Week 4: Managing ethnic and religious difference

Today:
In this week's lecture:
• Quick overview of theories of intergroup conflict and harm
Approaches to Diversity:
• Contact theory of prejudice reduction
• Assimilation v/ multiculturalism
• Acculturation
• Peace Psychology
• Positive Psychology
Theories of intergroup conflict and harm

Theories of Generalised Prejudice
- Frustration-Aggression
- Personality: Social dominance orientation and RWA

Theories of Intergroup Relations
- Realistic Conflict
- Social identity theory

Frustration aggression theory

Proposed by Dollard et al. (1939)
“the occurrence of aggressive behaviour always presupposes the existence of frustration and, contrariwise, the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression”.
Hovland and Sears (1940) used real-world data to test the notion that frustration is displaced upon weaker scapegoats.
Hovland & Sears (1940)

Hovland and Sears (1940) used real-world data to test the notion that frustration is displaced upon weaker scapegoats.

They examined the number of lynchings of Black men in 14 Southern states of the US, and correlated it with an index of economic prosperity in the South – the price of cotton.

Consistent with frustration-aggression principles, they found a strong negative correlation between the price of cotton and the number of lynchings ($r = -.72$).

Yeah but ...

- Frustrations may trigger some kinds of explosive / spontaneous violence
- But Australians still get frustrated in 2011, but there’s been no lynching
- Why lash out in one way in one historical context vs another?
- Lots of lynching was planned not outbursts
- Even in the US, not everyone was a lycner
Some **people** learn prejudice is ok…

**Right-wing Authoritarianism** (faith in authority, incl church, and belief obedience is a virtue; Altemeyer, Adorno) and **social dominance orientation** (hierarchical, competitive values vs. Egalitarianism; Sidanius, Pratto) are two individual difference variables that are linked to many different kinds of prejudice.

In Australia:
- RWA linked to unfavourable attitudes to Asian Australians (e.g., Johnston, Terry, & Louis, 2005)
- RWA and SDO linked to unfavourable attitudes to Asylum seekers (e.g., Nickerson & Louis, 2009)

.... Etc!
Some people learn prejudice is ok...
Data from 1st year psych undergrads at UQ in 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality factor</th>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>SDO</th>
<th>Positivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexuals</td>
<td>-.55*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealanders</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yeah but ...

- It is consistently true that some people are more prejudiced against a range of groups than others
- But should we focus on bigoted individuals or on social contexts?
  - If authoritaries were tolerant, RWA people would be more tolerant
  - If groups were seen as allies instead of threats, higher SDO would be linked to more favourable attitudes
- Social prejudices ebb and flow whereas the people are the same
Realistic conflict theory

Sherif argued that intergroup aggression is caused primarily by competition for scarce resources.

According to realistic conflict theory, it is when one group’s interests are in conflict with another group’s interests that intergroup relations deteriorate.
SHERIF’S BOY CAMP STUDIES

Phase 1
Children arrive at camp and get to know each other

Phase 2
Camp is divided into two groups isolated from each other

Phase 3
The groups are brought together to engage in organized intergroup competitions. At this point, nearly all the organized games degenerated into intergroup hostility that generalized into other situations.

Typically, winning teams showed more bias than losing teams (problematic finding for frustration-aggression theorists).

How can intergroup relations be improved?

According to Sherif’s realistic conflict theory, intergroup relations can be improved by turning a conflictual relationship into one where each group needs the other to achieve shared goals (“positive interdependence”)

Phase 4 of camp studies
The two groups were faced with situations in which they had to work together to achieve a common goal. At this phase, levels of intergroup hostility were reduced or eliminated.
External threat requiring groups to cooperate

STAGE 4

STAGE 3
Social identity theory

In part, SIT was created in response to the so-called “minimal group studies”, that showed bias could occur in the absence of frustration, relative deprivation, or material concerns.

Minimal group paradigm

Participants enter the lab, and are randomly separated into two categories. The categories are trivial (Klee lovers / Kandinsky lovers) or even meaningless (A / B).

They are then asked to allocate points to members of the two categories.

The points carry no real-world significance (you can’t buy anything with them) and members of the two categories never meet or interact.
Decide for each of the point combinations below how much you would like to give to members of the Klee and Kandinsky group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Klee 12</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kandinsky 03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most people show fairness, *BUT* …

Contrary to expectations, a significant portion of participants circle pairs of numbers that maximized ingroup profit, and some even circled numbers that maximized the difference between the ingroup and the outgroup (ingroup bias).

This suggests that categorization alone is enough to create intergroup biases. How can we explain this?
**Categorization**

According to SIT, intergroup biases emerge as a function of two processes: *categorization* and *comparison*.

The tendency to categorize people into ingroup and outgroups (e.g., men, women) is an inevitable human process; it helps reduce the complexity of the social world, and provides sense and order.

In the case of social categories, it can also provide a sense of meaning and self-definition (helps answer the question: *who am I?*)

**Consequences of categorization**

According to Tajfel (1959), one consequence of social categorization is that the differences within categories are perceptually minimized (assimilation) and the differences between categories are maximized (accentuation).
**Tajfel & Wilkes (1963)**

Participants were shown 6 vertical lines, and were asked to estimate the length of the middle two lines.
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The estimated difference in lengths between the two lines was exaggerated when the shorter lines were labeled “A” and the longer lines were labeled “B” (accentuation).

---

**Doise et al. (1978)**

Children were asked to form personality impressions on the basis of photos.

All children rated 3 boys and then 3 girls, but only half of them were told in advance that the sequence would go like that.

When the gender of the photos was made salient from the start, people used more different traits to describe the male and female photos (accentuation) and more similar traits were used to describe the photos of the same gender (assimilation).
Yeah but ...

- Can we create world peace by embracing one common identity?
  - Some people think so! (See later)
- Why are some categories salient (Secular / Fundamentalist; Muslim / Christian) while others are not (Protestant / Catholic)?

Creating Harmony

- Eliminating frustration?
- Reducing authoritarian beliefs and promoting egalitarianism?
- Cooperating to achieve mutual goals?
- Inclusive identities vs exclusionary ones?
- And ...
Reducing prejudice - contact

In 1954, US Supreme Court ruled against having segregated schools of Blacks and Whites, arguing that continued separation helped perpetuate prejudice and intolerance.

The implication of this argument was that contact between members of ethnic groups is a tool that can be used to reduce prejudice.

This theme was also articulated by Allport (1954) who recommended contact as a key method of reducing prejudice between ethnic groups.

Reducing prejudice - contact

BUT ... Allport specified a number of conditions that needed to be in place for contact to work.

- Contact should be prolonged and cooperative rather than casual and incidental (see also Sherif’s focus on cooperative interdependence)
- There should be a framework of institutional support for integration (e.g., Race Relations Tribunals)
- The contact should involve tasks and contexts where groups feel of equal power and status.
Interview between a black social psychologist and Eugene de Kock (“prime evil”) – who led death squads in South Africa with a mission to assassinate anti-apartheid rebels.

“I don't see you as a black person,” de Kock said when I asked him about the significance of race for him. He is not a racist, he claims, and justifies this assertion by pointing out … that he, Eugene de Kock, had worked with blacks all his life: “All my men were black.” He obviously didn’t think it significant that all of these relationships were with blacks who were his subordinates, and not just that but guerrillas who had been captured and turned to work for the apartheid cause”

Source: “A human being died that night”

The data ...

A meta-analysis of hundreds of studies on the contact hypothesis has revealed moderate support for the theory … (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006)

• The greater the contact, the lower the prejudice ($r = -.215$)
• The positive effects of contact appear to be generalized to the wider outgroup
• The effects of contact on prejudice are stronger (a) when prejudice is defined on affective dimensions, and (b) when Allport’s conditions for contact are adhered to.
Qualifications to power of contact and cooperative goals

(1) The relationship is quite weak, when one considers that the correlation is probably inflated by reverse causation.

Qualifications to power of contact and cooperative goals

(2) Contact might be destructive if it is handled insensitively, if it reinforces power/status differences, or if it exposes people to unpalatable truths about the outgroup.
Qualifications to power of contact and cooperative goals

(3) Positive effects of cooperation might be limited to situations in which the outcome of the cooperation was successful.

Worchel et al., 1977
Qualifications to power of contact and cooperative goals

(4) Effects of contact more likely to be generalized to the wider outgroup when the experience is negative than when it is positive …

Why does contact work? Decategorization hypothesis

The decategorization hypothesis argues that contact forces people to look beyond category boundaries and to get to know each other as individuals. Some experimental evidence for this in minimal group settings, and argument also has intuitive appeal.
Personal and social identities

According to SIT, the self comprises two aspects:

- your personal identity (idiosyncratic attitudes, behaviours and memories that distinguish you from other individuals), &

- your social identity (group-based attitudes, behaviours and memories that distinguish your group from other groups).

Social comparison

If the social category is an important part of your self-concept (i.e., you identify strongly with a particular group) then it stands to reason that the successes of your group boost your self-esteem, and the failures of your group threaten your self-esteem.

Working on the assumption that people typically want to feel good about themselves, then for self-esteem reasons we are motivated to think of our groups as being as good as – if not better than – other groups.

This motivation for positive distinctiveness is assumed to underpin many forms of ingroup bias.
Problems with decategorization hypothesis

Is it really feasible – or even desirable – that people see each other *entirely* as individuals.
Model often advocated by members of dominant groups, but minority group members not so keen on “colour-blind” approach.
Also, if people don’t label each other as group members, how can the positive effects of contact be generalized outside the contact environment?

Why does contact work? Common ingroup identity model

According to the common ingroup identity model (CIIM), contact allows people to see beyond subgroup differences and to see each other as one big happy group.
Again, some experimental evidence for this in minimal group settings.
**Gaertner et al., 1989, 1990**

*Stage 1 (form two groups)*

Two ad hoc groups of 3 people were formed in the laboratory. Each group was given a name and asked to perform the winter survival task.

![Diagram of two groups with Xs and Ys]

*Stage 2 (experimental manipulation)*

- retain two group categorization (control)
  ![Diagram of two groups with Xs and Ys]

- OR
  make everyone feel like one new group (common ingroup condition)
  ![Diagram of three groups with Zs]

- OR
  make everyone feel like individuals (decategorization condition)
Participants then were asked to rate how much they liked the other 5 people in the session.

Results

Gaertner and colleagues found that there were more harmonious relations in the one-group and individual conditions than in the control condition. Moreover, the most positive ratings of the outgroup were in the common ingroup condition (one big happy group).

Conclusion?

That the aim of intergroup contact should be to try to eclipse or ignore the group boundaries (whether they be boundaries based on race, gender, organizational identity etc).

Problems with CIIM

Could people react negatively to the blurring of group boundaries that sometimes happens when you impose superordinate groups?
Distinctiveness threat

According to social identity theory, group members strive to feel distinct from relevant outgroups. This leads to the bold (and rather counter-intuitive) prediction that intergroup biases will increase the more similar the ingroup and the outgroup become.

Evidence for distinctiveness threat …

Roccas and Schwartz (1993) made school students feel as though their school was either moderately similar, highly similar, or very highly similar to another school. They found that the amount of ingroup bias increased as perceived similarity increased.
Models of contact: the dual identity model

In response to this, a variant of the common ingroup identity model emerged which argues that it’s important to make people aware of what they share at the superordinate level, but people should be allowed to maintain their original subgroup identities as well (the dual identity model).

This model has two advantages:

(1) It minimizes distinctiveness threat among subgroup members (note that Gaertner et al. used ad hoc groups, so distinctiveness threat unlikely to come into play)

(2) It means that any attitude change that is experienced during the contact situation is more likely to be generalized outside the contact environment

Support for dual identity model

Deschamps & Brown (1983) had maths-science students and arts students cooperate to design a magazine article.

Interestingly, the groups showed more positivity toward each other when they each were given specific but unique roles to play (e.g., arts people do the pictures, maths-science people do the words).

Attempts to mix up the groups by having both groups cooperate on the same task appeared to backfire.
Support for dual identity model

Hornsey & Hogg (2000) asked maths-science and social science people to put forward suggestions for what should be included in Roma St Parklands – we manipulated how we categorized them during that task across 4 conditions.

CONDITION 1
individual condition
“we’re interested in you as an individual”

CONDITION 2
two groups condition
“we’re interested in comparing the responses of maths-science and social science students”

CONDITION 3
one-group condition (analogous to CIIM)
“we’re interested in comparing the responses of university students and town planners”

CONDITION 4
dual identity condition (a SIT approach)
“we’re interested in comparing the responses of maths-science and social science students, as well as comparing uni students to town planners”
Hornsey & Hogg (2000)

We then collected a number of measures of ingroup bias. We found most bias in the 1-group condition, and the least bias was found when subgroup and superordinate identities were acknowledged at the same time (dual identity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>individual</th>
<th>2-groups</th>
<th>1-group</th>
<th>dual identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assimilation

The CIIM is essentially the social psychological analogue of the political model of assimilation.

Underlying philosophies of assimilation

- By getting people to focus entirely on their shared superordinate membership, subgroup identities will “melt away”
- Ethnic identification is an immature stage of a nation’s development which needs to be overcome
- cultural differences create the potential for hostility: i.e., homogenization = harmony
Billy Snedden – Minister for Immigration, 1969

“We must have a single culture. If immigration implied multi-culture activities within Australian society, then it was not the type Australia wanted. I am quite determined we should have a monoculture.”

Melting-pot assimilation

Assumption that assimilation will happen naturally through extensive intergroup contact. Eventually old identities will fuse together into a new homogeneous identity e.g., American, Australian

“Into the melting pot with you all - God is creating the American!” (Zangwill, 1909)
Minority group assimilation

Assumption that minority groups (e.g., immigrants, indigenous people) should assimilate to the dominant culture.
Assimilation should be encouraged by training or schooling minority ethnic groups to let go of their old identities.

Minority group assimilation in Australia

1st conference of state and territory aboriginal protectors (1937)
1st resolution: “This conference believes that the destiny of the natives of aboriginal origin ... lies in their ultimate absorption by the people of the Commonwealth and it recommends that all efforts be directed toward this end.”
Voices from the “stolen generation”

“We were all happy together, us kids. We had two very wonderful old ladies that looked after us. It wasn't like an institution really. It was just a big happy family. Y’know they gave us good teaching, they encouraged us to be no different to anybody else. We went to the school, public school. There was no difference between white and black.”

*South Australian woman removed with her brother at 5 years in the 1930s*

**Voices from the “stolen generation”**

“I was very fortunate that when I was removed, I was with very loving and caring parents. My foster mother used to take me and my sister to town. Mum used to always walk through Victoria Square and say to us, ‘Let’s see if any of these are your uncles’. My sister and I used to get real ashamed. I used to go home and cry because I used to get so frightened and could never understand why my mum would do this to us, when it made us so upset. Only when I was near 29 did I realize why … I know my foster parents were the type of people that always understood I needed to understand my roots, who I was, where I was born, who my parents were and my identity … I remember one day I went home to my foster father and stated that I’d heard that my natural father was a drunk. My foster father told me you shouldn’t listen to other people: ‘You judge him for yourself, taking into account the tragedy that someday you will understand.’

*South Australian woman fostered at 4 years in the 1940s*
“y’know, I can remember we used to speak lingo. [In the home] they used to tell us not to talk that language, that it’s the devil’s language. And they’d wash our mouths with soap. We sorta had to sit down with Bible language all the time. So it sorta wiped out all the language that we knew”

South Australian woman taken from her parents with her 3 sisters when the family came into town to collect stores

“Aboriginal people weren’t allowed to speak their language while white people were around ... Aboriginal customs like initiation were not allowed. We could not leave Cherbourg to go to Aboriginal traditional festivals. We could have a corroboree if the Protector issues a permit. I never had a chance to learn about my traditional and customary way of life.”

Queensland woman removed in 1940s

“I was definitely not told that I was Aboriginal. What the Sisters told us was that we had to be white. It was drummed into our heads that we were white. It didn’t matter what shade you were. We thought we were white. They said you can’t talk to them coloured people because you’re white.

NSW man removed from home as infant in 1940s
Voices from the “stolen generation”

“My mum had written letters to us that were never forwarded to us. Early when we were taken she used to go into the State Children’s Department in Townsville with cards and things like that. They were never forwarded on to us.”

Queensland woman removed and fostered at 6 years of age in 1950s

Voices from the “stolen generation”

“That was one way they kept us away from our families. They'd turn around and say to you ‘See they don’t care about you’. Later on, when I left the home, I asked my mother ‘How come you didn't write letters?’ She said ‘But we did’. I said ‘Well, we never got them’. We were all rostered to do work and one of the girls was doing Matron’s office, and there was all these letters that the girls had written back to the parents and family – the answers were all in the garbage bin. That was one way they stopped us keeping in contact with our families. Then they had the hide to turn around and say ‘They don't love you. They don't care about you’.”

NSW woman removed at 2 years of age in 1940s
Voices from the “stolen generation”

“I remember this woman saying to me, ‘Your mother's dead, you've got no mother now. That's why you're here with us’. Then about 2 years after that my mother and my mother’s sister all came to The Bungalow but they weren’t allowed to visit us because they were black. They had to sneak around on to the hills. Each mother was picking out which they think was their children. And the other girl said, ‘Your mother up there’. And because they told me she was dead, I said ‘No, that’s not my mother. I haven’t got a black mother’.”

*NT woman removed at 5 years of age in 1930s*

Voices from the “stolen generation”

“I grew up sadly not knowing one Aboriginal person and the view that was given to me was one of fear towards (my) people. I was told not to have anything to do with them as they were dirty, lived in shabby conditions and, of course, drank to excess. Not once was I told that I was of Aboriginal descent. I was told that with my features I was from some Island and they (foster family) knew nothing of my family or the circumstances.”

*South Australian woman removed at 18 months of age in 1960s*

“All the teachings that we received from our (foster) family when we were little, that black people were bad ... I wanted my skin to be white”

*Victorian woman fostered at 10 years of age in 1960s*
Voices from the “stolen generation”

“When I was 14 years old and going to these foster people, I remember the welfare officer sitting down and they were having a cup of tea and talking about how they were hoping our race would die out. And that I was fair enough, I was a half-caste and I would automatically live with a white person and get married. Because the system would make sure that no-one would marry an Aborigine person anyhow. And then my children would automatically be fairer, quarter-caste, and then the next generation would be white and we would be bred out. I remember thinking ‘That’s a good idea, because all the Aborigines are poor’.”

NSW woman removed as a baby in 1940s

Stolen Generations today

• Many parents still grieving children taken in the 1960s and 70s
• Many children and grandchildren still disconnected from families of origin

Linkup services available
PROBLEMS WITH ASSIMILATION

- again, it may not be realistic to expect people to let go of their group memberships
- groups with low status or power risk being appropriated and extinguished – in other words the weak lose and the strong win.
- forced assimilation can be psychologically painful for members of minority groups; harm to well-being and functioning
- risk that distinctiveness threat will create reactive intergroup bias (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000)

“Assimilation to a new culture, especially when so speeded up, seems very like acquiring a new personality, particularly if one’s old personality has consisted largely of layer upon layer of stereotyped habits and attitudes acquired from the old culture. The immigrant who feels that he must give up this old personality to obtain a new one may feel that he is losing the last thing in the world that is really his. As the change starts to take place, the immigrant may feel very empty, with no roots, no possessions, not even intangible ones.”
Voices from the “stolen generation”

“It’s like a hole in your heart that can never heal”
*Victorian man*

“Actually what you see in a lot of us is the shell, and I believe as an Aboriginal person that everything is inside me to heal me if I know how to use it, if I know how to maintain it, if I know how to bring it out and use it. But sometimes the past is just too hard to look at.”
*Sth Australian woman*

MULTICULTURALISM

(essentially the political analogue of the dual identity model)
MULTICULTURALISM

Psychological assumptions:

- ethnic identity is fundamental to self-concept: “Man is a thinking and sensitive being: severing him from his roots could destroy an aspect of his personality and deprive society of some of the values he can bring to it” (Government of Canada, 1969)

- security of identity is a precondition for tolerance - attempts to eclipse valued identities will result in more aggressive intergroup behaviour

- difference is not inconsistent with unity (“Unity in diversity”, “Celebration of difference”)

“National unity, if it is to mean anything in the deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one’s own individual identity; out of this can grow respect for that of others and a willingness to share ideas, attitudes and assumptions. A vigorous policy of multiculturalism will help create this initial confidence. Canadian identity will not be undermined by multiculturalism. Indeed, we believe that cultural pluralism is the very essence of Canadian identity”

- Government of Canada, 1971

“A cohesive and united society, not a divided multicultural society, is what is needed”

One Nation, 1998
Maintenance of heritage culture

Relationships sought among groups

Integration  Assimilation  Marginalization  Separation

ACCULTURATION

(how do immigrants fit into their host culture?)
Separation: “sticking together” ... ghettoization

“All these people come out here and fester in their little cocoons. They've got no idea about becoming Australians. They just want to grab the golden orange off the tree. We must be the greatest suckers on earth.”

Bruce Ruxton, RSL President

Separation: “sticking together” ... ghettoization

Integration: maintaining cultural heritage while still supporting and participating in the culture of the host country

Assimilation: completely revoking cultural heritage and adopting the values and cultures of the host country

Marginalization: Retreat from all types of cultural identification ... individualization.
People look favourably upon the idea of retaining ethnic identities – but:

- assimilation to new culture tends to develop over time
- greater pressure to assimilate in public
- greater pressure to assimilate if you are a member of a visible minority
- assimilation may occur more readily on some dimensions than others
- freedom of expressing and maintaining heritage culture is dependent on migrants abiding by mutual civic obligations. All Australians are expected to show loyalty to basic structures such as the constitution, parliamentary democracy, freedom of speech and religion, English as the national language, and the rule of law (Department of Multicultural Affairs, 2003).

Creating Harmony

- Contact
  - Positive, equal status
  - Recognition of the individual
  - But recognition of the group member
- Protected dual (group) identities
  - Both groups willing to accept integration
  - Both groups’ heritage protected
  - Superordinate group values consensually accepted by both (vs one-sided)
  - Cooperation achieving mutual goals
Next week:
• Prejudice – Guest lecture by Michelle Nesic

Tutes:
• This week: Experimental design, ethics, and more on the intro
• Next week: The method section

Week 7:
• I return to lecture
• There are no tutes, but there will be optional meetings