhrmester, M. D., Vázquez, A., Jetten, J., & Swann, W. B. (2011). On the nature of identity fusion: Insights into the construct and a new measure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*, 918-933.
- Gómez, Á., Morales, J. F., Hart, S., Vázquez, A., & Swann, W. B. (2011). Rejected and excluded forevermore, but even more devoted: Irrevocable ostracism intensifies loyalty to the group among identity-fused persons. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 1574-1586.
- Gramzow, R. H., & Gaertner, L. (2005). Self-esteem and favoritism toward novel in-groups: The self as an evaluative base. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 801-815.
- Grant, P. R. & Brown, R. (1995). From ethnocentrism to collective protest: Responses to relative deprivation and threats to social identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58*, 195-212.
- Grieve, P. G., & Hogg, M. A. (1999). Subjective uncertainty and intergroup discrimination in the minimal group situation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 926-940.
- Guimond, S., Dambrun, M., Michinov, N., & Duarte, S. (2003). Does social dominance generate prejudice? Integrating individual and contextual determinants of intergroup cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 697-721.
- Haslam, S. A. (2004). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage.

- Haslam, S. A. (2014a). Making good theory practical: Five lessons for an applied social identity approach to challenges of organizational, health, and clinical psychology. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 53*, 1-20.
- Haslam, A. (2014b, June 23). The British Journal of Social Psychology 2014 – landmark article interview. Retrieved from [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)2044-8309](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)2044-8309)
- Haslam, S. A., Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., McGarty, C., & Hayes, B. K. (1992). Context-dependent variation in social stereotyping 1: The effects of intergroup relations as mediated by social change and frame of reference. *European Journal of Psychology, 22*, 3-20.
- Heaven, P. C. L. (2001). Prejudice and Personality: The Case of the Authoritarian and Social Dominator. In M. Augoustinos, & K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict* (pp. 89-106). London: Sage.
- Hendren, A., & Blank, H. (2009). Prejudiced behavior toward lesbians and gay men: A field experiment on everyday helping. *Social Psychology, 40*, 234-238.
- Herek, G. M. (1987). Religious orientation and prejudice: A comparison of racial and sexual attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13*, 34-44.
- Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. J. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams, & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 48-70). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Hinkle, S., Taylor, L. A., Lee Fox-Cardamone, D., & Crook, K. F. (1989). Intragroup identification and intergroup differentiation: A multicomponent

approach. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 305-317.

Houston, D. M., & Andreopoulou, A. (2003). Tests of both corollaries of social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis in real group settings. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 357-370.

Hunter, J. A., Banks, M., O'Brien, K. S., Kafka, S., Hayhurst, J., Jephson, D. R., et al. (2011). Intergroup discrimination involving negative outcomes and self-esteem. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41, 1145-1174.

Hunter, J. A., Cox, S. L., O'Brien, K., Stringer, M., Boyes, M., Banks, M., et al. (2005). Threats to group value, domain-specific self-esteem and intergroup discrimination amongst minimal and national groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 329-353.

Hunter, J. A., Kypri, K., Stokell, N. M., Boyes, M., O'Brien, K. S., & McMenemy, K. E. (2004). Social identity, self-evaluation and in-group bias: The relative importance of particular domains of self-esteem to the in-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 59-81.

Hunter, J. A., Platow, M. J., Bell, L. M., Kypri, K., & Lewis, C. A. (1997). Intergroup bias and self-evaluation: Domain-specific self-esteem, threats to identity and dimensional importance. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 405-426.

Hunter, J. A., Platow, M. J., Howard, M. L., & Stringer, M. (1996). Social identity and intergroup evaluative bias: Realistic categories and domain specific self-esteem in a conflict setting. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 631-647.

Hunter, J. A., & Stringer, M. (1999). Attributional bias and identity in a conflict region: The moderating effects of status. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 4, 160-175.

- Hunter, J. A., Stringer, M., & Watson, R. P. (1992). Intergroup attribution and social identity. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 132*, 795-796.
- Hunter, J. A., Suttie, M., O'Brien, K., Davidson, S., Banks, M., Kafka, S., et al. (2012). Negative intergroup discrimination and private collective self-esteem. In S. De Wal & S. Meszaros (Eds.), *Handbook on psychology of self-esteem*. New York: Nova Science.
- Jackson, J. W. (1999). How variations in social structure affect different types of intergroup bias and different dimensions of social identity in a multi-intergroup setting. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 2*, 145-173.
- Jackson, J. W. (2002a). Intergroup attitudes as a function of different dimensions of group identification and perceived intergroup conflict. *Self and Identity, 1*, 11-33.
- Jackson, J. W., & Smith, E. R. (1999). Conceptualizing social identity: A new framework and evidence for the impact of different dimensions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 120-135.
- Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997). Strength of identification and intergroup differentiation: The influence of group norms. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*, 603-609.
- Jones, A. (2013). *Genocide: A comprehensive introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Kapur, K. (2010). *Portraits of a nation: History of ancient India*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Karasawa, M. (1991). Toward an assessment of social identity: The structure of group identification and its effects on in-group evaluations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 293-307.
- Kelly, C. (1988). Intergroup differentiation in a political context. *British Journal*

of Social Psychology, 27, 319-332.

Kenworthy, J. B., & Jones, J. (2009). The roles of group importance and anxiety in predicting depersonalized ingroup trust. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 12, 227-239.*

Kevorkian, R. (2011). *The Armenian genocide: A complete history.* London: I. B. Taurus.

Kunstman, J. W., & Plant, E. A. (2008). Racing to help: Racial bias in high emergency helping situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95, 1499-1510.*

Lalonde, R. N. (2002). Testing the social identity-intergroup differentiation hypothesis: 'We're not American eh!'. *The British Journal of Social Psychology, 41, 611- 630.*

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., et al. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95, 144-165.*

Lemyre, L., & Smith, P. M. (1985). Intergroup discrimination and self-esteem in the minimal group paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 660-670.*

Levin, S., Henry, P. J., Pratto, F., & Sidanius, J. (2003). Social dominance and social identity in Lebanon: Implications for support of violence against the west. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6, 353-368.*

Long, K., & Spears, R. (1997). The self-esteem hypothesis revisited: Differentiation and the disaffected. In R. Spears, P. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 296-317). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

- Long, K. M., & Spears, R. (1998). Opposing effects of personal and collective self-esteem on interpersonal and intergroup comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28*, 913-930.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 302-318.
- Maass, A., Ceccarelli, R., & Rudin, S. (1996). Linguistic intergroup bias: Evidence for in-group protective motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 512-526.
- Major, B., Quinton, W. J., & Schmader, T. (2003). Attributions to discrimination and self-esteem: Impact of group identification and situational ambiguity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 220-231.
- Markus, H. R. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 63-78.
- Marsh, H. W., & O'Neil, R. (1984). Self-Description Questionnaire III: The construct validity of multidimensional self-concept ratings by late adolescents. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 21*, 153-174.
- Mathur, S., Moon, L., & Leigh, S. (2006). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with coronary heart disease: further perspectives on health status and treatment. Cardiovascular diseases series no. 25. Cat. no. CVD 33. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1978). *Identities and interactions: An examination of human associations in everyday life*. New York: The Free Press.
- McGarty, C. (2001). Social Identity Theory does not maintain that identification produces bias, and Self-categorization Theory does not maintain that salience is identification: Two comments on Mummendey, Klink and

- Brown. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 173-176.
- Meeres, S. L., & Grant, P. R. (1999). Enhancing collective and personal self-esteem through differentiation: Further exploration of Hinkle and Brown's taxonomy. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 21-34.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., Shaw-Taylor, L., Chen, S., Chang, E. (2009). Ironic effects of explicit gender prejudice on women's test performance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 275-278.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 674-697.
- Mikuls, T. R., Saag, K. G., George, V., Mudano, A. S., & Banerjee, S. (2005). Racial disparities in the receipt of osteoporosis related healthcare among community-dwelling older women with arthritis and previous fracture. *The Journal of Rheumatology*, 32, 870-875.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2012). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 109, 16474-16479.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103-122.
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., & Brown, R. (2001). Nationalism and patriotism: national identification and out-group rejection. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 159-172.
- Northern Ireland Assembly (2011). *Migration in Northern Ireland: A demographic perspective*. Retrieved August 6, 2014, from <http://www.migrationni.org/DataEditorUploads/NI%20ASsembly%20paper%20on>

%20demographics.pdf

Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1994). *Stereotyping and Social Reality*.

Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Otten, S., Mummendey, A., & Blanz, M. (1996). Intergroup discrimination in positive and negative outcome allocations: Impact of stimulus valence, relative group status, and relative group size. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 568-581.

Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 574-587.

Perreault, S., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1999). Ethnocentrism, social identification, and discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 92-103.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1958). Personality and sociocultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 29-42.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 3, 499-514.

Platow, M. J., & Hunter, J. A. (2001). Realistic intergroup conflict: Prejudice, power and protest. In M Augoustinos and K. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding the psychology of prejudice and racism*. London: Sage.

Platow, M. J., & Hunter, J. A. (2012). Intergroup relations and conflict: Revisiting Sherif's boys' camp studies. In J. R. Smith & S. Haslam (Eds.), *Social psychology: Revisiting the classic studies* (pp. 142-159). London: Sage.

Platow, M. J., & Hunter, J. A. (in press). Necessarily collectivistic: Reflecting on Muzafer Sherif's boys' camp studies. *The Psychologist*.

Platow, M. J., Hunter, J. A., Haslam, S. A., & Reicher, S. (in press). Reflections on

Muzafer Sherif's legacy in social identity and self-categorization theories. In A. Dost-Gözkan & D. Sönmez Keith (Eds.), *Norms group, conflict, and social change: Rediscovering Muzafer Sherif's psychology*. London: Transaction Publications.

Platow, M. J., McClintock, C. G., & Liebrand, W. B. G. (1990). Predicting intergroup fairness and ingroup bias in the minimal group paradigm. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 221-239.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.

Price, M., Klingner, J., & Ball, P. (2013). Preliminary statistical analysis of documentation of killings in the Syrian Arab Republic. *The Benetech Human Rights Program*. Report commissioned by The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

Queen's University Belfast and University of Ulster, Access Research Knowledge. (2013). *Northern Ireland Life and Times Survey*. Retrieved August 6, 2014, from the Access Research Knowledge Web site: http://www.ark.ac.uk/nilt/2013/Minority_Ethnic_People/MIGWRK2.html

Reynolds, K. J., & Turner, J. C. (2006). Individuality and the prejudiced personality. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*, 233-270.

Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2001). The role of personality and group factors in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 427-434.

Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Haslam, S. A., Ryan, M. K., Bizumic, B., & Subasic, E. (2007). Does personality explain in-group identification and

discrimination? Evidence from the minimal group paradigm. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 517-539.

Robins, R. W., Hendin, H. M., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2001). Measuring global self-esteem: Construct validation of a single-item measure and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 151-161.

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

Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S., Halevy, N., & Eidelson, R. (2008). Toward a unifying model of identification with groups: Integrating theoretical perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 280-306.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. Florida: Krieger Publishing Company.

Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40-62.

Ruttenberg, J., Zea, M. C., Sigelman, C. K. (1996). Collective identity and intergroup prejudice among Jewish and Arab students in the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 209-220.

Schmitt, M., & Maes, J. (2002). Stereotypic ingroup bias as self-defense against relative deprivation: evidence from a longitudinal study of the German unification process. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 309-326.

Schulman, K. A., Berlin, J. A., Harless, W., Kerner, J. F., Sistrunk, S., Gersh, B. J., et al. (1999). The effect of race and sex on physicians' recommendations for cardiac catheterization. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 340, 618-

626.

Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1079-1092.

Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American Racial Identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*, 18-39.

Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Oklahoma: Institute of Group Relations.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1953). *Groups in harmony and tension: An integration of studies on intergroup relations*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 12*, 248-279.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social Dominance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siegmán, A. W. (1961). A cross-cultural investigation of the relationship between ethnic prejudice, authoritarian ideology, and personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63*, 654-655.

Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*,

40, 85-107.

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment.. *The Urban Review*, 34, 317-342.

Smith, L. G. E., & Postmes, T. (2009). Intra-group interaction and the development of norms which promote inter-group hostility. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 130-144.

Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2000). Pride and prejudice: Fear of death and social behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 200-204.

Spears Brown, C., & Leaper, C. (2010). Latina and European American girls' experiences with academic sexism and their self-concepts in mathematics and science during adolescence. *Sex Roles*, 63, 860-870.

Spears, R., Doosje, B., & Ellemers, N. (1999). Commitment and the context of social perception. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.). *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 59-83). Oxford: Blackwell.

Spencer, R., Porche, M. V., & Tolman, D. L. (2003). We've come a long way – maybe: New challenges for gender equity in education. *Teachers College Record*, 105, 1774-1807.

Staub, E. (1989). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Staub, E. (2011). *Overcoming evil: genocide, violent conflict, and terrorism*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 2011.

Steele, C. M. & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 797-811.

- Stone, J., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2011). Non-conscious bias in medical decision making: What can be done to reduce it? *Medical Education, 45*, 768-776.
- Struch, N., & Schwartz, S. H. (1989). Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 364-373.
- Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57*, 16-35.
- Swann, W. B., Gómez, Á., Dovidio, J. F., Hart, S., & Jetten, J. (2010). Dying and killing for one's group: Identity fusion moderates responses to intergroup versions of the trolley problem. *Psychological Science, 21*, 1176-1183.
- Swann, W. B., Gómez, Á., Huici, C., Morales, J. F., & Hixon, J. G. (2010). Identity fusion and self-sacrifice: Arousal as a catalyst of pro-group fighting, dying and helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 824-841.
- Swann, W. B., Gómez, Á., Seyle, D. C., Morales, J. F., & Huici, C. (2009). Identity fusion: The interplay of personal and social identities in extreme group behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 995-1011.
- Swann, W. B., Jetten, J., Gómez, Á., Whitehouse, H., & Bastian, B. (2012). When group membership gets personal: A theory of identity fusion. *Psychological Review, 119*, 441-456.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information, 13*, 65-93.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social*

psychology of intergroup relations. London: Academic Press Inc.

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

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149-178.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33 – 47). Monterey: Brooks-Cole.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. G. Austin (eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*, (pp.7-24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Tatum, D. C. (2010). *Genocide at the dawn of the twenty-first century: Rwanda, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Darfur*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Thurlow, C. (2001). Naming the “outsider within”: Homophobic pejoratives and the verbal abuse of lesbian, gay and bisexual high-school pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 25–38.

Tiedemann, J. (2000). Gender-related beliefs of teachers in elementary school mathematics. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 41, 191-207.

Tilcsik, A. (2011). Pride and prejudice: Employment discrimination against openly gay men in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117, 586-626.

Tropp, L. R., & Wright, S. C. (2001). Ingroup identification as the inclusion of ingroup in the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 585-600.

Turner, J. (1978). Social categorization and social discrimination in the minimal

group paradigm. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 77-98).

London: Academic Press Inc.

Turner, J. C. (1999). Some current issues in research on social identity and self-categorization theories. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 6-34). Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Turner, J. C., & Reynolds, K. J. (2001). The social identity perspective in intergroup relations: Theories, themes, and controversies. In R. J. Brown, & S. Gaertner (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp.133-152). Oxford: Blackwell.

United Nations Security Council. (2014, April 15). *Report of the Secretary-General on the African Union-United Nations hybrid operation in Darfur*. Retrieved July 4, 2014, from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/unamid/reports.shtml>

Vaughan, G. M., & Hogg, M. A. (2014). *Social psychology* (7th ed.). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Australia.

Verkuyten, M. (2005). Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 121-138.

Verkuyten, M., & Hagendoorn, L. (2002). In-group favoritism and self-esteem: The role of identity level and trait valence. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 5, 285-297.

- Verkuyten, M., & Nekuee, S. (1999). Ingroup bias: The effect of self-stereotyping, identification and group threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 411-418.
- Voci, A. (2006). The link between identification and in-group favouritism: Effects of threat to social identity and trust-related emotions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 265-284.
- Whitley, B E., & Kite, M. (2006). *The psychology of prejudice and discrimination*. California: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Williams, D. R., & Rucker, T. D. (2000). Understanding and addressing racial disparities in health care. *Health Care Financing Review*, 21, 75-90.
- Wilson, M. S., & Liu, J. H. (2003). Social dominance orientation and gender: The moderating role of gender identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 187-198.
- Zakaria, F. (2008). *The Post-American world*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Appendix A

Importance to Identity Subscale (Studies 1a-1d, 2a-2f and 3a-3b)

[The subscale items below are modified to assess New Zealanders' importance to identity. We use exactly the same phrasing for all other identities excepting that we substitute New Zealanders for men, women or Northern Irish].

Please answer the questions below with respect to your group identity (i.e., as a New Zealander). Use the scale outlined below to denote how you feel right now, at this moment (even if you have felt differently at other times).

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. Being a New Zealander has very little to do with how I feel about myself. ____
2. Being a New Zealander is an important reflection of who I am. ____
3. Being a New Zealander is unimportant to my sense of who I am. ____
4. Being a New Zealander is an important part of my self-image. ____

Appendix B**Intergroup Discrimination Semantic-Differential Scales (Studies 1a, 1b, 2a and 3a)**

[The task below is modified to assess New Zealanders' discrimination toward Americans. We use exactly the same phrasing for other outgroups, excepting that we substitute Americans for Asians (Study 1b) and men (Study 2a). In addition to rating the outgroup, participants are asked to rate the ingroup on the scales below].

On the whole, how would you rate Americans on the following dimensions:

Competitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Co-operative

Helpful 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Unhelpful

Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Intelligent

Weak 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Strong

Warm 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Cold

Rigid 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Flexible

Unselfish 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Selfish

Manipulative 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Sincere

Fair 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Unfair

Honest 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Dishonest

Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Friendly

Trustworthy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Untrustworthy

Consistent 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Inconsistent

Appendix C**Intergroup Discrimination Semantic-Differential Scales (Studies 1a and 3a)**

[The task below is modified to assess New Zealanders' discrimination toward Americans. In addition to rating the outgroup, participants are asked to rate the ingroup on the scales below].

On the whole, how would you rate Americans on the following dimensions:

Loud 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Soft-spoken

Pushy 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Reticent

Humble 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Arrogant

Confident 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Shy

Aggressive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Non-aggressive

Ignorant 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Well informed

Straight forward 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Hypocritical

Appendix D

Intergroup Discrimination Distribution Matrices (Studies 1c and 1d)

On the following pages are a number of matrices. Each matrix consists of 13 columns. Each column contains two sets of numbers (one set is on top of the other). Imagine that the numbers represent time spent listening (in seconds) to the following noise. Your task is to allocate listening times to two different people. The times on the top row are given to one person. The times on bottom row are given to another person. You can only choose from numbers in the same column.

For example: Imagine that you are presented with the following matrix

36	35	34	33	32	31	30	29	28	27	26	25	24
11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35

The individual to be allocated listening times on the top row is person C from the Women's group.

The individual to be allocated listening times on the bottom row is person D from the Men's group

Time allocated to person C (Women's group) ____

Time allocated to person D (Men's group) ____

Imagine that you are distributing listening times to the members of each group.

There are a number of choices you can make. If for example you decide to

choose the column on the extreme left of the matrix 36

11 this means that person

C (in the Women's group) will spend 36 seconds listening, whilst person D (in

the Men's group) will spend 11 seconds listening.

An alternative would be to choose the column on the extreme right of the

matrix 24

35 This means that person C (in the Women's group) will listen for 24

seconds whilst person D (in the Men's group) will listen for 35 seconds.

Any of the columns may be used - there are no right and wrong answers.

You may now proceed.

18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
42	40	38	36	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person R from the

Men's group.

The individual getting the listening time on the bottom row is person L from the

Women's group.

Time to person R (Men's group) ____

Time to person L (Women's group) ____

18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
42	40	38	36	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person P from the Men's group.

The individual getting the listening time on the bottom row is person I from the Women's group.

Time to person P (Men's group) ____

Time to person I (Women's group) ____

18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
42	40	38	36	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person Y from the Men's group.

The individual getting the listening time on the bottom row is person U from the Women's group.

Time to person Y (Men's group) ____

Time to person U (Women's group) ____

18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
42	40	38	36	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person P from the Men's group.

The individual getting the listening time on the bottom row is person A from the Women's group.

Time to person P (Men's group) ____

Time to person A (Women's group) ____

18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
42	40	38	36	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person H from the Men's group.

The individual getting the listening time on the bottom row is person Y from the Women's group.

Time to person H (Men's group) ____

Time to person Y (Women's group) ____

18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38	40	42
42	40	38	36	34	32	30	28	26	24	22	20	18

The individual getting the listening time on the top row is person F from the Men's group.

The individual getting the listening time on the bottom row is person D from the Women's group.

Time to person F (Men's group) ____

Time to person D (Women's group) ____

Appendix E**Intergroup Discrimination Money Allocation Task (Study 2b)**

Imagine that you had a total of 100 dollars to distribute between the Men's and Women's groups. You can give as much or as little as you want to each group, however you must divide the whole 100 dollars. How much would you give to each group?

The Men's group ____

The Women's group ____

Appendix F**Intergroup Discrimination Removal of Positive Resources Task (Study 2c)**

Imagine that you are the manager in a factory. Your workforce is comprised of 200 people. One hundred are Polish immigrants. One hundred are people from Northern Ireland. 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 Polish group? ____

How many would you sack from the Northern Irish group? ____

Appendix G**Intergroup Discrimination Removal of Negative Resources Task (Study 2d)**

Imagine that you are the manager in a factory, which has just had to sack 200 people. One hundred are Polish immigrants. One hundred are people from Northern Ireland. You have just found out that you can give 100 people their jobs back. You can give jobs to as many people from either group as you want – but you must rehire 100 people all together.

How many would you rehire from the Polish group? ____

How many would you rehire from the Northern Irish group? ____

Appendix H**Intergroup Discrimination White Noise Allocation Task (Studies 2e, 2f and 3b experimental condition)**

[The task below is modified to assess New Zealanders' discrimination toward Asians. We use exactly the same phrasing for other groups, excepting that we substitute Asians for Americans (Study 2f) and New Zealanders for women and Asians for men (Study 3b)].

Imagine that you had a total of 100 seconds of noise (i.e., the noise you heard earlier) to distribute between the New Zealand and Asian groups. You can give as much or as little as you want to each group, however you must divide the whole 100 seconds. How much would you give to each group?

The Asian group ____

The New Zealand group ____

Appendix I**Intergroup Discrimination White Noise Allocation Task (Study 3b control conditions)****Control condition 1.**

Imagine that you had a total of 100 seconds of noise (i.e., the noise you heard earlier) to distribute between the women's and men's groups. You can give as much or as little as you want to each group, however you must give each group the same amount and you cannot exceed 100 seconds. How much would you give to?

The men's group ____

The women's group ____

Control condition 2.

Imagine that you had a total of 100 seconds of noise (i.e., the noise you heard earlier) to distribute to women. You can give as much or as little as you want to each member in the group, however you cannot exceed 100 seconds. How much would you give to?

Person A (in the women's) group ____

Person B (in the women's group) ____

Control condition 3.

Imagine that you had a total of 100 seconds of noise (i.e., the noise you heard earlier) to distribute to men. You can give as much or as little as you want to each member in the group, however you cannot exceed 100 seconds. How much would you give to?

Person A (in the men's) group ____

Person B (in the men's group) ____

Control condition 4.

Imagine that you had a total of 100 seconds of noise (i.e., the noise you heard earlier) to distribute between two groups. You can give as much or as little as you want to each group, however you cannot exceed 100 seconds. How much would you give to?

Person A ____

Person B ____

Appendix J**General Self-Esteem Subscale of the Self-Description Questionnaire III****(Study 2a)**

This is a chance for you to consider how you think and feel about yourself. This is not a test – there are no right or wrong answers, and everyone will have different responses. The purpose of these questions is to determine how people feel about themselves and what characteristics are most important to how people feel about themselves.

On the following page are a series of statements that are more or less true (or more or less false) descriptions of you. Please use the eight-point response scale outlined below to indicate how true (or false) each item is as a description of you by placing the appropriate number in the space provided.

Respond to the items as you now feel even if you felt differently at some other time in your life. Try to avoid leaving any items blank. Thank you.

1 = definitely false

2 = false

3 = mostly false

4 = more false than true

5 = more true than false

6 = mostly true

7 = true

8 = definitely true

1. Overall, I have a lot of respect for myself. ____
2. Overall, I lack self-confidence. ____
3. Overall, I am pretty accepting of myself. ____
4. Overall, I don't have much respect for myself. ____
5. Overall, I have a lot of self-confidence. ____
6. Overall, I have a very good self-concept. ____
7. Overall, nothing that I do is very important. ____
8. Overall, I have pretty positive feelings about myself. ____
9. Overall, I have a very poor self-concept. ____
10. Overall, I have pretty negative feelings about myself. ____
11. Overall, I do lots of things that are important. ____
12. Overall, I am not very accepting of myself. ____

Appendix K**Private Collective Self-Esteem Subscale (Study 2a)**

Please answer the questions below with respect to your group identity (i.e., as a woman). Use the scale outlined below to denote how you feel right now, at this moment (even if you have felt differently at other times).

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. I often regret that I am a woman. ____

2. In general, I am glad to be a woman. ____

3. I often feel that being a woman is not worthwhile. ____

4. I feel good about being a woman. ____

Appendix L**Public Collective Self-Esteem Subscale (Study 2b)**

Please answer the questions below with respect to your group identity (i.e., as a man). Use the scale outlined below to denote how you feel right now, at this moment (even if you have felt differently at other times).

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. Men are valued by women. ____

2. Most women consider men to be more effective than women. ____

3. In general, women respect men. ____

4. Others think that men are unworthy. ____

Appendix M**Membership Collective Self-Esteem Subscale (Study 2b)**

Please answer the questions below with respect to your group identity (i.e., as a man). Use the scale outlined below to denote how you feel right now, at this moment (even if you have felt differently at other times).

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. I am a worthy man. ____

2. I feel that I don't have much to offer other men. ____

3. I am cooperative with other men. ____

4. I often feel that I'm a useless man. ____

Appendix N**Perceived Intergroup Conflict Scale (Study 2c)**

People living in Northern Ireland can define themselves in any number of ways (e.g., Irish, Northern Irish, British). In the following study we would like you to think of yourself as a person who belongs to the Northern Irish group. Please respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about the Northern Irish group right now (that is even if you have felt differently at other times). Use the scale below to record your answers in the space provided.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. Do the goals of Polish people conflict with the goals of Northern Irish people?

2. Northern Irish people compete with Polish Immigrants for jobs. ___

Appendix O**Quality of Identity Scale (Study 2c)**

People living in Northern Ireland can define themselves in any number of ways (e.g., Irish, Northern Irish, British). In the following study we would like you to think of yourself as a person who belongs to the Northern Irish group. Please respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about the Northern Irish group right now (that is even if you have felt differently at other times). Use the scale below to record your answers in the space provided.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. I like being Northern Irish. ____

2. I am at ease being a Northern Irish person. ____

3. I am secure being a Northern Irish person. ____

Appendix P**Group Identity Scale (Study 2d)**

People living in Northern Ireland can define themselves in any number of ways (e.g., Irish, Northern Irish, British). In the following study we would like you to think of yourself as a person who belongs to the Northern Irish group. Please respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about the Northern Irish group right now (that is even if you have felt differently at other times). Use the scale below to record your answers in the space provided.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. I am a person who considers the Northern Irish group important. ____

2. I am a person who identifies with the Northern Irish group. ____

3. I am a person who feels strong ties with the Northern Irish group. ____

4. I am a person who is glad to belong to the Northern Irish group. ____

5. I am a person who makes excuses for belonging to the Northern Irish group.

6. I am a person who has a lot in common with the Northern Irish group. ____

7. I am a person who tries to hide belonging to the Northern Irish group. ____

8. I am a person who feels held back by the Northern Irish group. ____

9. I am a person who is annoyed to say I'm a member of the Northern Irish group. ____

10. I am a person who criticizes the Northern Irish group. ____

Appendix Q

Trait Self-Esteem Scale (Study 2d)

Please respond to the following statement. Use the scale below to record your answer in the space provided.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. Overall, I have high self-esteem. ____

Appendix R**Affective Commitment Scale (Study 2e)**

Please answer the questions below with respect to your national identity (i.e., as a New Zealander). Use the scale outlined below to denote how you feel right now at this moment (even if you have felt differently at other times).

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. I would like to continue working with the New Zealand group. ____

2. I dislike being a member of the New Zealand group. ____

3. I would rather belong to the Asian group. ____

Appendix S**Categorisation Scale (Study 2e)**

Please answer the questions below with respect to your national identity (i.e., as a New Zealander). Use the scale outlined below to denote how you feel right now at this moment (even if you have felt differently at other times).

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = disagree somewhat

4 = neutral

5 = agree somewhat

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

1. I identify with other members of the New Zealand group. ____

2. I am like other members of the New Zealand group. ____

3. The New Zealand group is an important reflection of who I am. ____

Appendix T**Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Study 2f)**

Please use the nine-point response scale outlined below to indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

1-very strongly disagree

2-strongly disagree

3-moderately disagree

4- slightly disagree

5-neutral

6-slightly agree

7-moderately agree

8-strongly agree

9-very strongly agree

1. This country would be better off if inferior groups stayed in their place. ____

2. Equality is a good idea. ____

3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were. ____

4. Increased social equality is a good idea. ____

5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.

6. Some people are just inferior to others. ____

7. To get ahead in life it is sometimes necessary to step on others. ____

8. Increased economic equality is a good idea. ____
9. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country. ____
10. We should try and treat one another as equals as much as possible. ____
11. In an ideal world all nations would be equal. ____
12. As a country's wealth increases, more of its resources should be channelled to the poor. ____
13. It's important that we treat other countries as equals. ____
14. Some people are just more deserving than others. ____

Appendix U**Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Study 2f)**

Please use the nine-point response scale outlined below to indicate the extent to which you either agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

1 = very strongly disagree

2 = strongly disagree

3 = moderately disagree

4 = slightly disagree

5 = neutral

6 = slightly agree

7 = moderately agree

8 = strongly agree

9 = very strongly agree

1. The way things are going in this country, it's going to take a lot of "strong medicine" to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals and perverts. ____

2. It's wonderful that people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to "do their own thing". ____

3. It's always better to trust the judgement of the proper authorities than to listen to those who are trying to create doubts in people's minds. ____

4. It would be better for everyone if the authorities censored magazines and movies. ____

5. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established church are no doubt as good as those who attend church regularly. ____

6. Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders and the way that things are supposed to be done. ____

7. In these troubled times laws have to be reinforced without mercy, especially when dealing with agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up. ____

8. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old forms of traditional religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral. ____

9. It may be considered old fashioned by some, but having a decent respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and, especially a lady. ____

10. One reason why we have so many troublemakers nowadays is that people have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly. ____

11. The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority, the better. ____

12. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse. ____

13. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn. ____

14. Free speech means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government. ____

15. Rules about being "well mannered" and respectable are chains from the past which we should question thoroughly before accepting. ____

16. Once our government and leaders condemn the dangerous elements in society, it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stamp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within. ____

17. In the final analysis the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders, generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protesters don't know what they are talking about. ____
18. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants. ____
19. The facts on crime and sexual immorality show we have to crack down harder on deviants and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order. ____
20. There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual. ____
21. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps. ____
22. If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is the parents' duty to get them back to the normal way. ____
23. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas but when they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down. ____
24. The self-righteous forces of law and order threaten freedom. ____
25. Everyone has the right to his/her own lifestyle, religious beliefs and disbeliefs and sexual preferences so long as it does not hurt others. ____
26. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behaviour are just customs which are not necessarily better or holier than those which other people follow. ____
27. The real keys to the good life are obedience and discipline. ____
28. It's best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind. ____
29. Our country will be better if we honour the ways of our parents, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the rotten apples who are spoiling everything. ____

30. Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents' ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticise the customs and traditions of our society. ____