Social Enhancement Strategies in Women's Career Development:
Identity Dynamics and Social Representations.

Konstantina Mavridi

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD

Department of Psychology
University of Surrey
1996
ABSTRACT

The thesis focuses on women’s social enhancement strategies (individual mobility, collective/social change) in relation to occupational segregation by gender. Social Identity Theory’s model of social enhancement strategies as reactions depending on the perception of the structure of specific intergroup situations is criticised. Contemporary social representations of social enhancement action, creating general individual preferences for the strategies and identity dynamics such as self-efficacy, are examined as predictors of action, within an alternative theoretical perspective on the basis of Social Representations Theory and its integration with Identity Processes Theory. A model of action (bringing together social representational and identity dynamics) is examined in relation to specific occupational contexts (Police Force/Nursing Care) within which discrimination against women is perceived or hypothesised. The model is tested on the basis of the responses of women trainees in those fields. In the case of perceived workplace discrimination against women, the model accounts for the 71% and the 91% and 69% of the variance in preferences for collective/social change strategy and individual mobility actions respectively. The multiple regression analyses show that social representations of social enhancement strategies and personal self-efficacy overwrite the effects of the perceived structure (permeability, legitimacy, stability) of the specific intergroup situation upon which SIT bases its model of action. In general, the findings support an interpretation of individual mobility and collective/social change strategies in terms of social representational fields created on the basis of social ideological belief-systems and/or systems of practices and general identity dynamics, rather than in terms of automatic personal self-esteem enhancement reactions to ingroup status inequality, as suggested by SIT.
(c) Konstantina Mavridi 1996
To Christopher, my parents and my brother

who have supported me through out this experience…
THE STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

(EXTENDED ABSTRACT)

The empirical interest of the thesis focuses on women’s social enhancement action in relation to the occupational segregation by gender which induces career discrepancies between working women and men. More specifically, the thesis examines within a social psychological perspective, the factors that underlie choice of type of social enhancement strategy (individual mobility or collective/social change strategies) in case of discrimination against women in various occupational contexts.

In relation to theoretical social psychological models of action, Social Identity Theory’s (SIT) model of choice of social enhancement strategy in case of low-status group membership (which is based on the perceived structure of the intergroup status-relationships) is considered and criticised. An alternative explanation of action is suggested on the basis of the social representations concerned with the social enhancement strategies as well as general identity dynamics such as self-efficacy. Eventually, a tentative model, based on the assumptions of this alternative explanation, is tested in cases of perceived or hypothetical discrimination against women in gender atypical and typical occupations.

In the first introductory chapter of this thesis (Chapter One), the empirical starting point and the theoretical considerations are more analytically presented. The second chapter (Chapter Two) of this thesis critically explores the assumptions of and research within SIT, firstly in relation to the more general aspects of the theory and
secondly with reference to SIT's model of social enhancement strategies. In relation to these criticisms, evidence for the involvement of social representations in group/social identity-related behaviour are considered.

In order to achieve an integrative approach to social enhancement action, Chapter Three focuses on Social Representations Theory (SRT) and the benefits from a consideration of identity dynamics on the basis of an integration with Identity Processes Theory (IPT). Social Representations Theory and the notion of social representations are extensively discussed. In the framework of the integrative approach, the role of identity dynamics such as those produced by group memberships (social identities), as well as personality traits and self-concept dynamics is discussed in relation to the exposure to, acceptance and use of social representations.

Within this integrative approach, it is argued that the social enhancement strategies rely on general individual preferences for the strategies which are developed within social representational fields and in relation to relevant social ideological belief-systems. In relation to this assumption, Chapter Four empirically investigates the operation of individual preferences for social enhancement strategies as the individuals’ general positions within social representational fields of individualism and collectivism.

The remaining of the chapters focus on women's social enhancement action in relation to occupational contexts segregated by gender, such as the police force and the nursing/ midwifery profession. More specifically, Chapter Five, in the frame of a
general introduction to the empirical studies that will be subsequently presented, focuses on specific assumptions for the role of the dynamics suggested within the integrative theoretical framework (i.e. general individual preferences for the social enhancement strategies and self-efficacy). The general method followed in the subsequent series of empirical studies and some preliminary results (e.g. comparisons between the samples) are also presented in Chapter Five.

Chapter Six is concerned with the testing of a model for women’s action (based on the suggested assumptions) in the case of women that perceive discrimination against women in the police profession. Chapter Seven deals with the testing of the model in case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession among the women who do not actually perceive such a discrimination. These results are discussed in comparison with those concerned with women’s coping action in actually perceived discrimination against women in the police profession. Chapter Eight presents the testing of the model in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession.

Finally, in Chapter Nine, the implications of the findings of the empirical studies are separately discussed in relation to SIT and to SRT and the integrative approach is assessed. Some implications of the findings for policies concerned with women’s social enhancement action at the workplace are also considered.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS: EMPIRICAL FOCUS AND THEORETICAL APPROACHES.

The thesis' empirical interest lies with working women's action in relation to the occupational segregation by gender which induces career discrepancies between working women and men. Although the thesis is concerned with women's action in relation to this occupational segregation as far as the latter constitutes a psychological reality for the individuals, it is necessary, however, to refer briefly to the characteristics of this phenomenon. Thus, for this thesis, the occupational segregation by gender mainly refers to (a) the gender typicality of various occupations and (b) the hierarchical status, income or prestige discrepancies between working women and men.

As far as the gender typicality of occupations is concerned, this can be identified from at least two different perspectives. One perspective concerns the proportional discrepancy between women and men working in specific occupations. For example, almost 91% of the nursing force in Britain today is comprised of women (census facts reported in Williams, 1994), whereas the proportion of women in relation to men in the police force is one to ten (census facts reported in Brown, 1994). From another perspective, occupational gender typicality is not only concerned with the numerical discrepancies between women and men in various occupations, but also with the gender stereotypicality of these occupations. In other words, some occupations are stereotypically perceived to be 'a women's job' or 'a men's job'.
Research demonstrates how occupational identities can be constructed on the basis of the existing stereotypes of the roles of women and men. To refer again to the previous examples of occupations, Gray (1989) discusses how the origins and structures of nursing are based upon women's traditional domestic roles of caring and nurturing. Also, Millward (1995) demonstrates how the nursing identity is bound up with social representations of femininity. On the other hand, Ott (1989) notes that the essential elements of policing - the exercise of authority and the ability to use force - are responsibilities traditionally assigned to men and denied to women. Brown (1994) also discusses how the occupational stereotype of police officers overlaps with stereotypical images of manhood. It has also been suggested (Martin, 1980 cited in Brown, 1994) that not only does stereotypically female behaviour conflict with the occupational role-definiciones of behaviour appropriate for a police officer, but also that the presence of women in the police threatens the construction of the policemen's masculine identity.

The other aspect of the occupational segregation by gender refers to the hierarchical status, income and prestige discrepancies between working women and men. These discrepancies may partially overlap with the gender typicality of occupations. In other words, female typical occupations are more often the ones which are lower paid or have a lower social prestige in relation to the male typical ones (without disregarding the fact that there are low paid or low social status male typical occupations). Nonetheless, hierarchical status discrepancies that result in income or prestige discrepancies between genders can occur within the same occupation or occupational
organisation. This means that proportionally it is more likely for men to be found in higher positions than it is for women. It is also possible even within female typical occupations, the relatively fewer men to be found relatively more often in the higher positions (Williams, 1994).

Regardless of these descriptions, the empirical interest of the thesis is concerned with working women’s action in relation to occupational segregation by gender, to the extent that the latter constitutes a psychological reality for them. More specifically, the thesis focuses on women’s perception of status discrepancies between genders in the workforce, their perception of unfair discrimination against their gender and the factors that influence their undertaking of action when discrimination is perceived.

Nevertheless, by definition, the occupational segregation by gender denotes a social categorisation of individuals into 'women' and 'men'. In other words, this occupational segregation presupposes the individuals’ connection with specific categories and the specific characteristics and roles attributed to these categories. Consequently, the implications of the segregation for the individuals are the result of their social category membership and the stereotypical perception of it. Having such an approach to the occupational segregation by gender and its implications for individuals, it was decided to examine women’s action using a social-psychological level of analysis. More specifically, it was considered appropriate to examine women’s action within the scope of Social Identity Theory (SIT) (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; for a review of this approach see Hogg & Abrams, 1988), since SIT
particularly examines individual action in relation to the status differentials of social group/ category memberships. In fact, women’s action has been often discussed in relation to SIT (i.e. Williams & Giles, 1978; Breakwell, 1979; Condor, 1986; Wetherell et al., 1987; for a review until 1989 see Skevington & Baker, 1989; Breinlinger & Kelly, 1994; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995). Research from a SIT perspective has also focused on women in specific occupational contexts (i.e. Marshall & Wetherell, 1989; Millward, 1995).

SIT is the first social-psychological approach that postulates the individuals’ self-identification with social groups/ categories which people are assigned to by a social system of categorisation. Furthermore, SIT examines individuals’ action in relation to the social status of their social groups/ categories. According to the theory, low-status group/ category memberships threaten the individuals’ self-esteem. As a result of this threat to identity, individuals adopt an individual mobility strategy, or collective/ social change strategies, in order to elevate self-esteem. (The thesis will refer to this range of strategies as 'social enhancement strategies' and to the relevant action as 'social enhancement action'.)

The first approach to women’s action within the framework of SIT is that of Williams & Giles (1978). These authors consider women as a distinct social group, and furthermore as an underprivileged group within the social matrix. Accordingly, women as members of a low-status group adopt one of the social enhancement strategies in order to elevate self-esteem. According to the authors, SIT’s model of strategies adequately explains how (a) some women accept the status quo and women’s
inequality as justifiable and legitimate and seek to differentiate self from other women in an attempt to individually enhance self-esteem, and (b) other women attempt to change the criteria on which superiority and inferiority attributions are based, through actively promoting social change, or through a strategy of social creativity which redefines positive and negative attributes. In this way, Williams and Giles assume that the women engaged in collective/social change strategies are also the ones that strongly identify 'as women' on the basis of a feminist re-evaluation of their category.

Skevington & Baker (1989) summarise three main criticisms that have been levelled against Williams & Giles (1978). The first criticism is that Williams and Giles assume womanhood to be a unified social category, perceived by all women in the same way on the basis of externally defined consensual and unfavourable dimensions that exclusively refer to their comparison with the category 'men'. The second criticism is concerned with Williams and Giles (as well as SIT's) association of collective/social change action with a stronger group identification. According to this assumption, only the women who adopt the collective strategies of social change and reject the sex-role status quo are the ones that identify strongly with their social category membership as women. However, empirical evidence (Condor, 1986) shows that the extent of gender category identification does not necessarily depend on beliefs about the women’s position of power and status in relation to men.

The third point that Skevington and Baker make is concerned with the nature of intergroup relationships between women and men. Williams (1984) discusses how SIT is based on the assumption that group differentiation arising from competition is essential to the expression of group identification (social identity). Contrasted with
this, Williams presents a case to show that groups may gain their social identity from cooperative relations with other social groups. She also suggests that women are more likely to display the latter type of identification, defining their relationships with men in relation to cooperation rather than competition.

Although this thesis focuses upon an intergroup conflict between the genders which is induced by the occupational segregation and not the more general aspects of the expression of women's social identity, the above criticisms also highlight in more general terms some of the problems that SIT has in conceptualising the dynamics underlying individual action in relation to social group/ category memberships. For example, SIT focused on cognitive and motivational processes, internal to the individual organism and disregarded the multiplicity of the dynamics underlying social-categorisation and their impact on the expression of social identities and individual action in relation to social intergroup conflicts.

As far as the social enhancement strategies are concerned, in this thesis, it will be argued that these strategies are not simply the individuals' self-enhancement reactions to the specific structures of various intergroup relationships (as suggested by SIT), but they also reflect individual orientations which are based on social ideological belief-systems regarding social enhancement action. These orientations are seen as regulated by both identity and social interaction/ communication dynamics. In order to achieve this alternative approach to people's action in relation to social categorisation dynamics, an integrative perspective on action will be adopted, by taking into account, SIT, Social Representations Theory (Moscovici, 1984) and Identity Processes Theory (Breakwell, 1986).
In order to do this, the second chapter of this thesis will explore in greater detail the assumptions of SIT firstly in relation to the more general aspects of the theory and secondly with reference to SIT's model of social enhancement strategies. The third chapter will deal with Social Representations Theory and the suggested integrative approach to individual action on the basis of Social Representations and Identity Processes theories. The remaining of the chapters will present the empirical studies conducted in order to examine alternative dynamics suggested within the integrative approach that might underlie social enhancement action. Chapter Four will investigate individual preferences for social enhancement strategies as the individuals' general positions within social representational fields of individualism and collectivism. Chapter Five, Six, Seven and Eight will specifically focus on women's social enhancement action in occupational contexts characterised by gender segregation. Finally, in chapter Nine, the findings of the empirical studies will be discussed both in relation to the theoretical approaches and women’s social enhancement action at the workplace.
CHAPTER TWO: SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The notion of social identity.

SIT acquired its shape mostly in the writings of Tajfel (1978). According to the author, individuals psychologically identify themselves with groups and act entirely as group members in specific situations. This assertion was empirically supported by evidence provided within the experimental paradigm of the 'minimal group' (for a review of these studies see Turner, 1981). In general, following this paradigm, researchers were able to identify that even within 'meaningless' small groups to which people have been randomly allocated within the experimental procedure, individuals act as 'group members'. Namely, individuals follow strategies to maximise a difference between (and mostly in favour of) the members of the 'ingroup' and the members of an 'outgroup'. The individuals' internal recognition of externally established groups (group differentiation) and allocation of self within the ingroup (group identification) was viewed as the psychological foundation of people's group-related action.

Furthermore, Tajfel (1978, p.63) attributes to the individuals a 'social identity', defined as "...that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his [her] knowledge of his [her] membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership".
Turner (1982) juxtaposes the notion of social identity with previous theories of psychological group formation. As this author notes, in contrast with the 'social cohesion' theories that explain group formation on the basis of the individuals' mutual interpersonal attraction, the notion of social identity allows for a conceptual identification of individuals with groups. At the self-conceptual level, individuals can identify with other individuals on the basis of their shared group/social category memberships that are externally imposed and are not the result of the individuals' interactions. Both for Tajfel and Turner, the individuals' awareness of their group/social category memberships is the necessary and the sufficient condition to elicit group-related action in specific situations.

For a number of authors (e.g. Turner & Oakes, 1986; Hogg & Abrams, 1988, Abrams & Hogg, 1990), SIT was considered as bridging the social and the psychological nature of the individuals' group-related behaviour. In contrast with earlier 'reductionist' psychological approaches that explain group-related behaviour on the basis of an inter-individual attraction which is irrelevant to broader social dynamics, SIT directly relates the individuals with socially established groups/categories.

Two tendencies characterise the development of theorising social identity dynamics. One perspective focuses on the emergence of group behaviour. On the basis of shared social identities, SIT attempted to reinterpret an array of phenomena, such as solidarity within the group, conformity to group norms or beliefs, ingroup favouritism
and discrimination against outgroups. Tajfel (1981; 1982) in particular, focused on the pervasiveness of stereotypes and the stereotypical perception of large categories of people.

According to this line of theorising, in situations perceived to be concerned with intergroup relationships, "...[the individuals'] social behaviour will be to a large extent independent of individual differences..." (Tajfel, 1978 p.44). Actually, for Tajfel, the emergence of social-identity dynamics is mainly concerned with situations that are perceived by the individuals as 'intergroup' ones. More specifically, these intergroup situations involve the confrontation of an identification group with the group(s) to which it is juxtaposed by the defining categorisation-system. Furthermore, for SIT, the nature of intergroup relationships is basically competitive. This happens for two different reasons. On the one hand, the social categorisation systems serve group functions that pose conflicting relationships between the groups. On the other hand, at the individual level, the intergroup comparisons (and the process of differentiation between groups and group-allocation of self) aim at enhancing the individual's self-esteem.

The second perspective of SIT is concerned with its attempt to encompass a consideration of macro-social phenomena (such as the power-status differentials between the juxtaposed social groups) in the psychological study of group/social category-related action (Tajfel 1978, Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Therefore, in relation to the status (low/high) of the group to which the individual is allocated by the categorisation system, SIT examines the circumstances where the individual dissociates
from or strongly identifies with the group. Following these interests, SIT mainly focuses on individual action in contexts where the identification group is in status-discrepancy (intergroup conflict) with the group to which it is juxtaposed by a system of categorisation (e.g. women in conflict with men).

Following the assumption of the situation-specific (and that includes the broader social situation) emergence of social identity dynamics, research within SIT focused on the dynamics that affect the patterns of individual differentiation among self, the members of an ingroup and those of an outgroup (group differentiation/identification) across different situations. According to the process of group differentiation/identification, the individual can freely differentiate (or not) between groups and allocate self in relation to both groups. Moreover, as will be discussed in the next section, SIT entirely focused upon the cognitive and the motivational dynamics that regulate this process across different situations.

The main core of research has been conducted in laboratories, using artificial categorisations between individuals. This line of approach, however, has proved insufficient to account for the complex manifestations of the operation of social identity dynamics in individuals' lives or actions. Problems arise when SIT is used to explain the dynamics of group/social category memberships outside the limits of a contextual intergroup confrontation (usually planned in laboratories). The assumptions of the theory regarding the deterministic function of processes internal to the individual as well as laboratory research have been strongly criticized by researchers conducting studies in people's natural environment. In general, researchers have
drawn attention to the inadequacy of general propositions, derived from laboratory studies that employ arbitrary categorisations, to account for the effects of categorical differentiations in a natural context. Some of these criticisms have already been reported in the first chapter of this thesis. In the next sections of this chapter, some further criticisms deriving from empirical evidence will be presented.

1.2. Cognitive and motivational processes of group differentiation/identification.

For SIT, the individual processes underlying group differentiation/identification are mainly concerned with (a) the accentuation of ingroup similarities and intergroup differences, when a categorisation is made salient and (b) the individual’s comparisons of the groups (in relation to self), along dimensions which can be externally defined. The second tenet of SIT is the competitive nature of this distinction and comparison between groups that involves ingroup favouritism. According to SIT, this happens because the process of group differentiation/identification is basically guided by the individuals’ need for a positive self-esteem and consequently a need for a positive social identity. (For a more analytical presentation, see Tajfel, 1978; Hogg & Abrams, 1988.)

The first set of assumptions is concerned with categorisation processes. For social-identity theorists, these processes clearly correspond to the individual’s cognitive categorisation processes that aim at a simplification of the environment. According to the human cognitive system of categorisation, various stimuli are classified on the
basis of their similarities and differences. However, this classification also involves biases, such as the accentuation of inter-class differences. Such 'automatically and naturally occurring' inclinations operate in order to provide a functional understanding of the surrounding reality.

These processes were linked by social-identity theorists to the processes underlying the individuals' group differentiation/identification. On the other hand, social-identity theorists also refer to the effects of social categorisation-systems upon the individuals' group-related action. First, it is assumed that the criteria and the dimensions along which the intergroup comparisons are taking place have social origins. More precisely, the dimensions can be externally established by a system of social categorisation. On the other hand, according to Tajfel (1981), social categorisation (and specifically the associated stereotyping) clearly serves social (group) functions. These functions mainly involve (a) the understanding of complex and distressful, large scale social events; (b) the justification of actions against people; and (c) a positive differentiation of the ingroup from selected outgroups.

Although Tajfel explicitly suggested that an analysis of social categorisation-related phenomena such as stereotyping should start from the social (group) functions to explain the psychological ones, the only specific hypothesis that SIT makes in order to link the individual processes of group differentiation/identification with the social level of the construction of the categorisation-system, is the provided dimensions of group classification. In this way, on the one hand SIT assumes the individuals to be
captured by an externally established categorisation-system and on the other hand, it examines the patterns of group differentiation/identification as being regulated by 'natural' mechanisms internal to the individual organism.

The intention of SIT to link the effects of social categorisation-systems with autonomous processes, internal to the individual, eventually resulted in a one-sided focus on the latter processes. This focus mainly led to an assumed one-way relationship between individual self-esteem and the process of group differentiation/identification. According to this line of theorising, a person will seek positive self-esteem through intergroup comparisons. Furthermore, this assumption served both as predicting the process of group differentiation/identification and the level of group identification (low/high) with assigned group memberships.

By considering the need for positive self-esteem as the primary motive for group differentiation/identification, social-identity theorists were led to the following hypothesis: According to Abrams & Hogg (1988), higher positive intergroup differentiation/identification should result in higher self-esteem. On the other hand, low self-esteem should motivate greater positive intergroup differentiation/identification. Regardless of the absence of any conclusive empirical support for both the corollaries of the hypothesis (Hogg & Abrams, 1990), when this relationship is correlationally examined, negative, positive and zero correlations between self-esteem and group differentiation/identification are all feasible (Abrams, 1992).
On the other hand, SIT also assumes that low social-status group memberships threaten self-esteem. As a result of this threat to identity, individuals will be engaged in social enhancement strategies. More specifically, in order to elevate self-esteem, people will either individually exit the group or will collectively attempt to positively alter the image or the position of the ingroup. (A more analytical discussion of these strategies will take place on the second part of this chapter). Consequently, the need for positive self-esteem is considered as the primary motive either for low (exit the group) or high (stand for the group) level of low-status-group identification.

In relation to the 'positive self-esteem assumption', Turner (1985) focuses on the contextual distinctiveness of social identities already established at a self-conceptual level. Oakes & Turner (1986) conclude that the social meaning of specific situations (the extent to which they involve comparisons of people on dimensions concerned with a social categorisation-system) affects the processes of the individuals’ group differentiation/ identification across situations.

An explanation however of a situation-meaningful salience of social identity dynamics does not explain individual variation. In an effort to account for individual variation, Abrams (1990; 1992) examines how theories of self-awareness can contribute to the explanation of the individuals’ group-related action. More specifically, the author examines how individuals perceive self according to the situation and how some situations are interpreted as intergroup ones. Abrams, however, mostly concentrates on the role of the focus of attention in specific situations. Thus, this line of research again focuses on the cognitive processes that lead to the salience of social identities in specific situations.
An examination of the cognitive or the motivational processes underlying social group/ category-related action has mainly taken place within experimental settings. Social-identity theorists’ persistence in experimental methodology reflects a methodological position that the various possible structures or dynamics of intergroup relationships can be isolated in the laboratory. Nonetheless, as it will be discussed in the next section, experimental research has demonstrated that the subjects’ pre-established social positions (Deschamps, 1982; Amancio, 1989; 1994) or (pre-established) perceptions of the specific intergroup or interindividual relationships that the experiment involves (Doise, 1978b; 1990; Abric, 1984; Codol, 1984) largely interfere in their responses within experimental settings and should therefore be taken into account. For this thesis, this line of theorising can also lead to linkages between the social (group) functions of social categorisation and the individual social category/group related action.

1.3. Social categorisation and group differentiation/ identification.

A line of research that clearly reflects Tajfel’s suggestions for a search for linkages between the social (group) functions of social categorisation-systems and the individuals’ patterns of group differentiation/ identification was initiated by Deschamps (1982). According to this author, there is evidence that the actual social position (the relative status of the ascribed social group membership) affects these patterns. More specifically, members of ‘dominant’ groups (i.e. men) differentiate themselves both in relation to the ingroup and to the outgroup members more than the ‘dominated’ groups (i.e. women) do, independently of the specific situation. In other
words, members of dominated groups tend more often to present self in terms of their ascribed social group membership than the dominant groups do. According to Deschamps, a social identity is assigned to the dominated group by those who dominate. Dominant groups maintain an identity that defines in more general terms the individual within a specific society. The identity however that derives from a subordinate group membership defines individuals as "...undifferentiated elements in a collection of impersonal particles,...thought of as 'objects' rather than 'subjects' " (Deschamps, 1982, p.90).

Amancio (1989; 1994) tested the 'asymmetry' assumption in various experimental intergroup contexts. The results showed that dominant (male) and dominated (female) groups not only differ in the meanings of their identities but also in the way context affects their patterns of ingroup/ outgroup differentiation. Amancio's studies showed how significant interactions among the sex of the subjects, the contextual minority versus majority condition and the evaluation of gender stereotypes influence the subjects' action relevant to group dynamics.

This line of research has proved important in revealing the impact of the dynamics of the social categorisation (and the functions that this serves) upon the individuals' patterns of differentiation/ identification in specific situations. Nonetheless, an assumed asymmetry that characterises the identities of dominated versus dominant groups leads to a monolithic perception of the social identity of the dominated groups. This perspective views the formation and the operation of social identities to be based on single stereotypes which are only concerned with the competitive comparison to the juxtaposed group as defining the social category.
This view is more widely evident within SIT, as a result of its justification of group identification processes upon intergroup conflict. The view that individuals realise their social identity on the basis of intergroup conflict also led SIT to an one-sided consideration of the 'strength' of the social identity rather than a 'qualitative' relationship of the individual with the dimensions that define the group's identity. To use Condor's (1989, p. 25) words, "...the question [posed by SIT] is 'how much' social identification [for example] a woman displays, rather than 'in what way' it is manifested."

The same problems also characterise the theoretical attempts to connect the processes of differentiation/identification with the nature of the group/category. These attempts are best reflected in Hinkle & Brown's (1990) suggestions regarding some broader dimensions (beyond the dominant/dominated asymmetry) along which, groups can be classified in types eliciting different patterns of individual group differentiation/identification.

As Condor (ibid) points out in relation to women's identity, an analysis of social identity dynamics should take into account the fact that a specific system of social categorisation (and its meanings) varies over historical time and/or across different social contexts. Consequently, different dynamics will underlie the expression of social identities across historical periods or even different social contexts. For example, Griffin (1989) discusses how women experience their gender identity in terms of gender relationships in specific social contexts such as school or the job market. The latter author also stresses how gender identification has different
implications for different groups of women, according to race, social class or age. Breakwell (1979) also points out the issue of the meaning that a given system of categorisation has for the individual and the specific resources (such as ideological-systems) that people have available in order to interpret the dynamics of their ascribed social group/ category memberships.

Regarding, however, the asymmetrical phenomenon of the group differentiation/identification of dominant versus dominated groups, Doise (1978) provides a wider explanation than this of the fixed social position of the individuals. He explains this phenomenon as the interference of the individuals’ (general) social representations in specific intergroup situations (such as those established by experimental manipulations). According to this author, intergroup relationships are not only contextually but also ideologically defined. Ideologies (seen as social belief-systems that establish the social positions of the individuals according to their social category memberships) largely interfere with the perception of specific and contextually defined intergroup situations. For Doise, this relationship (between social ideologies and the perception of a situation) is mediated by the social representations that the individual holds for the relative social positions of the social actors involved in the specific situation.

From his early writings on the subject of intergroup relationships, Doise (1978, 1984, 1990) explicitly refers to the notion of social representations of intergroup relationships. These representations interfere in specific intergroup situations (but are also modulated by the specific intergroup situations). In his later writings (Doise &
Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1991; Doise, 1995), he goes so far as to base all aspects of identity (including social identities) upon social representations that define these aspects. The notion of social representations refers to the socially constructed meanings attached to any 'piece of reality' (such as physical objects, concepts, ideologies, persons, relationships, events or phenomena). Therefore, it can be applied to groups/ social categories, intergroup relationships and beliefs concerned with individual action in relation to these dynamics. However, this notion (and the theory surrounding it) is not a straightforward one and will be more analytically discussed in the next chapter. Here, it can be noted that the notion of social representations is much more flexible than that of monolithic stereotypes defining a group’s identity.

Pursuing this perspective can lead to an alternative approach to the processes that underlie people’s identifications with social groups. This perspective goes beyond the boundaries of specific situations that involve direct intergroup cross-comparisons and juxtaposition. For example, a social representational explanation of the processes of social identification is provided by Duveen and Lloyd (1986; 1993). These authors present how individuals (children) can obtain their gender social identity on the basis of the social representations established for their ascribed gender category. In this case, the process of identification involves the social representations of gender roles that are embedded in the children’s schoolplay.

In an attempt to encompass a consideration of the social dynamics that regulate action, Tajfel himself (1981; 1982; 1984) turns to the widespread social belief-systems that substantiate categorisation-systems (such as stereotypes) and/ or regulate social
relationships and action in relation to 'others' (such as beliefs about social justice). However, as will be discussed in the next section, Tajfel and in general the social-identity theorists regard the operation of beliefs at a superordinate (social) level and not an individual one. For social-identity theorists, all individual group members internalise the same beliefs that serve situation-specific functions for the ingroup.

1.4. Social Identity Theory and beliefs relevant to group dynamics.

Tajfel acknowledges in some instances the need for an integration of the study of the psychological processes underlying group-related action, with a theory of the content of the beliefs relevant to social groups/ categories (such as stereotypes), or of the beliefs that regulate social relationships (such as beliefs about social justice). Moreover, in some instances, Tajfel considers the study of the content of some widespread beliefs (such as stereotypes) as a necessary condition in order to connect the individual and the group functions that group-related action (such as stereotyping) serves:

"The competitive and power relations between groups will largely determine the nature of the psychological functions which need to be fulfilled by the groups' reciprocal images. But when this is taken for granted as the indispensable background for any social psychological analysis, such an analysis should then be able to make theoretical sense of the contents of ingroup and outgroup stereotypes."

(Tajfel, 1981, p.162)
However, as has already been discussed, research within SIT largely focused on the study of the cognitive or the motivational processes that determine action, disregarding the social belief-systems which might affect or explain action. A justification of this neglect is substantiated by social-identity theorists as a result of their focus on the 'psychological' processes, whereas the construction of the beliefs is concerned with social dynamics (Hogg & Abrams, 1988). However, this argument implicitly asserts that such beliefs do not interfere with the psychological processes. Nonetheless, as presented earlier, research has demonstrated ways in which the individuals' beliefs (relevant to group dynamics) can affect the processes of group differentiation/identification in specific situations.

Furthermore, when social-identity theorists focus on the individuals' beliefs or attitudes, they are only concerned with those beliefs that are consensually shared among members of the same group. For example, according to Tajfel (1984), within a specific intergroup (social) situation, group members will endorse those beliefs that serve situation-specific group functions such as the maintenance or the enhancement of positive distinctiveness and the justification or the challenging of the status quo. According to Tajfel, the functions that the beliefs serve for the ingroup explain why these beliefs are shared among the members of the group. Accordingly, specific beliefs (and/or their changing) will be shared by people in accordance to their social group memberships. Consequently, SIT refers to the individuals' beliefs as far as these can be explained by the people's group/social category memberships and not as far as these are the endorsement of social belief-systems such as those substantiating social categorisations or regulating social relationships and action.
In relation to the latter perspective, SIT’s line of theorising does not explain how members of different (or even juxtaposed) groups share a common system of categorisation in order for psychological group differentiation/identification to occur in the first place. Furthermore, if the ingroup functions are the only ones to be served by the beliefs of the group members, then SIT’s assertions also do not explain how low-status group members ‘share’ the criteria and the evaluations of a social categorisation-system that puts the ingroup at a disadvantage.

Finally, it is self-evident for social-identity theorists that beliefs relevant to social groups/cATEGORIES are constructed at a macro-social, superordinate level (Condor, 1990). To use Tajfel’s (1984, p.696) own words, "...the fabric of intergroup relations in society at large, i.e. their social, historical, economic and cultural determinants and constraints, create the diversity of widely diffused social myths about people’s own and other social groups."

Furthermore, individuals do not participate in any active way in their own endorsement of such beliefs. For SIT, social group/category membership is the sufficient condition for the internalisation (by the individuals) of the appropriate beliefs. These assertions lead social-identity theorists to overemphasise the deductive (Doise & Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1991) nature of social categorisation and theoretically eliminate the possibility of variation across members of the same social group.

In general, SIT does not focus on the fact that different (even conflicting) belief-systems (deriving from different sources of social influence) circulate in specific societies. The ingroup is not the only possible source of social influence or necessarily
the most powerful one for all the individuals. Consequently, SIT disregards the possibility that different sources of social influence will *differentially* affect the individuals’ perceptions, opinions, attitudes or beliefs relevant to social groups/categories. Furthermore, SIT does not consider identity dynamics other than those that a common social affiliation produces. In this thesis therefore, it is argued that as far as the interference of social belief-systems in action relevant to group dynamics is assumed, SIT needs the collaboration of other theories that cover this interface.

2. SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES


Groups are characterised by power relationships. For social-identity theorists, the power discrepancies between groups are mainly illustrated in the status-discrepancies between groups. Members of low-status groups have less access to material resources (i.e. lower income, or less opportunities for a successful career) and they are more often characterised by negative stereotypes (or at least stereotypes that attribute different characteristics than those defining the 'successful' citizen or individual). According to SIT, low-status social group/category memberships will have a negative effect on an individual’s identity. As a result of the threatened self-esteem (negative social identity), members of a low-status group engage in social enhancement strategies. The theory distinguishes three types of social enhancement strategies. Based on the definitions given by Turner & Brown (1978), Tajfel & Turner (1979) and Hogg et al. (1986), these strategies are:
(i) **Individual Mobility.** The individual dissociates from the ingroup and/or seeks membership in higher-status groups. For example, an individual can adopt the norms of the higher-status group and attempt to individually 'pass' on this group.

(ii) **Social Competition.** The ingroup members seek to elevate self-esteem through direct competition with the higher-status outgroup in order to change the power-status-quo.

(iii) **Social Creativity.** The ingroup members try to achieve positively valued distinctiveness through altering or redefining the elements of the intergroup comparative situation. For example, they may (a) adopt (or create) new dimensions and criteria of intergroup comparison that are relatively more favourable to their group or, (b) make previously negative comparisons to be perceived as positive ones and/or, (c) avoid comparisons with the dominant group, and instead compare themselves with other low or lower-status categories. According to social-identity theorists, this strategy does not necessarily lead to a change in the ingroup's objective social position (i.e. better access to material resources, or change of the stereotypes), but it basically aims at 'psychologically' enhance the ingroup members' self-esteem. This strategy mainly arises when people cannot conceive cognitive alternatives of the power-status-quo.
The last two strategies involve not only personal enhancement, but also group enhancement. They both also presuppose some degree of doubt as to the status quo and involve an attempt to change the image of the ingroup. They are therefore both considered as collective/ social change strategies.

Within empirical research (i.e. Turner & Brown, 1978; Hogg et al. 1986; Ellemers et al., 1988; Ellemers et al., 1990; Ellemers, 1993; Van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1993), the strategies were clearly operationalised as the level of group identification. Accordingly, low level group identification is considered as denoting individual mobility strategy. Similarly, high level group identification is considered as denoting collective/ social change strategies. Thus, individual mobility and collective/ social change strategies are considered and treated as the two poles of a unidimensional preference for social enhancement strategy. This operationalisation, however, also reflects theoretical tendencies (i.e. Williams & Giles, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) to consider that identification with a low-status group equals awareness of its position and therefore engagement in collective/ social change strategies. Apart from SIT's problematic theorising regarding the process of the individuals' group identification per se, in the next sections some further problems resulting from the connection of the social enhancement strategies with the level of group identification will become apparent.
2.2. Women and the social enhancement strategies.

Applying the SIT perspective to women's action, Williams & Giles (1978) suggest a dichotomy between women that accept the status quo and women that reject it and attempt to change it on the basis of a feminist orientation. Within the strategy-range of SIT, Williams and Giles suggest that women who accept the status quo are following individual mobility strategy to enhance self-esteem. This also means that these women do not strongly identify with the category 'women' and try to differentiate self from other women. However, Breakwell (1979) and Condor (1989) criticise this perspective as a-historical, since it basically views women's gender category identification only within the frame of contemporary feminist groups. Furthermore, Condor (1986) examines the case of 'traditional' women. These women, although largely accepting the status quo (the roles traditionally assigned to women), appear to strongly identify with the category 'women' and positively value the traditional roles assigned to them. Furthermore, Gurin & Markus (1989) examine the effects of the centrality of a gender identity on women's processing of gender-roles-relevant information. Their findings show how the level of women's gender category identification can be significantly either positively or negatively correlated with the processing of feminist messages.

These studies demonstrate that level of gender category identification (at a general level) is independently related to either of the social enhancement strategies. However, as the next section illustrates, the general level of group identification, even when examined as an independent variable, does not seem to predict choice of social enhancement strategy. As far as women's social enhancement strategies are concerned,
a strong prediction of participation in collective action (feminist oriented) by level of group identification is reported by Kelly & Breinlinger (1995). However, their operationalisation of group identification concerns involvement with activist groups of women. Therefore, orientation in (feminist) collective/ social change social enhancement action is already established. In contrast, Breinlinger & Kelly (1994) report that in their study on female college students randomly selected, there was no evidence to suggest that strength of identification with one’s own sex group is related to choice of strategy.

Furthermore, as already presented, Williams and Giles also suggest that subgroupings of women can be coherently identified according to the strategy they follow. More specifically, women can be distinguished in those who accept the status quo and the traditional position assigned to women and those who reject the status quo and endorse egalitarian ideologies regarding sex roles. Nevertheless, Wetherell’s et al. (1987) findings point out the issue of inconsistency in people’s endorsement of ideologies. In a study of discourses regarding gender and career development, respondents seem to believe both in equal career opportunities and that 'a woman’s place is in the home, when the children are young’. These responses represent a conflict between people’s endorsement of an egalitarian ideology and their emphasis on the practical considerations supposedly limiting equal opportunities. According to the authors, these findings seem to suggest that people with a given gender identity (men/ women) do not consistently articulate one belief-system, whether in accordance with the status quo, an individual mobility or a social change strategy, but may inconsistently draw upon many belief-systems to make sense of their position. On the basis of this
evidence, Wetherell et al. (ibid) suggest that one way of examining these dynamics is to shift the emphasis from the fixed characteristics and traits of the person or of the gender category, to the systems of making sense of the social reality that are available in specific societies. "We should investigate the collectively shared practical ideologies which reconcile women and men to their employment options and structure representations of their social positions." (Wetherell et al., 1987, p.60).

However, when Breinlinger & Kelly (ibid) focused on differences among women in relation to their preferences for social enhancement strategies, they found women students’ responses to clearly distinguish them between those who believe that women are unfairly treated in society and should take collective action and those who object to feminist ideas and also have a belief in individual mobility. When contrasting the two different sets of findings, it should be taken into account that the latter researchers consider the strategies to be mutually exclusive and thus apply a methodology (Q-sorts) that stresses differences between clusters of people. On the other hand, Wetherell et al. (ibid) use a methodology (discourse analysis) that focuses on contradictions in the person’s own accounts.

Not only in relation to women’s preference for social enhancement strategies, but in more general terms, there is little empirical evidence that individuals organise their social enhancement action by distinguishing among the three types of strategies suggested by SIT. In general, SIT based its assertions regarding a dichotomy (or rather a trichotomy) of social enhancement action mainly on the macro-social level of the operation of these strategies (i.e. the impact they have for the social position of the group). The lack of evidence is largely the result of social-identity theorists
experimental methodological positions and the operationalisation of the strategies as a unidimensional continuum of the level of group identification. These methodological positions, however, also reflect SIT's theoretical tendencies to approach social enhancement strategies more as the individuals' spontaneous reactions to the social situation rather than as ideological orientations that guide individual action.

2.3. The social enhancements strategies as the individuals' reactions to the social structure.

According to SIT, the individuals' choice of strategy will be determined by their perception of the actual intergroup situation. This perception focuses upon three dimensions: the permeability of the intergroup boundaries, and the legitimacy and stability of the intergroup status-discrepancy. When the boundaries between the groups are perceived as permeable (i.e. it is possible for the individual to 'pass' into the other group), the low-status group members will first attempt individual mobility. When, however, the status-discrepancy is perceived as illegitimate and the low-status group members can perceive cognitive alternatives of the status-relationships (status-relationships insecure or unstable), they will engage in collective/social change strategies.

Research within SIT (Turner & Brown, 1978, Ellemers et al., 1988; Ellemers et al., 1990; Ellemers et al. 1993; Van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1993; Ellemers, 1993), treated the individuals' perception of the intergroup relationships as the characteristics of the situation. Therefore, it aimed at showing how permeability, legitimacy and
stability, as the manipulated conditions of the intergroup situation, affect people's choice of strategy. An account of the main findings of this type of research are outlined in Van Knippenberg & Ellemers' (1993) and Ellemers (1993) conclusions:

(i) There is an interaction between ingroup status and the perception of the situation. High-status group members do not perceive the same situation, in the same way as low-status group members.

(ii) Individual mobility (low group-identification) is the preferred identity enhancement strategy, when the group boundaries are permeable.

(iii) Unstable intergroup status relationships, implying the possibility of changing the ingroup's status ranking, elicit higher group identification (social change/collective strategy) in the low-status group members.

(iv) Illegitimacy of the low group-status elicits higher group identification, especially when group-status is unstable and group boundaries are impermeable. However, legitimate status-relationships lead to the acceptance of the status quo.

The conclusions of this experimental research are in accordance with Tajfel's (1978) assumption that an individual threatened by the status of the ingroup, will first attempt to exit it. These conclusions are also in accordance with Taylor & McKirnan's (1984) model of intergroup relations. The authors have proposed a diachronic five-stage model that focuses on the way different strategies emerge from earlier ones as a consequence of socio-historic changes. According to the model, following an
industrial individualistic ideology, the most competent low-status-group members first attempt individual mobility on the basis of their own abilities. Only when such a strategy has failed, can competent members of a low-status group to be involved in collective/social change action.

Nevertheless, when research in natural contexts was attempted, a different pattern emerges. The findings of an empirical study conducted by Moghaddam & Perreault (1991) show that individual mobility action was preferred by the less talented minority group members and was associated with higher belief in the legitimacy of the social system. Collective action was associated with perceived group but not personal discrimination. Although a test of SIT’s assumptions regarding the priority of the strategies in a natural context would demand longitudinal studies, the latter debate partially reflects the problem (discussed in previous sections of this chapter) that SIT has in conceptualising and thus operationalising group identification. As Moghaddam and Perreault note, SIT has underestimated the importance of the individuals’ attachment to their group, beyond the need for positive self-esteem or the specific situation. It assumes individuals to be mobile and untouched in any important ways by group ties and loyalties. The centrality of a particular group identification in the individual’s identity (Breakwell, 1986), as well as/ or perceived group traits (i.e. perceived group homogeneity or cohesion - Simon & Pettigrew, 1990; Simon, Bayerl & Stratenwerth, 1991), might be better predictors of the level of identification with a group as a dependent variable. At any rate, as discussed in previous sections, high level of general (out of a specific context) group identification does not necessarily imply involvement with collective/social change action.
The prediction of social enhancement strategies by the level of (general) group identification and the individuals' perception of the structure of the intergroup relationships (permeability, legitimacy, stability) was assessed in a natural context of intergroup conflict (between East and West Germans). In this study (Mummendey et al., in press) the predictors were tested in a structural equation model that allowed the demonstration of their interdependent effects. Also involvement with each of the social enhancement strategies was separately indexed. The findings suggest the following:

(i) The best predicted strategy is individual mobility. Social competition and social creativity are, however, poorly predicted by the perception of the structure of the intergroup relationships.

(ii) The strength of general identification with the group significantly predicted only individual mobility. It did not prove to be a significant predictor of any of the other strategies.

(iii) In contrast with the predictions of SIT, perceived permeability negatively predicted individual mobility (as well as social competition). That means that the more the low-status group members perceive the boundaries between the groups to be permeable, the less interested they are in following any of the two strategies.

(iv) Perceived legitimacy positively predicted individual mobility but it did not prove to be a significant predictor of social competition. (Legitimacy is considered by SIT as one of the primary reasons for engagement in collective/social change strategies.)
Perceived stability was on the whole a poor predictor. (Perceived ‘insecure’
status relationships are considered by SIT as a condition for the elicitation of
collective/ social change strategies.)

What this study illustrates is that there is no clear pattern which would allow a whole
set of assumptions with regard to either one single predictor or one single strategy to
be rejected or accepted. It should also be stressed that the model predicts collective/
social change strategies very poorly. Finally, these findings indicate that the effects
of the structural dimensions of the intergroup situation on preference for a strategy
differ when these variables are presented as the structure of the situation to when these
dimensions are perceived. A possible interpretation of this discrepancy is that in a real
situation, the range of the strategies available is constrained by other dynamics which
also affect the perception of the structure of the intergroup situation and distort its
effects. This also indicates the involvement of common predictors of the perception
of the structure of the situation and choice of social enhancement strategy.

In other words, the perception of the structure of the intergroup relationships is not
a direct cognitive process. The experimental manipulation of the structure of the
situation by social-identity theorists is based upon the implicit assertion that the
structure is perceived by all individuals in the same way. The only differential
perception of the structure of the intergroup relationships that is accepted by social-
identity theorists involves the ingroup’s status. Members of high status groups
perceive the structure of the intergroup relationships differently to the members of
low-status group. At the individuals’ level, the only explanation of this phenomenon
provided by social-identity theorists is that the dynamics of the group membership introduce biases in the perceptions of the group members. This implies that members of the same group perceive the same situation in the same way. However, empirical evidence clearly shows that even in homogeneous groups, all members do not react in the same way under the same conditions (Abrams, 1992). Moreover, from an historical perspective, the assumptions regarding the effects of the socio-structural conditions upon action do not explain how members of low-status groups perceive these conditions differently, either within the same or across different periods of time.

In general, research within SIT has left individual differences unexplored. In this way, it does not simply disregard individual dynamics on how people realise intergroup relationships and form their action. More importantly, it limits the search for other possible sources of variation in individual action. This thesis suggests that research on individual differences does not necessarily minimise the importance of the impact of the socio-structural factors upon social enhancement action. On the contrary, it can contribute to the explanation of how social and psychological processes interact in order to motivate action. A possible focus can be turned on the individuals' belief-systems that serve to organise action relevant to group dynamics. Therefore, the next section concentrates on the belief-systems of social mobility and social change.

**2.4. The social enhancement strategies as belief-systems.**

Tajfel & Turner (1979, p.35) refer to social mobility and social change as "...the individuals' belief systems about the nature and the structure of the relations between social groups in their society". The belief-system of social mobility is based on the general assumption that the society in which the individual lives is a flexible and permeable one. Individuals can move upwards regardless of their social group
memberships. This belief-system is explicitly considered by the authors as based on the cultural and ideological traditions of a society. On the other hand, the belief-system of social change denotes that the nature and structure of the relations between social groups in a society is rigid and impermeable. According to the authors, the 'social change' belief-system is based upon the actual economic or social reality that makes salient the individuals’ identification with groups (individuals are marked by their social group memberships). Furthermore, the authors attribute a causal function to these 'belief-systems' in relation to the elicitation of group-related action. A 'social mobility' ideology makes group identification and the interpretation of a situation as 'intergroup' one less salient. On the other hand, a 'social change' belief about the social structure makes salient the individuals' group memberships and the interpretation of situations as 'intergroup' ones.

Whereas these belief-systems can determine the perception of the situation, Tajfel and Turner also imply that these belief-systems are determined by the situation (especially the 'social change' belief-system). Therefore, it is not clear if these 'belief-systems' are beliefs that the individuals can hold and affect (or are affected by) the perception of the intergroup relationships, or are the actual structure of intergroup relationships. If the latter interpretation is the correct one, as it is implied by the research designs of social-identity theorists, then Tajfel’s & Turner’s theorising still does not explain how people of the same group perceive the same situation differently.
Other authors (Hogg et al., 1986; Hogg & Abrams, 1988) clearly refer to the belief-systems of social mobility and social change as types of *subjective belief structures* that the individuals hold regarding the nature of intergroup relationships in their society. Accordingly, individuals who believe that intergroup boundaries are permeable possess an individual mobility belief-structure. Those who believe that intergroup boundaries are rigid and impermeable possess a social change belief-structure. They recognise the impossibility of passing into the advantaged group and realize that to improve self-esteem they must improve the subordinate group's recognized evaluation, status or prestige.

However, this approach does not incorporate any assumptions regarding the formation of these subjective belief-structures. These beliefs are neither determined by the objective social reality nor a biased perception of it. They are not associated with specific social ideological systems - although the authors note that these subjective belief-structures will usually *reflect* the dominant ideology. Nonetheless, they do not specify any process through which the dominant ideology influences individual behaviour.

A systematic attempt to take into consideration the impact of social ideologies upon people's beliefs relevant to group dynamics is included in Taylor and McKirnan's model of intergroup relationships. Their model describes how an individual-oriented dominant ideology influences the processes of social comparison and causal attribution. Individuals on the basis of a 'meritocracy' ideology attribute their status to individual characteristics rather than to their group's status. As was discussed in the previous section, this model also assumes that individuals under the influence of a
social mobility dominant ideology will invariably first attempt individual mobility. Social change is attempted by low-status group members when individual mobility strategies have failed.

The problem with Taylor and McKirnan's model is that it refers to a specific historic period and to specific type of societies within which dominant groups cultivated a 'social mobility' ideology. Nonetheless, subordinated social groups/ categories not only existed before this historic period and in different types of societies but also, some have succeeded in changing their status. In other words, it would be misleading to base social change strategies simply upon the failure of individual mobility (or upon an unexplained perceptual change of the structure of the intergroup relationships as Tajfel and Turner suggest). Referring to women's engagement in social change strategies, Breakwell (1979, p.16) provides an explanation closer to historical facts regarding the emergence of social change strategies. She assumes the individuals engagement in social change action to follow the emergence of relevant ideological systems:

"In respect to change, the primary power lies in an ideology which allows the actual perception of the possibility of a change and the means to bring it about. There is a temptation to talk about these strategies of change in theoretical isolation and as if each group seeking social change would find them equally available. In fact, woman, as a group, has particular problems in gaining access to these strategies of change and the wherewithal to use them because of the nature of the group and the nature of the ideology which surrounds it."
In this thesis, it will be argued that in general the social enhancement strategies identified by SIT -individual mobility or collective/social change ones- should be treated as forms of action relying upon distinct ideological social belief-systems (or systems of practices) circulating in specific societies. Within SIT, although the ideological origins of an individual mobility strategy are largely accepted by social-identity theorists, social change is mostly viewed as a reflective reaction to the power-status quo which emerges regardless of a specific social belief-system (or system of practices) that individuals can draw upon.

Furthermore, when approaching individual belief-systems, in general SIT lacks a level of analysis that explains variation or change (across people/situations/historical periods) in the articulation and/or the impact of these belief-systems. As was discussed in the first part of this chapter, the assumed mediating mechanism of a relationship between sources of social influence and individual beliefs (one's social identity) cannot totally account for the effects of social belief-systems upon action relevant to group dynamics. As mentioned earlier, the next chapter will attempt to substantiate a more flexible perspective on the social construction of the individuals' beliefs relevant to group dynamics and their impact upon social enhancement action, though an integrative approach to SIT, SRT and IPT.
CHAPTER THREE: INTEGRATING THE LEVELS OF ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL IDENTITY, SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS AND IDENTITY PROCESSES THEORIES.

1. INTRODUCTION

The usefulness of an integration of the levels of analysis of Social Identity (SIT) and Social Representations (SRT) theories has been discussed by various authors (Doise, 1984, 1990; Gaskell & Fraser, 1990; Breakwell, 1992a; 1993). The two theories represent different and in some ways contrasting epistemological paradigms (both in terms of their explanations of human behaviour and their exploratory methods). In order to account for action relevant to the dynamics of social groups/ categories, SIT largely bases its assumptions upon the operation of an automatic cognitive mechanism of categorisation and a universal human drive for positive self-esteem. Alternatively, SRT focuses upon the social construction of people's understanding of reality. It bases its assumptions upon the deterministic power of interpersonal communication. Respectively, SIT assumes processes, internal to the individual, to account for behaviour, as far as these processes (a) underlie the individuals' identification with social groups/ categories and (b) accommodate the perception of the social reality of these groups/ categories. On the other hand, (as will be presented later), SRT asserts the products of social communication (the social representations) to determine psychological processes.
Pointing in different directions, SIT as an explanatory model of behaviour provides definitions of the constructs it uses, describes their relationships and makes specific predictions. Social-representations theorists, on the other hand, are largely concerned with describing the content and the lattice of specific social representations, rather than making any predictions regarding these representations and individual action.

Having these discrepancies as a starting point, the benefits from an integration of the theories are reciprocal. As it has been discussed in the previous chapter, SIT lacks consideration of an independent impact of the socially formatted and variant belief-systems that surround social categorisation systems or regulate social behaviour upon individual action. SRT can provide a theoretical framework to account for the dynamic social construction of people's understanding of the world and therefore the shaping of their perceptions, beliefs, opinions, attitudes and actions. This understanding is shaped by products of social communication (that is by social representations). Moreover, social-representations-theorists have empirically demonstrated how the content dimension of people's social identities can be meaningfully examined as being constructed on the basis of social representations (e.g. in relation to gender identities see Nakbi & Arnal-Duchemin, 1987; Nakbi, 1990). Others (i.e. Duveen & Lloyd, 1986; Duveen & Lloyd, 1993) have further argued that social (gender) identifications are actually mediated by social representations of the relevant categories in the form of social practices. Within Breakwell's (1986) identity model, it can also be argued that social representations can account for the building up of a multidimensional self-concept, systematising (among
other experiences) multiple social group/ category identifications. Doise & Lorenzi-Cioldi (1991) and Doise (1995) also focus on the construction of the representation of 'self' and identity on the basis of social representations.

As far as the positive gains of SRT are concerned, one of the major criticisms that the theory has received is its lack of consideration of the impact of the dynamics of social group/ category memberships on (a) the formation of social representations and (b) their acceptance, use or development by individuals. In general, as Doise (1993) points out, in order to make specific hypotheses in relation to social group/ category dynamics, SRT needs (but also allows space for) other theories which define the social-psychological meaning of social group/ category memberships. In that respect, SIT can provide a useful theoretical framework to account for these dynamics and particularly these surrounding social intergroup conflict.

In relation to action relevant to intergroup conflict, this thesis has already presented suggestions that the perception of intergroup relationships in specific contexts is influenced by the individuals' pre-established social representations regarding these relationships (Doise, 1978; Doise, 1990). Furthermore, it is suggested that social belief-systems (such as social ideologies of individualism and collectivism), operating through the individuals' socially constructed representations of social enhancement strategies, are the resources of the action taken in cases of intergroup conflict. More specifically, it will be attempted to demonstrate empirically that strategy-related action in specific intergroup conflict situations relies upon relevant social belief-systems and not upon a direct perception of the structure of the situation, as SIT assumes.
Although in this thesis social representations will be examined as determining forces, it will be also theoretically stressed that SRT lacks the level of analysis that SIT has introduced to social-psychological research - namely, the prediction of individual action on the basis of social dynamics (such as those between social groups). This inadequacy is largely the result of SRT's focus on the content of various social representations rather than on the prediction of individual action.

In general, SRT lacks a level of analysis that takes into consideration the individuals' identity dynamics (including those that social identifications produce). In this thesis, it will be argued that identity dynamics play a major role both in the endorsement of social representations and individual action. Nonetheless, by accepting SRT's position regarding the social construction of the individuals' perceptions (including self-perceptions), beliefs, opinions or attitudes, theoretical perspectives that isolate identity (personality or idiosyncrasy) dynamics from the individuals' social environment cannot be adopted. Within the framework, however, of Identity Processes Theory (Breakwell, 1986), identity is viewed as a flexible structure which basically accommodates social experiences. The processing (assimilation/ accommodation - evaluation) of social experiences is guided, nonetheless, by identity principles (such as distinctiveness, continuity and self-esteem). Since both theories (Identity Processes Theory and Social Representations Theory) view individuals as agents of social experiences, they can be usefully integrated. This theoretical integration could facilitate social-psychological research to make specific (and testable) hypotheses regarding the relationships between identity dynamics and social representations.
Also, since there is a theoretical background that does not isolate individual dynamics from the social environment, there is no reason to believe that research on individual differences will minimise the importance of social conditions in influencing individual action. On the contrary, research on individual differences can be particularly useful in revealing sources of variation in the processing of social experiences and the undertaking of action. This thesis will support suggestions that research on individual differences does not necessarily promote reductionist explanations of behaviour. Although SRT is broadly associated with the search for uniformity ('consensus') in people's views, in this thesis, it will be argued that the social (and 'shared') nature of people's representations does not rely upon a superficial consensus among the individuals' representations.

SRT has been broadly viewed (e.g. Jaspars & Fraser, 1984; Gaskell & Fraser, 1990) as a model to substantiate the social nature of people's representations of reality as far as these are 'uniformly shared' (at least across groups of people). Such an approach inevitably implies that some (the uniformly shared ones) representations are social and some belong to the individuals. Gaskell & Fraser (1990, p.14) suggest that Moscovici recognizes that "...many representations are individual representations rather than social ones...". In this thesis, it will be argued that it is in the core of SRT that all people's and all understanding of the world is shaped by social representations.

At this point, it should be noted that the interest of the present author in SRT originates from the actual flexibility (and not the consensus) in which formulated social belief-systems can be empirically found in people's beliefs, opinions or attitudes. Discrete social belief-systems (e.g. feminist versus traditional beliefs about gender roles) can be found to harmonically cohabit in people's beliefs, opinions or attitudes and more importantly in people's practices relevant to (for example) gender
roles (Wetherell et al., 1987). As will be presented later, SRT particularly allows for a discrepancy between formulated beliefs and people's social representations, without undermining the social nature of the latter. For SRT, the social nature of the people’s representations relies upon their communicative and not their normative (leading to consensus) capabilities. In the next sections, these arguments will be developed, as a more explicit presentation of Social Representations Theory will take place.

2. SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS THEORY

2.1. The notion of social representations.

The notion of social representations was introduced by Moscovici (1961/1976), in his effort to describe a phenomenon which accounts for people’s conceptual understanding. In his original theorising about social representations, Moscovici (ibid) was empirically concerned with the diffusion of a specific scientific theory (namely psychoanalysis) into the broader community.

In these early accounts, the central preoccupation of Moscovici was an explanation for people’s fragmentary and contradictory but also conclusive understanding (in this case) of a scientific theory. Apart from his assertion of the operation of two cognitive systems (one operational and one regulating meta-system), Moscovici (ibid) theorises
the correspondence (and therefore the adjustability) of people's cognitive system to a collective situation or interaction. Accordingly, the fragmentary or contradictory accounts of individuals regarding an issue correspond to a dynamic collective debate about the nature of this issue. This correspondence between people's cognitions and the collective situation is realised through the operation of social representations. At the collective level, people (in the course of social communication) produce representations aiming at a mutual understanding of 'pieces of reality'. At the individual level, people's understanding of reality is determined by these representations.

Gradually, Moscovici develops a theoretical framework regarding people's understanding of reality and therefore, their opinions, attitudes and action. In order to present the basic assumptions of this theoretical framework, this introduction will mainly refer to Moscovici's (1984) account, since this is probably the most complete one in the English language.

The core assumption of SRT's framework is that any specific reality is represented in people's minds through the filter of socially created and established meanings attached to this reality - that is through social representations. Social representations not only have the power to penetrate, but actually adjust people's information processing systems. Using Moscovici's (1984) own words:
"...we note the intervention of representations which either direct us towards that which is visible and to which we have to respond; or which relate appearance and reality; or again which define this reality. I do not wish to imply that such representations do not correspond to something we call the outside world. I simply note that, where reality is concerned, these representations are all we have, that to which our perceptual, as well as our cognitive, systems are adjusted." (p. 5)

"...we [people] are never provided with any information which has not been distorted by representations 'superimposed' on objects and on persons which give them [objects and persons] a certain vagueness and make them partially inaccessible." (p. 6)

For Moscovici, the function of these representations (both at the individual and at the collective level) is to turn something unfamiliar into something familiar. Through the social representational processes of anchoring and objectification, new elements of the surrounding reality acquire meaning for the individuals. The first process strives to anchor the new elements of the reality, to reduce them to already meaningful categories, to set them in a familiar context. The purpose of the second process is to objectify them, that is to turn something abstract into something almost concrete.
Therefore, these representations (a) conventionalise the elements of the reality that surrounds people and (b) impose themselves upon individuals with an irresistible force. They create pre-established and immediate frames of reference, within which reconstructions of objects, persons, events and phenomena occur automatically. Furthermore, social representations being socially constructed and connected with each other in networks, do not involve only 'naming' the objects of the reality, but they include beliefs about the nature of these objects. This mainly happens as the process of the anchoring involves the classification of new objects of reality in already meaningful categories (Moscovici, 1984):

"When we classify a person among the neurotics, the Jews or the poor, we are obviously not simply stating a fact, but assessing and labelling him [/her]. And, in so doing, we reveal our 'theory' of society and of human nature." (p.30)

And:

"To classify something means that we confine it to a set of behaviours and of rules, stipulating what is and is not, permissible in relation to all the individuals included in this class." (p.31)

Therefore:

"Thus, it is obvious that naming is not a purely intellectual operation aiming at a clarity or logical coherence. It is an operation related to a social attitude." (p. 35)
Furthermore, social representations, by determining people's understanding of the world, also create frames of reference not only for perceptions, but also for the individuals' opinions and attitudes. In other words, people's manner and content of thinking depend on social representations. Individuals organise their thoughts in accordance with comprehension-systems which are conditioned to collective processes and their products, the social representations. By relating the individuals' thinking processes to collective processes, Moscovici, therefore, attempts to substantiate the social nature of the individuals' opinions and attitudes.

By making these assertions, Moscovici takes the notion of social cognition much further than other theorists in that field. Traditionally, the notion of social cognition refers to the cognition of the social reality. According to early theories (i.e. Festinger's categorisation theory), the 'cognition' of the social reality is biased by human mechanisms striving for a simplified, but effective information processing. Thus, the perception of social reality is determined by processes that rely upon the individual. Moscovici sees the cognition of reality (physical or social) to be social by its nature, since the individuals' understanding is realised solely through socially constructed representations.

Early theories on social cognition have been criticised for the subordination of phenomena (such as social categorisation phenomena) to some assumed 'natural' human needs (namely, the simplification of the environment). In this way, these theories detach these phenomena from the social dynamics (such as the power
relationships between social groups) that underlie them. However, despite its social constructionism, SRT can also be criticised for its lack of focus on power and social group dynamics.

Moscovici (1961/1976) describes the interference of social groups (religious versus communist) in the diffusion of the scientific theory of psychoanalysis into the broader community. Nonetheless, he does not theorise about the power of these groups to impose their version both on the broader community or the group’s opponents. In these early writings, Moscovici is interested in only describing the communicative ways through which social representations take their shape. He distinguishes among three systems of communicative relationships: diffusion, propagation and propaganda.

Diffusion is characterised by a lack of differentiation between the source and the receivers of the information. For example, in the case of the transition of a scientific theory, journalists pass on the information which they have received from specialists. Their aim is to create common knowledge and to adapt themselves to the interests of their readers. The propagation is realised by members of a group who rely on a well-organised world vision, who have a belief in propagation and who aim to accommodate concepts of other doctrines to their own well established system. In the study of Moscovici, an example of propagation is the communication which emanated from the Catholic church. This communication tries to accommodate psychoanalytical knowledge to the principles of religion. Finally, propaganda is a form of communication that is embedded in conflicting social relations. The aim of the communication is to clearly differentiate ‘true’ and ‘false’ knowledge and to entertain an antagonist vision.
In comparison with Social Identity Theory's assumptions for the determining influential power of social group/category memberships, Moscovici's distinction among the three types of communication is a more elaborate (and empirically broader) account of the social formation of people's perceptions, beliefs, opinions or attitudes. Nevertheless, in this thesis it is suggested that SRT can profit from an integration which accounts for the influential dynamics of social group/category identifications.

Moscovici's neglect of the social groups' power dynamics is not arbitrary. He actually attributes the deterministic power of social representations to the need for a mutual understanding that serves communication purposes. Therefore, since social representations aim at a mutual understanding, their construction is realised within the 'consensual' universes. As it will be presented in the next sections, these universes are free of the power of social group dynamics. Thus, Moscovici eventually puts aside the distinction among the three types of communicative purposes and prefers to extensively theorise upon the 'consensual' universes (Moscovici, 1984), where people meet as equals to develop social representations. This development is based upon people's everyday thinking and interpersonal communications. In the next section, these assertions will be presented more analytically, while an account of Moscovici's version of the collective level of the construction of social representations will take place.
2.2. The creation of social representations.

Although social representations have an imposing effect on the individuals’ understanding of the world, they themselves are dynamic entities. By substantiating the dynamic nature of social representations, Moscovici’s model manages to establish the deterministic power of social constructionism and at the same time, to account for the dynamic character of human actions, lives and societies.

Arising collectively, social representations have dynamic characteristics. They are autonomous entities which are not necessarily identifiable in the thinking of particular individuals. Individuals and groups create representations in the course of communication. Once created, however, they lead a life of their own, circulate, amalgamate, attract and deflect each other, and give birth to new representations, while old ones disappear.

Social representations are produced and developed from a sequence of elaborations and transformations which occur over the course of time, by successive generations of human beings participating in collectivities. All the systems that circulate within a society, even recent ones such as scientific discoveries, presuppose a link with previous systems, through a reference to collective memories and a reproduction in language. Thus, even systems that were triggered by new scientific achievements, anchor into and become objectified with the help of past knowledge. These processes can even break the bounds of the structured current information, as Moscovici was able to demonstrate in his study of the social representation of psychoanalysis.
Finally, representations become materialised and crystallised, as far as they are the product of people's actions and communications. This is the reason why and the way in which, social representations and their transformations become capable of influencing the behaviour of the individual participant in a collectivity. Moreover, this is how they sometimes are created even inwardly, "..for it is in the form of practices and communications that the collective process itself penetrates, as the determining factor, into individual thought..." (Moscovici, 1984, p.12). This is the way in which social and public processes, being the first to occur, are gradually interiorised to become psychological processes.

According to Moscovici, the most remarkable result of their reconstruction through practices and interpersonal communications, is that social representations become independent of the communications that produced them in the first place. In this way, insofar as they become the property of the broader community, they also become detached from any group's subjectivity. In order for social representations to acquire permanence and stability, they have first of all to be meaningful for the community. For example, a concept (e.g. scientific) acquires its power as a social representation insofar as it becomes meaningful as a point of reference for the 'non-specialist' people. However, during this procedure (as this new concept anchors in old meaningful representations, becomes objectified and crystallised through practices and diverse communications), it will 'lose' some of its original formulation. This is the way that social representations acquire distance from the sources that generate them.
This assertion can be essential for an explanation of how people can draw upon different, even conflicting belief-systems in order to make sense of their experiences. Having acquired 'distance' from the sources that generate them, people's social representations might not be coherent in relation to specific belief-systems, as those can be found formalised by groups or other sources of social influence. Accordingly, social representations which were originated for specific purposes or from specific communicative purposes (tied to the sciences' or to groups' interests), can be articulated by individuals in much more flexible forms. Nonetheless, by stressing the latter assumptions of Moscovici, the aim is not to underestimate the powerful impact of the sources of social influence upon the formation of social representations. At this point, a differentiated position to that of Moscovici will be supported in this thesis.

As presented earlier, in his original studies, Moscovici describes the dynamics of diffusion, propagation and propaganda. The last two types of communication clearly serve group purposes. However, Moscovici gradually disregarded the power of these communications and developed a set of assertions according to which, people form their social representations within the 'consensual' universes. The basis for this set of assertions is that the main function of social representations is a mutual understanding of reality which will allow social communication to take place.

Therefore, according to Moscovici, people's understanding not only arises from but also serves social communication. First, social representations are generated from social communications and secondly they have an imposing effect upon individuals' understanding in order to allow social communication to take place. Furthermore,
according to Moscovici, since social representations serve the purposes of communication and of mutual understanding, they are created within the 'consensual' universes.

Consensual universes, in opposition to the reified ones, are the ones in which society is seen as a group of individuals who are equal and free, each entitled to speak in the name of the group. Individuals as responsible 'amateurs' or 'curious' observers can and do express their opinions about whatever preoccupies the community. This requires common linguistic conventions, and a certain degree of communality in the participants representations. In the long run, conversation creates referent points of stability and recurrence, 'a communality of significance between those who communicate'. Conversation enables individuals to share an implicit stock of ideas which are taken for granted and are mutually accepted. In this way, thinking becomes a public activity which satisfies the need for communication.

Moscovici asserts that social representations are constructed within the consensual universes mainly because he identifies these universes in opposition to the scientific ones (reified ones). Accordingly, the purpose of (positivistic) sciences is to establish a map of forces, objects and events which are outside people's awareness. Moscovici also believes that the efforts of these sciences is outside people's immediate interests or desires. Therefore, within the consensual universes, representations restore collective awareness and give it shape, explaining forces, objects and events so that they become accessible to everyone and to coincide with people's immediate interests.
Moscovici substantiates both the 'consensual' universes and the function of 'mutual understanding' as far as he describes how people come to make sense of scientific 'inventions'. However, aiming at a theory for people's understanding of reality, he articulates assertions which supposedly apply to all communications regarding the formation of any social representations. Are people free from the sources of social influence, when they form social representations? Do they form 'consensually' (as the simple result of interpersonal communications) any type of social representations? And why do social representations serve a mutual understanding of reality free of the purposes of groups or even of individuals? Before answering these questions, however, it is essential to refer to the way in which Moscovici conceptualises social change.

2.3. Social change and the study of social representations.

One of the most important aspects of SRT is the way it explains social change and how this can be studied. For Moscovici, social change takes place through the progressive transformations of social representations. It is triggered by the introduction of new ideas or experiences that demand to be named and to acquire a meaning for the collectivity. Furthermore, through the process of the anchoring of new representations to old ones, the construction of social representations regarding new 'pieces of reality' also brings transformations to old social representations and/or generates new ones that replace the old ones or makes them disappear.
Nonetheless, taking into account the enduring character of social representations and this process of the anchoring of new representations to old ones, change does not occur automatically. New social representations can be both transformed and transformative.

Thus, for Moscovici, social change is not something that can be explained only by analyzing the power interaction between forces of classes, groups, their norms and rules, as far as these occur at a fragment of time. Change does not occur automatically with the introduction of new concepts, practices or rules by external forces, but as far as these become part of people’s everyday thinking, communications and practices and help them make sense of reality. As presented earlier, this is the function upon which Moscovici bases the deterministic power, and the permanence and stability of social representations.

Nonetheless, even if social change takes place in a progressive way, this does not necessarily mean that power dynamics of sources of social influence do not have an impact on the progressive transformation (or the creation) of people’s social representations. It seems that Moscovici himself does not object to a consideration of the impact of social forces when he speaks about the way social change should be studied. However, his suggestions are not at all clear.

According to Moscovici, social change can be fruitfully studied as far as social representations are studied. Research should concentrate on the emergence of social representations, either starting from scientific theories -so as to follow the
metamorphosis of the latter within a society and the manner in which these theories renew common sense -, or starting from current events, experiences and 'objective' knowledge which a group has to face in order to constitute and control its own world.

In contradiction with the assumption of the consensual universes (in which group dynamics do not have any place), Moscovici (1984, p.15) suggests that in order to achieve a fruitful study of social-psychological dynamics (and of social representations), researchers should turn to the powerful dynamics of groups. More specifically researchers should focus on:

"... (a) the circumstances in which groups communicate, make decisions and seek either to reveal or to conceal something; [and] (b) groups’ achievements and their beliefs, that is their ideologies, sciences and social representations."

Although Moscovici calls for the study of the social representations of the 'groups', he is less willing to specify how the dynamics of the groups are related to social representations. Moscovici is much more persistent in suggesting that a 'social representations theory' demands social-psychological study to reveal the content of specific social representations, the processes of anchoring and objectification through which social representations are shaped and the (sub)function they serve in a specific context.
Although SRT manages to substantiate social representations as the social-psychological dynamics responsible for the social construction of individuals' understanding of the world and thinking, Moscovici suggestions for research promote a description of social representations (which is evident in most social-psychological research of social representations) rather than an analysis of the forces that give them their dynamic life at the level of individuals or their groups.

The problem is that Moscovici acknowledges the main function of social representations as concerning people's understanding and familiarisation with the world. He is not willing to relate the functions served by social representations to groups' (or individual) purposes and therefore the impact of groups upon the formation or the development of social representations.

Moscovici accepts that in some cases an individual or a group might create social representations which constitute subjective distortions of an objective reality, in order to either express or conceal intentions. Alternatively, groups can create representations so as to filter information derived from the environment and thus to control individual behaviour. But for Moscovici such functions can also be fulfilled by other methods (science or religions) and he cannot perceive why such functions should be fulfilled by the creation of social representations which is a method of mutual understanding and communicating.

In order to link the communicative and the intentional nature of social representations, Breakwell (1993) proposes that it is essential to distinguish between the functions that specific social representations serve (which might be related to group dynamics) and
the functions (understand and communicate) which are served by the processes of social representations (anchoring and objectification). It might also be the case that some (not all) representations are related to groups, in which case social representations should be distinguished into types.

The regulative character of power dynamics upon social relationships, social practices and individuals’ action has been clearly demonstrated, even in laboratory experiments. The 'forcing' power of the majority or the 'intrusive' power of the minority are phenomena extensively explored in social-psychological studies and theorised in relation to the power dynamics of social groups.

In this thesis, it is suggested that group dynamics can be involved in the operation of social representations in two ways. Firstly, in the actual shaping of social representations and secondly in their internalisation by individuals. However, before proceeding with these arguments, a more analytic presentation of the place of 'groups' within SRT will take place. First, an example will be given to illustrate the problems arising from the limited theorising of SRT about group dynamics. This example concerns the account of SRT for people's causal attributions in relation to social issues.
2.4. Social representations, social categorisation and social causality.

An example of the way Moscovici bases social constructionism upon the operation of social representations is given in the way he explains and redefines causal attribution regarding social issues. Thus, the causal attributions that individuals make, when seeking to explain the causes of an event, are based upon their social representations. For example, unemployment will be attributed personally to the unemployed individual (lack of interest, competence or even luck), because of the 'individualistic' social representations of those who make the attribution. Their social representations regard the individuals as responsible for their social enhancement. On the other hand, unemployment will be attributed to economic recession, redundancies or to the social-economical system, when the attributors' social representations stress social responsibility, denounce social injustice and call for collective solutions.

Furthermore, these two distinct categories of social representations correspond to a 'capitalistic' (what Moscovici calls 'right-wing') and 'socialistic' ('left-wing') division of the social scene. According to Moscovici (1984, p.50), social psychology cannot ignore the fact that the world is structured and organised according to such a division. Accordingly, people's action is "...dictated by, and related to, social reality, a reality whose contrasting categories divide human thought as neatly as do dualities...".

Moreover, Moscovici (1984) cites an empirical study (Guimond and Simard, reference incomplete) to confirm that the social representations of the "just world" and the "unjust world" correspond to 'dominating' and 'dominated' groups respectively. High-status groups attribute the status of the members of the lower-status group to the
characteristics of the members of the lower-status group, providing individualistic explanations. The members of the lower-status group attribute their status to the members of the higher-status group, and their explanations involve the structure of the society.

For Moscovici, dominating and dominated classes do not have the same representation of the world they share, but see it with different eyes, judging it according to different criteria. However, as far as individual action is concerned, these assertions disregard two crucial points. Firstly, not all the group/category members 'by outside definition' identify with their group/category to the same degree. Although SIT focuses upon the cognitive and motivational processes of group differentiation/identification, nevertheless, it particularly stresses the psychological significance that a group/category membership has for the individual. Moreover, SIT extensively theorises regarding the different strategies (individual mobility, social creativity and social competition) that the members of lower-status groups choose to enhance self-esteem. This theorising also implies that the perception of the social structure also varies (although SIT does not account for this variance) among the members of the same group/category. Thus, in relation to SIT's scope, Moscovici's assumptions for the 'division by social class' of people's causal attribution are simplistic.

Secondly, in the former example, Moscovici acknowledges the impact of social categorisation upon the individuals' social-representational systems but he does not explain why or how one's social membership influences the way that he/she will endorse social representations. As Hogg & Abrams (1988) note, SRT does not
sufficiently define the notion of psychological group formation or identify a process relating the individuals' consensual points of view to their group memberships. In that respect, SIT provides a systematic and empirically fruitful definition of the psychological meaning and the impact of social group/ category dynamics upon people's identity and action. What SIT needs, in respect to action relevant to intergroup conflict, is a theory to encompass the historic and social dynamics of the transformations that categories and their attributed characteristics are subject to, and these of the ideologies that underlie social enhancement action. The framework of SRT can serve to encompass these dynamics. For the moment, the most feasible way to achieve a more complete view on intergroup conflict, is an integrative approach.

It is widely evident that SRT does not encompass a social-psychological theorising for the dynamics of the social group/ category memberships. This is evident from the early efforts to integrate SRT and SIT (i.e. Doise, 1984), to the recent ones (Gaskell & Fraser, 1990; Breakwell, 1992a; 1993). This 'neglect' of SRT results from a theoretical position that the formulation of predictions at the individuals' level is unnecessary. Therefore, SRT (a) does not theorise upon the dynamics of the individuals' positions within the social matrix, or the dynamics of specific situations, as SIT does (Doise, 1984); and (b) ignores the impact of identity dynamics (these arising from group memberships or other) upon the variations in which people endorse or even contribute to the construction of social representations (Breakwell, 1992a; 1993). In the next sections, there will be a more analytical reference to the accounts of the later authors. First, some major references to the way various authors have related social representations to groups or categories will be presented.
GROUPS AND SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS

3. GROUPS AND SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS

3.1. The place of 'groups' in Social Representations Theory.

The first thing to note in SRT's account of groups is that the notion (and consequently the dynamics) of 'groups' is equalled with that of 'individuals' or 'others'. Social representations are created either by groups or individuals (not, however, in isolation). Following Sotirakopoulou's (1991, p.22) account of SRT, the theory conceptualises "...individuals and groups as active entities, thinking in an active and productive way, try to explain whatever seems new and unfamiliar, producing and communicating their own representations". Moreover, Moscovici & Hewstone (1983) base the social nature of representations - at least those concerned with a group's identity - upon a 'feedback' triangularity among subject (the individual), object (the target of a social representation) and third person. People (as subjects) compare their interpretation of reality (the object) with those of others (the third person). The 'third person' in this triangular relationship are 'the others', in the shape of "a real or imaginary partner" (p.117). By including in the notion of 'others' both, other individuals and/ or groups, social-representations theorists appear not to make a qualitative distinction among the dynamics of a 'group' and those of the 'other individuals'.

Nevertheless, Moscovici and Hewstone relate social representations to groups, as far as these shape the identity of a group. According to the authors, social representations have the power to lead to distinctions among categories and establish an identity for
a group. At this point, the authors do not seem to distinguish between the social representations that the members of a group have for their own group and those that other people outside the group (or other groups) have for the target group. In their account of stereotypes as constructs based on social representations, Moscovici & Hewstone (ibid, p.116) confine themselves to saying that "...it is probable that some advanced group would formulate these [widely shared] representations [about a group] more consistently, and express them more concisely, than would the wider public".

But clearly, Moscovici (1987, p.515) also argues that the social representations associated with a group's identity provide a definition for the group itself: "...the group's self representation or its representation of the social setting to which it belongs is an integral part of the group's identity, of its concrete existence".

Moreover, Moscovici & Hewstone (ibid, p.118) while considering the socialisation of the individuals as another social function of the social representations, they relate them to groups in a different way:

"Every member of a group, by birth or otherwise, has the group's representation impressed on him or her. In this way, representations infiltrate to the core of the individual's personality. They restrain one's attitudes and perceptions, and one's attachments or repulsions with regard to objects."
Again, it is very unclear as to what definition of group these authors are referring to. The latter passage could equally refer to the process of the people's group identification, for example according to their ascribed group memberships (i.e. Duveen & Lloyd, 1986, for the formation of the gender identity), or, group can be viewed as the cultural category within which people are socialised. The reference to anthropology that immediately follows this passage from Hewstone and Moscovici, rather suggests the second interpretation. Consequently, the authors are not referring to the dynamics that group identifications produce, but to those that the social representations per se (their determining character) produce.

Another ambiguity with regard to group identifications has its origins in the same account of Moscovici and Hewstone. It is concerned with the relationship between the extent to which social representations are shared, and psychological group formation. Although not explicitly stating it, the authors imply that shared representations form kinds of conceptual groups in the minds of the people that share them. More accurately, according to the authors, the fact that some people (a group, in a numerical sense) share common representations allows them to justify their perceptions and actions.

Other authors have further theorised upon a relationship of the way social representations are shared and distinct groups of people. This concern has triggered one of the most popular debates regarding SRT. The explicit origins of this debate are to be found in the account of Jaspars & Fraser (1984) of the relationship between social representations and people's attitudes. The authors parallel the theoretical
framework of social representations with the original framework of attitudes, presented by Thomas & Znanieki (1918-20, cited in Jaspars & Fraser, ibid) who first introduced the notion of attitudes and their measurement in relation to distinct social groups. The latter authors were concerned with attitudinal differences as far as these vary systematically according to people's social group memberships. Furthermore, Jaspars and Fraser equate the empirical study of social representations with the measurement of an 'attitudinal consensus' at least among members of the same group (as defined by external criteria). Accordingly, if consensus is to be found among the members of a distinct social group, then a social representation is revealed. If then a study of social representations does not involve groups (to use the criterion of between-groups difference), some potentially unanswered questions arise. For example, how many people have to consent for a social representation to be revealed and where do the positions of the rest of the people come from? Nonetheless, it is necessary for the moment to concentrate on the place of groups within SRT and leave the relationship between social representations and consensus to be considered elsewhere in this thesis.

To continue this account about how various authors regard the relationship between groups and social representations, Duveen & Lloyd (1993, p.91), relating social representations to the individuals' beliefs - the former being expressed through the latter - extend Moscovici's (1985a, cited in Duveen & Lloyd, ibid) statement in The age of the Crowd regarding the capability of beliefs to organise groups of people:
"...beliefs serve to organize groups of people; indeed, what makes a group is the existence of a shared set of beliefs among its members, beliefs which will be expressed in the practices of the group, whether these are linguistic practices, preferences, activities of one kind or another, and so on."

In relation to the notion of the group, Duveen and Lloyd seem to take a theoretical position very similar to that of social cohesion theories, especially when they claim that what makes a group is the existence of a shared set of beliefs among its members. If this is the case, then, what is the correspondence between these 'self-formed' groups and the groups used as referent points to characterise people (i.e. women, blacks, poor, etc.). What about the social representations (stereotypes) which are used to characterise people belonging to these categories? Is it the social representations of the group members that define the group's identity, or the social representations of people or groups outside the target group? Does the quoted assertion made by Duveen and Lloyd correspond to that of Jaspars and Fraser (1984) regarding the homogeneity of social representations among members of the same social group and a discrepancy among members of different social groups? Where do these assumptions lead to? What beliefs or social representations distinguish members of different social groups? Is it rational to claim that members of a 'sociologically', 'economically', or 'stereotypically' defined group will have more similar representations in comparison with another social group about anything? If the authors are referring to the specific social representations that serve group functions, then the claims of Social Identity Theory that it is group identification that creates consensual beliefs, and not the reverse, remain sufficient.
Furthermore, when one accepts both, that (a) the sharing of social representations is responsible for psychological group formation and (b) social representations are to be found consensually shared by members of distinct groups, then a vicious circle begins for empirical research. In this circle, in order to establish the psychological formation of a group, the researcher asks the consensual representations that define the group to be identified by the members of an already hypothesised concrete group (McKinlay, Potter and Wetherell, 1993).

In this thesis, it is suggested that different perspectives could apply to the relationship of social representations and groups. People are categorised by social representations, either through the operation of stereotypes and/or by internalising the social representations that define social identities according to social categorisation systems. In that case however, the social representations that define a group's identity are not only property of the ingroup.

As Millward (1995) notes, an integrative approach of SIT and SRT should particularly address the issue of the origins of the social representations that define a group's identity. Identities may also be constructed by social representations diffused by other sources of social influence than the ingroup. Identities may be imposed by social representations created by outgroups which have a vested interest in and the power to circumscribe how the ingroup defines and evaluates itself. Furthermore, recognition of the importance of ownership also gives rise to the question of how beliefs about the group's identity are distributed within the group. Different possibilities are available to group members.
Nevertheless, people do also categorise themselves on the basis of their shared social representations. More specifically, people can also form or join groups on the basis of shared social representations. For example, not all women are feminist and adopt the social representations of a feminist group as a result of their social category membership. But a shared representation of the 'unjust' position of women in the social matrix can lead them to create or to join (pragmatically or conceptually) feminist groups. These representations are becoming shared on the basis of the individuals' experiences. As Kelly & Breinlinger (1996) were able to demonstrate, women participating in feminist activist groups largely base their identification with these groups upon their every day life experiences. On the other hand, it should be noted that one and a half centuries ago women experienced subordination as well. However, there were no women that would act claiming a 'feminist' identity or ideology. That happened only after social movements substantiated 'feminism' as an ideology to interpret (and even to reveal) the experience of subordination and to support action against it. These movements (substantiated by persons or groups) initiated the belief-systems that today women call upon to interpret their experiences and to articulate their social representations.

By criticising some ambiguities resulting from theoretical approaches to the relationship between groups and social representations, the aim is to stress that this relationship is not as clear-cut as various authors have theorised. This relationship can be realised in various ways. Social-representations-theorists mainly focused on the structure (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1988), the production (Jodelet, 1991), the development in children (Augoustinos, 1991), or the impact on action (Di Giacomo, 1980) of social representations that have as their target groups/social categories. Social-
representations-theorists have also often focused on the perceptions of different groups regarding the same target of a social representation (for a review of some of these studies, Doise et al., 1993). Before, however, some more extensive references to some of these studies, there are still theoretical aspects of the relationship between group dynamics and social representations to be considered.

Breakwell (1992a, 1993), in presenting an integrative proposal between SIT and SRT, suggests two main ways that social representations can be related to groups. One way concerns the group functions that social representations may serve and therefore the role of groups in the shaping of specific representations. The other one concerns the dynamics of the individuals' identification with groups.

3.2. Group functions and the shaping of social representations.

According to Breakwell, group dynamics can direct or channel the formation of specific social representations. A group may be the producer of a representation, but also a social representation that concerns the group can be produced outside the group. A social representation can also be co-produced by different groups. According to the author, the tendency to see social representations as a product of unstructured conversations of individuals communicating with no goal (or simply with the goal of communicating) is misleading. To use Breakwell’s (1993, p.183) own words:

"To the extent that structured groups are the producers of social representations, their form and development will not be controlled by any simple intra-individual, or even interpersonal, processes of anchoring and objectification. The form will serve group objectives."
Consequently, intergroup power differentials will also have an important impact upon the development of a social representation. The acceptance of alternative social representations of the same 'piece of reality' will be affected by the relative power of the groups that have an interest in the issue.

Breakwell also notes that, regardless of the power of the group, the suggestion that the group members' social representations are influenced by the ingroup interests is only one side of the issue. There is also the possibility that some social representations will constrain the group's range of options. For example, Lyons & Sotirakopoulou (1991) illustrate how established representations can constrain the ingroup's attempts to achieve positive differentiation. Their research evidence showed how even the most ardent British nationalists would not claim Britain to be superior to France in food or fashion (though they were also unwilling to acknowledge inferiority). Already established social representations, therefore, can constrict schemes for improving the ingroup's position, by determining what is credible as a claim.

Additionally, the group-serving functions identified by Tajfel (social causality, social justification and social differentiation) focus upon the group's manipulation of facts and/or their interpretation in a way that serves the members' self-interest in the course of intergroup comparisons. But, social representations can also serve other types of function for the group. Groups can also use representations to advance common consciousness among the members, regardless of an 'intergroup' (comparison or conflict) context. In other words, social representations can serve group functions
at the 'intragroup' level. This assumption helps to take the notion of social identity further than SIT’s implicit assertion that it results from intergroup comparison and conflict.

Furthermore, a social representation may be significant to a group not because the group produces it or because it directly defines group identity; it may simply be targeted upon an object which is important to the group at a specific time. Then, as Breakwell emphasises, another issue appears to be relevant in analyzing the relationship between social representations and group dynamics. It concerns the importance that a social representation has for the group. In other words, in order to understand the role that a group membership has in the shaping of a social representation that holds the individual, it is important to look not only at the part that the ingroup plays in the production of the representation and the relevance of the target of the representation to the group definition and objectives, but also to consider how significant or salient the representation is for the group. Moreover, the importance that the same social representation has for the group can vary over time and/or across situations. If one wishes to investigate the importance of the representation for the group, one possible prediction would be that the more significant the social representation is to the group, the more likely it will be that group membership will affect the individual’s involvement with the representation.

Finally, in considering groups and social representations, Breakwell also discusses the issue of the networking of the social representations. It is notable that most empirical research on social representations has chosen single targets of representation and
treated the resulting representations in isolation (for example representations of health, mental illness, the city, a student protest, or the family). Yet it is already known that a social representation of one target relates to that of another (this is actually implicit in the notion of anchoring). The problem empirically lies in knowing when one finishes and another begins. Sotirakopoulou (1991), in her longitudinal study of the nature of anchoring, has shown empirically (in relation to the changing representations of the unification of Europe) how difficult it is to talk about one discrete social representation being anchored to a separate discrete but prior representation. However, it seems reasonable to suggest that groups can also dictate which are the appropriate linkages between representations, constraining individual degrees of freedom in association. Nonetheless, whatever the nature of a relationship between social representations and groups, it should not be forgotten that this is mediated by individuals.

4. SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

4.1. Social representations and individual action.

"... [Social representations] are to be studied by sociologists and historians who should relate them to the historical development of a society. But it still remains to be explained how the historical dynamics are actualised through psychological dynamics. If social representations have life it is because they are lived by individuals, co-ordinating their actions, organizing into groups and occupying different social positions in relation to one another. " (Doise, 1984, p. 268)
Nevertheless:

"...the theory of social representations takes as its point of departure the diversity of individuals, attitudes and phenomena, in all their strangeness and unpredictability. Its aim is to discover how individuals and groups can construct a stable, predictable world out of such diversity." (Moscovici, 1984, p. 44)

As Moscovici associates social representations with the study of the 'consensual universes of mutual understanding', he devotes little attention to explain in a systematic way the diversity in people's reconstructions of reality, opinions, attitudes or actions. Social representations (constructed at the collective level) although they may force themselves upon individuals, do go through transformations, elaborations and changes that are the product of individuals' active communication and cooperation with other individuals and of their efforts in understanding the world around them. But even if this explanation is sufficient for SRT not to be accused of regarding the individuals as passive receptors of the reality that social representations create, when it comes to explain the individuals' diversity, it does not provide any links between the social (or collective) level of the creation of social representations and their endorsement by individuals.
For social-representations theorists, social representations are not simply the mediating variables between the external world and the individuals' information processing systems. They are the independent variables which shape the individuals' understanding of the world. They determine both the perception (its direction) and the character of a stimulus within reality, as well as the response it elicits. Social representations both determine the choice and restrict the range of reactions. Thus, according to SRT, researchers trying to explain individuals' behaviour, instead of trying to isolate universal 'psychological' mechanisms, would do better to reveal and make explicit the specific representations which, after all, shape the individuals' understanding of the reality within which action takes place. Moreover:

"When we study social representations we study [hu]man, insofar as he [she] asks questions and seeks answers or thinks, and not insofar as he processes information, or behaves. More precisely, insofar as his aim is not to behave, but to understand." (Moscovici, 1984, p. 15)

Accordingly, researchers have spent little energy in establishing a predictive relationship between social representations and individual action. An implicit assertion that action is embedded in social representations was broadly followed as an axiom by the psychologists who worked within the framework of social representations. Most empirical works in the field were preoccupied with the description of specific social representations. In some cases, researchers were also able to demonstrate the communications that contributed to the development of these representations (i.e. Moscovici, 1961/ 1976; Jodelet, 1991). Most, however, of the recent research is concerned with a demonstration of the structure of social representations (e.g. Abric,
An empirical demonstration of the relationship between social representations and action has largely been considered unnecessary. A straightforward connection of social representations and action was however in some cases (i.e. Di Giacomo, 1980) retrospectively demonstrated. In this case (of a students’ protest movement), DiGiacomo was able to demonstrate that it was the students’ social representations of the social groups represented by the activist teams that determined their positions rather than the declarations of these teams regarding the protest.

The relationship between representations and action was also empirically inferred by the laboratory experiments (discussed in the second chapter of this thesis), regarding action in intergroup conflict situations. To recap, these experiments showed that the situational (intergroup conflict) dynamics, imposed by the experimental conditions, were actually mediated by the intervention of representations which were independent of these situations and concerned with more general representations of the dynamics between social groups present in the broader society. Consequently, the interference of social representations in guiding action was inferred. However, it should be kept in mind that these experiments linked social representations with action through experimental settings of which the dynamics are accounted for by SIT.

According to Doise (1982/1986; 1984; 1990), the relationship between social representations and individual action can be demonstrated by making linkages between the three first and the fourth of his suggested levels of analysis: (a) the intra-individual; (b) the interindividual/ intrasituational, (c) the positional (social group membership) and (d) the ideological one. Doise places SIT at the first three levels (by considering cognitive mechanisms at the intra-individual level) and SRT at the fourth
one. Nonetheless, there are still problems, when individual differences are to be explained systematically. Although SIT focuses on the cognitive and the motivational dynamics underlying action relevant to group dynamics, it considers these dynamics as 'stable' and 'naturally occurring ones', independent of the individuals' social environment - something that is in contrast with SRT's social constructionist model of the individuals' understanding of the world.

In order to maintain the social constructionist level of explanation of SRT, and at the same time take into consideration identity dynamics, there is a need for a theoretical model to account for identity as a structure open to the social environment. As it has been already suggested, Breakwell's (1986) Identity Processes Theory (IPT) provides this type of model. According to this theory, identity is viewed as a structure processing (assimilating/ accommodating and evaluating) social experiences - following, however, some identity principles. The same author has extensively theorised (1992a; 1993) on an integrative modelling of action on the basis of the three theories (SIT, SRT and IPT). In the next sections, some of the assumptions of this integration will be presented.

4.2. Social identities and individual processing of social representations.

According to the integrative approach proposed by Breakwell, if one acknowledges (a) the interests of groups in the operation of social representations and (b) the dynamics of the individuals' group identification (as those were theorised by SIT), it follows that group identifications will influence the individuals endorsement of
particular social representations. Group memberships will first affect the exposure of individuals to certain social representations, as well as to the targets of the representations per se. Groups ensure that members are informed about, or engaged with, social representations which are central to group objectives and definition. Outgroups ensure that members are presented with other aspects of social representations which may be rather less in keeping with the ingroup's interests. Additionally there are, of course, many other purveyors of social representations (the media, the educational establishment, the government and so on). Memberships may influence exposure to these not directly but indirectly, influencing the level of attention paid to particular social representations, or affecting opportunities to interact with them.

The effects of exposure can be examined in a developmental perspective. Augoustinos (1991) has argued that age, in so far as it denotes the length of exposure to a group's repertoire of social representations, will relate to the degree to which the individual shares a social representation with others of the same age. Augoustinos tested this assumption by examining the representations of various groups in Australian society, held by different age-groups. She showed that while individual differences were present in all age groups, they reduced systematically with age.

Furthermore, group memberships will affect the acceptance (or the rejection) of a social representation. Breakwell suggests that they do this sometimes by establishing the extent of the credibility of the source of the social representation, or at other times by explicit commentaries on the representation. Failure to accept the group's verdict
on a social representation can put the individual at risk of reproof or even rejection. The consequences of rejecting the group’s preferred representation of an object clearly vary with the importance that it has for the group. The consequences will also depend upon the individual’s power within the group. Finally, memberships will affect the extent to which the social representation is used. In her definition of ‘use’, Breakwell mainly focuses on the frequency with which the social representation is reproduced (that is, communicated to others) and addressed (that is, used as a point of reference in making decisions, assimilating new information, and evaluating a situation).

On the whole, the importance of the social representation to the group and its relationship to the group’s objectives and self-interests will affect the extent of the identified-individuals’ exposure, acceptance, and use. Furthermore, in order to illustrate these relationships between social identities and social representations Breakwell (1993) refers to a research on the political and economic socialization of British 16-19 year old people carried out by Banks et al. (1991, cited in Breakwell, ibid). This project involved a longitudinal study of two cohorts of teenagers (15-16 and 17-18 at the start of the study) over a period of two years. One of the main concerns of the study was the exploration of political party identification over this period when young people first officially participate in politics.

The first thing to note is that the representation of the political system, held by these young people, was clearly related to their political group membership. Those who had some consistent party preference that is to say, those who identified themselves as consistently Conservative or consistently Labour over the three data collections were
more likely to represent the political system as responsive to the electorate (and essentially as democratic). More importantly, those who had a consistent political-party preference were more likely to reproduce coherently the ideological pattern of policy which separates 'Left' from 'Right' (in British politics) in their own representations. This was expressed in their opinions about taxation, welfare rights, nationalization, and other policy issues. These data indicate that consistency in political-party identification is connected with coherence in reproducing the current party-ideologies: Those who are totally inconsistent over the three surveys are least systematic in reproducing party-ideologies; those with total consistency are most likely to reproduce the party line.

Thus, consistency in political-party identification is linked to the coherent reproduction of a social representation of political issues matching with what is espoused by the political party preferred. To return to the theoretical model of this relationship, it is possible that consistency allows for greater exposure to the party’s ideology; consistency is likely to be reinforced if the party-ideology is found to be acceptable, and may encourage more intense use of it over time. It should be noted that the findings also showed that those who were consistent were more likely to report engagement in more frequent discussions of politics.

It is reasonable to assume that not just the stability of a social identity, but also its centrality to the overall self-concept, will affect exposure, acceptance, and use. There are some indirect empirical illustrations of this point. An example already mentioned in this thesis is the exploration by Gurin & Markus (1989), of the cognitive
consequences that the centrality of a gender-role identification (in a woman's identity) has for her processing of information relevant to gender issues. This processing is more active and efficient when a gender-role identification is central in a woman's identity than when it is not.

Finally, taking into consideration SIT's account for social identity dynamics, one would expect that the centrality of the social identity changes across situations and thus affects the differential use of particular social representations. As Breakwell notes, even if a social representation is very salient to a group and thus to a social identity, it is unlikely to be used in a particular situation unless that social identity is seen to be relevant to the situation.

In conclusion, while social representations play a part in shaping social identities through defining group boundaries and group identities, social identities in turn, through influencing exposure to, acceptance, and use of social representations can shape their development. It is only rational to expect that a new idea might be repressed and never become a social representation if group dynamics restricted its exposure, acceptance, and use.

4.3. Individual differences and the processing of social representations.

The effects of social identities upon the individuals' processing of social representations also imply that there will be considerable individual differences in this processing. Furthermore, when one starts to accept the effects of social identity
dynamics upon the individuals' social representations, one cannot ignore other identity
dynamics that might affect the shaping of social representations in the individual.

Within her integrative model, Breakwell also suggests that individuals customize their
social representations to suit personal goals and fulfil personal needs: in identity
terms, these goals or needs would include positive self-esteem, continuity and/or
positive distinctiveness (Breakwell 1986, 1988). According to the author, there is
evidence that (at least) these three principles can direct the processing (assimilation/
accommodation, evaluation) of the individuals' experiences. Consequently, these
identity dynamics can also influence the processing of social representations.

Nonetheless, these dynamics may also be constrained by social representations. As the
author notes, social representations with a negative impact upon the individual's
identity can be also accepted and used. For instance, in the early 1980's unemployed
young people were found to accept and reproduce aspects of the very negative social
representation of unemployed youth - the representation which was common at the
time (Breakwell et al., 1984, cited in Breakwell, 1993). They did, however, add
elements to it which set their version apart from the general one: combining
self-recrimination for lack of ability and effort with a strong fatalism which was not
present in the common version of the representation.

In considering the relationship between identity dynamics and social representations,
it becomes evident that it might be necessary to consider personality traits as potential
determinants of individual differences in the processing of social representations. In
order to incorporate a consideration for these dynamics, Breakwell (1993) first remarks that traits and social identities are not always clearly discrete and separate. Traits can lead to sorts of group identification. For example, having the trait of shyness can lead to self-definition as part of some conceptual grouping of shy people; it may even lead to seeking out the company of other shy people. Traits are certainly concerned with classifications defined by other people or the social environment. When a shy person is identified as such, entire domains of social behaviour are no longer expected of him/her. In contrast, group membership may call forth or intensify certain traits: membership in a women's group might actively promote assertiveness, while membership of the Conservative party might actually nurture conservativeness.

At this point, it is not so necessary to consider the potential relationships between traits and social identities. It may be useful, however, to consider the operation of traits when a social representation is to be acquired, evaluated, and/or applied. Breakwell proposes two sorts of ways in which traits can be related to social representation processes:

(a) Traits as psychological states may shape the individual's exposure to, acceptance of, and use of a social representation. For example, Moscovici argues that social representations are a product of interindividual communication/interaction. One should recognise that many personality traits would influence the course of such interaction. To use again the example of the shy person, shyness could prevent participation in communications, necessary either to acquire or to influence a social representation. On the other hand, the trait of curiosity has a self-evident relationship to gaining exposure to a variety of social representations.
(b) Traits as *self-conscious self-definitions* also may shape readiness to expose oneself to, to accept, or to use a social representation. The importance of self-attributed traits can be illustrated with data from a cohort-sequential longitudinal study conducted on the sexual activities of British 16-21 year old people (Breakwell & Fife-Schaw, 1992; Breakwell et al., 1991).

In this study, a series of questions were posed to elicit aspects of what might constitute a representation of AIDS/ HIV: knowledge of the routes of transmission, beliefs about people with AIDS, convictions concerning the possibility for discovering a cure, and feelings about personal chances of contracting the virus (including levels of fear). An extensive set of questions about sexual activity (for example, age of first intercourse, numbers of partners, condom use, and patterns of sex acts) were also asked. Additionally, self-descriptions of traits, which included willingness to take risks, were elicited. As the authors note, the trends in this data are clear: self-professed riskiness is correlated with less 'safe' patterns of sexual behaviour (basically, more partners and less use of condoms). There is no need to claim here that the behaviour reported is determined by the trait; for the purposes of this argument, what matters is the relationship of both behaviour and trait to the representation of AIDS/ HIV. Riskiness (defined in terms of self-ascribed behaviours and trait) was positively correlated with a representation of AIDS/HIV which effectively diminishes the risks attached. So, risk-takers are more likely to feel that a cure is feasible, to think it is possible to identify a person with AIDS by looking at him or her, and to think that having sex with only one partner will prevent infection.
No indisputable reasons for this relationship between a self-ascribed trait and aspects of a representation can be offered here. It may be that the representation is just a justification or rationalization for risky acts, generated either before or after they occurred. The point is merely that this sort of relationship between self-description, representation, and action exists and that researchers need to adopt the empirical approaches which will allow it to be explored. The argument does not require that all traits affect the adoption of every social representation. It merely suggests that when examining the differential adoption of a social representation, either in its entirety or in some part, it might be necessary to consider the role of personality traits.

Treating personality traits as important in the study of social representational processes has significant implications for the type of empirical approach which is feasible. Clearly, the data source for both traits and representations must be at the level of individuals. Sampling must allow for individual variations, and the form of data analysis chosen must permit exploration of individual differences.

The relationship between personality traits and social representations can be examined in reverse. As already cited in the introduction of this chapter, Doise & Lorenzi-Cioldi (1991) and Doise (1995) discuss the construction of a representation of 'self' and 'identity' on the basis of social representations. It could be argued that, in so far as traits are socially-constructed prototypes, they are a product of social representations processes. As Breakwell notes, the notion that the dimensions of personality are socially-constructed segments, with a socially-determined meaning and significance, is appealing. It dismisses assumptions that view traits as reductionist and non-social explanations of action.

In the framework of this thesis, by adopting a perspective considering both identity dynamics and social representations, the aim is to achieve an adequate modelling of action. As argued before, social representations can relate to either individual or group actions, or to both, through the dynamics of social identities. They often specify objectives for action and the course that it should take. The major problem in explaining, worse still predicting, individual action in any particular situation lies in the fact that the person will be characterized by several social identities and their attendant social-representational baggage at the time. These identities may push towards different, even conflicting, forms of action.

The emphasis which is placed upon notions of centrality or contextual salience of identities is meant to overcome this problem. The identity salient in the context will direct action, or so the line of argument goes. The problem is then that it is usually impossible to establish, except post hoc, that a particular identity is salient in the situation.

Breakwell (1993) suggests that another approach to this problem is to examine the interactive effects of group memberships. This recognizes that identities do not have separate existences, but interact; their interaction changes their implications for both social representational processes and action decisions. Research exploring these issues of 'multiple-category membership' (i.e Hogg et al., 1986; Kraemer & Birenbaum, 1993) is however limited.
Research on cross-category memberships has so far tended to rely upon stylized pairings of memberships (high/low status; Muslim/non-Muslims; male/female; arts/science students) and to explore them as if their effects are global (without variations across individuals or situations). This line of research is hardly likely to produce a robust model for predicting action. If one realises the implications of multiple category memberships, then the empirical problem lies in catching the implications amid the fluidity of transitions in the relative importance of each membership at a specific time or situation.

At any rate, it is safer for an empirical study to allow for an examination of individual differences and try to reveal possible sources of variation. One suggestion would be modelling possible relationships between identity dynamics, social representational processes and action in relation to specific situations. Nevertheless, a consideration of individual differences in the examination of the operation of social representations requires some further clarifications on the 'nature' of social representations. The last part of this chapter concentrates on the relationship between individuals' beliefs, opinions or attitudes and social representations.
5. BELIEFS AND SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS.

5.1. The notion of social representations as a meta-theoretical explanation of beliefs and the problem of 'consensus'.

SRT was broadly viewed as a framework to account for the social nature of the individuals' opinions and attitudes. The origins of this point of view are to be found in Moscovici's (1963) account regarding the relationship between the construction of social representations (within social representational fields) and the origination of the content of the individuals' opinions or attitudes. As presented earlier, Moscovici (1984) suggests that social representations create frames of reference within which people construct their points of view. (see Farr, 1990 for a similar view).

Thus, for some authors (Jaspars & Fraser, 1984; Gaskell & Fraser, 1990; Fraser, 1993), Moscovici's assumptions regarding the operation of social representations are considered just as renewing a social psychological interest in the social construction of individuals' attitudes. According to these authors, this interest should mainly focus on the relative similarity of attitudes among members of a specific group in relation to members of other groups (see also section 3.1. in this chapter). Thus, according to these authors, the social origins of attitudes can be substantiated. Taking however this argument further, it can be claimed that SIT's assumptions (of which the limitations were discussed in the previous chapter) regarding the capability of group
identification in inducing consensual beliefs, opinions or attitudes among the members of a group, would be sufficient to account for this phenomenon. At any rate, Fraser (1993) has progressively minimised the value of SRT as an alternative theoretical explanation for the construction of people's beliefs.

On the other hand, Potter & Litton (1985), McKinley, Potter & Wetherell (1993) identify an assumed 'consensual sharedness' of social representations as the main problem of SRT. The latter authors consider as a starting point for their criticisms the fact that "Moscovici and other advocates have persistently stressed that representations are consensually shared across groups of people" (McKinley, Potter & Wetherell, 1993 p.137). Therefore, their basic criticisms concern (a) the circularity of the notion of group as defined by the presence of consensually shared social representations among its members (see also section 3.1. in this chapter) and (b) the lack of empirical evidence for consensual social representations, when research techniques imposing consensus on the data are absent. Although these criticisms are valuable in their own right, according to the present author's (and others -i.e. Doise, 1993, for a similar argument) exploration and understanding of SRT, Moscovici does not argue that social representations are consensually (uniformly) shared across groups of people. It can also be argued that this is one of the main reasons why Moscovici (1984, p.10) draws upon Jahoda's (1970, cited in Moscovici, 1984) words to advocate that "...social representations are not necessarily identified in the minds of particular individuals".
Moscovici substantiates the social construction of social representations upon interpersonal communication (not upon normative processes). For Moscovici, communication explicitly includes argumentation, disagreement and debate regarding social representations. Therefore, the social representation of a particular object cannot actually be consensual in the sense of a uniform representation of the individuals. It is essential, however, for a certain degree of consensus to exist in order to allow communication to take place. Alternatively, argumentation or dialogue would not take place, if consensus was not their aim.

As discussed earlier, for Moscovici, the term 'consensual' is concerned with a 'universe' at the level of which people communicate as part of their every day community life and not at the level of power or group interactions. Although these assertions can be criticised (as they have been in this thesis) for their underestimation of the relative power of the sources of social influence, consensus is by no means associated with uniformity:

"We can be sure that this consensus does not reduce to uniformity; nor, on the other hand, does it preclude diversity. How could we have a 'social dialogue' or a conversation without a mixture of the two?" (Moscovici, 1985b p.92)

And

"...the divergences in this universe are necessary for the continued existence of the representation in social life." (Moscovici, 1985b p.92)
The above quotations are actually taken from the reply of Moscovici to Potter’s & Litton’s (1985) article regarding the problem of ‘consensus’. In this article the later authors articulate a need for clarification of the level of consensus that concerns social representations. Although Moscovici in his reply to them denies this need, he does use the notion of a level of consensus when he attempts to describe the processes underlying the social construction of social representations.

According to the present author’s interpretation, consensus (in Moscovici’s terms) is concerned with a collective need for the construction of social representations. Social representations are constrained (to an extent) by a demand for a mutual understanding. People should have a shared understanding of what the ’social dialogue’ is about. (For example, one could not argue that psychoanalysis is a new type of furniture and be considered to express an ’attitude’ regarding psychoanalysis). But there is not any reason for the theory to assume a consensus that results in uniform social representations.

At this point, one of the reasons that Moscovici did not wish to follow Durkheim’s notion of ’collective’ representations will be considered: Social representations are not some representations which (based on structured beliefs-systems) are internalised and reproduced in their entirety by members of a collectivity. As Farr (1984) notes, Durkheim defines his ’collective’ representations as distinct from ’individual’ ones. Moscovici, allows individuals to vary in the way their understanding is shaped, but individuals do not have an understanding that is ’out’ of social representational processes. It is in the core of SRT that all people’s and all their understanding of the
world is determined by representations which are being shaped collectively. The theory is not concerned with some representations of reality which are identifiable as 'social' on the basis of 'how many people' they share them.

In order to illustrate this point, it is appropriate to further pursue this debate. Following a 'consensus' assumption, some authors (i.e. Hammond, 1993; Fife-Schaw, 1993) would verify the existence of a (real) social representation only if groups of (or 'enough') people consensually shared a uniform representation (or at least agree in some specific dimensions) about a given object. These hypotheses presuppose that not all individuals' (or all) points of view are socially originated. According to these authors' criteria, only if the elicited points of view are shared, then, it can be said that they are social. For this thesis, such hypotheses are incompatible with SRT.

Problems then arise as to what is the content of a social representation (of something). How does a researcher describe a representation, if this is not identifiable in the minds of particular individuals and it does not correspond per se to formulated belief-systems? Is a social representation the aggregate or the denominator of the individuals' points of view?

This is a problem that the studies (i.e. Moscovici, 1961/1976; Jodelet, 1991) that focused on the long-term communications underlying the production, diffusion or transformation of representations, actually, did not need to face. On the other hand, researchers dealing with the 'short-term' study of social representations tried to overcome this problem by the use of 'no data-reduction' statistical analyses, usually, matrices of proximity following qualitative data collections (for an analytical account
on these techniques, see Breakwell & Canter, 1993; Doise et al., 1993). Thus, the application of 'consensus revealing' techniques (noted by McKinley, Potter & Wetherell, 1993) is concerned with a structural description of the content of social representations, and not the demonstration of a 'representational consensus' among individuals (as inferred by McKinley, Potter & Wetherell, 1993). Nonetheless, this effort results, to some extent, from a negative theoretical position towards statistical analyses that consider individual differences (e.g. factor analysis).

This 'statistical technique' inclination partially also reflects an effort to link SRT with a specific research methodology, although Moscovici has supported a methodological pluralism in the study of social representations (for a discussion in support of a methodological pluralism, see also Breakwell & Canter, 1993; Doise et al., 1993). However, inclinations towards specific methodologies mainly resulted from a stress on the description of the content of social representations, theoretically supported by Moscovici.

In this thesis, it is argued that problems of 'consensus' are inherently tied with SRT's focus on the description of the content of a social representation. More specifically, the present critique aims at initiating an interest in what a conceptualisation of the 'content' of social representations involves.

For Moscovici, it is clear that social representations should be studied as autonomous entities, 'not necessarily identified in the minds of particular individuals'. This is the reason why he consistently promoted examples of studies of social representations that are concerned with the development of a social representation within specific communities. Here, it is suggested that, as far as one wishes to study the content of
social representations at the level of individuals, at a fragment of time, it is more appropriate to refer to social representational fields than to a social representation. (It has to be noted that the term 'social representational fields' is not used here in the same sense that it is used by Doise et al. (1993), that is, to denote relationships among the elements of a representation. The term is also used by Rose et al. (1995) in order to denote the 'no consensual' nature of social representations. In this thesis, the characterisation 'fields' denotes the nature of social representations, in two ways:

(a) In the sense that the operation (the existence, as well as the content) of any particular representation in the mind of an individual, is determined on the basis of communication/interaction with 'other' individuals, groups and/or sources of social influence. (This to be considered as the 'key' hypothesis to verify the social origination of the individuals' points of view.) It is worth noting that this view on the social nature of the individuals' formation of points of view, is very close to the assumption of triangularity made by Moscovici & Hewstone (1983).

(b) In the sense that points of reference for communication (as those mentioned above) do vary in the communication they emanate and the information they elicit regarding the same issue. Accordingly, the shaping of the individuals' social representations is subject to diverse communications and to the social (e.g. power) or identity dynamics that determine people's positions in the created social representational fields. Moreover, the fact that individuals form points of view and have positions in relation to these representational fields, does not necessarily mean that they are not aware of 'other' positions.
This perspective also suggests a substantiation of the 'consensual' nature of social representations upon the sources of social influence and not upon the individuals' points of view. In other words, it is suggested that uniform representations can be found only as far as the researcher approaches the origins of a social representation, the groups or the persons that initiate (or have an immediate interest in) their production, diffusion, propagation or propaganda. For example, the most 'consensual' representation of psychoanalysis would be found in Freud, a less consensual one among psychoanalysts, a more dispersed one among people of a community and more rigid ones in groups that have an interest in creating specific representations about psychoanalysis (i.e religious, Communist).

Nonetheless, by making these assumptions, it is not wished to suggest that individuals do not systematise their social representations. This systematisation could also be influenced by identity dynamics (as those discussed earlier) and/ or people’s social affiliations (such as group identifications, or the espousal of specific ideological systems). Since, group identifications have already been discussed, the next section focuses on ideologies and specifically on how SRT can confer to the explanation of their endorsement by the individuals.
5.2. Social Representations and Ideologies.

"Ideologies constitute a set of beliefs which are bound together in some systematic way; [this] system of beliefs is a property of groups both in the sense that an ideology is generated by an identifiable group and that it may be shared, or used, by others." (Scarborough, 1990, p.103)

In this quoted paragraph Elinor Scarborough gives a modest but broadly agreed definition for ideologies. Her concern for ideology arises from a deficiency of the theory of attitudes to explain political behaviour. Her consideration of SRT arises from the need "to understand how political ideologies have their roots in the life of a society" (p.106). The concern of this section is also to consider how the theory of social representations can contribute to a more fruitful account of ideologies, with regard to action relevant to intergroup conflict.

As already suggested, the present thesis considers SRT as having a crucial role in the examination of the impact of social ideologies in action relevant to intergroup conflict. For this reason, various accounts of the relationship between social representations and ideologies will be presented in this section and it is hoped that a fruitful use of this relationship in the empirical study of intergroup conflict will be acknowledged in the conduct of the empirical studies of this thesis. Nevertheless, it should be noted that it is not possible in the space of this thesis to specifically concentrate on the notion of ideologies, but only as far the notion of social representations can contribute to an explanation of their dispersion.
To continue this account, the origins of Scarbrough’s (ibid) consideration of a relationship between social representations and ideologies are to be found in the features that she attributes to the social world. Those are "the inherent, endemic uncertainty of social life arising from the inter-subjective, reflexive character of social practices..." (p.103). Moscovici (1984), although not explicitly, attributes the same features to the social world. Social representations serve to provide people with meanings in order to understand the 'uncertain' social (as well as the 'material' one) world. Social representations reflect and become crystallised through social practices as well as they prescribe behaviours.

Scarbrough’s consideration of an empirically useful affiliation between SRT and the study of ideologies arises from a dissatisfaction with the existing explanations of how people come to endorse a political ideology. The notion of "rational" interests is challenged, by the apparently 'deviant' beliefs of working-class right-wing voters and upper-class socialists. Conceptual difficulties with 'real interests' make it difficult to dismiss 'mistakes' under the rubric of 'false consciousness'.

Moreover, political ideologies which do not speak to the life of a society would be odd. For interest groups (such as political parties) commonality in individuals' interests requires the construction of common understandings. To secure its interests the group needs to shape, or reshape, understandings in the community at large. According to Scarbrough, structural explanations of ideology yield constricted, deterministic, accounts of political life.
In an attempt to overcome a deterministic or monolithic account of ideologies, Billig (1991) turns to the argumentative character of thinking, embedded (but overshadowed) even in the most rigid ideological accounts. However, this perspective still does not explain how ideological systems affect individual thinking.

According to Scarbrough, "... we have to turn elsewhere, to understand how political ideologies have their roots in the life of a society" (p.106). For this author, it is here that the notion of social representations, as delineated by Moscovici, captures the attention. She then goes on to construe ideologies as "extensive but internally structured complexes of social representations" (p.107). In other words, the author restates the various component elements of ideologies to operate as separate social representations, which, however, are structurally linked to each other. Scarbrough clearly states the purpose of defining ideologies as complexes of social representations:

"Our purpose in making such a move would be to secure ideologies as essentially social phenomena. That is, in this light, the social character of ideologies would extend beyond being shared by some number of people and having as their concern matters in the public domain. Rather, ideologies could be understood as social in being rooted in the processes of social life and in being expressed as images of social reality. (...) the seeds of ideologies could be understood to lie in the very nature of the interchanges of everyday life, and the force of ideologies could be understood as setting the forms of everyday life. And in rendering ideologies social both from the beginning and in the end, as it were, we might more readily understand what is social in 'individual' interests and attitudes" (p.109)
Social psychologists therefore, can uncover the dynamics of social life, by studying social representations and "capturing the ideological in that which is located in persons" (not in the formalised versions of ideologies) (Scarborough, 1990, p.109).

For this thesis, seeing ideologies under the scope of SRT gives space to speculate that ideologies, when formalised by their formal sources (i.e. by the constitutions of political parties), can be presented as specific, systematic, rigid forms of thought, providing explanations, establishing common understandings, interests, goals, values and principles of action. But when these messages are 'diffused' to take part in the life of individuals, by being anchored to previous social representations, providing new meanings to experiences and crystallised through communications and social practices, ideologies become 'live entities', subject to transformations and at the same time transformative. In other words, they integrate into other established social representations to transform them or to be transformed and/ or trigger the formation of new complexes of social representations. In that respect, ideologies have the same place as scientific 'knowledge' within SRT.

The position of this thesis is that ideologies within SRT 'can find their roots and destination in social life' and constitute referent points for perceptions, opinions, attitudes or actions. Having in mind the way that Moscovici envisages social change, it can be argued further that the real regulative dynamics of ideologies, through the transformations that provoke and the transformations that undergoing, are realised through the dynamics of social representations.
In social psychological theorising in general, the notion of group was considered as the main link between the individual and the social environment. Also, a correspondence between group/category identification (social identity) and individual beliefs was often assumed. Regardless of the ambiguous theorising of SRT regarding groups, the position of this thesis is that the framework of SRT allows a place for the individuals’ beliefs to substantiate per se this link between individual action and social dynamics.

Powerful social belief-systems (such as social ideologies) can be normally distributed among individuals. This assumption is made, not on the basis of a reductionist explanation of individuals’ attitudes, but because (a) SRT provides a framework to account for the collective (and thus subject to social dynamics) level of 'individual thinking' and (b) because an integrative model of identity and social representational dynamics allows a place for individual differences, which are subject both to the variation of the points of reference for communication and to identity dynamics - either those which are directly related to specific group/category memberships or other.

On this basis, in the empirical studies of this thesis, it will be attempted to demonstrate how powerful ideological social belief-systems, namely individualism and collectivism, examined as the individuals’ social representations of the social enhancement strategies are crucial determinants of individual action in intergroup conflict situations.
CHAPTER FOUR: GENERAL PREFERENCES FOR SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES AS THE INDIVIDUALS’ POSITIONS IN SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONAL FIELDS OF INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM.

1. INTRODUCTION

An examination of preferences for social enhancement strategies as the individuals’ general positions in relation to social ideological belief-systems of individual mobility and collective social enhancement, rather than as spontaneous reactions to the structure of specific intergroup situations has already been suggested in this thesis. Thus, instead of examining the strategies as preferences for action within the frame of a specific intergroup conflict, the first empirical study of this thesis attempts to explore them as general social-psychological orientations.

It has been already presented how Taylor and McKirnan (1984) assume that an ideological belief-system of individual mobility (which characterises western societies) affects the individuals’ perception of intergroup dynamics and choice of social enhancement action. Nevertheless, as discussed in Chapter Two, this model stresses the deterministic nature of the dominant ideology and does not adequately explain the operation of social ideological belief-systems at the level of the individuals. Moreover, collective/social-change social enhancement action, in particular, is not discussed as a social ideological belief-system or system of practices.
Other theorists (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis et al., 1986) approach individualism-collectivism as a single cultural dimension that typifies societies. Along this dimension, a society can be characterised in relation to the extent that it emphasises individual achievement and separation from an ingroup or collective achievements and cooperation with ingroups. Furthermore, Gudykunst et al. (1987), Wheeler et al. (1989) and Triandis (1989) provide empirical evidence that individualism-collectivism (as a cultural dimension) influences individuals’ self-regulation in relation to their social ingroups and outgroups.

From a SIT perspective, Hinkle & Brown (1990) suggest that the 'individualism-collectivism' dimension along with a 'cooperation-competition group ideology' dimension can also typify groups. On this basis, groups can be distinguished as to the extent they stress individual or collective accomplishment and involve social comparisons (competitive or cooperative) with other groups. Furthermore, these authors suggest (and provide some empirical support) that the individuals’ intergroup behaviour will vary according to the type of the ingroup.

However, within a SRT perspective, this study aims at examining individualism and collectivism, not as fixed characteristics of the group or the society within which an individual acts, but as ideological systems circulating in specific societies and as such affecting individual thought and action. As previously discussed, the suggestion is that such ideological systems (formulated by groups and/or denoting sets of social practices) form social representations of individualistic and collectivistic social
enhancement action. Therefore, individuals will hold general preferences for social enhancement strategies within the created social representational fields. Furthermore, as argued earlier, these preferences (positions within the social representational fields) can be normally distributed among individuals.

By making these statements, the aim is not to theorise these possible general individual preferences as fixed personality traits. Psychological theorising regarding the dimension of individualism-collectivism (as identified by Triandis) is not free from such tendencies. For example, Hui (1988) regards individualism-collectivism as a personality dimension along which people can be characterized as 'individualists' or 'collectivists' ('idiocentrics'-'allocentrics' according to Triandis et al. (1988)). Such tendencies however, neglect the dynamics underlying the operation of social ideological systems (and their endorsement or their creation by individuals) and overemphasise the static nature of people's possible general preferences for action.

On the contrary, this thesis views the individuals' possible general preferences for social enhancement strategies as an essentially social phenomenon since these preferences are formed in relation to systems of beliefs and practices that are socially and collectively originated and developed. By using a social-representations-framework, it is clear that the emphasis is placed on the assertion that individuals construct their understanding of reality, form their opinions and act on the basis of social representational dynamics. In this way, individuals' points of view and/or their expression will co-vary according to the dynamics of social and collective processes.
Nevertheless, the multiplicity of these dynamics, the variety of sources of social influence, identity dynamics and individuals' particular experiences, communications and interactions allow an assumption of a normal distribution of general preferences for social enhancement strategies.

Moreover, it has to be noted that the present series of studies focus on those aspects of individualism and collectivism which are concerned with the undertaking of social enhancement action in cases where an ingroup is at a social disadvantage. Thus, it was not considered appropriate to adopt measurements of individualism-collectivism (idiocentrism-allocentrism) that follows Triandis' operationalisation, which focuses on the individuals' preference to work/achieve within and/or for the community or the group. These measurements were considered inappropriate, firstly because they focus on other aspects of individualism-collectivism and secondly because they are based on the assertion that individualism and collectivism are the two poles of the same dimension, whereas this thesis regards them as distinct social ideological systems that form general preferences for individual action by creating social representational fields. Regardless of the theoretical positions and the focus of this series of studies, it has also to be noted that in some recent studies (Kelly & Breinlinger, 1996), the effects of the individuals' idiocentrism-allocentrism (as a willingness to cooperate with and stand for an ingroup) upon participation in collective action proved weak and been moderated by the level of specific-group identification.
Assuming therefore that ideological social belief-systems or systems of social practices operate at the level of general individual orientations, the first empirical question is whether the individuals do hold some systematic general preferences for type of social enhancement strategy that operate independently of specific intergroup conflict situations. The prediction of this study is that when individuals are confronted with discrimination against an identification group, regardless of (a) the type of the identification group (b) a specific structure in the intergroup relationships (permeability of intergroup boundaries, stability and legitimacy of intergroup status-discrepancy) and (c) the level of the individuals identification with the group, individual differences will be present in preferences for the strategies, indicating that individual action also relies upon general preferences for type of social enhancement action.

The other empirical issue involved here is whether the preferences for social enhancement action are organised in distinguishing between individual mobility, social creativity and social competition. As discussed in chapter two, SIT bases the distinction between the three types of strategies on the macro-social level of their operation (the implications they have for the group’s objective position) and not upon a social-psychological organisation of individual action. Since the strategies are examined here as the individuals’ general preferences in relation to broader social belief-systems and not as the result of particular intergroup situations that might constrain the strategy-options, this distinction can be fruitfully assessed.
The first empirical study of this thesis therefore intends: (a) To demonstrate that without manipulating structural conditions (permeability, stability and legitimacy), and regardless of the level of identification and the type of the identification group, individual differences will be present regarding preferences for the social enhancement strategies; (b) To assess SIT’s distinction between the three different types of social strategies at the level of the individuals and (c) To develop measurements of general preferences for the social enhancement strategies, so that their effect on action in specific situations can be subsequently assessed.

2. METHOD

2.1. Design

A questionnaire constructed to tap general preferences for social enhancement strategies, was administered to 220 students of the University of Surrey, 170 of which were social science students. The questionnaire was distributed individually or in large numbers in classrooms. The return rate was 63% (N = 145).

2.2. Subjects

Of the respondents, 127 (88%) were social science students (93 Psychology students and 34 Applied Psychology & Sociology students). Furthermore, 116 (80%) were female and 29 (20%) were male. The age range was from 17 to 48 years old (mean 23.43, Std. Dev. 6.25, mode 19). Moreover, 116 (80%) of the respondents were
British and 23 (15.8%) had other European Nationalities. Of the respondents, 85 (58.6%) had an English ethnic origin and 49 (33.7%) belonged to other European ethnic groups. As far as the religion of the respondents is concerned, 91 (62.7%) were Christians, 21 (14.6%) were agnostics, 15 (10.4%) atheists, 3 (2.1%) Muslims, 3 (2.1%) Jewish and 2 (1.4%) spiritualists.

2.3. Questionnaire Description and Construction.

In the distributed questionnaire (Appendix 1) the subjects were asked to indicate how likely it is that they would react in the way described by each of a list of 50 statements, if they felt that a group they belong to and which is very important for them was being discriminated against by other group(s). Their answers were coded on the basis of a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Very Unlikely) to 5 (Very Likely).

Before rating their preferences, the subjects had been previously asked to think of and state a group they belong to and which is very important to them. Some examples of groups, ranging from ethnic groups to sport teams, were presented as an indication of the sort of choice the subjects could make. The respondents were then asked whether they had ever experienced discrimination as part of this group. Irrespective of their answer, they were asked to consider how they would feel and what they would do if the group was discriminated against by another group(s).
This referencing of the respondents to a specific group, and the consideration of discrimination against it, was asked as a minimum manipulation of a context of discrimination against an ingroup that would make it meaningful for the respondents to articulate preferences for the types of social enhancement action. It was also expected that the variety of types of identification groups would allow for comparisons of the effects of the type of identification group. Furthermore, it has to be noted that all the individuals were asked to think of and state an ingroup which is very important to them, in order to standardise the level of group identification. No other experimental manipulations of the intergroup situation were made.

The fifty items (L1 to L50 in Appendix 1) were describing in very general terms actions reflecting individual mobility, social competition or social creativity strategies. The items were constructed on the basis of the definitions of the three types of social enhancement strategies given by Turner & Brown (1978) and Hogg et al. (1986) (see Chapter Two).

Thus, individual mobility items were mostly describing efforts to dissociate self from the ingroup and/or to advance individually. Social competition items were focusing on conflict for power and/or active (extrovert) attempts to establish an equal position for the ingroup. Social creativity items focused on the search for alternative criteria (or alternative groups) for intergroup comparisons and passive (introvert) attempts to maintain the group as an entity. Moreover, efforts were made so that the actions described in the questionnaire could be employed in coping with discrimination against any kind of ingroup.
Finally, a panel of social psychologists in the University of Surrey, who were familiar with SIT to different degrees, were asked to identify the type of each item according to the definitions that were given to them. The most controversial items were either excluded or restructured so as to more clearly reflect the strategy as defined by SIT.

From the items included in the questionnaire, sixteen were considered according to the definitions of SIT as reflecting individual mobility (L1, L5, L11, L14, L16, L19, L23, L27, L28, L31, L37, L41, L45, L50), eleven were considered as describing social creativity (L2, L7, L15, L17, L18, L21, L22, L25, L26, L29, L30, L40, L46) and twenty three were considered as referring to social competition (L3, L4, L8, L10, L12, L20, L24, L32, L34, L35, L36, L38, L39, L42, L43, L44, L47, L48, L49).

3. RESULTS

3.1. Identification groups.

'Friends' was most frequently reported as an identification group (52.5 %). Such a frequency of identification group limited an attempt to test for possible effects of the type of identification group. However, eliciting the same type of group identification from the majority of the respondents also decreases the chances that the distribution of the preferences elicited is caused by the type of the group. The second more frequent identification groups (6.4 % in both cases) were religious groups and family. Finally, 26.9 % of the respondents had experienced discrimination as members of the group which was important to them.
3.2. Factors underlying general preferences for social enhancement action.

A Principal-Components analysis was employed on the 50 items. An oblique rotation was used since it allows for correlations between the extracted factors to be estimated. Overall, fifteen factors were extracted, accounting for 67.5% of the variance.

The items describing (according to SIT) social competition actions loaded on eight different factors:

- Items focusing on the group’s power (L34, L8, L20, L32)* loaded on factor 1.
- Items describing extreme actions, such as defence by any means, use of physical force or verbal attack (L47, L35, L44) loaded on factor 3.
- Items L42 and L39 emphasising retaliation loaded on factor 11.
- Items L38, L24 involving the use of symbols to emphasise group membership loaded on factor 13.
- Items L3, L4, L12, L10 referring to effort to inform or to involve into action ‘others’ outside the group loaded on factor 14.

* Throughout the thesis, only the items with factor-loadings above 0.3 (in absolute value) are reported as 'loaded on a factor'. Also, the items are always reported starting from this with the higher loading and ending with this with the lower loading.
- Items L43, L48 loaded on factor 6 along with a majority of social creativity items.

- Item L49 stressing the group’s lack of power loaded on factor 4 along with the social creativity item L18 which suggests the isolation of the ingroup from the groups discriminating against it.

- The negative (reverse) social competition item L36 (‘I would not stand up for the rights of my group’) loaded on factor 7 along with social creativity item L15 (comparing the ingroup with groups of inferior status).

The items describing individual mobility type of strategy loaded on four different factors.

- Items involving clear exit and dissociation from the ingroup (L28, L27, L31, L41) loaded on factor 2.

- Items L45, L23, L50, L14 expressing effort to differentiate (partially) self from other ingroup members loaded on factor 9.

- Items L11, L37, L5, L1 describing occasional avoidance of been categorised as a member of the group (pretending, avoiding contexts in which one can be discriminated, hide the group membership) loaded on factor 15.

- Items L16, L19 (‘try to become famous as a representative of the group in order to gain personal acceptance’ or ‘try to get into a position of high status in the group’) loaded separately on factor 5, but also loaded on factor 3 along with a majority of social competition items.
Social creativity items loaded on three different factors.

- Items L46, L22, L29, L25 expressing an effort to use alternative criteria for the evaluation of the ingroup loaded negatively on factor 10.

- Items L26, L17 which were concerned with finding ways of showing that discrimination is unfair or counterproductive, loaded on factor 1 along with a majority of social competition items.

- Items L2, L21, L30 focusing on a positive evaluation of the difference of the ingroup from other groups loaded on factor 6 (along with social competition items).

- Items L7 and L40 loaded on factor 12.

None of the correlations between the pairs of factors was statistically significant or high (above 0.3) (Table 4.1.). However, the relatively higher correlations (ranging from 0.24 to 0.29) were either between 'social competition/ social creativity' factors (i.e. factors 1 and 6), or between a 'social competition/ social creativity' factor and a 'social competition' one (i.e. factors 1 and 14), or between 'individual mobility' factors (i.e. factors 2 and 9, factors 2 and 15, factors 9 and 15).
### Table 3.11
Correlation matrix of the factors extracted from the principal components analysis on the 50 items of general preferences for social enhancement strategies. (N=145)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All coefficients are statistically insignificant.
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3.3. The organisation of action according to the three types of social enhancement strategies.

A three-factor solution was imposed on the data in order to assess SIT’s distinction between the three different types of social enhancement strategies. An oblique rotation was again used in order to estimate the correlations between the three factors. The three factors accounted for the 33.1% of the variance. The three-factor solution achieved a simple structure.

Both 'social competition' and 'social creativity' items loaded on factor 1. 'Individual mobility' items loaded on factor 2. Finally, factor 3 was characterised by loadings on items describing extreme actions (i.e. use of physical force, defence by any means, retaliation, try to get a high status position within the ingroup, being a famous representative of the group). Factor 1 was not statistically significantly or highly correlated with factor 2 or 3 (r = -0.13 in both cases). Factor 2 and factor 3 were also not highly or statistically significantly correlated (r = 0.04).

Both the factor-solutions clearly indicate that social creativity and social competition do not constitute two different factors organising preference for social enhancement action. In the case of the three-factor solution, the extremity of the action proved to be a more important factor when considering forms of coping action. However, individuals seem to distinguish their preferences between individual mobility and collective/social change type of strategy. Since the focus of this thesis is on these types of social enhancement action, a two-factor-solution was imposed on the data, in order to assess this distinction and develop relevant measurements.
The two factors accounted for 27.3% of the variance. Simple structure was achieved. Factor 1 was characterised by loadings on 'collective/social change' items and factor 2 by loadings on 'individual mobility' items. Factor 1 was labelled "Voice" and factor 2 "Exit". The two factors were not highly correlated (r = -0.06).

According therefore to the results, a distinction between individual mobility and collective/social change type of strategy seems to underlie individual preferences for action in cases of discrimination against an ingroup. It has also to be stressed that, as it became apparent from the minimal correlation between the two factors, the two types of social enhancement strategy are not rated by the individuals as the opposite poles of a unidimensional inclination towards either the one or the other. The findings from all the Principal-Component analyses support the conceptualisation of the elicited preferences for these types of action as the individuals' positions in relation to distinct social systems of beliefs or practices.

Finally, the internal reliability of both the developed scales (briefly referred as the 'Voice' and 'Exit' scales) was high (respectively, a = 0.89, eighteen items and a = 0.86, fifteen items). Also, the scales were not highly correlated to each other (r = -0.29). The items of the two scales with their factor loadings (in the two-factor solution) are presented in Table 4.2. and Table 4.3.
Table 4.2. Factor loadings of the items comprising the Voice Scale (a= 0.89). (Factor 1 in the two-factor solution of the 50 items of general preferences for social enhancement strategies.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L12</td>
<td>I would campaign for equality.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L48</td>
<td>I would try to persuade others, outside my group, about the rights of my group.</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L26</td>
<td>I would find ways of showing the discrimination was unfair.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L32</td>
<td>I would try to increase the actual objective power of my group.</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>I would argue for equal treatment.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L17</td>
<td>I would find ways to prove discrimination was counterproductive for everyone.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L25</td>
<td>I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the criteria used for evaluating it.</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>I would try to persuade others, outside my group, that such discrimination is unfair.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L34</td>
<td>I would use whatever power the group possessed to change the relationships between groups.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td>I would try to change the balance of power between the groups.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L21</td>
<td>I would argue that my group should be treated as different from but equal to other groups.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>I would try to persuade others, outside my group, to protest for the rights of my group.</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L46</td>
<td>I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the value attached to the characteristics associated with group members.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>I would try to ally my group with other more powerful groups.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L43</td>
<td>I would challenge the right of any group to discriminate against my group.</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L20</td>
<td>I would try to show the power of my group.</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L29</td>
<td>I would try to change the way the group is perceived by comparing its characteristics with those of groups that were not discriminated against.</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing that it possesses additional or different characteristics not previously recognised.</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3. Factor loadings of the items comprising the Exit scale (a= 0.86). (Factor 2 in the two-factor solution of the 50 items of general preferences for social enhancement strategies.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L28</td>
<td>I would try not to think about being a member of that group.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L31</td>
<td>I would leave it and ensure everyone connected with me left it.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L14</td>
<td>I would keep away from other members of my group.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L41</td>
<td>I would not tell anyone I was a member of that group.</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L23</td>
<td>I would try to prove that I am different from the other members of the group.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L27</td>
<td>I would try to become so famous in my own right that people did not treat me like a member of the group.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9</td>
<td>I would leave the group if I could.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>I would pretend, when necessary, not to be a member of the group.</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>I would act in such a way as to avoid being categorised as a member of that group.</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L50</td>
<td>I would try to act in such a way that others would not attribute to me the characteristics thought to be common to members of my group.</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L30</td>
<td>I would argue that the characteristics of my group were valuable.</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L37</td>
<td>I would avoid contexts where that group membership led me to be discriminated against.</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>I would never hide the fact that I was a member of that group.</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L36</td>
<td>I would not stand up for the rights of my group.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L45</td>
<td>I would minimise the importance of that group membership when thinking about myself.</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.4. The Voice and Exit scales.

The scores for both scales were almost normally distributed. The distribution statistics for the two scales are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. Distribution statistics for the Voice and Exit Scales. (N=145)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Dev.</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>S.E. Mean</th>
<th>S.E. Kurtosis</th>
<th>S.E. Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be seen in Table 4.4., both distributions are skewed towards one of the poles of each scale. It could be argued that the homogeneity of the sample (Social Science Students) is responsible for the skewness and that if the sampling allowed for greater variance, the distributions would be closer to the normal one. However, taking into account the literature regarding individualism/collectivism as a cultural dimension, the skewness of the distributions can be interpreted as reflecting cultural inclinations towards collective and against individualistic strategies. Although western societies have been characterised as individualistic ones, it could be argued that students as a social subgroup have greater preference for collective/social change strategies and less for individualistic ones.
As far as systematic sources of variation are concerned, the categorisation of identification groups into broader types was attempted in order to examine possible effects of type of identification group. Nonetheless, the distribution of the chosen identification group (apart from 'friends') was very spread. Taking into account the constraints of the distribution, a meaningful categorisation was considered this between the racial/ ethnic/ religious groups (N = 12) that characterise individuals from birth and the groups in which people decide to participate as a result of their interests (ecological, animal rights, political, community and Amnesty International, N = 11). This typification of groups did not produce a significant effect on preferences for individual mobility or collective/ social change strategies (pooled t = -1.76, df = 21, n.s. for the Voice scale and pooled t = -0.14, df = 21, n.s. for the Exit scale).

Regarding the effects of the specificity of the experience connected with the chosen identification group, another possible source of differentiation was examined - namely, the experience of discrimination against the chosen identification group. The results from the conducted t-tests showed that the respondents that reported having experienced discrimination as members of their important identification group (N = 39) did not differ as a group from the people that reported not having experienced discrimination (N = 90) (pooled t = 1.74, df = 127, n.s. for the Voice scale and pooled t = -1.52, df = 127, n.s. for the Exit scale).

Overall, the distributions of preferences cannot be attributed to a systematic effect of the type of the chosen identification groups, or to the level of the individuals' identification with these groups (since all the subjects were asked to think of an
ingroup that is very important to them). Also, the distributions cannot be attributed to systematic variations of the structural dimensions of specific intergroup conflict situations. Therefore, the results reinforce the argument that the elicited preferences for social enhancement strategies as measured by the two scales rely upon general individual preferences for the strategies which are independent of structural elements of specific intergroup relationships and rather reflect the individuals’ positions in relation to relevant social belief-systems and systems of social practices.

4. DISCUSSION

In accordance with the predictions of this study, individual differences do operate in people’s preferences for the social enhancement strategies independently of systematic effects by the variables suggested by SIT - that is the permeability, the legitimacy and the stability of the intergroup status-relationships (Turner & Brown, 1978; Ellemers, 1990; Ellemers 1993; Ellemers & Van Knippenberg, 1993), the level (strength) of the individuals’ identification with an ingroup (Williams’ & Giles 1978; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1995), or the type of the identification group (Hinkle & Brown, 1990). These individual differences were predicted and are interpreted as reflecting the individuals’ general preferences for the social enhancement strategies as those are developed within the social representational fields of the relevant ideological social belief-systems and/ or systems of social practices concerned with the strategies.
Regarding the social-psychological organisation of these preferences in terms of the three types of social enhancement strategies suggested by SIT, the results from the factor analyses indicate the distinction between individual mobility and collective/social change types of strategy. However, it became apparent that a distinction between social competition and social creativity type of actions is not strong. The individuals’ concern about the extremity of the action proved to be a stronger factor underlying their preferences for type of action than a distinction between social competition and social creativity.

Although social competition and social creativity are identified by SIT as qualitatively different strategies, the covariance of preferences indicates that when individuals are to consider action, they perceive these actions as the same type of strategy. SIT’s distinction between these two types of action is mainly concerned with the change of the status-position of the group through direct social competition versus the search for alternative criteria of comparison that would 'psychologically' and not 'socially' improve the position of the group. According to social-identity-theorists, the latter type of strategy will emerge when cognitive alternatives of the status-quo are not conceivable. Nevertheless, according to the findings of this study, developing new criteria for the evaluation of the ingroup, or campaigning for equality and competing for power seem to be just different tactics aiming at the same goal.

Therefore, although social creativity was considered by social-identity theorists (Hogg & Abrams, 1988) as a more passive strategy, the success of which does not involve an 'objective' change in the social-position of the group, it seems that psychologically
this type of tactic aims at social change (as social competition does). This interpretation is actually closer to Lemaïne’s (1974) original description of social creativity as a social enhancement-strategy which as an alternative to a hopeless choice of direct competition, aims at changing the position of the ingroup by bringing social change while establishing original criteria of intergroup comparison and differentiation.

Nevertheless, a distinction between individual mobility type of action and collective/social change strategy does seem to organise individual preferences for social enhancement action. Although it can be said that these two factors explained a small part (27.9%) of the variance in the individuals’ preferences, it should also be taken into account that the most frequent identification group was ‘friends’. This type of group calls for more interpersonal ways of coping than for example ‘campaigning for equality’. Thus, there may well be more distance between preference for ‘arguing for equal treatment’ and preference for ‘campaigning for equality’ than it would probably be if it was to stand up for another kind of group. Consequently, less variance can be explained by just a ‘collective/social change’ factor. The same explanation could apply for the distance between preference for individual mobility actions such as ‘leave the group’ and ‘trying to become so famous that people did not treat me like a member of the group’. Nevertheless, an overall distinction between a ‘collective/social change strategy’ and ‘individual mobility’ is still the strongest one among other possible distinctions between the originally extracted underlying factors.
Additionally, the independence of preferences for individual mobility and collective/social change strategy is supported from the factor analyses. In the two-factor solution, the correlation between the two factors was almost zero \((r = -0.06)\). Thus, the findings strongly indicate that these preferences should not be treated as a unidimensional preference for social enhancement action, as most of the empirical research within SIT's experimental paradigm measures it, but rather as the individuals’ preferences in relation to distinct social ideological belief-systems or systems of social practices concerned with social enhancement action.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the unidimensional measurement of preference for strategy within SIT's experimental paradigm is related to SIT's parallelism of social enhancement strategy with the level of group identification. As already discussed, in the present study, individual preferences for the social enhancement strategies were found to operate independently from the level of group identification which was the same for all the subjects of the study. Elsewhere (Mummenday et al., in press) the relationships between level of group identification and preference for type of social enhancement strategy have been explored in the case of East-Germans as a social group at a disadvantage in comparison to West-Germans after the unification of Germany. Apart from the weak relationships that the researchers found, the point to realise here is that preference for or involvement in social enhancement strategy and level of group identification are two different things. In the present study, it became apparent that other dynamics are involved in determining preference for/engagement in a strategy, even when the level of identification with their ingroup is high for all the people.
Focusing on the individuals' general preferences for the social enhancement strategies as such possible dynamics, the results from the factor analysis also contribute to the construct validity of two measurements of general preferences for social enhancement action - one measuring preference for collective/ social change strategy (Voice) and the other one measuring preference for individual mobility (Exit). Additionally, the results show high the internal reliability of the two scales.

To build on this, the next step is to examine the involvement of these general preferences for the social enhancement strategies in action within specific intergroup situations. Within the framework of an integrative modelling of action on the basis of identity dynamics and social representations, the following empirical studies will focus more specifically on how these general preferences are related to identity and social representational dynamics as well as to the perception of the structure of and action within specific intergroup contexts. These relationships will be examined while focusing on women's social enhancement action in relation to occupational segregation by gender.
CHAPTER FIVE: WOMEN'S SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT ACTION IN RELATION TO OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION BY GENDER. (GENERAL INTRODUCTION, METHOD AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS)

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

As stated in Chapter One, the thesis particularly aims at examining women's social enhancement action in relation to the occupational segregation by gender which induces career status discrepancies between women and men. Thus, the next series of studies focuses on women's perception of these discrepancies and the undertaking of action within occupational contexts characterised by gender segregation. Alternatively to SIT's assumption of a specific-intergroup-structure preference for a strategy, the following studies concentrate on the role of general social representational and identity dynamics in women's perception of and action in relation to occupational segregation by gender. A more detailed analysis of the hypothesised role of these dynamics is presented in the following sections of this introduction.

1.1. General preferences for social enhancement strategies.

The following series of studies examines both the direct and the indirect effects of the individuals' general preferences for the social enhancement strategies (as those were identified in the previous study) upon choice of type of social enhancement strategy in specific contexts of intergroup conflict between genders at the workplace. As far as the direct effects are concerned, it is possible that the general preferences have
stronger effects when the individuals estimate their preferences for action in hypothetical terms rather than when their options are restricted by the constraints of an actually perceived threatening intergroup situation. Thus, as it will be presented later, in the following series of studies, the effects of the general preferences are separately examined in the case of perceived discrimination against women at the workplace and in the case of hypothetical discrimination.

As far as the indirect effects are concerned, as discussed in Chapter Two, SIT assumes that choice of type of social enhancement strategy depends entirely on the perceived structure of the specific intergroup situation. Here, it is proposed that the individuals' general preferences for the types of social enhancement strategies actually affect the perception of the structure (permeability, legitimacy and stability) of specific intergroup relationships. As discussed in Chapter Two, the discrepancies between empirical evidence for the impact of a manipulated intergroup structure and these examining the impact of the perceived structure of natural intergroup contexts suggest that this perception not only affects but is also affected by choice of strategy. Although such a relationship is not tested in the following series of studies, the individuals' general preferences for the social enhancement strategies are examined as common predictors of the perception of the specific intergroup structure and preference for strategy in the specific situation.

Moreover, in the framework of this thesis, the perception of the situation does not refer only to the structure (permeability, legitimacy, stability) of the intergroup relationships, but also to the perception of intergroup status discrepancies per se and
the extent that a situation is perceived as involving intergroup conflict. Thus, in the following series of studies, the extent to which women perceive status discrepancies between the two genders and consider their gender as affecting their career development are examined as dependent variables.

An assumption is made that the perception of a situation as involving intergroup conflict relevant to one’s group/ category membership, is affected by the individuals’ general preferences for type of social enhancement strategy. It is argued that such an assumption can actually derive from Tajfel & Turner’s (1979) theorising regarding the ‘social belief-systems’ of social mobility and social change. As it was discussed earlier in Chapter Two, according to these authors, these belief-systems are concerned with the interpretation of the social situation as intergroup one. More specifically, social mobility concerns a belief that people advance (or not) regardless of their social group/ category memberships. Following this belief, people are less likely to attribute their status to (and consequently identify with) their memberships. On the other hand, in the case of social change, individuals believe (perceive) that their social group/ category memberships affect personal status. Although Tajfel and Turner do not clarify the boundaries between belief and the perceived specific situation, the view (supported in this thesis) of these social belief-systems as creating individual general positions/ preferences for the strategies allows for an assumption that these affect the perception of a specific situation as an 'intergroup' one and consequently affect the individuals’ 'specific-situation' identification with a group/ category.
Moreover, the dynamics underlying the formation of social representations in the individuals were also discussed in Chapter Three. Accordingly, social interaction/communication and identity dynamics will determine the individuals' understanding of reality, beliefs and action. In order to include a consideration of these dynamics, some facets of this operation are examined in the following series of studies. Thus, apart from a particular focus on identity dynamics, the relationship between the individuals' general preferences and what the individuals believe to be the preferences of their society for type of social enhancement strategy will be also examined.

This relationship (and its subsequent effects on the perception of the specific situation and choice of strategy within it) is investigated in an attempt to explore one possible facet of the social/collective level of the construction of the individuals' representations of reality, opinions, attitudes and action: individuals do not form their points of view or act in isolation, but take into consideration the tendencies operating in their societies. In other words, they rely on the belief-systems or systems of practices that circulate in their society in order to form their opinions and/or act.

In the following studies, the strength of the relationship between the individuals' general preferences and what they believe to be the preferences of their society will be linearly examined. It should be stressed however, that in order to support the social/collective origination of the individuals' points of view and action, SRT does not necessarily assume a linear relationship between the individuals' representations (positions) and the ones believed to be of others or the society's in general. Therefore, a linear relationship is examined only as a possible aspect of this interface.
1.2. Focusing on Identity Dynamics: The role of Self-Efficacy.

In Chapter Three, the way in which identity dynamics (including self-concept dynamics) may affect the endorsement of social representations and consequently can contribute to the explanation of individual positions within social representational fields was also discussed. At least one self-concept dimension, self-efficacy (one’s belief in one’s ability to handle problems and to achieve goals - Bandura, 1989) has been found to be related to the acceptance of specific social representations (Breakwell, 1992b). More specifically, in a cohort-sequential longitudinal study on British young people’s identity development and economic and political socialisation, self-efficacy was found to be positively correlated with acceptance of the social ideological belief in the equality of the sexes. In the same study, self-efficacy was found to be positively correlated with interest and involvement in politics. As the author notes, self-efficacy seems to predispose acceptance of a specific social representation of the political system (as being open to social change through the individuals’ participation in it).

In general, within the theoretical framework of self-efficacy, it is assumed that people’s perception of their own competence influences how they act, their motivation, their thought patterns, and their reactions in demanding situations. More specifically, self-efficacy is theorised within the framework of social learning theories, as initially determined by people’s experiences of their own performance. However, self-efficacy as a self-concept dimension eventually acquires some stability and influences choice of activities. Furthermore, it is even probable that action does not occur at all if one subjectively believes that one cannot act in certain ways.
In this thesis, it is assumed that self-efficacy influences preference for social enhancement strategy through two paths: firstly, by affecting one's formation of general positions/prefers for social enhancement action and secondly by directly affecting choice of action in the specific situation. Self-efficacy is considered as a potentially important determinant of preference for type of strategy not only because its power in predicting in general action is acknowledged, but also because of the theoretical arguments of social-identity theorists that associate choice of social enhancement strategy with people's competence and abilities. For example, Hogg & Abrams (1988) assume that individuals attempt individual mobility on the basis of their competence and abilities. If this is the case, one's self-efficacy should be a major factor in determining choice of strategy. Nevertheless, as this thesis considers self-efficacy as a major determinant of the undertaking of action versus inaction, it is rather expected that women's self-efficacy will positively affect engagement in either type of social enhancement strategy in order to cope with the implications of the occupational segregation by gender.

Moreover, it is plausible not for one's general self-efficacy but for one's specific self-efficacy in a job, to affect choice of strategy. In fact, Bandura (1989) is concerned with the person's specific self-efficacy in relation to particular activities, tasks or contexts. As Breakwell (1992b) notes, a focus upon a specific area of self-efficacy could provide a much better tool for predicting actual action. Thus, a woman's choice of social enhancement strategy (or more obviously her preference not to act) may well be affected by the specific self-efficacy she has in relation to activities in the occupational environment.
Job-related-self-efficacy may directly or indirectly affect action. More specifically, it is expected that according to their job-related-self-efficacy, women will make different attributions of their status in the occupational context and therefore differently perceive the status-discrepancies between women and men and the permeability, legitimacy and stability of the status relationships. For example, it is more likely for the highly job-self-efficacious women to perceive the intergroup boundaries as permeable and the status relationships unstable. On the other hand, low job-self-efficacious women are more likely to perceive the status relationships as legitimate.

Nonetheless, job-related-self-efficacy is also expected to be affected by one’s global self-efficacy. As Breakwell (1992b) discusses, measurements of self-efficacy have been found to tap a psychological construct which is coherent and more wide-ranging than small batches of activity. Since self-efficacy also operates as a global self-concept dimension, it is reasonable to expect that influences one’s self-efficacy in relation to particular activities. As such therefore, one’s global self-efficacy is also expected to affect women’s action in the ways assumed above.

1.3. The occupational context of the intergroup conflict.

When examining women’s perceptions and action in relation to occupational segregation by gender an important factor to consider is the specific occupational/professional contexts that women are situated in. The most obvious point to consider is that the gender typicality/ atypicality of their occupation/ profession has implications for the emergence of gender identity dynamics and the perception of an
occupational intergroup conflict between genders. Within the framework of SIT, it has been often assumed (i.e. Taylor et al., 1978; McGuire & McGuire, 1981 cited in Abrams et al., 1990) that salience of social identity dynamics is produced by the numeric minority group membership or the contextual subordination of the group that one belongs to. According to this set of hypotheses, gender salience should be stronger in the context of minority group membership in gender atypical jobs than that of majority group membership in the context of a gender typical job.

According to the latter argument, one can predict that gender intergroup conflict is re-established in terms of the specific occupational context. In that case, in the context of a female typical job, women will be the dominant and men the dominated group. However, the study of Ott (1989) on the effects of the male-female ratio at work indicates that women comprising a numerical minority within a work organisation (police) face the disadvantages of a minority group, whereas male nurses (also comprising a numerical minority) enjoy advantages from being one of the few among female colleagues. According to Ott, the opposite effects on men and women of being in a minority are attributed to a difference in the general status of gender. According to Ott (ibid, p.53):

"Low- [general] status majorities will treat high- [general] status minorities with the usual deference and respect, while high-status majorities will treat low-status minorities with the disrespect that a low status by definition entails."
As Ott concludes, the shape of the interactions and the nature of the disadvantages/advantages for minorities in specific contexts depend on the general stereotypes that exist about the majority and the minority. Although Ott’s findings are not concerned per se with how women in gender typical jobs perceive the occupational segregation by gender in terms of the status of women, her interpretation of women’s and men’s perceptions is very close to that of the interference of more general social representations in contextually defined intergroup conflicts (Doise, 1978; 1990; Amancio, 1989; 1994), instead of supporting the contextual numerical distinctiveness of the involved groups.

To return to the debate in relation to the salience of social identity dynamics, self-categorisation theorists (Turner, 1985; Turner et.al., 1987), although they attempt to predict salience on the basis of cognitive principles (such as the perceived ratio of intergroup differences and intragroup similarities), they nevertheless conclude that only when the ‘social meaning’ of a specific situation allows it, will this cognitive functioning result in salience (Oakes & Turner, 1986). Nevertheless, an explanation of the salience of social identity dynamics in terms of the ‘meaning’ of the social situation is closer to an explanation which is based on the operation of widespread social representations associating particular contexts with particular social identities than to the ‘cognitive’ explanations that social-categorisation theorists often offer.

According to a social-representational explanation it can be assumed that the salience of gender intergroup dynamics in specific occupational contexts relies upon widespread social representations that refer to the status-position of women and men
within specific occupational contexts. In Chapter One of this thesis, examples of the operation of social representations associating the two genders with specific occupational contexts were discussed (i.e. Millward, 1993; Brown, 1994). Strong social representations of the gender typicality of professions and particularly of the genders’ status-positions in these professions have been even found among students that have not actual experience in these professions (Lorenzi-Cioldi & Joye, 1988; Lorenzi-Cioldi & Meyer, 1990).

Therefore, on the basis of a social representational explanation, it is reasonable to expect that gender intergroup conflict dynamics will be salient in occupational contexts which are characterised by social representations either of their gender typicality or atypicality. It is also reasonable to assume that the operation of social representations also will concern the structural elements of the specific intergroup conflicts between the genders within these occupations, such as the permeability, the legitimacy and the stability of women’s status position and the perception of unfair discrimination against women.

In the general framework of this thesis which focuses on the diversity in people’s endorsement and shaping of social representations, the following series of studies do not intend to ‘prove’ social representations by ‘showing’ their shared aspects. In a search for alternative criteria for the operation of social representations other than that of their shared nature, the operation of social representations will be explored by examining the articulation of individual points of view about the women’s status-position in a profession in relation to the length of personal working experience in this profession. It should be stressed however that the aim of examining such a
relationship is not to argue that people’s perceptions are irrelevant to an objective reality (and the experience of this reality), but to establish that people’s interpretation of their environment and/or their points of view are subject to social representational dynamics and not to a direct ‘cognitive’ perception of the structure of the situation as SIT claims. Furthermore, as already argued in the two previous sections general dynamics such as the individuals’ general preferences for the social enhancement strategies and self-efficacy are also expected to influence the individuals’ perceptions regarding an intergroup conflict between genders in their professions and their endorsement of relevant widespread social representations.

The gender typicality/atypicality of the profession might however have ‘ingroup-status-related’ implications for the individuals’ representations of the intergroup conflict between genders in their profession. Evidence provided by the experimental paradigm on the social enhancement strategies (VanKnippenberg & Ellemers, 1993; Ellemers, 1993 reviews), show that the contextual status of the ingroup interacts with the experimentally manipulated elements of the structure of the intergroup conflict (i.e. the permeability, the legitimacy and the stability of the intergroup relationships) in order to determine choice of strategy. As discussed in Chapter Two, these evidence suggest the ‘psychological manipulation’ of the perception and evaluation of the elements of the structure of the intergroup situation according to the contextual position of the ingroup. Thus, it is possible that women in gender typical occupations/professions estimate and/or evaluate the elements of the intergroup situation in their profession differently from the women in gender atypical professions.
To further illustrate this point, it can be noted that even in the nursing profession (which is typically female), men are proportionally found more often in higher positions than women are (Williams, 1994). The same applies for gender atypical jobs (Brown 1994 -for the police profession). These facts suggest discrimination against women in both cases. Nonetheless, it is possible that the representations of the gender typicality/ atypicality of the profession (the former profession is traditionally assigned to and dominated by women and the latter traditionally assigned to and dominated by men) differentiate the perception of unfair workplace discrimination against women between the two occupational populations.

It is also possible that the dynamics related to the gender typicality/ atypicality of the occupational context differentiate the operation of the general dynamics such as the general preferences for social enhancement strategies and self-efficacy in relation to women’s action. Having pointed out the deficiencies of the experimental paradigm of SIT and aiming at a naturalistic study of women’s action, it was not aimed at experimentally compare the isolated effects of the occupational context. It was preferred to examine the action of women in gender typical and gender atypical occupational contexts separately and interpret the emergent relationships in relation to each context.
2. METHOD

2.1. Selection of samples.

In order to take into consideration the dynamics of the gender typicality/ atypicality of the occupation in examining women's action in relation to the occupational segregation by gender, a questionnaire was administered to female nursing/ midwifery students and to female police officers trainees. Trainees were selected instead of professionals, in an attempt to examine the operation of pre-established representations of the position of women in the specific professions. It has to be noted, that both the nursing/ midwifery students and the police officers trainees become familiar with the working environments as part of their training. Thus, according to the stage of their training, individuals will have personal working experience to different degrees. Some individuals will not have any working experience in these professions.

As far as the sampling of the specific occupations is concerned, both occupational fields satisfy at least two conditions of gender typicality and atypicality respectively: a) the numerical dominance of one of the two genders and b) the stereotypicality of the occupational stratification of the two genders. As mentioned in the first chapter of the thesis, women constitute approximately the 91% of the nursing force in Britain today. Moreover, nursing is one of the most stereotypically feminine occupations. Gray (1989) extensively discusses how the origins and structures of nursing are based upon women's traditional domestic roles of caring and nurturing and Millward (1995) demonstrates how nursing is bound up with social representations of femininity.
As far as the gender atypicality of the police profession is concerned, census facts found in Brown (1994) suggest that there are approximately 142,000 police officers in Britain today, of which one in ten are women. As the same author comments, it has taken some eighty years since the first British women entered the police to progress from zero to ten percent. Furthermore, police work is one of the most stereotypically masculine occupations. As Lord (1986) confirms, practical law enforcement has historically been a male dominated and a male defined profession. Ott (1989) also notes that the essential elements of policing - the exercise of authority and the ability to use force - are responsibilities traditionally assigned to men and denied to women. Moreover, Brown (1994) discusses how the occupational stereotype of police officers overlaps with male gender stereotypes. It has also been suggested (Martin, 1980 cited in Brown, 1994) that not only does stereotypically female behaviour conflict with the occupational role definitions of behaviour appropriate for a police officer, but also the presence of women in the police threatens the construction of the policemen's masculine identity.

2.2. Construction of the measurements.

A questionnaire (Appendix 2) was constructed comprising of different scales aiming at tapping the various dimensions in examination. The measurement of all the dimensions is based on five-point Likert scales. In the following paragraphs, the theoretical or empirical bases upon which each scale was constructed will be presented.
2.2.1. General preferences for social enhancement strategies.

The Voice and Exit scales of general preferences were a shorter adaptation of the scales generated in the previous study (see Chapter Four). To recap, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of the original scales for a students' population were 0.89 and 0.86 for the Voice and Exit scales respectively. The items with loadings under 0.5 in each factor were removed from each scale in order to reduce the number of the items of the present questionnaire (items GP1 to GP24 in Appendix 2). Only one item loaded under 0.5 was kept in this adaptation of the Exit scale, as it was the only negative one. Additionally, an item of the Voice scale was changed into a negative one, as there were no negatively loaded items left after the reliability analysis in the previous study.

2.2.2. General Ethos

The measurement of General Ethos was developed in order to take into consideration the impact of the perceived social ideologies concerned with social enhancement action. Although Western European cultures are characterised as individualistic (i.e. Hofstede, 1980 cited in Triandis, 1989) the measurement of the General Ethos was constructed to tap the individuals' perception of their society and its dominant ideologies regarding social enhancement action. For this reason, subjects were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree that the relevant statements (GE1 to GE9 in Appendix 2) reflect what is generally believed in Britain today.
The construction of the scales (perceived individualism/ perceived collectivism) was based on Taylor & McKirnan's (1984) operationalisation. It has been already presented how their model describes the way an individualistic social ideology (meritocracy) influences people to attribute their status (success or failure) to individual characteristics than to their social group memberships. Thus, three of the statements were concerned with causal attribution of personal advancement to one's social category membership/ background (items GE4, GE7, GE9). Three statements reflected causal attribution of one's advancement to one's own merit, effort and competence (items GE5, GE6, GE8). Three other items were concerned with British people's opinion about the appropriateness of each type of social enhancement strategy: one of these items promoted individual action (GE1) and two were concerned with collective/ social change action (GE2, GE3).

2.2.3. Global Self-Efficacy

In order to examine the relationship between Global Self-Efficacy and the adoption of a social enhancement strategy, an adaptation of Sherer et al. (1982) Self-Efficacy Scale was included in the questionnaire (GSE1 to GSE6 in Appendix 2). The original scale was specifically developed to measure generalised self-efficacy expectancies as a result of individual differences in past experiences and causal attributions of success to skill or chance. Two subscales, a General Self-Efficacy subscale and a Social Self-Efficacy subscale were yielded by the original factor analysis of Sherer et al. (ibid).
In the report of Sherer et al., several predicted conceptual relationships between the Self-Efficacy subscales and other personality measures (i.e. locus of control, personal control, social desirability, ego strength, interpersonal competence and self-esteem) were confirmed and provided evidence of construct validity. Moreover, positive relationships between the Self-Efficacy measurement and vocational, educational and military success established criterion validity. Finally, the reported Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were 0.86 and 0.71 for the General Self-Efficacy and for the Social Self-Efficacy subscales respectively.

In the present series of studies, the measurement included to tap Global Self-Efficacy was a shorter adaptation of the Sherer et al. one. The same adaptation was also used in the survey on identity development and economic and political socialisation of British young people (see Breakwell, 1992b). In the latter study the factor analysis of the items resulted to the same two factors and the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were around 0.65 for both subscales.

2.2.4. Specific Self-Efficacy

In order to test the assumption that one's action relevant to the intergroup conflict dynamics of specific situations is related to the self-efficacy one has in acting within these specific contexts, a measurement of Job-Specific-Self-Efficacy was included in the questionnaire (SPSE1 to SPSE15 in Appendix 2). The measurement was constructed to tap trainees' self-efficacy regarding their job. The measurement was an adaptation of the original two subscales of Sherer et al. (1982). More specifically, the
items comprising the original subscales (17 for the General and 6 for the Social Self-Efficacy) were altered in order to tap the self-efficacy one has in doing his/ her job (General) and interacting with his/ her colleagues (Social). The items corresponding to the items of Sherer et al. which were loaded under 0.5 in each of the two factors, were excluded from the present adaptation of the subscales in order to reduce the size of the questionnaire. This resulted in 15 items being used, ten adapted from the General subscale (items SPSE1 to SPSE10) and five from the Social subscale (items SPSE11 to SPSE15).

2.2.5. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce.

Nine items (PDG1 to PDG9 in Appendix 2) were constructed in order to tap perception of the status discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce. The items were constructed to reflect the two forms of the occupational segregation by gender discussed in Chapter One of this thesis. The first aspect is concerned with the vertical occupational segregation by gender which refers to hierarchical status and salary discrepancies between working women and men. The second aspect, the horizontal segregation, refers to the different kinds of professions, jobs, posts or tasks assigned to women and men.

Accordingly, four of the items included in the measurement were concerned with the vertical type of status discrepancies between genders in the workforce (e.g. proportions of women and men in high status jobs, high positions and highly paid jobs) (items PDG2, PDG3, PDG5, PDG8). The remaining five items were concerned
with the horizontal status discrepancies (e.g. different types of jobs and career options for women and men, availability of jobs for each gender and gender typicality of jobs) (items PDG1, PDG4, PDG6, PDG7, PDG9).

2.2.6. Salience of gender identity at the workplace.

As discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis, as a result of the problems arising from a situation-specific prediction of salience of social identity dynamics, researchers constructed general measurements of the 'strength of the identification' (i.e. Abrams et al., 1985) in an attempt to classify group members as high or low 'identifiers', regardless of a specific context of intergroup comparison. However, as already argued, these measurements have been proved problematic in predicting women's choice of social enhancement strategy (see Chapter Two).

Thus, a measurement of the general identification of the respondents with their gender was not included in the present series of studies. The intention was rather to examine the salience of gender identity in relation to the specific occupational contexts. Although a contextual conceptualisation of salience reflects Tajfel's problematic notion of situation-specific group differentiation/identification, in this thesis it is argued that contextual salience can be both predicted (i.e. by the social representations associating a social identity with a specific context) and predictive of strategy (as mediating a more general tendency to identify with an ingroup).
Therefore, in the present questionnaire, respondents were asked if they consider their
gender to be involved in their job in relation to six dimensions: (a) the way they are
treated by their colleagues, (b) the kind of job they are doing, (c) the kind of tasks
they are asked to do, (d) the positions they hold, (e) the evaluation of their work
performance and (f) their chances of promotion. (SAL 1 to SAL 6 in Appendix 2).

2.2.7. Perceived status discrepancies between genders in the profession.

Nine items were included in the questionnaire in order to tap the perception of the
status discrepancies between genders in the specific profession which the respondent
was being trained for (PDP 1 to PDP 9 in Appendix 2). Four of the items referred
to the vertical discrepancies between genders (proportion of women and men in high
and/ or managerial positions, discrepancies in salaries etc.) (items PDP1, PDP3,
PDP6, PDP8). The rest of the items were constructed to measure perceptions of
horizontal status discrepancies between genders within the profession (e.g. women and
men working in different departments, having different career options, posts, tasks
and so on) (items PDP2, PDP4, PDP5, PDP7, PDP9).

2.2.8. Perceived stability of intergroup status discrepancies between genders in own
profession.

Within SIT, the notion of stability refers to the capability of the members of a
disadvantaged group to conceive of cognitive alternatives of the intergroup status
relationships. In the present series of studies, the measurement of the perceived
stability of the gender intergroup relationships in one's own profession comprised of 5 items (PDP 10 to PDP 14 in Appendix 2). The items referred to the extent to which people perceive the status relationships between genders and the status-position of women in their profession as stable or changeable. The measurement focused on the type of tasks, chances of promotion, proportions in high positions and the general position of women in the profession. Thus, the respondents were asked the extent to which they believed the status of women regarding the above mentioned dimensions would remain the same or change in the future.

2.2.9. Perceived legitimacy of intergroup status-discrepancies between genders in the profession.

For social-identity theorists, the legitimacy of the intergroup status differences refers to the group members' belief that the status discrepancies are justified (for example on the basis of the different abilities of the members of the different groups). Thus, the items constituting the measurement of perceived legitimacy (PDP15 to PDP18 in Appendix 2) referred to the extent to which the trainees perceive the status of women in own profession to be justified and fair and to the objectivity of the procedures of work evaluation and promotion.
2.2.10. Perceived permeability of intergroup boundaries between genders in the profession.

The notion of permeability refers to the extent that the intergroup boundaries are soft and permeable (or rigid and impermeable). To express it in Tajfel & Turner's (1979, p. 44) own words, perceived permeability is "the extent that the objective and the subjective prohibitions to "passing" [into the other group] are weak". People who perceive group boundaries to be permeable, also believe that members of a disadvantaged group can pass into the privileged group by personal effort, hard work, personal connections, or due to their abilities and competence (Hogg & Abrams, 1988). On the other hand, people who believe that intergroup boundaries are rigid and impermeable recognise the impossibility of passing into the advantaged group (Hogg et al., 1986). Thus, in the present questionnaire, the items constructed to tap perceived permeability of a woman's gender-status-position in the profession followed these definitions, by stressing the possibility for a woman to be assigned to typically male tasks or positions and to be treated as equal to men, on the basis of her abilities (PDP19 to PDP22 in Appendix 2).

2.2.11. Personal Discrimination.

The measurement of Personal Discrimination (PERDIS1 to PERDIS5 in Appendix 2) was constructed to identify the women who had personally felt discriminated against as women during their working experience in the profession and had a concrete experience of discrimination. Thus, the respondents were asked to indicate on a five-
point Likert scale ranging from never to very often, the extent to which they had actually felt discriminated against as women at work in the last year. The index was concerned with five dimensions: (a) treatment by colleagues, (b) kind of tasks, (c) positions, (d) evaluation of work performance and (e) chances of promotion. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that women rated their preferences for social enhancement action on the basis of perceived discrimination in general against women in their profession. The latter measurement comprised of one question which was answered by the respondents on the basis of a three-point Likert scale (1 = Yes, 2 = Not sure, 3 = No).

2.2.12. Social enhancement strategies in perceived discrimination against women in the profession.

Seventeen items were constructed to tap preferences for collective/social change and individual mobility strategies (as well as inaction) in the case of perceived general discrimination against women in the profession. This part of the questionnaire (STRA1 to STRA17 in Appendix 2) was completed only by the trainees who considered women to be in general discriminated against in their profession.

The measurement consisted of five items describing social competition actions (STRA2, STRA4, STRA11, STRA13, STRA14), four items referring to social creativity (STRA6, STRA9, STRA12, STRA15) and four items picturing individual mobility actions (STRA1, STRA3, STRA7, STRA10). These items were constructed according to the definitions of Turner & Brown (1978), Tajfel & Turner (1979),
Hogg et al. (1986) and Abrams & Hogg (1988). However, the items were specifically designed to refer to actions feasible to be undertaken by working women in order to cope with discrimination against their gender at the workplace. Apart from the fact that the items were specifically concerned with working women’s social enhancement action, it should be stressed that they were not constructed with a sentence-structure similar to the items of the scales measuring general preferences for the strategies. Thus, although the two groups of items were constructed to denote the same types of strategies, they do not have any apparent similarities in the actions they describe or the ways that these actions are described.

Finally, four other items reflecting inaction were included in the measurement (items STRA5, STRA8, STRA16, STRA17). These items referred to such actions as ignoring the discrimination, complying with the discrimination, quitting the job and feeling unable to do something about the discrimination. These options were included because inaction is a feasible reaction to discrimination and it was aimed at examining its relationship to self-efficacy and to the individual positions to the ideological systems of individual mobility and collectivism.

2.2.13. Social Enhancement Strategies in the hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession.

Aiming at also examining preferences for type of social enhancement strategy in the hypothetical situation of discrimination, a relevant section was included in the questionnaire. This section was completed by the trainees who did not consider or
were not sure if women are discriminated against in their profession. These people were asked to rate how they believe they would react if they felt that women employees were discriminated against in their profession. The seventeen items comprising this measurement (STRHYP1 to STRHYP17 in Appendix 2) were identical to the items included in the measurement of strategies in the case of perceived discrimination, but were adjusted to express hypothetical action.

2.2.13. Demographic questions and working experience.

Respondents were asked about their age, their marital status, whether they had children and the highest educational qualification they had already obtained. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the extent of time, if any, they had spent in a work setting within the profession which they were being trained for. This variable was included in an attempt to examine the presence of pre-established social representations of the women’s position in these occupational contexts.

Finally, it should be noted that the measurements were tested in a pilot study with a small sample of students (N = 21). The results of this pilot study did not indicate large alterations in the measurements and thus, they will not be reported in particular, but only in cases where an essentially different pattern from this in the main series of studies had emerged.
2.3. Procedure, Return Rates and Samples’ Description.

The questionnaire was administered to 279 female nursing/midwifery students and 285 female police officers trainees. The questionnaires were distributed in the students’ classes but were completed privately. The same instructions as written on the cover-page of the questionnaire (Appendix 2) were communicated verbally to the students in order to explain the aims of the study. The data collection started in the middle of October 1994.

Questionnaires were distributed to female nursing/midwifery students of all three years of study. Data were collected from the students of Frances Harrison College of Healthcare and the Department of Nursing & Midwifery of the University of Surrey. The questionnaire was personally administered by the researcher in the students’ classes. The completed questionnaires were then returned to special boxes left in the receptions of the departments. The return rate was low. Reminder requests were made to the students’ boards, in order to increase the return rate. Collection was stopped at the beginning of December 1994. Overall, the return rate was 33.3% (N=93). The age of the nursing/midwifery students that responded to the questionnaire ranged from 18 to 45 years old (mean 25.09, std. dev. 7.10). Overall, 73.3% of these respondents were single and the most frequent highest educational qualification already obtained was A-levels (59.3%).

Questionnaires were also administered to the trainees of six different Police Training Centres (Ashford, Bruche, Cwmbran, Durham, Shotley, Ryton-on-Dunsmore). During November 1994, 285 questionnaires were administered to most female trainees
attending these centres. The questionnaires were distributed by the police training personnel of these centres. Along with copies of the questionnaire, the training personnel received written instructions for the administration of the questionnaire (Appendix 3). The collection of data was completed at the end of January 1995. The overall return rate was 51.2% (N = 146).

The age of the police officers trainees ranged from 18 to 43 years old (mean 24.82, std. dev. 4.52). Overall, 57.9% of these respondents were single and 36.5% were married or living with a partner. The highest educational qualifications already obtained varied among this sample. The 20.3% of the respondents had A-levels, 21.7% had O-levels and 13% had obtained their GCSE’s.

In general, the relatively low return rate of the questionnaire by the nursing/midwifery students could be interpreted as reflecting an unwillingness to respond to a measurement concerned with discrimination against women in their profession. It should also be noted that midwifery students commented that the questionnaire was irrelevant to their profession. This is indicative of strong views among students regarding the gender status dynamics in their profession. Indeed, only 8 out of 93 nursing/midwifery students perceived discrimination against women in their profession. The higher return rate among the female police officers trainees could be interpreted as indicating the perceived relevance of the study with women in the police profession. Indeed, 26.9% (N=39) of the female police officer trainees perceived discrimination against women in their profession. However, it has to be taken into account that greater compliance in trainers’ requests was expected among police officer trainees.
3. WORKING EXPERIENCE AND PERCEPTION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN THE PROFESSION.

As part of their training, nursing/midwifery students are placed in work settings in a hospital or in the community. As the collection of data took place during the first term of the academic year, first year students did not have this experience. However, among the sample there were people who had worked for several years as nurses without an academic qualification. Overall, the sample’s (nursing/midwifery) working experience ranges from zero (0) to 14.5 years (174 months) (mean 23.26, std.dev. 37.20 months, skewness 2.31, variance 1384.14). Nevertheless, half of the sample (50%) had a working experience of less than 6 months (median 7.5 months).

As stated earlier, only 8 (9.1%) nursing/midwifery respondents perceived discrimination against women in their profession. Fifteen (17%) respondents were not sure if there was discrimination and 65 (73.9%) respondents said there was not. Of these 65 respondents, 51% had working experience of less than 4 months (median 4), but on the whole they were confident to say that there was not discrimination against women in their profession.

Due to the large sample-size differences among the latter three responding groups, it was not possible to statistically compare the variance in time spent in a work setting. Nonetheless, the three distributions for this variable seem equivalent. For the 8 women that perceived discrimination, working experience ranges from zero (0) to 30 months (skewness 0.44, variance 183.23). For the women that denied the existence
of discrimination, working experience ranges from zero (0) months to 14.5 years (skewness 2.37, variance 1534.31). For those that were not sure if there is discrimination, the amount of working experience ranges as well from zero (0) months to 12 years (skewness 2.13, variance 1520.25). Such an uncertainty among the people with many years of working experience may well be reflecting a perceived irrelevance of such a matter in their nursing career. In general, time spent in the work setting does not seem to consistently relate to the existence (or not) of views among the students.

Police training also involves experience in a work setting. Overall, the sample’s experience in a work setting ranged from zero (0) to 60 months (mean 9.45, std.dev. 14.90 months, skewness 1.59, variance 222.10). Nevertheless, half of the sample (52.7%) had working experience of less than one month (median 1).

As stated earlier, 39 (26.9%) police trainees perceived discrimination against women in their profession. Forty-five (31%) respondents were not sure if there is discrimination and 61 (42.1%) respondents answered this question negatively. An oneway analysis of variance was conducted in order to examine if there were any differences in the distributions of working experience for the three responding categories. No differences were found (\(F = 1.19, df = 2, 129 \text{ n.s.} \)).

As it becomes apparent from the examination of the relationship between working experience and the articulation of students’ views, both populations (nursing/midwifery, police trainees) have representations of gender status dynamics in the
professions which they are being trained for, even when they do not have a long personal working experience. In the context of intergroup conflict, these findings regarding the students' views provide further naturalistic evidence for the shaping of action: Individuals are not isolated perceivers of the situation within which they are situated at a fragment of time. Widespread social representations that circulate in their social environment also shape their perception of particular intergroup conflicts such as the status-discrepancies between genders in various professions. This evidence supports the arguments regarding the social representational shaping of intergroup conflict discussed in the previous chapters of this thesis.

4. GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PREFERENCES FOR SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES.

The explanations given for the aims of this series of studies were carefully structured in order to avoid confusion between the first part of the questionnaire (general preferences) and responses regarding the specific gender intergroup conflict in the profession. However, the context within which the questionnaire was administered involved only female respondents and the specific professional environment. Therefore, there was a possibility that the chosen group identifications, elicited in relation to general preferences for social enhancement strategies were contaminated by the context of the procedure.
This possibility was eliminated by the examination of the chosen identification groups. For the nursing/midwifery students, the most frequent identification groups were 'friends' (36.6%) and religious groups (21.1%). The total frequency for the choice of 'women', 'nurses' or 'midwives' as identification groups is only 8.4% (N=6). For the police officers trainees, the most frequent identification groups were 'friends' (43.2%) and 'sports' groups (17.1%). Only 2.7% of the police officers trainees chosen to identify with 'women in traditional male jobs' (1.8%) or 'women at work' (0.9%). No other identification groups relevant to the specific intergroup conflict were reported.

Consequently, it can be said that on the whole, ratings in the 'general preferences for social enhancement strategies' section are not concerned with gender intergroup conflict in the profession. This affirmation is essential in order to be able to demonstrate the independent effect of the general preferences for the social enhancement strategies upon preferences for strategies in specific intergroup conflicts.

5. CONFIRMATION OF THE MEASUREMENTS

In order to test the construct validity and the reliability of the different scales, separate factor analyses for each group of items and reliability tests were applied to the data. These analyses were employed on the whole of the data (N = 241) obtained from the two samples (Nursing/Midwifery students (N=93) and Police Officers trainees (N=146)). The aggregation of the data was preferred in order to take into account the whole of the emerging variance in confirming the scales and to use identical measures in testing the models of preferences for strategies in perceived or hypothetical workplace discrimination against women.
Initially however, separate factor analyses were employed on the data from each sample. In general, the patterns emerging from the two samples were similar. This fact also allowed us to proceed with the confirmation of the scales using the variance arising from both samples together. Generally then, the presented results are concerned with the analyses employed on the whole of the data obtained from both samples. However, references will be made to the results from the separate factor analyses, when a pattern emerging from these is significant for the interpretation of the results of a specific study.

The present factor analyses are mainly concerned with the confirmation of the scales measuring the various dimensions under examination. Since these analyses were not directed in order to study the psychometric properties of these dimensions, the results from the principal components analyses conducted with unspecified number of factors will be briefly reported, but not analyzed or interpreted. **It should be noted that all the viable scales (with the items and their factor loadings) are displayed in Appendix 3. In this section, the factor-solutions presented in tables are concerned only with cases where the imposed number of factors did not result in the expected solution.** These cases will be explored in more detail.

Finally, it is noted that in this section, the items are represented by the number they have in the questionnaire after the abbreviation given to represent the dimension. Their order of presentation within the description of the factor, corresponds to the diminishing order of their factor loadings (which are explicitly presented in Appendix 3). Also, before the presentation of the results, a general finding will be reported in this paragraph, since it concerns almost all the factor solutions that resulted from the
Principal components analyses: Items structured negatively (reversed items) loaded accordingly (with the reverse sign), when loaded in the same factor with items of the same intended scale. When that is not the case, it will be reported.

5.1. General Preferences (GP)

A principal components analysis was employed on the data for the 24 items describing actions adopted when an important identification group is discriminated against. Initially six factors were extracted accounting for the 59.3% of the variance. In order to confirm the two scales of general preferences for the social enhancement strategies (Exit and Voice), a two factor solution was employed on the data for the 24 items.

The two factors accounted for 39.2% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 6 iterations. Simple structure was achieved. All the eleven 'exit' items loaded highly (above 0.48 in absolute value) on factor 1. All the thirteen 'voice' items loaded highly (above 0.40 in absolute value) on factor 2. The two factors were not highly correlated (r = -0.10).

The Cronbach alpha coefficients resulting from the final reliability tests were 0.85* (11 items- GP17, GP21, GP16, GP24, GP7, GP18, GP1, GP9, GP5, GP13, GP3) for the 'exit' scale and 0.83* (12 items- GP20, GP22, GP19, GP15, GP23, GP4, GP11, GP2, GP14, GP8, GP6, GP10) for the 'voice' scale. (The items and their factor loadings are fully presented in Appendix 3.)

* Accepted reliability scales.
5.2. General Ethos (GE)

A principal components analysis was employed on the data for the 9 items concerned with the respondents’ perception of social ideologies. Three factors were extracted accounting for 51.5% of the variance.

A two-factor solution was employed on the data in order to test the construct validity of two scales, one aiming at tapping ratings regarding societal individualism and the other one regarding collectivism. The two factors accounted for 37.5% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 5 iterations. Simple structure was achieved.

Items GE3, GE2 and GE1, referring to the appropriateness of collective (GE3, GE2) or individualistic (GE1) action, loaded highly (above 0.60 in absolute value) on factor 2. Item GE1 loaded negatively in this factor. The factor appears to refer to the appropriateness of collective versus individualistic enhancement strategies. The rest of the items (except GE9), expressing causal attribution of success/failure to one’s merits/social background, loaded highly (above 0.48 in absolute value) on factor 1. The factor appears to underlie the causal attribution of individuals’ success to their merits versus their social background. The correlation between the two factors was low (r = 0.03). The factor loadings of the items are presented in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1.  Factor loadings of the items concerned with the perception of societal individualism/collectivism. (Main study.)

| GE1. | individual action is considered the best way for people to improve their position. | -0.60 |
| GE2. | it is believed that joining a social movement is the appropriate way for people to stand up for their rights. | 0.66 |
| GE3. | collective action is considered the best way for people to improve their position. | 0.84 |
| GE4. | it is believed that people's advancement does not depend upon their family background. | 0.63 |
| GE5. | it is believed that one’s position in society does not depend on one’s own merits. | -0.48 |
| GE6. | it is believed that any person who works hard will succeed. | 0.62 |
| GE7. | it is believed that it is very difficult for a person who belongs to an underprivileged group to succeed. | -0.60 |
| GE8. | it is believed that success depends on one’s own competence. | 0.60 |
| GE9. | it is believed that people use the fact that they do not belong to a privileged group as an excuse when they fail. | -0.60 |

It seems that the two-factor solution on these data did not result in a distinction between individualism and collectivism (see Table 5.1). The solution rather reflects a particular combination of individualistic and collectivistic ideologies, in a society where individuals are supposed to enhance their social position by their own merits, but collective strategies are considered appropriate when social issues are to be resolved. This interpretation does not inhibit - on the contrary, it reinforces - a theoretical approach of individualism and collectivism as different parallel social ideologies, rather than two poles of one dimension.
Moreover, it can be noted, that the two-factor solution employed on the data from the pilot study (N = 21) did differentiate between two factors, one concerned with either appropriateness of action or causal attribution of success/ failure according to an individualistic ideology and the other one according to a collectivistic ideology. The items' factor loadings as found in the pilot study are presented in Table 5.2. From the items used in the pilot study (see Table 5.2), one item that did not load properly on the factors (GE10 in the pilot study) was excluded from the questionnaire of the main study and two items (GE5 and GE4 in the pilot study) were restructured negatively for the scale to meet the requirements of psychometric scaling in the main study.

The pattern of the items' factor loadings resulted from the pilot study was followed on the present data, in order to test the reliability of two scales, one referring to individualism and the other to collectivism. The two items that were changed into negative ones for the main study, were recoded arbitrarily. The final Cronbach alpha coefficients resulting from the reliability tests were 0.46 (3 items- items GE8, GE6, GE5) for the scale of individualism and 0.46 (3 items- items GE4, GE7, GE2) for the scale of collectivism. As the reliability of these scales is low, individual items (GE1 and GE3) were selected to represent perceived individualism and perceived collectivism.
Table 5.2. Factor loadings of the items concerned with the perception of societal individualism/collectivism. (Pilot study.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In Britain today, ...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE8. ...it is believed that success depends on one's own competence.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE6. ...it is believed that any person who works hard will succeed.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GE5)*...it is believed that one's position in society depends on one's own merits.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE9. ...it is believed that people use the fact that they do not belong to a privileged group as an excuse when they fail.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1. ...individual action is considered the best way for people to improve their position.</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GE4)*...it is believed that people's advancement mainly depends upon their socioeconomic background.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE7. ...it is believed that it is very difficult for a person who belongs to an underprivileged group to succeed.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE2. ...it is believed that joining a social movement is the appropriate way for people to stand up for their rights.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)**...it is believed that people should try individually to improve their socioeconomic status.</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3. ...collective action is considered the best way for people to improve their position.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Item reversed into a negative one for the main study.
** Item excluded from the main study.
5.3. Global Self-Efficacy (GSE)

A principal components analysis was employed on the data for the 6 items included to tap generalised self-efficacy expectancies. Two factors were extracted accounting for 57.5% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 6 iterations. Simple structure was achieved. Items GSE3, GSE2 and GSE1 referring to self-efficacy for general tasks loaded highly (above 0.69 in absolute value) on factor 1. The two items referring to social self-efficacy (GSE5 and GSE6) loaded highly (above 0.80 in absolute value) on factor 2. Item GSE4 also loaded highly (0.57) on factor 2. The correlation between the pair of factors was low ($r = -0.20$).

The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were 0.66* (3 items- GSE3, GSE2, GSE1) for the general self-efficacy scale and 0.58 (3 items- GSE5, GSE6, GSE4) for the social self-efficacy scale. Because of the low reliability of the 'social' self-efficacy scale, only the 'general' scale of global self-efficacy (Appendix 3) can be used in further analyses.

5.4. Specific Self-Efficacy (SPSE)

A principal components analysis was employed on the 15 items included to measure job related self-efficacy. Initially three factors were extracted accounting for 53.1% of the variance. A two-factor solution was imposed on the data in order to confirm two measurements for job general and job social self-efficacy. The two factors accounted for 44.9% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 7 iterations. Simple structure was achieved.
All the 'job general' items (SPSE4, SPSE5, SPSE3, SPSE1, SPSE10, SPSE7, SPSE8, SPSE9, SPSE6, SPSE2) loaded highly (above 0.43 in absolute value) on factor 1. One item (SPSE13) referring to job social self-efficacy also loaded highly (-0.31) on this factor. The rest of the items referring to job social self-efficacy (SPSE15, SPSE11, SPSE14, SPSE12) loaded highly (above 0.42 in absolute value) on factor 2. The correlation between the pair of factors was high (r= 0.39). The Cronbach alpha coefficients resulting from the reliability tests were 0.83* (10 items- SPSE4, SPSE5, SPSE3, SPSE1, SPSE10, SPSE7, SPSE8, SPSE9, SPSE6, SPSE2) for the 'general' scale and 0.72* (3 items- SPSE15, SPSE11, SPSE14,) for the 'social' job-related self-efficacy scales.

5.5. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce. (PDG)

A principal components analysis was employed on the data for the 9 items aiming at indexing respondents’ perception of the status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce. The analysis extracted four factors accounting for 66.5% of the variance. In order to test the construct validity of two scales, one concerned with the vertical occupational segregation and the other with the horizontal one, a two-factor solution was employed on the data.

The two factors accounted for 43.2% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 5 iterations. Simple structure was achieved. Items PDG8 PDG2 PDG5 PDG3 referring to the vertical segregation and items PDG7 PDG1 PDG4 referring to the
horizontal one, all loaded highly (above 0.33 in absolute value) on factor 1. Reversed items PDG9 and PDG6 referring to the horizontal segregation loaded highly (above 0.78) on factor 2. The two factors were not highly correlated ($r = -0.13$).

The Cronbach alpha coefficient resulting from the reliability test for the 'vertical segregation' scale (Appendix 3) was $0.74^*$ (4 items- items PDG8, PDG2, PDG5, PDG3). A reliability test was attempted on the set of the three items (PDG7, PDG1, PDG4) referring to the horizontal segregation and loaded on factor 1. The alpha for this set of items was 0.36 and therefore the scale cannot be used in further analyses.

5.6. Salience of gender identity at the workplace (SAL)

Two factors emerged from the principal components analysis employed on the data for the 6 items included to index the salience of gender identity in the workplace. The two factors were minimally correlated ($r = -0.06$) and accounted for 63.3% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 5 iterations. Factor 1 had high loadings (above 0.61 in absolute value) on items SAL5, SAL4, SAL3 SAL1 and SAL6. The reliability test employed on the items which loaded on factor 1 resulted into a five-item scale (Appendix 3) with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of $0.78^*$.

Item SAL2 loaded (loading 0.94) on factor 2. Item SAL2 referred to the gender typicality of the job. It has to be noted therefore, that the gender typicality of the job constitutes a separate factor underlying responses. This pattern also emerged in both separate principal component analyses for the sample of nurses/ midwives and police
officer trainees. Thus, perceiving gender as affecting some of the most important aspects of a career development in a profession was considered by the respondents as a separate issue from the gender typicality/atypicality of that profession. A possible interpretation of this differentiation might be concerned with the fact that the respondents were asked if they 'agree or disagree' that their job is typical for their gender. Therefore, the fact that gender might affect one's career development in the job (factor 1) does not mean that the job should be considered as typical for one gender (factor 2).

5.7. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the profession (PDP)

The principal components analysis, of items PDP1 to PDP9 (perception of the status-discrepancies in the profession) extracted two factors accounting for 48.1% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 13 iterations. Items PDP4 PDP2 PDP5 PDP7 PDP9 referring to horizontal segregation and reversed items PDP8 and PDP1 referring to vertical segregation loaded highly (above .41 in absolute value) on factor 1. Items PDP3 and PDP6 referring to vertical segregation loaded highly (above 0.55 in absolute value) on factor 2. Item PDP8 (a 'vertical segregation') item also loaded highly (0.55) on factor 2 but not with the appropriate sign. Item PDP9 (a 'horizontal segregation' item) also loaded highly (0.39) on factor 2. The two factors were not highly correlated \( r = 0.17 \). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the horizontal segregation scale (Appendix 3) was 0.69* (5 items- PDP4 PDP2 PDP5 PDP7 PDP9).
5.8. Personal Discrimination (PERDIS)

Only one factor was extracted by the principal components analysis employed on the data for the 5 items referring to personal discrimination. The factor accounted for 73.4% of the variance. The Cronbach alpha coefficient resulting from the reliability test on the 5 items (Appendix 3) was 0.90*.

5.9. Social Enhancement Strategies in perceived discrimination against women in the profession. (STRA)

As explained in relation to the construction of the measurement, actual preferences for the strategies were only elicited from the people who perceived discrimination against women in their profession. The number of the respondents who rated their preferences and therefore constitute the sample for the principal components analysis is 48 (N = 48). Only eight of these respondents were nursing/ midwifery students. The principal components analysis which was employed on the data for the 17 items describing coping reactions in perceived discrimination extracted six factors accounting for 73.6% of the variance.

Three-factor solution.

A three-factor solution was employed on the data for the 17 items, in order to test the construct validity of three scales (individual mobility, collective/ social change strategies and inaction). The three factors accounted for 50.4% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 19 iterations. The factor loadings of the items are shown in Table 5.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRA10. I try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA8. I say to myself that there is nothing I can do about the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA17. I have learned to live with the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA5. I ignore the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA9. I have nothing to argue about how women’s work performance can be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA4. I talk to my female colleagues about strategies we can use to confront the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA2. I campaign for gender equality in the workplace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA14. I try to organise my female colleagues to do something about the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA16. I might quit the job.</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA7. I never try to disguise my femininity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA11. I actively support an organisation that stands for the rights of women at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA1. I try to persuade my superiors that I personally can do the job as well as a man would do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA3. I try to prove that I am different from other women.</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA13. I do not get involved in protests to establish a fair policy for the women in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA15. I argue that many women are better for this job than some men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA12. I argue that women have some additional qualities to men, which are more useful to the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA6. I argue that women have different but equally valuable abilities for the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Factor loadings of the items describing coping action in perceived discrimination. (Three factor solution.)
As it can be seen in Table 5.3, the 'mobility' item (STRA10) expressing effort to behave according to stereotypically male norms, three 'inaction' (STRA8, STRA17, STRA5) and one negative 'change' item (STRA9) all loaded highly (above 0.65) on factor 1. Three 'change' items loaded highly (above 0.77) on factor 2. An item describing inaction (STRA16) loaded highly both on factor 2 (loading 0.55) and on factor 1 (loading 0.34). Finally, one 'change' item (STRA11), two 'mobility' items (STRA1 and STRA3) expressing effort to differentiate self from other women and two other 'change' items (STRA15 and STRA12), all negatively loaded on factor 3. Also, a negatively structured 'change' item (STRA13) positively loaded on factor 3. As far as the correlations between the pairs of factors are concerned, factor 1 was minimally correlated with both factor 2 and 3 (r = -0.09 and r = 0.02 respectively). The correlation between factor 2 and 3 was also low (r = -0.14).

In summary, the majority (3 out of 4) of the 'inaction' items loaded highly on factor 1. Factor 2 was characterised by loadings of items describing collective/social change strategy actions. Factor 3 was characterised by negative loadings of 'collective/social change' and 'individual mobility' items. In general, the items' loadings on factor 3 do not lead to an apparent interpretation of the factor, except that it underlies a negative (evaluative) position to any type of social enhancement strategy.

Items describing individual mobility type of action did not characterise a separate factor, although a 'mobility' item had the highest loading on factor 1. On the whole, 'mobility' items loaded on all three factors. The absence of an 'individual mobility' factor will be also discussed later. For the moment what becomes apparent from this
analysis is that the items included as describing 'mobility' actions were not perceived as the same type of strategy. More specifically, items describing effort to 'behave like a man would, if he was doing the job' and items expressing effort to differentiate self from other women are loaded on different factors.

Two-factor solution

Since the pattern emerged from the principal components analysis clearly did not result to an 'individual mobility' factor, a two-factor solution was employed on the data in order to test the loading of collective/social change strategy items versus inaction. The two factors accounted for 39.2% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 14 iterations. Simple structure was achieved.

The same 'inaction' items which loaded together on factor 1 in the three-factor solution (STRA8, STRA17, STRA5) also loaded together on factor 1 in the two-factor solution. However, the highest loading on factor 1 was this of item STRA10 ('mobility' item). The negative (reversed) 'change' item STRA9 also loaded on factor 1. In general, the same items loaded highly on factor 1 of the three-factor solution and on factor 1 of the two-factor solution. A further mobility item (STRA3) had a significant loading on factor 1 of the two-factor solution. All the remaining (apart from item STRA9) eight items describing collective/social change strategy actions (STRA14, STRA2, STRA4, STRA11, STRA15, STRA6, STRA12, STRA13) loaded highly (above 0.32 in absolute value) on factor 2. This factor clearly underlies
preferences for collective/social change strategy. Finally, the 'inaction' item STRA16 loaded highly both on factor 1 (loading 0.33) and on factor 2 (loading 0.57). The correlation between the two factors was low ($r = -0.07$).

The Cronbach alpha coefficient, resulted from the reliability test on the three 'inaction' items (loaded on factor 1) was $0.85^*$ (3 items- STRA8, STRA17, STRA5). The Cronbach alpha coefficient resulting from the reliability test on the items loaded on the 'collective/social change' factor was $0.69^*$ (8 items- STRA14, STRA2, STRA4, STRA11, STRA15, STRA6, STRA12, STRA13). (For the resulted scales see Appendix 3.)

5.10. Social enhancement strategies in hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession. (STRHYP)

Preferences for type of social enhancement strategy and inaction in the hypothetical situation of workplace gender discrimination were obtained by the trainees who did not perceive (or were not sure if there is) discrimination against women in their profession. The number of the respondents who rated their preferences is 179 ($N = 179$). A principal components analysis was employed on these data for the 17 items describing coping action in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the profession. Six factors were extracted, accounting for the 61.7% of the variance.
Three-factor solution

A three-factor solution was employed on the data for these 17 items, in order to test the construct validity of three scales aiming at tapping preference for individual mobility, collective/social change strategies and inaction. The three factors accounted for 42.4% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 14 iterations.

Most of the 'change' items (STRHYP14, STRHYP11, STRHYP15, STRHYP4, STRHYP2 STRHYP12 and STRHYP13) loaded highly (above 0.38 in absolute value) on factor 1. This factor clearly underlies preferences for collective/social change strategy type of actions. Item STRHYP10, describing an individual mobility action, three 'inaction' items (STRHYP 8, STRHYP17, STRHYP5), a negative (reversed) 'mobility' item (STRHYP7) and a negative (reversed) 'change' item (STRHYP9) loaded highly (above 0.40 in absolute value) on factor 2. Finally, factor 3 had loadings (above 0.45 in absolute value) on items STRHYP6 ('change' item), STRHYP3 ('mobility' item), STRHYP16 ('inaction' item) and STRHYP1 ('mobility' item). The combination of the items loaded on factor 3 does not lead to an apparent interpretation of the factor.

The factor loadings of the items are presented in Table 5.4. As far as the correlations between the pairs of factors are concerned, factor 1 was minimally correlated with both factor 2 and 3 (r = -0.16 and r = 0.08 respectively). The correlation between factor 2 and 3 was also minimal (r = -0.02).
Table 5.4. Factor loadings of the items describing coping action in the hypothetical discrimination. (Three-factor solution).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP14</td>
<td>I would try to organise my female colleagues to do something about the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP11</td>
<td>I would actively support an organisation that stands for the rights of women at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP15</td>
<td>I would argue that many women are better for this job than some men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP4</td>
<td>I would talk to my female colleagues about strategies we can use to confront the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP2</td>
<td>I would campaign for gender equality in the work place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP12</td>
<td>I would argue that women have some additional qualities to men, which are more useful to the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP13</td>
<td>I would not get involved in protests to establish a fair policy for the women in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>I would try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP8</td>
<td>I would say to myself that there is nothing I can do about the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP17</td>
<td>I would get used to live with the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP5</td>
<td>I would ignore the discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP7</td>
<td>I would never try to disguise my femininity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP9</td>
<td>I would have nothing to argue about how women's work performance can be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP6</td>
<td>I would argue that women have different but equally valuable abilities for the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td>I would try to prove that I am different from other women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP16</td>
<td>I would quit the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51 -0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP1</td>
<td>I would try to persuade my superiors that I personally can do the job as well as a man would do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.39 0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, the items describing individual mobility actions failed to load separately on one factor. Apparently, items STRHYP10 and STRHYP7, expressing engagement in stereotypical male behaviour as a strategy, loaded in the same way as 'inaction' items on factor 2. Items STRHYP3 and STRHYP1, expressing individual differentiation from the gender ingroup, loaded on factor 3 along with a 'change' item and an 'inaction' item (this item loaded negatively), making difficult the interpretation of this factor.

It should be noted that when the responses of each sample were factor-analysed separately, items describing individual mobility actions did not characterise one separate factor, in either the responses of nursing/midwifery students, or these of police officer trainees. In these factor analyses, item STRHYP10 ("I would try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job.") consistently loaded along with 'inaction' items (as happened in the present factor analysis for the whole set of the data). Items STRHYP3 and STRHYP1 (expressing individual differentiation from the gender ingroup) loaded along with collective/social change strategy items (but not with the same 'change' items each time) in all three factor analyses. Finally, item STRHYP7 did not load in a consistent way in all of through these factor analyses.

Two-factor solution

Since the three-factor solution did not result into strong 'inaction' or 'mobility' factors, a two-factor solution was also obtained in order to decide which was the strongest underlying factor. The two factors accounted for 33.6% of the variance. The oblique rotation converged in 11 iterations. Simple structure was achieved.
All items describing collective/social change actions apart from item STRHYP9, (items STRHYP14, STRHYP2, STRHYP11, STRHYP15, STRHYP4, STRHYP12, STRHYP6, STRHYP13) loaded highly (above the absolute value 0.38) on factor 1. Factor 2 was characterised by positive loadings (above 0.49) of 'inaction' items (STRHYP8, STRHYP17, STRHYP5, STRHYP16). Also, 'Mobility' items STRHYP10, STRHYP7 and STRHYP1 (but this last one in the opposite direction to the other 'mobility' items) and the reversed 'change' item STRHYP9 loaded in the same way on factor 2. The correlation between the two factors was low (r = -0.12).

The Cronbach alpha coefficients resulting from the reliability tests were 0.74* (8 items-STRHYP14, STRHYP2, STRHYP11, STRHYP15, STRHYP4, STRHYP12, STRHYP6, STRHYP13) for the collective/social change strategy scale and 0.55* (3 items- items STRHYP8, STRHYP17, STRHYP5) for the inaction scale. (For the resulted scales, see Appendix 3.)

In general, it became apparent from these analyses that women who did not perceive (or were not sure if there is) discrimination against their gender in their profession, when faced with the possibility of discrimination, regardless of the gender typicality of this profession, organised their preference for action along two options: change the situation collectively or comply with it (adjust or exit from it). A possible explanation of the absence of an individual mobility factor is that since this group generally regards a workplace intergroup conflict 'between gender categories' as less relevant to their profession, when discrimination against women is hypothesised, it is not clear
if this is concerned with a comparison of the qualities in general of women to those of men or whether it is concerned with a part of women. Consequently, engaging self in male patterns of behaviour and differentiating self from other women is not perceived as the same type of strategy.

However, since the lack of an individual mobility factor is also evident when coping with perceived discrimination against women in the profession, a possible interpretation may lie in the fact that most of the women constituting the sample have just joined the profession and therefore individual mobility in relation to a long established gender identity is not formed as a separate strategy in this new context. There is also the possibility that the absence of a concrete 'individual mobility' option as a social enhancement strategy, more generally characterises women's action at the workplace. Nevertheless, such a possibility requires a much more broad and elaborate investigation than this data set allows.

Since in the present factor analyses an effort to differentiate self from other women signifies a different type of coping action than does an effort to behave according to male norms, the corresponding items STRA3- STRA10 in the case of perceived discrimination and STRHYP3- STRHYP10 in the case of hypothetical discrimination, will be separately examined in the following analyses in an attempt to better understand the dynamics differentiating between these two types of action.
5.11. Cronbach alpha coefficients for the indices of perceived permeability, legitimacy and stability of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession (PDP)

Due to the small number of items included to measure each of the perceived structural dimensions, it was not possible to employ factor analysis on each group of items. Therefore, imposter reliability tests were employed on each group of items. (For the resulted indices see Appendix 3).

(a) Perceived Stability

The final Cronbach alpha coefficient resulting from the reliability tests on items PDP10 to PDP14 (intending to measure perceived stability) was 0.68* (4 items- PDP11, PDP12, PDP13, PDP14).

(b) Perceived Legitimacy

The Cronbach alpha coefficient for items PDP15 to PDP18 (intending to index perceived legitimacy) was 0.70* (4 items- PDP15, PDP16, PDP17, PDP18).

(c) Perceived Permeability

The final Cronbach alpha coefficient resulting from the reliability tests on items PDP19 TO PDP22 (intending to measure perceived permeability) was 0.61* (3 items- PDP19, PDP20, PDP21).

Finally, as stated earlier, the scales are fully presented in Appendix 3. Moreover, the tables with the resulted variables’ short characterisations and abbreviations which are used in the rest of the thesis can be found in Appendix 4. Please note that this Appendix can be unfolded out and used while reading the thesis.
6. COMPARISONS BETWEEN NURSING/ MIDWIFERY STUDENTS AND POLICE OFFICER TRAINEES.

The means of the two samples in all dimensions were compared using t-test estimates. These comparisons did not take place in order to test specific hypotheses regarding differences produced by the occupational context. The comparisons are mainly used to check the effectiveness of the various measurements and to reassure that further findings are not the result of unbalanced sampling. However, in some cases, some naturalistic evidence are provided in support or in opposition to theoretical assertions.

6.1. General characteristics and beliefs.

A series of t-tests was conducted in order to compare the means of the two occupational populations, for those dimensions which are not concerned with the perception of a status discrepancy between genders in the profession (general characteristics). These dimensions include Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, general preferences for Voice and for Exit, Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy and finally Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce. There is no theoretical or empirical basis to expect these two populations to differ in these dimensions. On the contrary, the comparisons are taking place in order to confirm that the two populations do not differ on general dimensions. The means of the two samples and the associated t-test estimates are presented in Table 5.5.
As it can be seen in Table 5.5, the means of the two populations do not differ in any of the general dimensions. Job Social Self-Efficacy constitutes an exception to this general statement. Police Officers trainees appear as a group to report higher (small values indicate agreement) self-efficacy in dealing with their social job-environment than the nursing/midwifery students. This finding was not expected. A possible interpretation is that police training also focuses on cooperation (police officers always work in pairs). The interpretation that it is rather the training that is associated with reported higher Job Social-Self-Efficacy and not a generalised aspect of these women's self-concept is promoted by the finding that Global Self-Efficacy does not differ between the two populations.
In general, the t-test estimates shown in Table 5.5 demonstrate that the two populations do not differ in general characteristics as was expected. The findings also contribute to the validation and reliability of the scales. Particularly in relation to the general preferences for the social enhancement strategies, these findings indicate that the two scales are measuring individuals’ general preferences which are not influenced by the occupational context which these women are situated in, or by specific intergroup conflicts in this context. Therefore, according to SIT’s assumption of the situational dependence of the strategies, these general preferences should be irrelevant to women’s preferences for action in perceived discrimination against the gender ingroup in the specific occupational context.

Furthermore, can be stressed that the extent of the perceived vertical status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce did not differ between the two populations. Belonging to a female typical (member of majority/ dominant group) or atypical (member of minority/ subordinate group) occupation was not found connected with a differentiated perception of the general dynamics between genders in the workforce. Thus, the extent to which a differentiated perception of the general dynamics affects the perception of the status- discrepancies between genders in the specific occupational contexts remains to be identified.
6.2. Salience of gender identity at the workplace.

When a natural empirical situation is at hand, hypotheses (cognitive/ situation-functional, or motivational) for the arousal of salience of a social identification in a person's identity cannot be tested. As far as motivational explanations are concerned, longitudinal studies would be required to examine the relationship between salience of social identity and identity dynamics. A testing of Oakes & Turner's (1986) assumptions regarding the social meaning of a situation requires experimental factorial designs with control groups. Abrams (1992) explicitly advises that a measurement of salience in Oakes & Turner's (ibid) terms should be included only as a manipulation check of the salience of identity, when natural situations are to be examined.

However, an explanation of salience in terms of Oakes & Turner (ibid) is at variance with hypotheses that base it on the numerical distinctiveness of the categorisation within a context. As presented in the general introduction of this series of studies, according to the latter set of hypotheses (i.e. Taylor et al., 1978; McGuire & McGuire, 1981 cited in Abrams et al., 1990), gender salience should be stronger in the context of minority group membership than in this of majority. In opposition, following the assumptions of Oakes and Turner, when salience is compared in the context of a gender typical versus atypical occupation, the means of the two populations are expected not to differ: Gender typicality/ atypicality of the occupation will produce salience of gender identity in both cases (for a similar argument, see Abrams et al., 1990).
However, as discussed in the general introduction of this series of studies, such a prediction does not correspond to 'cognitivistic' explanations of salience the ones that self-categorisation theorists often assume. On the contrary, such a prediction attributes the predictability of salience to the individuals’ social representations of the relevance of gender dynamics in specific occupational contexts ('social meaning' of the context). In accordance with such a prediction, salience of gender identity at the workplace does not statistically differ between the two populations (t = 1.25, df=228 n.s.).

To reiterate, this comparison of gender identity salience between the two populations does not test Oakes & Turner’s (ibid) assumptions or any other assumptions regarding the arousal of social identity dynamics. The comparison provides some naturalistic evidence in relation to the various sets of theoretical assumptions regarding salience. This evidence promotes an explanation of salience on the basis of the social representations associating social identities (such as gender) with specific social contexts (e.g. occupational).

6.3. Perceived gender intergroup status-relationships in the profession.

A series of t-tests was conducted in order to compare the way the two samples perceive the gender status-relationships in their profession. The comparisons involve the perceived horizontal status-discrepancies and the perceived permeability, legitimacy and stability of the status-relationships. On the whole, these measurements apply to a perceived either high or low status-position of women in the profession. Consequently, these dimensions can be equivalently evaluated by the two populations.
According to theoretical arguments of same social-identity theorists (i.e. Turner & Brown, 1978; Hogg & Abrams, 1988), members of a contextually high-status group will tend to perceive the intergroup situation as permeable, legitimate and stable. These assertions imply that, at the 'subjective' level, members of the same group (e.g. women) will perceive the structure of an intergroup conflict situation according to the contextual status (high/low) of their group. In the present series of studies, the t-test comparisons alone cannot test if this perception is biased by the contextual status of the ingroup. For this testing, a measurement of the objective structures should have been included. Nevertheless, some naturalistic evidence can be provided. Table 5.6 presents the means of the two samples and the associated t-test estimates for the variables concerned with the perception of the gender intergroup-relationships in the profession.

As it can be seen in Table 5.6, in both professions, women perceive horizontal status-discrepancies between men and women (PEDIPR) to the same extent. This was expected as a result of the effect of the gender typicality/atypicality of the profession and since the measurement does not imply low-status group membership for women.

Permeability of gender intergroup status boundaries is also equally perceived by the two samples. The measurement of permeability involved the likelihood of women being assigned in male typical positions on the basis of their abilities. This was considered equally feasible by both samples. If one takes into account the results regarding the equally perceived existence of horizontal status discrepancies between genders in the two professions, a male typical position may well be perceived as equally accessible for a woman in either profession.
Table 5.6.  Trainees' Means and t-test estimates for the variables concerned with the perception of the gender intergroup status-relationships in profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nurses/ Midwives</th>
<th>Police Officers</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERME</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>10.66*</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SMALL VALUES INDICATE AGREEMENT

Nevertheless, an alternative interpretation is possible. Although according to an assumed influence of the contextual status-position of the ingroup it was expected that the police officers trainees would perceive less permeability of the gender intergroup boundaries in the police profession, these women have recently experienced permeability insofar as they were recently admitted to the police force. This interpretation of the police officer trainees perception of permeability is reinforced by the fact that the police officers trainees perceive the intergroup relationships in the profession as less stable and more likely to change than the nursing students do.
Perceived Legitimacy and Perceived Stability of the status of women significantly differ between the two populations. Police officers trainees perceive the status of women in their profession as less legitimate and less stable than nursing/ midwifery students do in their profession. In other words, the findings indicate that the contextual dominance of the ingroup is associated with a higher tendency to perceive the status quo as legitimate and stable than when the ingroup is contextually subordinate.

Empirically, it seems only rational that a contextually dominant group will tend to maintain and justify the status quo, while the opposite tendency will be true for low ingroup status position. However, although some authors have suggested this, research within SIT does not test such a set of hypotheses, since the perception of the structure of the intergroup situation is mainly operationalised as a direct cognitive process.

As presented in Chapter Two, interactions between ingroup status and the manipulated structure of the intergroup conflict have been demonstrated (e.g. Ellemers, 1990; 1993). More specifically, what was demonstrated, was the differential impact of the same experimental structure of intergroup relationships on the action of high and low status group members. It seems plausible therefore that the ingroup status affects the members' perception of the structure of the intergroup situation. Such an approach would more generally allow space for hypotheses concerned with the individuals' 'psychological manipulation' of the structure of the situation.
6.4. Social enhancement strategies in hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession.

Differences between preferences for the social enhancement strategies in the hypothetical situation of gender discrimination at the workplace are not expected between the two samples. The intergroup structure of hypothetical discrimination was not specified or manipulated in the following series of studies. Nonetheless, subjects might have included some elements about an intergroup structure in their representation of hypothetical discrimination against women in their particular profession that would affect their preferences for strategies. Thus the means of the scores of the two samples for preferences for social enhancement strategies in hypothetical discrimination are compared in Table 5.7.

As it becomes apparent in Table 5.7, in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession, nurses/midwives as a group show stronger preference for collective/social change strategies than do police officers trainees. There is not a clear explanation for this discrepancy. One explanation may stem from the finding that police officers trainees as a group proved to rate higher on specific social self-efficacy and this dimension is also associated with preference for action. However, as will be seen later, job social self-efficacy does not affect preference for collective strategies.
Table 5.7. Trainees' Means and t-test estimates for preferences for the social enhancement strategies in hypothetical discrimination in the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trainees' Means</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurses/ Midwives</td>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAHYP</td>
<td>18.36*</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>p-0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACTHYP</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SMALL VALUES INDICATE AGREEMENT

Another explanation is that female nurses/ midwives (as a contextually dominant group) are more strongly identified with the ingroup in case of a threat against it (for experimental support see Ellemers, 1993). Nevertheless, this stronger identification should have also produce differences in mobility strategies. Such differences were not found (see STRHYP3, STRHYP10 in Table 5.7).

It is also possible that nurses/ midwives hold a stronger preference for collectivism as part of their professional identity. This interpretation is supported by Millward's (1995) findings regarding the content of the representation of the nursing professional identity and the militancy observed in relation to issues of the professional status of nurses in Britain today. However, it needs to be clarified that this preference is only connected with nurses/ midwives' professional identity, since general preferences for collective strategies did not differ between the two samples. Since these explanations are merely speculative, it remains to acknowledge this finding in further analyses.
7. FACTORS DISCRIMINATING BETWEEN WOMEN WHO DO NOT AND WOMEN WHO PERCEIVE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN THE POLICE PROFESSION.

Only a very small minority of the nursing/midwifery students perceived discrimination against women in their profession. In contrast, 29.9% of the police officers trainees perceive such discrimination in the police force. The next step in the present series of studies was to examine the factors that differentiate the representation of discrimination against women in the police force among the police officers trainees.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the study of factors underlying the individuals' differentiation in the perception of an intergroup situation is not on the agenda of classic social-identity theorists. Moreover, the systematic focus on the impact of an experimentally manipulated structure gives rise to the implicit assertion that the perception of the situation is a direct cognitive process. Within the integrative theoretical framework of this thesis, general social representations and identity dynamics are expected to affect the perception of specific intergroup conflicts. In relation to the perception (or not) of discrimination against women in the specific occupational context, the general social representations and identity dynamics were examined in relation to the extent to which they discriminate between the two groups of people (those who perceive and those who deny discrimination), in the context of discriminant function analyses.
The examined factors included the general dimensions of individual differences in self-concept or in general social representations (Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, General Preference for Exit and for Voice, Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy and finally Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), and the dimensions involving the perception of the elements of the gender intergroup situation in the profession (Gender Salience, Perceived Discrepancy in Profession, Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy and Perceived Stability). The means of the two responding groups and the associated t-test estimates for all these dimensions are presented in Table 5.8.

As it can be seen in Table 5.8, the means of the two groups do not significantly differ as far as the 'general dimensions' are concerned, apart from the case of the Perceived Discrepancy in the Workforce. On the other hand, the groups' means for almost all the 'situation-specific dimensions' differ significantly. Nevertheless, Table 5.9 indicates that there are strong correlations between the examined variables and therefore it is possible that the variables have joint effects. Thus, the variables' contribution to a discriminant function was observed in two ways: (a) by separately examining the contribution of the 'general dimensions' and this of the 'specific-situation' dimensions; and (b) by examining using a stepwise method all variables' tolerance to an overall discriminant function.
Table 5.8. Means and t-test estimates between the police officer trainees who perceive and those who deny discrimination against women in the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Perceive Discrimination (N=39)</th>
<th>Deny Discrimination (N=61)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.04*</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>46.68</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>27.92</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIF</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>-8.15</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>-7.07</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERME</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SMALL VALUES INDICATE AGREEMENT
Table 5.9. Correlation matrix for the variables discriminating the perception of discrimination against women in the police profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GE1</th>
<th>GE3</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>PEDIMF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDIPR</th>
<th>PERME</th>
<th>STAB</th>
<th>LEGIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>-0.39***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td>-0.57***</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.61***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

All coefficients are statistically insignificant except for * p < 0.05

** p < 0.005

*** p < 0.000

2-tailed
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The chi² of the discriminant function of only the general dimensions was not statistically significant (Lambda = 0.88, chi² = 10.21 n.s.). Nevertheless, the discriminant score and the group variable were moderately correlated (Canonical Corr. = 0.34). Moreover, Perceived Discrepancy between genders in the Workforce and General Preference for Voice weighted higher into this function (above 0.3 in absolute value). Global Self-Efficacy and Job Social Self-Efficacy reversely (negatively) contribute to the function. The function could be interpreted as the women's militancy in relation the status of women in the workforce in general.

The chi² of the discriminant function of only the 'specific-situation' dimensions was statistically significant (Lambda = 0.40, chi² = 74.04, p<0). The discriminant score and the group variable were highly correlated (Canonical Corr. = 0.77). All variables (except perceived stability) contributed to the function (above 0.5 in absolute value). Perceived Legitimacy weighted higher in this function.

When the discriminating power of the variables was examined using a stepwise method, the variables entered the function were (in step order): Perceived Legitimacy, Gender Salience, Perceived Discrepancy in Profession, Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce, General Preference for Voice, Perceived Individualism and finally Perceived Stability (Table 5.10). The chi² of this discriminant function was statistically significant (Lambda = 0.38, chi² = 76.32 p<0). The canonical correlation was high (Canonical Corr. = 0.78).
Table 5.10. Wilks’ Lambda reduction in each step of the overall discriminant function for the perception/denial of discrimination between police officer trainees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>P-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as the elements of the structure of the intergroup situation are concerned, Perceived Legitimacy of the status discrepancies between genders is the variable that is most influential in explaining the differentiation of the perception of discrimination against women in the police force. However, the measurement of perceived legitimacy involved the perception of unfair discrimination. Consequently, the two measurements are likely to be tapping almost the same dimension. From the rest of the variables concerned with the structure of the intergroup situation, Perceived Stability had the smallest significant contribution to the discriminant function. People who perceive discrimination also perceive the status relationships as more stable than the people who do not perceive discrimination.
Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in the Profession also significantly contribute to the discriminant function for the two groups of the respondents. People who believe there is discrimination in the profession are the ones who more strongly perceive their gender to affect their career development in this profession and also perceive stronger status discrepancies between genders in the profession than the people who do not perceive unfair discrimination against women. It has to be noted that the means for these variables do not differ between the nursing/ midwifery students (who in general do not perceive discrimination against women in their profession) and the police officers trainees, but they differ between the two groups of police officers trainees. Thus, it seems that gender salience and gender intergroup status-discrepancies at the workplace have a different meaning for the two occupational populations. In the case of the police officers trainees, gender salience is more connected with the perception of unfair discrimination against women in this profession rather than other aspects of salience of gender identity dynamics.

Perceived Discrepancy in the Workforce also independently contributes to the explanation of the differentiated perception of the gender intergroup conflict in the specific occupational context. The people who perceive discrimination are also the ones who more strongly perceive the status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce. Thus, it can be said that the perception of discrimination against women in the particular profession is also differentiated on the basis of how women perceive the general intergroup dynamics between genders at the workforce.
More notably Preference for Voice and Perceived Individualism, although they explain a small part of the variance in the differentiation, do independently contribute to the discriminant function. In other words, even in the prior presence of the perceived elements of the intergroup situation in the discriminant function, these general dynamics play an independent role in the explanation of the differentiation of people’s opinions regarding the intergroup dynamics in this specific context. People who perceive discrimination in the specific context are also the ones that have higher general preference for collective/ social change action and perceive their society as less individualistic (Voice has the reverse sign in the function than this of GE1.

As expected, not only the elements of the specific intergroup situation but also the individuals’ perceptions regarding more general dynamics in their society contribute to the differentiation of the perception of discrimination against women in the specific occupational context. These findings support an integrative approach to action relevant to group dynamics and demonstrate the need to include a consideration for the impact of social representations which are not concerned per se with a specific environment and identity dynamics in SIT’s model of action relevant to intergroup conflict.
CHAPTER SIX: TEST OF AN INTEGRATIVE MODEL OF WOMEN'S ACTION IN PERCEIVED WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN.

1. INTRODUCTION

The next step in this series of studies was to test an integrative model of women’s preferences for type of social enhancement strategy (individual mobility, collective/social change) and/or inaction, in the case of discrimination against women at the workplace. As discussed in the general introduction of this series of studies, the model is proposed on the basis of the operation of social representational and identity dynamics and more specifically focuses on the role of the individuals’ general preferences for the social enhancement strategies, their self-efficacy and how these are related to the individuals’ representations of an intergroup conflict between genders in their occupations/professions.

The full model was tested only for the case of perceived workplace discrimination against women in the police force, using the ratings of the police officers trainees who actually perceived discrimination against women in their profession (N = 39). As reported earlier, only 8 nursing/midwifery students from the sample perceived discrimination against women in their profession. It was not possible therefore to test the proposed model of preferences for action in the case of perceived discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession. Nevertheless, the rest of the nursing/midwifery students (N = 85) rated their preferences for type of social
enhancement strategy and inaction in the hypothetical case of discrimination against women in their profession. These ratings were used in order to test the model of action based on same proposed principles, in the case of hypothetical workplace discrimination against women in one’s own profession. Similarly, police officer trainees who did not perceive or were not sure if there is discrimination against women in their profession (N = 106) also rated their preferences for action in the case of hypothetical workplace discrimination against women and these ratings were also used to test the model of action in hypothetical workplace discrimination against women. The latter studies will be presented in Chapters Seven and Eight.

As it became apparent, the sizes of the groups of the respondents are smaller than would ideally be required in order to test a rigorous model of action on the basis of such a variety of variables, especially in the case of perceived discrimination. Nevertheless, aiming at an alternative modelling of action than the one proposed traditionally by SIT and exploring the role of general social representations and identity dynamics in individual action in specific contexts, it was considered preferable to examine the role of all the suggested variables rather than to test a simple and rigorous model of action. Thus, it was not considered appropriate to test such a number of variables in a structural equation model by using e.g. LISREL. The method of hierarchical regression analysis of sets was used in order to identify the relative effects of the variables assumed to be prior to others so that a tentative path analytic model of action could be tested, but also the particular relationships between the various variables could be separately examined.
Following this method, the variables included in the model were classified and ordered hierarchically in six different functional sets. The classification and the hierarchical ordering of the variables followed the hypotheses made earlier in the general introduction of this series of studies regarding the relationships between the variables and their priority on the basis of their level of generality. The six different sets are presented here from the higher level one to the outcome set: (For a visual presentation of the proposed model, see Figure 6.1.).

(a) Perceived Individualism (item GE1), Perceived Collectivism (item GE3) and Global Self-Efficacy were included in Set A. These variables constituted the highest level set. Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism were both hypothesised to affect the general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies and eventually the coping strategies. As already discussed, Global Self-Efficacy is expected to positively affect Job General Self-Efficacy, the general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies and the social enhancement strategies, whereas it is expected to negatively affect preference for Inaction.

(b) General Preference for Exit and General Preference for Voice were included in Set B, since they were hypothesised to be affected by variables of the prior level set and affect variables of lower levels. One of the major predictions of this study is that the general preferences will directly and indirectly influence preference for strategy in the specific situation. General preferences are also expected to affect the perception of the structure of the status-discrepancies in
a way that will lead to the corresponding specific preference for the strategy. Finally, it was predicted that the general preferences will influence Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce as well as Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in the Profession (General Preference for Voice will be positively associated with these variables and General Preference for Exit negatively).

(c) Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce and Gender Salience formed Set C. All variables included in the set focus on work. These variables were seen as focusing on dimensions relevant to work in general without being concerned with the perception of the status-position of women (in relation to men) in the profession per se. Moreover, these variables were not considered as affecting each other and could thus be included in the same functional set. Furthermore, according to the predictions of this study: (i) Specific (Job) self-efficacy dimensions positively affect preference for social enhancement strategies and negatively affect preference for Inaction. (ii) Gender Salience positively influences preference for collective/social change strategy and negatively predicts individual mobility and inaction. (Gender Salience is considered as also denoting a tendency to identify more strongly with ingroups and as such influencing choice of strategy.) Salience is also expected to have indirect effects on the social enhancement strategies through Perceived Discrepancy in Profession. (iii) Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce directly and positively influences Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and indirectly preference for the strategies.
(d) Perceived Discrepancy in Profession constitutes Set D. This variable was predicted to be positively affected by Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce and Gender Salience and thus constitutes a lower level variable. Perceived Discrepancy in Profession was expected to affect the variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the status-discrepancies and Personal Discrimination. Moreover, this variable is expected to directly positively affect preference for collective/ social change strategy.

(e) The variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the intergroup status-discrepancies (permeability of intergroup boundaries, legitimacy and stability of intergroup status—discrepancies) were included in the lowest level set of independent variables, since these variables are assumed by SIT to have the immediate (and most strong) effect upon the social enhancement strategies. Theses effects are expected to be in accordance with SIT’s assumptions see Chapter Two). Personal Discrimination was also included in this set, because it was considered to have immediate effect upon the social enhancement strategies (positively affect preference for collective/ social change strategy) and be affected by the Perceived Discrepancy in Profession.

(f) Preference for Change, STRA3, STRA10 and Inaction constitute the outcome variables. Each of these types of action was progressively regressed on each set of variables, beginning with the higher level set. Nevertheless, before this procedure took place, each variable of the model was regressed on its higher level set(s) in separate regression analysis sections. In this way, it was possible to identify the affect of a dimension by hierarchically prior sets of variables.
Figure 6.1. Proposed model of women's preferences for social enhancement strategies/inaction in perceived workplace discrimination against women.

Note:
For reasons of clarity, a box is used to indicate that all the variables included in the box have the relationships represented by the lines drawn from/to the box.
2. REGRESSION RESULTS FOR THE OUTCOME VARIABLES OF THE MODEL.

2.1. Distribution statistics and correlations between the variables.

The proposed model of women’s preferences for social enhancement action (Figure 6.1.) was tested in the case of the female Police Officers trainees who perceive discrimination against women in their profession. In order to test the model, the method of hierarchical regression analysis of sets was used (see previous section).

The cases with missing data, in any of the variables, were excluded from all stages of the set of the regression analyses. Thus, the variance taken into account in testing all through this model is produced by women who actually perceived discrimination against women in the police profession (N = 28). Before the presentation of the regression results, the distribution statistics (for this sample) and the zero-order correlations of the variables are presented in Table 6.1. and Table 6.2. respectively.

In the next sections, the results concerned with the regression of each outcome variable of the model will be presented. After this analytical presentation, a summarised presentation of the main findings will follow. During the summarised presentation, the resultant path diagram and the table of R²'s will be displayed.
Table 6.1. Distribution statistics for the variables of the model of action in perceived discrimination. Police officer trainees (N= 28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>46.35</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>70.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>83.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>32.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERME</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA10</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA3</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-1.64</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>23.78</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>26.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACTION</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2.  
Correlation matrix for the variables of the model of action in perceived discrimination. Variance emerging from the respondents who perceive discrimination (N=28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GE1</th>
<th>GE3</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>PEDIWF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDIPR</th>
<th>PERME</th>
<th>LEGIT</th>
<th>STAB</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>STRA10</th>
<th>STRA3</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>INACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.41*</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.73***</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.55**</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERME</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.44*</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>-0.53**</td>
<td>0.66***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA10</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRA3</td>
<td>-0.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
All coefficients are statistically insignificant except for * p < 0.05  
** p < 0.005  
*** p = 0  
2-tailed
2.2 The relationship of the general preferences for the social enhancement strategies with global self-efficacy and perceived societal individualism and collectivism.

General preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies were each regressed on Global Self-Efficacy and Perceived Individualism and Collectivism. Only 7% ($R^2 = 0.07$, $F = 0.62$ n.s.) of the variance in General Preference for Exit was accounted for by the three predictor variables of this model. None of the three variables had a statistically significant effect. The largest effect, however, was that of Perceived Individualism ($Beta = 0.28$, $T = 1.36$ n.s.).

Nevertheless, 20% ($R^2 = 0.20$, $F = 2.04$ n.s.) of the variance in General Preference for Voice was accounted for by the predictors of this model (Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism). The best predictor (and the only one with a statistically significant effect) was Perceived Collectivism ($Beta = 0.46$, $T = 2.42$ $p < 0.05$).

Overall, the findings indicate that the individuals’ general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) is positively affected by their perception of collectivism as a social ideology. More specifically, the more one perceives collective action to be generally promoted by one’s society, the stronger one’s general preference for collective strategy is. However, none of the predictor variables of this model significantly affected one’s general preference for individual mobility.
2.3. General belief-systems and specific self-efficacy at the workplace.

Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy were each regressed on Global Self-Efficacy and the variables included in the same set with it (Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism). At the second step, the two dimensions of specific self-efficacy were each regressed on the variables of general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies.

Overall, 39% ($R^2 = 0.39$, $F = 2.83 \ p < 0.05$) of the variance in Job General Self-Efficacy was accounted for by the predictors of this model. Job General Self-Efficacy was predicted only by Global Self-Efficacy ($\beta = 0.56$, $T = 3.33 \ p < 0.005$). In both steps, the regression coefficient of Global Self-Efficacy was similar to its zero-order correlation coefficient ($r = 0.58$) with Job General Self-Efficacy. The latest finding indicates that Global Self-Efficacy shares little common effect with the rest of the predictors in explaining variance in this outcome variable.

As far as the prediction of Job Social Self-Efficacy is concerned, the $R^2$ of the regression equation of Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy was almost zero. The $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.18$), but not enough to reject the null hypothesis ($R^2 = 0.18$, $F = 1.02 \ n.s$), when the general preferences entered the equation. None of the direct effects of the variables was statistically significant. The largest direct effect was that of General Preference for Voice ($\beta = 0.38$, $T = 1.71 \ n.s$).
Overall, the general factor of the specific self-efficacy one has for doing her job was significantly affected by Global Self-Efficacy (general factor), as was predicted. This finding reinforces the theoretical arguments that self-concept in relation to specific activities rely upon generalised beliefs about self - these beliefs being part of one's identity. Nevertheless, Global Self-Efficacy did not have a statistically significant direct effect on Job Social Self-Efficacy. The measurement, however, of Global Self-Efficacy involved only the general factor of global self-efficacy. Therefore, the later result is not surprising, since it is known by previous studies on self-efficacy that the general factor is independent of the social one.

2.4. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce.

Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce was regressed on the two first sets of variables (Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy (set A) and the general preferences for Voice and for Exit strategies (set B). At the last step of the regression analysis, neither the overall ($R^2 = 0.10$, $F = 0.51$ n.s) nor any of the separate effects (Betas) of the predictor variables were statistically significant. No increase in $R^2$ has occurred, between the two steps of the regression analysis. At the last step of the regression analysis, the largest Beta was this of Global Self-Efficacy ($Beta = -0.30$, $T = -1.48$ n.s.).

Thus, according to the results from the regression analysis, the perception of the vertical status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce seems to be independent of the higher level dimensions of this model. According to the predictions
of this study, the general preferences for strategies were expected to have an impact upon this perception. The rationale was that stronger general preference for collective/social change social enhancement strategy favours the perception of status-discrepancies between social groups, in opposition to general preference for individualistic social enhancement strategy. However, the findings described above indicate that it is Global Self-Efficacy that has the largest effect (although not a statistically significant one) upon the perception of the status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce. As will be shown later, Job General Self-Efficacy has a statistically significant effect upon Perceived Discrepancy in Profession. Therefore, it seems that self-efficacy dimensions have stronger effects upon the perception of intergroup status-discrepancies.

2.5. General belief-systems and salience of women’s gender identity at the workplace.

Gender Salience was regressed on the two higher level sets of variables - Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, Global Self-Efficacy (set A) and general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies (Set B). Overall, 29% \( (R^2 = 0.29, F = 1.82 \text{n.s.}) \) of the variance in Gender Salience was explained by the model. None of the direct effects of both sets of variables was statistically significant.

At the first step of the regression analysis \( (R^2 = 0.17, F = 1.66 \text{n.s.}) \), the largest Beta was that of Perceived Collectivism \( (\text{Beta} = 0.30, T = 1.53 \text{n.s.}) \). When the general preferences for Exit and for Voice entered the regression, the overall effect
considerably increased \( R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.12 \). At this last step, the regression coefficient of Perceived Collectivism considerably decreased (Beta = 0.09, T = 0.44 n.s.). The largest Beta was this of General Preference for Voice (Beta = 0.39, T = 1.84 n.s.). These results indicate that Perceived Collectivism and General Preference for Voice share some variance in jointly predicting Gender Salience. (Perceived Collectivism and General Preference for Voice were both highly \( r = 0.36 \) zero-order correlated with Gender Salience and, as it was presented earlier, Perceived Collectivism affects General Preference for Voice.)

According to the predictions of this series of studies, Gender Salience was expected to be positively affected by General Preference for Voice (and indirectly by Perceived Collectivism). Stronger general preference for collective/social change social enhancement strategy (Voice) and remaining loyal to a group was expected to be connected with a stronger tendency for salience of group identification. However, the effects of Perceived Collectivism and General Preference for Voice did not prove strong enough. According to the results from the regression analysis, in the case of women who perceive discrimination, salience of gender identity at the workplace appears to operate independently from the higher level variables of this model. Taking into account the results from the discriminant function of the perception of discrimination, for this group, salience appears to be more connected with the perception of unfair discrimination against women of the profession rather than other aspects of salience.
2.6. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the profession.

Perceived Discrepancy in Profession was regressed on the three higher level sets of variables: (a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy, (b) general preferences for Exit and for Voice and (c) Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce, Gender Salience and the variables included in the same set (Job General and Social Self-Efficacy).

Overall, 55% of the variance in Perceived Discrepancy in Profession was explained by the model. The $R^2$ dramatically increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.31$) and became statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.55$, $F = 2.46$ p $< 0.05$) at the last step of the regression analysis, when the third set of variables entered the equation. Significant predictors were Job-General-Self-Efficacy ($\beta = -0.59$, $t = -2.45$ $p < 0.05$) and Gender Salience ($\beta = 0.54$, $t = 2.66$ $p < 0.05$).

Moreover, it can be noted that Perceived Individualism (GE1) had a high negative zero-order correlation with the Perceived Discrepancy in Profession ($r = -0.41$). Indeed, in the first two steps of the regression analysis, the largest partial effects were those of Perceived Individualism ($\beta = -0.33$, $t = -1.75$ n.s. and $\beta = -0.36$, $t = -1.67$ n.s. respectively). However, it seems that Perceived Individualism shares common effect with other variables present in the regression and particularly with Perceived Collectivism to which it is highly correlated ($r = -0.32$). Perceived Collectivism also had a high zero-order correlation with Perceived Discrepancy in the
Profession ($r = 0.37$) - this relationship being positive. At the first step of the regression, the Beta coefficients of these two predictors were smaller than their zero-order correlation coefficients with Perceived Discrepancy in Profession, indicating that the variables carry common information in predicting the outcome variable.

In conclusion, for the police officers trainees who perceive discrimination against women in their profession, salience of gender in the specific occupational context is closely connected with the perceived status-discrepancies between the two genders in this context. It seems that for this group, gender salience is connected with perception of strong status-discrepancies between genders. This interpretation is reinforced by the results indicating that Gender Salience strongly differentiates women's perception of discrimination against women in the police force.

Perception of status-discrepancies between genders in the profession is also affected by the specific self-efficacy women have in doing their job. The low job self-efficacious women are more likely to perceive strong status-discrepancies between genders in the police profession. This finding demonstrates the need to include an examination of self-concept dynamics in the study of action relevant to intergroup conflict, especially when those are concerned with the specific context within which the action takes place.

As far as the indirect effect of Global Self-Efficacy is concerned, the zero-order correlation coefficient between Job General Self-Efficacy and Perceived Discrepancy in Profession was the same ($r = -0.17$) with their partial correlation coefficient
(pr = -0.17), when controlling for Global Self-Efficacy. This finding indicates that Global Self-Efficacy adds no variance to Job General Self-Efficacy in explaining Perceived Discrepancy in Profession.

2.7. Perceived structure of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession.

Each of the variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the intergroup status-discrepancy between genders in the profession (permeability, legitimacy and stability of status discrepancies) was regressed on the four higher level sets of variables: (a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy (Set A), (b) General preference for Exit and General Preference for Voice (Set B), (c) Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce (Set C) and (d) Perceived Discrepancy in Profession (Single Variable). Before the presentation of the regression results, it should be noted that Perceived Permeability and Perceived Stability were negatively correlated (r = -0.44). Perceived Legitimacy and Perceived Permeability were positively correlated (r = 0.36). Perceived Legitimacy and Perceived Stability were not highly correlated (r = 0.11).

2.7.1. Perceived permeability of intergroup boundaries.

On the whole, 47% ($R^2 = 0.47$, $F = 1.51$ n.s.) of the variance in the perception of the permeability of intergroup boundaries was accounted for by the model. The $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.17$) at the last step of the regression analysis, when
the Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation. Perceived Discrepancy in Profession had a significant direct effect upon the Perceived Permeability (Beta = -0.61, T = 2.33 p < 0.05). This effect demonstrates that the stronger the status-discrepancy is perceived as, the less permeable the intergroup boundaries are seen as being.

Moreover, none of the variables of the first set (Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy) or of the second set (general preferences) had a statistically significant effect (R² = 0.16, F = 1.53 n.s. and R² = 0.17, F = 0.94 n.s. respectively) on Perceived Permeability. In both steps, the largest effects were those of Perceived Individualism (Beta = 0.29, T = 1.49 n.s. and Beta = 0.25, T = 1.12 n.s. respectively) and Global Self-Efficacy (Beta = -0.28, T = -1.47 n.s. and Beta = -0.28, T = -1.42 n.s. respectively). When the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), the R² considerably increased (R² change = 0.13, R² = 0.30, F = 0.85 n.s.), but none of the variables had a statistically significant effect. The largest Beta was this of Global Self-Efficacy (Beta = -0.50, T = -1.83 n.s.). The Beta of Global Self-Efficacy considerably dropped (Beta = -0.25, T = -0.96 n.s) when Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation at the last step of the regression analysis.

Regarding the indirect effects of self-efficacy dimensions on Perceived Permeability through the Perceived Discrepancy in Profession, an examination of the correlations took place. The zero-order correlation coefficient between Perceived Discrepancy in
Profession and Perceived Permeability was -0.55. The partial correlation coefficient between them was -0.57 when controlling for Job General Self-Efficacy. This finding indicates that the indirect effect of Job General Self-Efficacy on Perceived Permeability is very small.

As far as the indirect effect of Gender Salience is concerned, the partial correlation coefficient between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and Perceived Permeability was -0.55 (the bivariate correlation was -0.55) when controlling for Gender Salience. This finding indicates that Gender Salience does not contribute to the explanation of the perception of permeability through the perceived discrepancy in the profession.

In conclusion, the perception of the permeability of intergroup boundaries is significantly affected by the perception of the extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession. The stronger status-discrepancies one sees, the less permeable one perceives the intergroup boundaries to be.

2.7.2. Perceived legitimacy of the status-discrepancies.

The regression analysis conducted for the prediction of Perceived Legitimacy showed significant effects in all its steps (with the exception of the third one). At the first step ($R^2 = 0.16, F = 1.53$ n.s.), the direct effect of Global Self-Efficacy reached the boundaries to reject the null hypothesis ($\beta = -0.38, T = -2.05 p = 0.05$). According to this effect, the higher the self-efficacy women have the less likely are to perceive the status-discrepancies between the two genders as legitimate. Furthermore, the $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.20$), when the general preferences entered the
equation, but with a marginally significant overall effect ($R^2 = 0.36$, $F = 2.57$ $p = 0.0556$). Global Self-Efficacy ($\beta = -0.37$, $T = -2.16$ $p < 0.05$) and General Preference for Exit ($\beta = 0.38$, $T = 2.07$ $p = 0.05$) both had statistically significant effects.

When the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), the $R^2$ increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.08$), but became insignificant overall ($R^2 = 0.44$, $F = 1.60$ n.s.). The effect of Global Self-Efficacy increased in value, but became marginally significant ($\beta = -0.50$, $T = -2.06$, $p = 0.0539$). The effect of General Preference for Exit also slightly increased but became insignificant ($\beta = 0.40$, $T = 1.98$ n.s.).

The $R^2$ increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.13$) when Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation, but remained insignificant ($R^2 = 0.57$, $F = 2.34$ n.s.). Perceived Discrepancy in Profession had a statistically significant direct effect on Perceived Legitimacy ($\beta = -0.54$, $T = -2.33$ $p < 0.05$). General Preference for Exit also had a statistically significant direct effect on Perceived Legitimacy ($\beta = 0.44$, $T = 2.41$ $p < 0.05$). However, when Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation, the effect of Global Self-Efficacy considerably decreased and became insignificant ($\beta = -0.28$, $T = -1.20$ n.s.).

Although Global Self-Efficacy does not have a statistically significant effect on Perceived Legitimacy in the presence of other explanatory variables, it has already been demonstrated that Global Self-Efficacy affects Job General Self-Efficacy and the
latter variable negatively affects Perceived Discrepancy in Profession. Therefore, the indirect effect of Job General Self-Efficacy on the perception of legitimacy has to be examined.

The zero-order correlation coefficient between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and Perceived Legitimacy was -0.35. The partial correlation coefficient between them was -0.41 when controlling for Job General Self-Efficacy. This examination indicates that Job General Self-Efficacy has a small indirect effect via the Perceived Discrepancy in Profession upon Perceived Legitimacy. This effect has the opposite direction (positive) than the direct effect of Job General Self-Efficacy. According to this effect, highly job self-efficacious women, perceiving less discrepancy in the profession, are more likely to see this discrepancy as legitimate. Nevertheless, both the direct effects of Global Self-Efficacy and Job General Self-Efficacy, although not statistically significant, they were negative on Perceived Legitimacy. Additionally, at the second step of the regression analysis, Global Self-Efficacy had a statistically significant negative direct effect on Legitimacy. According to this effect, highly self-efficacious women are less likely to perceive the discrepancy as legitimate.

As far as the indirect effect of Gender Salience is concerned, the partial correlation coefficient between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and Perceived Legitimacy was -0.31 (the bivariate correlation was -0.35), when controlling for the effect of Gender Salience. Therefore, the indirect effect of salience upon perceived Legitimacy is small and in the same direction (negative) as its direct effect. According to this indirect effect, women perceiving their gender to be strongly involved in their job and
perceiving stronger status-discrepancies between genders in their profession, are more likely to perceive these status-discrepancies as illegitimate.

In conclusion, the stronger the status-discrepancies are perceived, the more likely they are to be perceived as illegitimate. Job General Self-Efficacy has also a small positive indirect effect upon perceived legitimacy, through the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies. According to this effect, high self-efficacious women, perceiving less status discrepancies between genders in the police profession, are more likely to see these discrepancies as legitimate. However, when the effects of self-efficacy dimensions do not involve perception of the extent of status-discrepancies, these effects are negative (high self-efficacious women are more likely to perceive the status quo as illegitimate). Also, gender salience has a small negative indirect effect upon perceived legitimacy through the perceived status-discrepancies in the profession. According to this effect, women who perceive their gender to strongly affect their working life and also perceive stronger status discrepancies between genders in the police profession are more likely to perceive these discrepancies as illegitimate.

Finally, the perceived legitimacy of the status-discrepancies is positively affected by one’s general preference for individual mobility. This effect is in accordance with SIT’s connection of individual mobility with a faith in the legitimacy of the status quo, although here it is shown in the opposite way, that is, one’s general preference for individual mobility affects the perception of the legitimacy of the specific intergroup situation.
2.7.3. Perceived stability of the status-discrepancies.

Overall, 20% of the variance in Perceived Stability was explained by the model ($R^2 = 0.20$, $F = 0.45 \text{ n.s.}$). None of the variables included in the prior level sets significantly affected the perception of stability at any step of the regression analysis. The largest increase in $R^2$ ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.09$) occurred with the entrance of the general preferences for Voice and for Exit strategies ($R^2 = 0.14$, $F = 0.72 \text{ n.s.}$). At this step, the largest effect was this of General Preference for Exit (Beta = -0.32, $T = -1.48$, n.s.). The effect of General Preference for Exit remained the largest (statistically insignificant though) effect through all the subsequent steps of the regression analysis (Beta = -0.28, $T = -1.14 \text{ n.s.}$ and Beta = -0.29, $T = -1.16 \text{ n.s.}$ respectively). These findings indicate that the perception of stability is not affected by the variables of the prior level sets of this model.

2.8. Personal discrimination.

Personal Discrimination was regressed on the four higher level sets of variables: (a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, Global Self-Efficacy (Set A), (b) General preferences for Exit and for Voice Strategies (Set B), (c) Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce (Set C) and (d) Perceived Discrepancy in Profession.
Overall, 62% ($R^2 = 0.62$, $F = 2.82$, $p < 0.05$) of the variance in Personal Discrimination was accounted for by the model. The only statistically significant effect on Personal Discrimination was that of Gender Salience ($\beta = -0.49$, $T = -2.16$, $p < 0.05$). The largest increase in $R^2$ ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.41$) occurred when the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in the Workforce). At this step, Gender Salience had a larger direct effect ($\beta = -0.74$, $T = -3.53$, $p < 0.005$). Nevertheless, the effect of salience considerably decreased, when Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation, at the last step of the regression analysis. (As presented, Gender Salience has a significant direct effect upon Perceived Discrepancy in Profession.)

According to the predictions of this study (and more specifically according to the predictions of SIT), it was expected that Perceived Discrepancy in the Profession will have a positive direct effect and Gender Salience will have an indirect/ or direct positive effect upon Personal Discrimination. The regression coefficients of Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Profession were smaller in absolute value than their zero-order correlations with Personal Discrimination, indicating that these variables carry common information in explaining variance in personal discrimination. Nevertheless, although Gender Salience had a statistically significant direct effect upon Personal Discrimination, this effect was negative.

One possible interpretation of this relationship is that the more salient a woman perceives her gender category at the workplace, the less discrimination she is likely to feel 'as an individual'. Such an interpretation contradicts SIT's assumptions for the
implications of group identification. Nevertheless, in the measurement of 'personal
discrimination', the respondents were clearly asked to indicate how often they have
experienced discrimination 'as women' in their workplace. Thus, for the interpretation
of this relationship, two points have to be taken into account. Firstly, the instructions
given for the completion of the measurement of personal discrimination were asking
for an indication of actual personal discrimination during the last year at work (within
the profession which the respondents are being trained for). However, the sample is
comprised of trainees who have little actual working experience in this profession.
Secondly, these results are concerned with the variance emerging from trainees who
do perceive discrimination against women in their profession. Thus, among this
sample, although there are fewer women feeling that they have actually been
personally discriminated against (Variance 19.44, Kurtosis -1.21, Skewness -0.16),
there are more women who perceive gender categorisation to be involved in their job
(Variance 9.7, Kurtosis -0.36, Skewness 0.43). Consequently, the negative
relationship between Gender Salience and personal discrimination could be explained
as an artifact of the opposite skewed distributions. This interpretation has also some
theoretical implications. It reinforces the arguments that salience of a category
membership in a specific situation depends rather on widespread social representations
associating social identity dynamics to the situation than on an autonomous perception
of the situation based on personal experiences.
2.9. Preferences for action in perceived discrimination against women in the profession.

Each of the strategies was regressed on the five higher level sets of variables: (a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy (Set A), (b) the General preferences for Exit and for Voice Strategies (Set B), (c) Job General Self-Efficacy, Specific Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce (Set C), (d) Perceived Discrepancy in Profession (Single Variable) and (e) the variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the status discrepancy in the profession (permeability of intergroup boundaries, legitimacy and stability of intergroup status discrepancy) and Personal Discrimination.

2.9.1. Collective/social change strategy.

The model accounted for the 71% ($R^2 = 0.71$, $F = 2.36$ n.s.) of the variance in preference for collective/social change strategy. Statistically significant effects were these of General Preference for Voice ($\text{Beta} = 0.53$, $T = 2.63$ $p < 0.05$) and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce ($\text{Beta} = -0.46$, $T = -2.36$ $p < 0.05$). Indeed, the largest increases in $R^2$ occurred (a) at the second step ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.36$), when the general preferences entered the equation ($R^2 = 0.46$, $F = 3.81$ $p < 0.05$) and (b) at the third step ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.20$), with the entrance of Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce, Gender Salience, Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy ($R^2 = 0.66$, $F = 4.02$ $p < 0.05$). (The $R^2$ of the regression equation of Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy was small ($R^2 = 0.10$, $F = 0.94$ n.s.).
Moreover, at the fourth step of the regression analysis, Job General Self-Efficacy had a statistically significant direct effect on Preference for Change (Beta = 0.51, T = 2.23 p < 0.05). It has to be noted that the direct effect of Job General Self-Efficacy was insignificant (Beta = 0.31, T = 1.5 n.s.) when the variable first entered the regression equation. The considerable increase of this direct effect was a result of the entrance of Perceived Discrepancy in Profession. (It has been demonstrated that Job General Self-Efficacy has a statistically significant direct effect on Perceived Discrepancy in Profession.) The effect of Job General Self-Efficacy slightly decreased in value and its statistical significance dropped (Beta = 0.50, T = 1.8 n.s.) when the fifth set of variables entered the equation, at the last step of the regression analysis. At this step, with the entrance of Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy, Perceived Stability and Personal Discrimination, the R² of the equation remained the same and its statistical significance dropped (R² = 0.71, F = 2.36 n.s).

In conclusion, the findings indicate that in this case of perceived discrimination against one’s group, the choice of collective/social change strategy relies primarily upon one’s general preference for collective/social change type of social enhancement strategy. Perceived social ideologies did not directly affect preference for collective/social change strategy in the specific situation. However, Perceived Collectivism has a small indirect effect through General Preference for Voice upon Preference for Change. This indirect effect is indicated by the partial correlation coefficient between the General Preference for Voice and Preference for Change when controlling for Perceived Collectivism (pr = 0.57, r = 0.60). This indirect effect of Perceived Collectivism has the same direction with its direct effect (positive).
Moreover, the extent of the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce negatively influences preference for collective/social change strategy when discrimination against women is perceived at one’s workplace. The stronger the perceived general discrepancies, the less the chance of choosing collective/social change strategy. This finding is also against the predictions of SIT and particularly Tajfel’s & Turner’s predictions that when the perceived intergroup status-discrepancies are prominent, individuals will be forced to stand up for their group in order to improve their own status and self-esteem.

Nevertheless, the extent of the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the profession itself did not seem to affect choice of collective/social change strategy in order to cope with discrimination against women in the profession. Nevertheless, as it became apparent, the perception of the status-discrepancies in the profession strongly (and negatively) depends on Job General Self-Efficacy which positively affects preference for collective/social change strategy in the specific situation. Thus, high job self-efficacious women perceive less status-discrepancies between the two genders and have a greater preference for collective/social change strategy. Nevertheless, it seems that the effects of the two independent variables are counterbalanced in the prediction of preference for collective/social change strategy in the specific situation, in such a way that none of them has a statistically significant independent effect in the presence of perceived permeability, legitimacy and stability of the status-discrepancies.
As far as the perceived structure of the status-discrepancies in the profession is concerned, Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy and Perceived Stability did not have any statistically significant direct effects upon Preference for Change in the presence of other explanatory variables. Indeed, their entrance in the regression equation did not add to the explained variance and lessened its overall significance. Therefore, in this case of perceived discrimination against one’s group, involvement with collective/ social change strategy was directly associated with general preferences for the social enhancement strategies without the mediation of the perception of the structure of the specific discriminatory situation.

2.9.2. Individual mobility actions.

Two items were selected to represent individual mobility strategy type of actions, since the analyses did not result in a reliable scale. These two items were regressed separately on the five higher level sets of variables.

A) Item STRA10: "I try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job."

Overall, the 91% ($R^2 = 0.91, F = 10.21 p<0$) of the variance in preference for the particular individual mobility action (STRA10) was explained by the model. As in the case of Preference for Change, the $R^2$ of the regression equation for STRA10 dramatically increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.61$) and became statistically significant when the general preferences entered the equation ($R^2 = 0.69, F = 9.81 p<0$). At this step,
General Preference for Exit had the only statistically significant effect (Beta = 0.71, T = 5.51 p = 0). The effect of General Preference for Exit remained statistically significant in all the subsequent steps of the regression analysis.

Moreover, in contrast with Preference for Change, the R² of the regression of the mobility action considerably increased for a second time (R²_change = 0.14), when the variables of the fifth set (Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy, Perceived Stability and Personal Discrimination) entered the equation (R² = 0.91, F = 10.21 p < 0). At this step, the effect of Perceived Discrepancy in Profession dramatically increased and became statistically significant (Beta = 0.60, T = 3.82 p < 0.005). Perceived Stability also had a significant effect on preference for STRA10 (Beta = -0.27, T = -2.37 p < 0.05). General Preference for Exit maintained its significant effect (Beta = 0.54, T = 4.28 p < 0.005).

As far as the effect of Perceived Discrepancy in Profession is concerned, its zero-order correlation coefficient was 0.01 while its regression coefficient was 0.60. The dramatic increase of this effect occurred after the entrance of Perceived Legitimacy, Permeability and Personal Discrimination. As presented, the first two variables are directly affected by Perceived Discrepancy in Profession. The enhancement of the effect of Perceived Discrepancy in Profession is probably due to the abstraction of variance emerging from contrasting relationships. Indeed, Perceived Discrepancy in Profession negatively affects the Perceived Permeability and Perceived Legitimacy and positively affects STRA10. However, Perceived Permeability and Perceived Legitimacy are positively correlated with STRA10 (r = 0.34 and r = 0.32 respectively).
Moreover, as demonstrated earlier, Gender Salience and Job General Self-Efficacy have significant direct effects upon Perceived Discrepancy in Profession. In order to assess the indirect effects of these variables upon STRA10, an examination of the correlation coefficients took place. Accordingly, while the zero-order correlation between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and STRA10 is low ($r = 0.01$), the partial correlation coefficient between them is the same in value but negative ($pr = -0.01$) when controlling for Job General Self-Efficacy (general factor). Thus, it should be noted that the relationship between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and STRA10 changes direction when the effects of Job General Self-Efficacy are taken out.

Moreover, the partial correlation coefficient between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and STRA10 is 0.13 when controlling for Gender Salience (the bivariate correlation is 0.01). Thus, the indirect effect of Gender Salience upon STRA10 (via Perceived Discrepancy in Profession) is considerable. This effect is in the opposite direction (positive) to the direct effect of Gender Salience. According to this effect, women who perceive their gender to be salient in their job and thus perceive stronger discrepancies between genders in their profession, also have a stronger preference to 'exit' their gender membership and behave like men.

Summarising these results, the model accounted for 91% of the variance elicited for preferences for a specific individual mobility strategy action (STRA10). The best predictor was Perceived Discrepancy in Profession ($Beta = 0.60$, $T = 3.82$ $p < 0.005$). The stronger discrepancy women perceive in their profession, the more likely
are to have a stronger preference for this individual mobility action. The second best predictor was General Preference for Exit \((\text{Beta} = 0.54, \text{T} = 4.28 \ p < 0.005)\). As was predicted in this series of studies, the stronger one's general preference for the Exit strategy, the more likely one is to be engaged in individual mobility actions in a specific situation of discrimination against the group.

Finally, preference for this specific individual mobility strategy was also predicted by the perceived stability of the gender intergroup status differences at the workplace \((\text{Beta} = -0.27, \text{T} = -2.37 \ p < 0.05)\). The less stable the status relationships are seen as, the stronger the preference for this individual mobility type of action. The effect of stability is direct upon preference for mobility strategy, but in the opposite direction to the predictions of SIT. The perception of unstable relationships led in this case to the choice of an individual mobility type of action. According to SIT, unstable relationships should lead to greater preference for collective/social change type of strategy.

B) Item STRA3: "I try to prove that I am different from other women."

The model accounted for 69% \((R^2 = 0.69, F = 2.13 \ n.s.)\) of the variance in preference for the particular individual mobility action. The \(R^2\) dramatically increased \((R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.47)\) and became statistically significant, when the general preferences variables entered the equation \((R^2 = 0.50, F = 4.44, p < 0.05)\). General Preference for Exit had a statistically significant direct effect on STRA3 \((\text{Beta} = 0.73, \text{T} = 4.45 \ p < 0.0005)\). The effect of General Preference for Exit remained statistically
significant in all the subsequent steps of the regression analysis. A further substantial increase in $R^2$ ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.10$) occurred when Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation ($R^2 = 0.66$, $F = 3.43$ $p < 0.05$). Perceived Discrepancy in Profession had a statistically significant effect ($\beta = 0.47$, $T = 2.27$ $p < 0.05$).

Furthermore, the $R^2$ of the regression of STRA3 slightly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.03$) and its statistical significance dropped when the variables of the fifth set (Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy, Perceived Stability and Personal Discrimination) entered the equation ($R^2 = 0.69$, $F = 2.13$ n.s.). The effect of General Preference for Exit considerably decreased at this last step but remained statistically significant ($\beta = 0.57$, $T = 2.38$ $p < 0.05$). This was the only statistically significant direct effect on STRA3. The effect of Perceived Discrepancy in Profession increased but became statistically insignificant ($\beta = 0.58$, $T = 1.93$ n.s.), at this last step of the regression analysis. On the whole, preference for differentiation from the ingroup in this case of perceived discrimination against the ingroup was directly and uniquely predicted by individual general preference for individual mobility.

2.9.3. Preference for inaction.

The model accounted for 80% of the variance in preference for Inaction. The statistical significance of the predictors in the regression equation of Inaction changed at the different steps of the regression analysis. For this reason the results will be presented analytically.
Approximately 23% of the variance in preference for Inaction was accounted by Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy ($R^2 = 0.23, F = 2.44\ n.s.$). None of the direct effects of these variables was statistically significant. The largest effect was this of Perceived Collectivism (Beta = -0.35, $T = -1.89\ n.s.$). It has to be noted that Perceived Collectivism had a significant zero-order correlation with Inaction ($r = -0.38$). The regression coefficients of Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism were smaller than their zero-order correlations with preference for Inaction, indicating that they share information in explaining variance in preference for Inaction (redundancy).

The $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.33$), when the general preferences entered the equation, and became statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.56, F = 5.76, p < 0.005$). General Preference for Exit had the only statistically significant effect (Beta = 0.51, $T = 3.31\ p < 0.005$).

At the same step, the effect of Perceived Collectivism dropped, probably due to the entrance of General Preference for Voice which is significantly affected by Perceived Collectivism. It is noted that General Preference for Voice has also a high zero-order correlation with Inaction ($r = -0.46$). The regression coefficients of Perceived Collectivism and General Preference for Voice were smaller than their zero-order correlations with preference for Inaction, indicating that they share common variance in explaining preference for Inaction (redundancy).
As the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), the $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.15$) and remained statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.71$, $F = 4.90$ $p < 0.005$). The direct effect of Perceived Collectivism slightly increased and became statistically significant (Beta $= -0.38$, $T = -2.37$ $p < 0.05$). It can be noted that the direct effect of Perceived Collectivism at this step has the same value with its zero-order correlation with Inaction. Moreover, the effect of General Preference for Exit considerably decreased, but remained statistically significant (Beta $= 0.37$, $T = 2.51$ $p < 0.05$). Job Social Self-Efficacy had also a statistically significant direct effect (Beta $= -0.42$, $T = -2.76$ $p < 0.05$).

The $R^2$ slightly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.01$) when Perceived Discrepancy in Profession entered the equation and remained statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.72$, $F = 4.43$ $p < 0.005$). The effect of Perceived Collectivism slightly increased and remained statistically significant (Beta $= -0.39$, $T = -2.44$ $p < 0.05$). The effect of General Preference for Exit slightly decreased but remained statistically significant (Beta $= 0.36$, $T = 2.41$ $p < 0.05$). Job Social Self-Efficacy maintained also its statistically significant direct effect (Beta $= -0.46$, $T = -2.87$ $p < 0.05$). Additionally, the effect of Global Self-Efficacy increased and became statistically significant (Beta $= -0.42$, $T = -2.18$ $p < 0.05$).

Furthermore, the $R^2$ of the regression increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.08$) and remained statistically significant, when the variables of the fifth set (Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy, Perceived Stability and Personal Discrimination) entered the
equation \( R^2 = 0.80, F = 3.87, p < 0.01 \). The effect of Perceived Collectivism slightly decreased but remained statistically significant (Beta = -0.36, T = -2.18, 
\( p < 0.05 \)). The effect of Global Self-Efficacy increased and remained statistically significant (Beta = -0.48, T = -2.38 \( p < 0.05 \)). Job Social Self-Efficacy also maintained its statistically significant direct effect (Beta = -0.52, T = -3.08 \( p < 0.01 \)). The effect of General Preference for Exit decreased and became statistically insignificant (Beta = 0.32, T = 1.65, n.s.).

As far as the effect of General Preference for Exit after the entrance of the structural variables is concerned, it has to be noted that the regression coefficients of all these variables (General Preference for Exit, Perceived Permeability, Perceived Legitimacy and Perceived Stability) were smaller in value than the zero-order correlation coefficients of these variables with Preference for Inaction. (Also, the sign of Perceived Legitimacy was reversed.) These findings indicate that these variables carry common information about preference for Inaction.

Summarising these results, 80% of the variance in Preference for Inaction was accounted for by the model. The best predictors were Job Social Self-Efficacy (Beta = -0.52, T = -3.08 \( p < 0.01 \)), Global Self-Efficacy (Beta = -0.48, T = -2.38 \( p < 0.05 \)) and Perceived Collectivism (Beta = -0.36, T = -2.18 \( p < 0.05 \)). These results are in accordance with the predictions that self-efficacy dimensions negatively predict inaction. In general, the results indicate that in the case of police women trainees who perceive discrimination against women in their profession, a negative relationship with a collectivistic social ideology and a weak general preference for individualistic strategy lead the less self-efficacious women to a greater preference for passive coping, such as to ignore discrimination, to think that there is nothing they can do about it and/or learn to live with it.
3. **SUMMARIZED PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTANT PATH ANALYTIC MODEL OF WOMEN'S ACTION IN PERCEIVED WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION.**

The resultant path diagram of preference for type of social enhancement strategy and/or inaction in the case of perceived discrimination against women in the police profession is presented in Figure 6.2. Only the finally statistically significant paths are shown. The $R^2$ of the regression equation of each outcome variable is listed in the summary of sub-analyses under the diagram. Moreover, the overall effect ($R^2$) of each set of variables upon each outcome variable is listed in Table 6.3.

In summary, the proposed model accounted for 71% of the variance in preference for collective/social change strategy, 91% of the variance for a specific individual mobility strategy action (item STRA10) and 69% of the variance elicited for another individual mobility strategy type of action (item STRA3). Finally, the model accounted for 80% of the variance in preference for inaction.

More specifically, preference for collective/social change strategy in the specific situation was positively predicted by one’s general preference for this type of strategy. Also, the individual’s general preference for collective/social change strategy was found to be positively affected by her perception of collective strategies as a prevalent ideology in her society. On the other hand, the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce negatively affected women’s preference for collective/social change strategy as a way to cope with discrimination against women.
Figure 6.2. Path diagram resulting from the regression analyses: Women's preferences for action in perceived workplace discrimination. (N=28)

Summary of sub-analyses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>PERME</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>INACTION</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>STRA10</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>STRA3</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3. Overall effects ($R^2$) of each set of variables upon each outcome variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variables</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDIWF</th>
<th>PEDIPR</th>
<th>PERME</th>
<th>LEGIT</th>
<th>STAB</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>STRA10</th>
<th>STRA3</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>INACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sets of predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF GE1 GE3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT VOICE</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF SPGEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55*</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>0.66*</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN PEDIWF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.66*</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERME LEGIT STAB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91***</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.80*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

All $R^2$ are statistically insignificant except for *p< 0.05
**p< 0.005
***p< 0.000
in their profession. The stronger they perceived the discrepancies in the workforce, the less likely they were to choose collective/social change strategy in order to cope with discrimination against women in their profession.

As far as the perceived structure of the specific status-discrepancies in the profession is concerned, that is, their perceived permeability, legitimacy and stability, not only they did not have statistically significant direct effects upon preference for collective/social change strategy in the presence of other explanatory variables, but in fact they did not contribute at all in the explanation of preference for collective/social change strategy. Indeed, their entrance in the equation caused the decline of the overall statistical significance of the equation (see Table 6.3).

It has also to be noted that before the entrance of these variables, Job General Self-Efficacy had a statistically significant positive direct effect upon preference for collective/social change strategy. According to this effect, the higher the self-efficacy that women have in relation to their job, the more likely they are to choose collective/social change strategy in order to cope with discrimination against women in their profession.

Choice of a specific individual mobility type of action (STRA10) was positively predicted by the extent of the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the profession: The stronger the perceived discrepancies, the more likely is for women to choose this individual mobility action ('behave like a man would, if he was doing the job') to cope with discrimination. Moreover, preference for this individual
mobility action was also positively predicted by one’s general preference for individual mobility type of social enhancement strategy. Finally, preference for the specific individual mobility action was also significantly but negatively predicted by the perceived stability of the status-relationships between genders in the profession. The less stable the status-relationships were seen, the stronger the preference for the individual mobility action. Although the effect of stability was direct upon the preference for this individual mobility action, it however is in the opposite direction to the predictions of SIT. In these results, it was the perception of unstable relationships that led to the choice of individual mobility strategy and not their perceived stability.

As far as the effects of perceived legitimacy are concerned, this variable was negatively affected by the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession, but positively affected by the individual’s general preference for individual mobility. However, both the perceived discrepancies and the general preference for individual mobility positively affect preference for the individual mobility action in the specific situation. Consequently, the effect of perceived legitimacy which is due to the general preference for individual mobility is counterbalanced by the effect of perceived legitimacy which is due to the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies.

As far as the effect of permeability is concerned, according to SIT, perceived permeability should be positively associated with preference for individual mobility action. In the present study, perceived permeability did not have a significant direct effect upon the individual mobility action (STRA10). However, perceived
permeability was negatively affected by the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies in the profession and the individual mobility action was positively affected by the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies in the profession.

As far as the indirect effects are concerned, the indirect effect of the job general self-efficacy upon the particular individual mobility action (STRA10) was very small. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the relationship between Perceived Discrepancy in Profession and STRA10 changes direction (becomes negative) when the effects of Job General Self-Efficacy are taken out. Finally, gender salience had a considerable indirect effect upon preference for the individual mobility action through the perceived discrepancies in the profession. According to this effect, women who perceive gender to be salient at their work and thus perceive stronger discrepancies between genders in their profession, also have a stronger preference to 'exit' their gender membership and behave like men.

The model also accounted for 69% of the variance in preference for the other individual mobility action (item STRA3). The best predictor (and the only statistically significant one) was one's general preference for individual mobility.

Lastly, 80% of the variance in preference for inaction was accounted for by the proposed model. The best negative predictors were the specific self-efficacy one has in dealing with the social environment at the workplace and one's global self-efficacy. The perception of collectivism as a prevalent social ideology had also a significant negative effect on preference for inaction. The latter results are in accordance with the
predictions of this study that self-efficacy dimensions will be negatively associated with inaction. In general, the regression of preference for inaction indicates that in the case of police women trainees who perceive discrimination against women in the police profession, a negative relationship with a collectivistic social ideology and a weak general preference for individual mobility lead the less self-efficacious individuals to have a greater preference for passive coping, such as to ignore discrimination, think that there is nothing they can do about it and/or learn to live with it.

Overall, the individuals’ general preferences for type of social enhancement strategy proved to be very important determinants of the individuals’ type of social enhancement action in the specific situation of discrimination against one’s identification group. Self-efficacy (global and specific) also proved to play an important role in the way the individuals perceive the intergroup situation and estimate options for coping action.

As far as other outcome variables are concerned, the proposed model accounted for 47% of the variance in perceived permeability and 54% of the variance in perceived legitimacy. Perceived permeability was negatively predicted by the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies. Perceived legitimacy was also negatively predicted by the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies in the profession and positively predicted by one’s general preference for individual mobility. Moreover, personal discrimination was negatively predicted by gender salience.
Furthermore, the proposed model accounted for 55% of the variance in perception of the status-discrepancies in the profession. The perception of the discrepancies was positively predicted by job general self-efficacy and gender salience. Finally, as it was presented earlier, Job General Self-Efficacy was found to be positively affected by Global Self-Efficacy. Other outcome variables were not significantly predicted by variables of prior level sets.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Perceived social ideologies and the social representational field of social enhancement strategies.

As presented earlier, the individual’s perception of societal collectivism was found to positively affect her general preference for collective/ social change strategy. According to this effect, the more an individual perceives society as favouring collectivism, the more likely it is for this individual to have a stronger general preference for collective/ social change strategy in order to cope with discrimination against an ingroup. This relationship demonstrates the attachment of the individuals’ general preferences for social enhancement strategies to perceived social dynamics. The finding supports one of the major assertions of this thesis regarding the foundation of the individuals’ general preferences for type of social enhancement action upon perceived social ideologies.
For this thesis, the dimension of 'perceived social ideologies' is used to denote the individuals' formation of social representations of social enhancement strategies on the basis of social ideologies (embodied in social belief-systems or systems of social practices). Actually, in these measurements respondents were asked about the beliefs of 'other people' ("In Britain Today, ...") regarding individualistic/collectivistic action. The finding that people's 'own' preferences are in a linear relationship with those (believed being) of 'others' can be interpreted as a demonstration of the operation of a social representational field of social enhancement strategies. People's opinions about and preferences for these strategies are not arbitrary individual properties. They vary according to estimations of the opinions of others and the tendencies prominent in their societies. This view of the individuals' opinions, attitudes, or preferences for action supports the assumptions of SRT (Moscovici, 1984) regarding the social representational nature of opinions and attitudes. Moreover, it supports SRT's assumption of the importance of social communication and interaction. Individuals base their opinions on estimates regarding the opinions of others (individuals, groups or other sources of social influence). Consequently, people need and use social communication in order to shape an understanding of reality, form their points of view and action.

To clarify, this interpretation should not be taken to imply that individuals' opinions (perceptions or preferences) are always in a linear (or indeed positive) relationship with what it is believed as being the opinions of 'others'. This constitutes only one case of the manifestation of the operation of social representations. Individuals can argue, oppose, synthesise and contribute with their elaborations to the canvas of the
social representations (Moscovici, 1984). Social representations can be debated (e.g. see rhetorical approach to social representations, Billig, 1991, 1993), fade and certainly change. Therefore, it is rational to expect that these processes manifest themselves in other empirical ways than the linear relationships between perceived opinions (preferences) of 'others' and personal ones.

In a broader sense, the latter approach could help in explaining the fact that Perceived Individualism was not found to affect individual general preferences for the social enhancement strategies, or any other dimension of the model. To interpret this finding it should firstly be noted that the involved society (a Western European one) is broadly characterised as an individualistic one (i.e. Hofstede, 1980). It might therefore be the case that people use alternatives to the dominant ideology when articulating a preference for social enhancement strategy in the case of low status group membership.

This suggestion is also supported by the finding that preference for inaction was explained by a negative relationship with perceived collectivism (above the relationship with general preferences). Estimations that the society (or 'others') do not prefer collective strategies lead to a stronger preference for inaction. This implies that other alternative points of reference for action were not present in the model. (And perceived societal individualism does not constitute one of them.)
This interpretation has serious implications for Taylor & McKirnan’s (1984) model of intergroup relationships and particularly for their assumptions regarding the impact of the dominant social ideology of meritocracy. It might not be the dominant ideology, but the existence of alternative ideological belief systems or systems of practices established as social representations that are used as points of reference for choice of social enhancement strategy. However, this explanation should be further investigated. It will be discussed again in later sections of the thesis. For the moment, it is sufficient to say that in this case, a linear relationship between perceived individualism and general preferences did not occur.

4.2. General preferences for social enhancement strategies.

Overall, the individuals’ general preferences for individual mobility (Exit) and collective/ social change (Voice) strategies proved to be important determinants of their action in the specific situation of workplace discrimination against women in the police profession. This is not only indicated by the predictability of action from the general preferences, but also by the absence of significant effects (when controlling for the effects of other variables) of such general preferences on inaction. Strong general preferences do operate as a precondition of the preferences for social enhancement strategies in order to cope with low-status group membership in specific contexts of intergroup relationships.
This does not exclude the fact that these general preferences might be influenced (and shaped) by previous experiences in the context of specific situations. On the contrary, within the scope of SRT these general belief-systems rely upon social processes not only because they rely upon social ideologies, but also because they are indeed subject to experiences and social interactions within specific contexts. However, it was not intended to test this reciprocity within the design of this series of studies. From these results, the prior presence of general preferences in predicting action relevant to group dynamics can be clearly inferred. Thus, regardless of how these general preferences are developed, they do operate as a precondition of situation-specific preferences for social enhancement strategies.

Moreover, the effects of the general preferences for the social enhancement strategies on strategy-related action in specific intergroup conflict situations is not to be considered as simply the effect of some additional explanatory variables. The demonstrated effects of the general preferences fundamentally oppose SIT's situational model of preference for type of social enhancement strategy. SIT's assumptions for the determining impact of a direct cognitive perception of the structural conditions of the intergroup situation is put into question. The demonstration of the operation of general preferences for social enhancement strategies contributes to:

(a) an alternative consideration of the impact of social dynamics on individual action: Individuals' strategy-related action is not entirely based on a direct cognitive perception of the structure of the social intergroup situation. Social representational fields of social enhancement strategies need to have been established in order to guide individual action; and
(b) a consideration of individual differences (in this case, tapped in the individuals’ general preferences for the strategies) in the study of action relevant to intergroup dynamics.

In that respect, the findings support the construction of integrative models of action on the basis of Social Representations and Identity Processes Theory (Breakwell, 1992a; 1993), rather than mechanical models of action within strictly defined external (social) conditions, such as that suggested by Social Identity Theory.

4.3. Factors influencing the perception of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession.

Contrary to the evidence provided by experimental research within SIT, the perceived structure of the specific intergroup situation (especially the permeability of the intergroup boundaries and the legitimacy of the status quo), appear not to have independent effects upon preferences for social enhancement strategies in the presence of other explanatory variables. At one level, the findings demonstrate the problematic operationalisation of the role of the structural conditions by social-identity theorists. Within SIT’s research paradigm, these conditions were experimentally manipulated and on the basis of this, it has been demonstrated that the 'objective' structure of intergroup conflict influences individual action. Although, there is evidence that the perception of the structure interacts with the ingroup’s status-position (Turner & Brown, 1978; Ellemers, 1993), experimental research does not leave space for the examination of the 'psychological manipulation' of the perception of the structure of an intergroup conflict and its relationship with choice of social enhancement strategy.
In Chapter Two of this thesis, it was suggested on the basis of previously found discrepancies between experimental and naturalistic evidence that the 'objective' and 'subjective' nature of the structure of an intergroup conflict should be examined as different dimensions. Moreover, in the general introduction of this series of studies (see Chapter 5), it was suggested that the way individuals perceive and characterise the structure of contextually defined intergroup relationships is not a direct cognitive process but (a) it is based on social representations of specific contextually defined intergroup comparisons and (b) is affected by the individuals' general preferences for type of social enhancement strategy and their self-efficacy. (For the theoretical arguments in support of these predictions see Chapter 5). Such an investigation could also lead to discovering other, less direct ways in which the perception of the structure of the situation is linked with type of social enhancement strategy.

In relation to these predictions, in the present series of studies it was demonstrated that the individuals' points of view regarding the women's position in their profession do not seem to depend on length of working experience in the specific occupational contexts and are rather based upon relevant widespread social representations concerned with gender dynamics in specific professions (for the relevant findings, see chapter 5). Also, it seems that these social representations include beliefs about the structure of the specific intergroup status-relationships (i.e. unfair discrimination).

As far as the effect of the individuals' general preferences for social enhancement strategies on the individuals' perception of the structure of the intergroup situation is concerned, in contrast with the predictions of this study, these preferences were not
generally found to linearly affect the variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the specific situation. An exception is perceived legitimacy. Perceived legitimacy was found to be affected by general preference for individual mobility: Stronger general preference for individual mobility leads to a greater tendency to perceive specific intergroup status-discrepancies as legitimate. This effect is in accordance with SIT's connection of individual mobility with a faith in the legitimacy of the status quo, although here it appears in a reverse way: one's general preference for individual mobility seems to affect the perception of the legitimacy of the specific intergroup status-relationships.

Moreover, perceived permeability of intergroup boundaries (as well as their perceived legitimacy) were found to be significantly affected by the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession and indirectly by the perceived salience of gender. Furthermore, self-efficacy dimensions were found to globally affect the perception of the specific intergroup status-discrepancies (directly the perceived extent of status-discrepancies and indirectly the perceived structure of the intergroup situation).

More specifically, it was found that low job self-efficacious women tend to perceive greater status-discrepancies between genders in the profession. This could mean that these women having less faith in their abilities, are accepting of greater status-discrepancies between women and men in the profession. In that case however, job
self-efficacy should also differentiate the perception of unfair discrimination against women in the profession (the women who did not perceive unfair discrimination against women in the profession should also be less job self-efficacious). This however did not happen. It is therefore possible that this relationship between self-efficacy and perceived extent of the status-discrepancies is more related to the extent that these women perceive that the status-discrepancies are bridgeable and therefore minimal or not. Such an interpretation of this relationship also has consequences for the relationship between self-efficacy and choice of strategy. This will be discussed later.

At any rate, the perception of the specific occupational intergroup conflict between genders and its structural elements is shaped by more widespread social representations regarding this intergroup conflict, but also is affected by the individuals' self-concept (self-efficacy) and for some components (i.e. its legitimacy), by the individuals' general preferences for individualistic/collectivistic social enhancement strategies. These findings demonstrate the need to extend research on action relevant to group dynamics by taking into account identity dynamics and social representations apart from the 'objective' context of the intergroup relationships. They also support the overall arguments made in this thesis regarding the social and 'psychological manipulation' of the perception of intergroup conflicts that move away from explanations on the basis of the direct cognitive processes assumed by SIT.
4.4. The relationship between general, specific preferences for social enhancement strategies and the perceived structure of status-discrepancies between genders in the profession.

As indicated by the regression results, the perception of the extent and the structure of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession come to play a role in preferences for the specific individual mobility actions (although in the opposite way than this assumed by SIT), but not in preference for collective/social change strategy in the specific situation. In the regression analyses, the variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the intergroup relationships, although not having statistically significant direct effects, do add to the variance explained by other predictors in both individual mobility actions. Also, perceived stability had a statistically significant direct effect on one of the mobility actions, although in the opposite direction from the assumptions and the findings of the research within SIT. On preferences for this mobility action ("...behave like a man would, if he was doing the job"), the extent of perceived discrepancies also had a considerable impact. In contrast, the extent or the structure of the perceived status-discrepancies, did not affect the preference for collective/social change strategy in the presence of other explanatory variables, and in fact, did not contribute at all in the explanation of involvement with this strategy.

These findings are in accordance with those of Mummendey et al. (In Press). Their model of preferences for social enhancement strategies, including only variables concerned with the perception of the structure of the intergroup situation, accounted
for 81% of the variance in preferences for individual mobility, but for only 17% and 5% of the variance for the social competition and social creativity type of collective/social change actions respectively.

In the present series of studies, it became apparent that in predicting preferences for both types of strategies, people’s general preferences for the one or the other type of action are crucial. But it seems that preference for collective/social change strategy in a specific intergroup situation more strongly depends on one’s general preference for such a strategy. Also, this preference relies upon the individuals’ perception of the extent that her society accepts collective strategies. These findings reinforce the arguments made earlier regarding the relationship between social representations of social enhancement action and individual action in specific situations of intergroup conflict. Especially in the case of collective/social change type of strategy, the related social representations are the main resources of the action taken and therefore need to have been established in order for the relevant action to emerge. It could also be said that Tajfel & Turner’s (1979) notion of the ‘cognitive alternatives of the situation’ (as the necessary condition for involvement in social change strategy) can be reinterpreted as the establishment of social representations of collective/social change strategies.

As far as the differential effects of the perceived status-discrepancies upon the preferences for strategies are concerned, a possible interpretation could be that according to an individualistic ideology, an individual’s social enhancement depends upon one’s adjustment to the specific situation in which one is involved. An individual
is not called to change the situation, but to succeed in it. Therefore, when discrimination against an ingroup is perceived, the elements of the situation come to play an important role in determining involvement with mobility strategy actions in the specific situation. On the other hand, following the social representations of collective/social change social enhancement action, when the minimum conditions of discrimination are met in a situation, general preference for collective/social change strategy better explains the choice of collective/social change strategy type of action, than the perception of the structure of the intergroup dynamics.

The independence of the situation-specific preference for collective/social change strategy from the perceived structural elements of the specific situation and its dependence on more general dynamics is reinforced by another finding: This preference is also affected by the extent of the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce. Consequently, preference for change in this specific situation is subject more to the perceived general situation between the social groups involved, rather than the specific one.

On the whole the findings indicate that preferences for individual mobility and social change strategies are not only different dimensions, but they are shaped and they operate following different paths: Individual mobility is also affected by beliefs about the structure of the specific situation that the individual is situated in, whereas collectivistic strategies are adhered to the perception of more general societal dynamics.
Nevertheless, as will be discussed in the next section, the effect of the extent of the perceived discrepancies upon preference for individual mobility in the specific situation is connected with the individuals' self-efficacy rather than general preference for individual mobility. Moreover, although a self-efficacy dimension had a separate direct effect on preference for collective/social change in the specific situation, this effect emerged because of its relationship to the extent of the perceived discrepancies in the profession. It seems therefore that probably the effects of the extent of the perceived status-discrepancies (general or specific) are closely related to the effects of self-efficacy dimensions.

4.5. The role of self-efficacy

As far as self-efficacy dimensions are concerned, these self-concept dynamics played the most crucial role in determining preference for inaction. More specifically, it was found that the lower the global self-efficacy women have, the more likely they are to turn to more passive solutions in order to cope with discrimination against women at their workplace. It is more accurate to say that low self-efficacious women actually do not deal with the discrimination. Even though they are aware of (perceive) discrimination, they tend to 'ignore it', to 'learn how to live with it' or just 'quit their job'. In relation to SIT, this finding demonstrates that even when people are aware of their ingroup disadvantaged status-position, not only 'social identity' dynamics, that is, the extent of the individual's identification with the group, but also general individual identity dynamics such as self-efficacy determine engagement in action relevant to intergroup dynamics and conflict.
As far as the role of self-efficacy in preference for type of social enhancement strategy is concerned, as discussed in the general introduction of this series of studies, social identity theorists positively associate efficacy (although not operationalised as self-efficacy) with individual mobility and negatively with collective/social change strategy. According to these authors, low status group members will first attempt individual mobility on the basis of their competency (or following the dominant ideology). Moreover, these assumptions are crucial to SIT, since it bases action relevant to group dynamics upon the individual's need for positive self-esteem. Consequently the individual will first attempt individual mobility on the basis of his/her abilities. Nevertheless, when these predictions were tested in an empirical study on ethnic minorities (Moghaddam & Perreault, 1991), the results demonstrated that individual mobility action was preferred by less 'talented' minority group members. From a minority group perspective, the most efficacious members will attempt to maintain their group membership and uphold their culture. In another field study (Breakwell, 1992), efficacy was found to be positively correlated with involvement in political action, such as protests and demonstrations (collective/social change strategies).

In the present study, taking into account the zero-order correlations (Table 6.1.) between the variables, it can be said that self-efficacy dimensions are positively related to both types of strategies. Nevertheless, the relationship between self-efficacy and preference for type of social enhancement strategy seems to be much more complicated and mostly related to the perception of the extent of the intergroup status-discrepancies.
More specifically, job-general-self-efficacy had a statistically significant positive effect upon preference for collective/social change strategy. According to this effect, the higher the self-efficacy women have for doing their job the more likely they are to choose a collective/social change strategy in order to cope with the perceived discrimination against women in their profession. When interpreting this finding it should be taken into account that the effect of job-general-self-efficacy became significant with the entrance in the equation of the variance of the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies in the profession and lost its statistical significance with the entrance of the variables concerned with the perceived structure of the intergroup status-discrepancies.

One explanation of the fact that the higher job-self-efficacious the women are, the greater their preference for collective/social change strategy is, could be that this is because the high job-self-efficacious women feel the status-discrepancies between genders as more unfair and therefore they are more determined to change the situation. However, as it was argued earlier regarding the effect of job-general-self-efficacy upon the perceived extent of the status discrepancies, if this relationship was concerned with the fairness of the status-discrepancies on the basis of one’s own abilities, job-general-self-efficacy should also differentiate the perception of unfair discrimination against women in the profession (the more low job self-efficacious women should not perceive unfair discrimination against women in the profession). This however did not happen. It is therefore possible that the negative relationship between self-efficacy and the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies is more related to the extent that these women perceive the status-discrepancies as being bridgeable. The findings regarding the positive relationship between the extent of the
perceived status-discrepancies and preference for individual mobility actually support
the latter interpretation: women show greater preference for an individual mobility
strategy not simply because they perceive the status-discrepancies to be 'large', but
also because they perceive bridging these discrepancies to be less 'feasible'.

Following such an interpretation the effects of women's job-general-self-efficacy are
crucial for both their preferences for collective/ social change and individual mobility
strategy in order to cope with perceived discrimination against women in their
profession. Job-general-self-efficacy positively affects preference for collective/ social
change strategy and negatively that for individual mobility, not directly but because
job-general-self-efficacy is related to the extent that women perceive the status-
discrepancies between genders in the profession as being unbridgeable. These
relationships are of course opposite to the assumptions of SIT regarding the role of
the individual's trust in his/ her abilities when chooses individual mobility and have
implications for the nature of the individual mobility strategy itself.

Moreover, the direct relationships between self-efficacy dimensions and preference for
type of social enhancement strategy will be more clearly examined in the next studies
on preferences for the strategies in the hypothetical situations of discrimination, where
the effects of the general dynamics will be examined in the absence of the perceived
structure of the intergroup relationships. For the moment it becomes apparent that on
the whole the individuals' self-efficacy plays a very important role in the individual's
perception of intergroup relationships and their undertaking of action as members of
a group/ category. These findings open a new research area regarding the operation
of self-concept dynamics on the individual's action in relation to intergroup conflict
dynamics.
It should be also stressed that although global self-efficacy significantly affects job-general-self-efficacy, the variables had clearly distinct effects upon action relevant to intergroup conflict dynamics. That is, global self-efficacy regulates preference for action/ inaction and enhancement strategy in the context of workplace discrimination against ingroup. These findings indicate that generalised self-efficacy expectancies should be separately examined from self-efficacy expectancies regarding specific activities. Also, further research is needed to explore the relationship between these two levels of self-efficacy.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the findings from this study support the operation of social representational fields of social enhancement strategies and this of identity dynamics (individual positions and self-efficacy) in action relevant to intergroup conflict. These findings oppose Social Identity Theory’s predictive model of preferences for strategies in intergroup conflict. This model regards individuals’ social enhancement action as an effect of the situational structure of intergroup relationships mediated by an individual direct perception. The findings of this study support the need for an integrative theoretical framework for the analysis of individual action in intergroup conflict. This theoretical context should include a consideration of identity dynamics as well as the individuals’ positioning in relation to the dynamics of the social situation and the social representational fields that are involved.
CHAPTER SEVEN: TEST OF THE INTEGRATIVE MODEL OF WOMEN'S ACTION IN HYPOTHETICAL WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN THE POLICE PROFESSION.

1. INTRODUCTION

As presented earlier, the proposed model of preferences for action was tested in its entirety only for the case of women who perceived discrimination against women in the police profession. Nursing/midwifery students and police officers trainees who did not perceive (or were not sure if there is) discrimination against women in their profession rated their preferences for action in the hypothetical case of discrimination against women in their profession. These ratings were used in order to test the proposed model of action in the case of hypothetical workplace discrimination against women.

In the testing of the model in cases of hypothetical discrimination, the variables concerned with the actual perceived status-discrepancies in the profession (i.e. Perceived Discrepancy in Profession, Perceived Permeability, Perceived Stability, Perceived Legitimacy) and Personal Discrimination were not included. Thus, the predictive power of general dynamics (i.e. self-efficacy, social representations of social enhancement strategies and perceived general status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce) was tested in the absence of variables concerned with perceived structural elements of intergroup conflict. In this way, the effects of the
general dynamics can be examined in a more general way, separately from the effects of dimensions of perceived structure of the intergroup situation and also on a more 'abstract' version of action, since the hypothetical situation is not a real threat for these individuals.

Nevertheless, the effects of the general dynamics are still examined in a natural context of action. That is, when discrimination against women is suggested, it is possible that the individuals include in their representation of hypothetical discrimination structure elements, on the basis of the existing gender dynamics in their profession. These dynamics will be taken into account as the next studies will separately focus on women's action in gender typical and gender atypical professions.

As far as the testing of the model of preferences for action in case of hypothetical discrimination is concerned, the same hypotheses regarding the priority of the variables made for the case of perceived discrimination were also adopted in the hypothetical case of discrimination. The hypothesised relationships among the variables were again examined by following the method of hierarchical regression analyses of sets (see previous study). Thus, the same sets of variables were formed, as far as the general dynamics and the coping action is concerned. The two intermediate sets (perceived extent (Set D) and variables of the perceived structure of the status-discrepancies in the profession (Set E)) were excluded from these analyses. The model is visually presented in Figure 7.1. To recap, the four different sets of predictors and the associated predictions are presented here from the higher level sets to the outcome set:
(a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy (Set A). Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism were both expected to affect the general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies and eventually the social enhancement strategies in the specific situation. Global Self-Efficacy was expected to positively affect Job-General-Self-Efficacy, the general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies and finally the social enhancement strategies in the specific situation, whereas it was expected to negatively affect preference for inaction.

(b) General preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies (Set B). General preferences were expected to directly and indirectly influence preference for social enhancement strategies in the specific hypothetical situation. General preferences were also expected to affect Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce and Gender Salience. More specifically, General Preference for Voice was expected to be positively associated with these variables.

(c) Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce (Set C). According to the predictions of this series of studies: (i) Specific Self-Efficacy dimensions positively affect preference for social enhancement strategies in the specific situation and negatively affect preference for inaction. (ii) Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce will directly influence the situation specific preferences for the strategies. (iii) Gender Salience positively affects preference for collective/social change strategy and negatively predicts individual mobility and inaction in the hypothetical situation of discrimination.

(d) The variables of the coping action in hypothetical discrimination (collective/social change strategy, individual mobility actions and inaction) constitute the outcome variables.
Proposed model of women's preferences for social enhancement strategies/ inaction in hypothetical workplace discrimination against women.

Note:
For reasons of clarity, a box is used to indicate that all the variables included in the box have the relationships represented by the lines drawn from/to the box.
In the following sections of the chapter, the regression results which are based on the ratings of the female police officer trainees who did not perceive (or were not sure if there was) discrimination against women in their profession (N = 94) will be presented and discussed. The regression results regarding the testing of the model in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the nursing/ midwifery profession will be presented and discussed in the next chapter (Chapter Eight).

2. REGRESSION RESULTS FOR THE OUTCOME VARIABLES OF THE MODEL.

2.1. Distribution statistics and correlations between the variables.

As already stated, female police officer trainees who did not perceive (or were not sure if there is discrimination against women in their profession (N = 94), were asked to rate their preferences for coping strategies in the hypothetical case of discrimination against women in their profession. The data from this sample was analysed by the method of hierarchical regression analysis of sets in order to test the proposed model of preferences for action in hypothetical workplace gender discrimination (Figure 7.1). Before the presentation of the regression results, the variables’ distribution statistics are presented in Table 7.1. Also, the zero-order correlation of the variables are presented in Table 7.2.
Table 7.1. Distribution statistics for the variables of the model of action in hypothetical discrimination. Police Officers trainees (N= 94).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>46.44</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>34.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>37.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>25.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAHYP</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INACTHYP</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2. Correlation matrix for the variables of the model of action in hypothetical discrimination. Police Officers trainees (N= 94).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GE1</th>
<th>GE3</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDIWF</th>
<th>STRHYP10</th>
<th>STRHYP3</th>
<th>CHAHYP</th>
<th>INACTHYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.41***</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.47***</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAHYP</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

All coefficients are statistically insignificant except for * p< 0.05
** p< 0.005
*** p< 0.005
2-tailed
In the following section, the results concerned with the regression of each outcome variable of the model will be presented. After this analytical presentation, a summarised presentation of the main findings will follow.

2.2. The relationship of general preferences for social enhancement strategies with global self-efficacy and perceived societal individualism and collectivism.

Approximately 5% ($R^2 = 0.05$, $F = 1.76$ n.s.) of the variance in General Preference for Exit was accounted for by the variables of the higher level set (Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism). From the three variables, only Global Self-Efficacy had a statistically significant effect ($\beta = -0.20$, $t = -2.02$ $p < 0.05$) upon General Preference for Exit. The regression coefficient of Global Self-Efficacy was almost the same in value as the variable’s zero-order correlation, indicating that Global Self-Efficacy shares no common effect with Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism in explaining General Preference for Exit. According to this effect, the higher of women’s self-efficacy is, the less is her general preference for individual mobility strategy (Exit).

Moreover, 7% ($R^2 = 0.07$, $F = 2.49$ n.s.) of the variance in General Preference for Voice was accounted for by the predictor variables of this model (Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism). None of the separate direct effects of these variables was statistically significant. The largest effect was that of Global Self-Efficacy ($\beta = 0.19$, $t = 1.90$ n.s).
2.3. **Global self-efficacy and specific self-efficacy at the workplace.**

Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy were regressed on Global Self-Efficacy and the variables in the same set with it. At the second step, the two variables of specific self-efficacy were regressed on the general preferences.

Overall, 45% ($R^2 = 0.45$, $F = 14.69$ $p=0$) of the variance in Job General Self-Efficacy was accounted for by the model. In both steps, the only statistically significant effect was that of Global Self-Efficacy ($\beta = 0.65$, $T = 8.27$ $p=0$ and $\beta = 0.61$, $T = 7.55$ $p=0$ successively).

Global Self-Efficacy also had the only statistically significant effects ($\beta = 0.41$, $T = 4.37$ $p=0$ and $\beta = 0.38$, $T = 3.91$ $p=0$ successively) in the two steps of the regression analysis of Job Social Self-Efficacy. Overall, the model accounted for 21% ($R^2 = 0.21$, $F = 4.72$ $p<0.005$) of the variance in Job Social Self-Efficacy.

In conclusion, the self-efficacy a woman has for doing her job (Job General Self-Efficacy) was significantly affected by Global Self-Efficacy (general factor), as was predicted. Nevertheless, Global Self-Efficacy also had a statistically significant effect on Job Social Self-Efficacy. This was not expected, since it is known by previous studies that the 'general' and the 'social' factor of self-efficacy are independent to each other.
2.4. General belief-systems and salience of gender identity at the workplace.

Gender Salience was regressed on the two higher level sets of variables - Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, Global Self-Efficacy (set A) and General preferences for Exit and Voice strategies (Set B). Neither the overall ($R^2 = 0.01$, $F = 0.45$ n.s.) nor any of the separate direct effects of the first set of variables were statistically significant. As the general preferences for the Exit and the Voice strategies entered the regression, the overall effect increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.08$), but did not reach significance ($R^2 = 0.09$, $F = 1.83$ n.s.). Nevertheless, General Preference for Voice had a statistically significant direct effect upon Gender Salience (Beta = 0.24, $T = 2.32$ p < 0.05).

According to this finding, in the case of women trainees who do not perceive discrimination against women in the police profession, General Preference for Voice has positively affected gender salience. As predicted, higher general preference for collective strategies is connected with the higher salience of a category/group identification in specific situations.

2.5. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce.

Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce was regressed on the two higher level sets of variables - Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, Global Self-efficacy (set A) and General preferences for Exit and Voice (Set B). As in the case of Gender Salience, a considerable increase in $R^2$ ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.09$) occurred in the regression.
analysis for the Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce when the second set of variables -the general preferences for Exit and Voice entered the regression equation 
\( R^2 = 0.14, F = 2.91 \ p < 0.05 \). Of the direct effects, only that of the General Preference for Voice was statistically significant (Beta = 0.30, T = 2.91 \ p < 0.005). Therefore, in accordance with the predictions, one’s general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) affects one’s perception of the extent of status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce.

2.6. Preferences for action in hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession.

Each of the strategies was regressed on the three higher level sets of variables: (a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-efficacy (Set A), (b) General preferences for Exit and for Voice (Set B) and (c) Job General and Job Social Self-efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce (Set C).

2.7.1. Collective/ Social Change Strategy

In the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the police profession, approximately 25% \( R^2 = 0.25, F = 3.20 \ p < 0.005 \) of the variance in preference for collective/social change strategy was accounted for by the model.
The $R^2$ of the regression equation of Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy in predicting variance in Hypothetical Preference for Change was small ($R^2 = 0.01, F = 0.46 \text{ n.s.}$). None of the direct effects of the variables was statistically significant.

The $R^2$ dramatically increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.22$) and became statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.23, F = 5.28 p<0.005$) when the general preferences entered the equation. At this step, General Preference for Voice had a statistically significant direct effect (Beta = 0.47, $T = 4.84 p<0.005$). The effect of General Preference for Voice decreased, but remained statistically significant (Beta = 0.41, $T = 3.94 p<0.005$) in the next last step of the regression analysis. At this last step (Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce, Gender Salience, Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy), the $R^2$ increased slightly ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.02$) and remained statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.25, F = 3.20 p<0.005$).

### 2.7.2. Individual Mobility Actions

Two items were selected to represent individual mobility, since the analyses did not result in a reliable scale. The two items were regressed separately on the three higher level sets of variables.
A) Item STRHYP10: "I would try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job."

Overall, 19% ($R^2 = 0.19$, $F = 2.26 \ p < 0.05$) of the variance in preference for STRHYP10 was explained by the model. The 13% of the variance was accounted for by Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy ($R^2 = 0.13$, $F = 4.85 \ p < 0.005$). At this step, Global Self-Efficacy had the only statistically significant direct effect upon preference for the action described by STRHYP10 ($Beta = -0.31$, $T = -3.19 \ p < 0.005$).

The general preferences slightly contributed to the prediction of this individual mobility action (STRHYP10) ($R^2_{change} = 0.02$, $R^2 = 0.15$, $F = 3.20$, $p = 0.05$). Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce also negligibly contributed to the prediction of this action ($R^2_{change} = 0.04$, $R^2 = 0.19$, $F = 2.26$, $p < 0.05$). Global Self-Efficacy had statistically significant direct effects in both last steps of the regression analysis for the individual mobility action ($Beta = -0.27$, $T = -2.72$, $p < 0.05$ and $Beta = -0.28$, $T = -2.12$ $p < 0.05$ successively).

B) Item STRHYP3: "I try to prove that I am different from other women."

In general, only 8% ($R^2 = 0.08$, $F = 0.84$ n.s.) of the variance elicited for STRHYP3 was accounted for by the model. Perceived Collectivism was the only statistically significant predictor of this individual mobility action.
The overall effect of the regression equation of Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy in predicting variance in STRHYP3 was small and insignificant ($R^2 = 0.05, F = 1.61 \text{ n.s.}$). However, the direct effect of Perceived Collectivism was statistically significant and negative ($\text{Beta} = -0.23, T = -2.09 \ p < 0.05$).

The $R^2$ very slightly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.02$), when the variables of general preferences entered the equation and remained statistically insignificant ($R^2 = 0.07, F = 1.33 \text{ n.s.}$). As the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), the $R^2$ again negligibly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.01$) and remained statistically insignificant ($R^2 = 0.08, F = 0.84 \text{ n.s.}$). Only Perceived Collectivism had statistically significant effects in both last steps of the regression analysis ($\text{Beta} = -0.24, T = -2.11 \ p < 0.05$ and $\text{Beta} = -0.24, T = -2.09 \ p < 0.05$ successively).

Thus, in this case of hypothetical discrimination against ingroup, preference for differentiation from the ingroup (STRHYP3) was directly and negatively predicted by the perceived collectivism of the individual’s society.

2.7.3. Preference for inaction

Although only 6% ($R^2 = 0.06, F = 2.12 \text{ n.s.}$) of the variance in hypothetical preference for Inaction was accounted for by Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy, Global Self-Efficacy had a statistically
significant direct effect (Beta = -0.24, T = -2.44 p < 0.05) upon this preference. The R² dramatically increased (R²\text{change} = 0.20), when the general preferences entered the equation, and became statistically significant (R² = 0.26, F = 6.35 p < 0). Both the general preferences for Exit (Beta = 0.20, T = 2.12 p < 0.05) and for Voice (Beta = -0.40, T = -4.23 p < 0) had statistically significant direct effects. These were the only statistically significant effects. The effect of Global Self-Efficacy considerably decreased and became insignificant (Beta = -0.12, T = -1.36 n.s.) in the presence of the general preferences.

As the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce and Gender Salience), the R² increased (R²\text{change} = 0.04) and remained statistically significant (R² = 0.30, F = 4.16, p < 0). Only the direct effect of General Preference for Voice remained statistically significant (Beta = -0.40, T = -3.94 p < 0). The effect of the General Preference for Exit decreased and became statistically insignificant (Beta = 0.17, T = 1.80 n.s.).

It has to be noted that this decrease was probably due to the entrance in the equation of specific self-efficacy dimensions. (Preference for Exit is highly (and negatively) zero-order correlated with specific self-efficacy dimensions.) To recap, the negative significant effect of Global Self-Efficacy on Inaction was eliminated with the entrance of the general preferences. It therefore becomes apparent that self-efficacy dimensions and general preference for exit are in a strong relationship in the prediction of preference for inaction. However, general preference for voice finally determines preference for inaction.
3. SUMMARIZED PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTANT PATH ANALYTIC MODEL OF WOMEN’S ACTION IN HYPOTHETICAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN THE POLICE PROFESSION.

The resultant path diagram of preferences for coping strategies in the case of hypothetical discrimination is presented in Figure 7.2. Only statistically significant paths are shown in the illustrated diagram. The $R^2$ of the regression equation of each outcome variable is listed in the summary of sub-analyses under the diagram. Moreover, the overall effect ($R^2$) of each set of variables upon each outcome variable is listed in Table 7.3.

In summary, in the case of hypothetical discrimination, the proposed model of preferences for coping action accounted for 25% of the variance in preference for collective/social change strategy, 19% of the variance for a specific individual mobility action (item STRHYP10) and 8% of the variance elicited for another individual mobility strategy action (item STRHYP3). Finally, the model accounted for 30% of the variance in preference for inaction.

As can be seen in Figure 7.2., in this case of hypothetical discrimination against one’s group, the choice of collective/social change strategy was predicted only by one’s general preference for this strategy (Voice). Choice of a specific individual mobility action (item STRHYP10) was negatively predicted by Global Self-Efficacy.
Figure 7.2. Path diagram resulting from the regression analyses: Preferences for action in hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession. (N=94)

**Summary of sub-analyses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>STRHP10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>STRHP3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
<td>CHAHP</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>INACHTHP</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 7.3. Overall effects ($R^2$) of each set of variables upon each outcome variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variables</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDIFW</th>
<th>STRHYP10</th>
<th>STRHYP3</th>
<th>CHAHYP</th>
<th>INACTHYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sets of predictors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

All $R^2$ are statistically insignificant except for *$p<0.05$

**$p<0.005$

***$p<0.000$

Furthermore, the model accounted only for the 8% of the variance in preference for the other individual mobility action (item STRHYP3). The best predictor was the perceived collectivism of the society. Lastly, inaction in the hypothetical situation of discrimination was negatively predicted by General Preference for Voice.
Global Self-Efficacy and General Preference for Voice seem to be the two crucial points of reference for action in the hypothetical situation of discrimination and in the absence of variables concerned with the perceived structural elements of the intergroup situation. Apart from hypothetical preference for action, General Preference for Voice was found to positively affect trainees’ perception of the status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce and salience of gender at the workplace. On the other hand, Global Self-Efficacy, apart from affecting specific self-efficacy at the workplace (both general and social), also predicts preference for mobility action not only at the specific, but also at the general level (General Preference for Exit). General Preference for Exit was found to be negatively associated with Global Self-Efficacy.

General Preference for Exit does not appear to affect the individual mobility actions in the hypothetical situation. However, General Preference for Exit is affected by Global Self-Efficacy in the same way as the individual mobility action in the specific situation of hypothetical discrimination. Finally, perceived society’s individualism and/or collectivism do not appear to affect general preferences for the social enhancement strategies. Nevertheless, Perceived Collectivism directly and negatively predicts differentiation from the ingroup in the case of hypothetical discrimination.
4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Perceived Social Ideologies.

In the present study, perceived social ideologies were not found to affect general preferences for the social enhancement strategies. Perceived collectivism, however, directly and negatively affected preference for differentiation from the ingroup (STRHYP3) in the case of hypothetical discrimination. Although not mediated by individual general preferences, this effect demonstrates how the social representational fields of social enhancement strategies affect individual preference for action in a specific context of intergroup conflict: The greater the individuals perceive their society’s preference for collective action, the less likely they are to choose to differentiate self from the ingroup in the case of hypothetical discrimination against this ingroup. Consequently, this finding also demonstrates that individuals’ social enhancement action depends upon the perceived social ideologies and the social representational fields of these social ideologies. (For further discussion see also Chapter Six).

On the other hand, perceived societal individualism (GE1) did not predict general or specific preferences for action in the hypothetical case of discrimination (as also happened in the case of perceived discrimination). This finding supports the interpretations discussed in the previous study that alternative rather than the dominant ideologies regarding social enhancement action are used as points of reference in order to cope with discrimination against an ingroup. (For further discussion see Chapter Six).
4.2. General preferences for social enhancement strategies.

As it was stated earlier, in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession, Global Self-Efficacy and General Preference for Voice appear to be the two crucial points of reference for women’s action. As far as coping action is concerned, preference for collective/social change action in the specific situation was found to be predicted only by one’s general preference for collective/social change action (Voice). The perceived societal collectivism or the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce did not contribute to the prediction of preference for collective/social change action in coping with hypothetical workplace discrimination against women, as happened in the case of actually perceived discrimination. In a similar way, in the case of hypothetical discrimination preference for inaction was found to be negatively predicted by one’s individual general preference for collective/social enhancement action (Voice) instead of the perceived societal collectivism as it happened in the case of perceived discrimination.

These findings could mean that in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against an ingroup, people’s action relies on their own preferences for type of social enhancement strategy rather than on their considerations for more general social dynamics such the preferences of their society or the more general status-discrepancies between the involved groups. When people are faced with the perceived situation of discrimination against an ingroup these dynamics come to play a more important role in people’s choices for coping action. This interpretation also has implications for methodological issues in research in intergroup behaviour: extensive care should be taken in the use of experimental designs and subsequent explanations, since by definition these do not involve the actual situations in which people are involved.
Moreover, in the case of hypothetical discrimination, general preference for individual mobility (Exit) did not prove a strong predictor of action. It can be argued that its effect is obscured by the effects of the individuals' global self-efficacy, since this dimension predicts preference for individual mobility at both the general and the specific level. Thus, it is not the general preference for individual mobility that affects preference for individual mobility in the specific situation but the individuals' self-efficacy.

Taking into account the findings from the case of perceived discrimination, it should be noted that preference for individual mobility action in this specific situation was, to some extent, linked with the perception of the elements of the particular situation. It was also demonstrated that this perception was affected by the level of the individual's job-general-self-efficacy. Thus, it is probable that in the case of hypothetical discrimination, because of the absence of specifically perceived structural elements of the situation, the negative effects of global self-efficacy become direct on individual mobility and obscure the effect of the general preference for this strategy. (As will be discussed in the section concerned with the effects of self-efficacy, this might happen because in the absence of an actually perceived discrimination, preferences for strategies become more 'idealised' in the hypothetical situation.) In that sense, it could be again argued that the absence of the effects of specifically perceived structural elements of the intergroup situation is the reason for the preference for individual mobility actions being largely unrelated to the general preference for individual mobility. In other words, it can be again argued that general preference for individual mobility loses its predictive power in the absence of perceived structural elements of the situation.
In contrast to this, taking into account both the findings from the case of perceived and the hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession, it can again be argued that (a) one's general preference for the collective/social change type of strategy (Voice) operates regardless of the independent power of the perceived structure of the intergroup situation and (b) that specific preference for collective/social change action is directly attached to general preference for this strategy without the mediation of the structural elements of the specific intergroup situation. This interpretation is reinforced by the findings of this study, since the predictive power of the General Preference for Voice proved strong in the absence of specifically perceived structural elements of the intergroup relationships.

As argued in the previous study, it could be assumed that within an individualistic ideology, an individual's social enhancement depends upon adjustment to the specific situation. Therefore, when discrimination is perceived, within such an individualistic ideology, the perceived elements of the situation -even if these are affected by the individuals' self-efficacy- come to play an important role in determining involvement with individual mobility strategy actions. On the other hand, general preference for collective/social change strategy better explains the choice of collective/social change strategy action when the minimum condition of discrimination against a ingroup is met in a situation, than the perception of any structural elements of the intergroup situation. According to such an ideology, the priority would be for the discriminatory situation to be changed for all the ingroup. Therefore, these findings also support the arguments made in the discussion of the findings from the previous study that individual mobility and collective/social change strategies are not only different
dimensions, but that they are shaped and they operate following different paths. Moreover, it becomes apparent that these paths are more related to the content of these dimensions as social ideologies, rather than to the properties of these strategies as self-esteem enhancement reactions to the structure of specific intergroup relationships.

4.3. Social representations of collectivism, perceived status-discrepancies between genders in workforce and salience of gender identity at the workplace.

The findings drawn from this study of action in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against an ingroup confirm the predictions that general preferences for the social enhancement strategies affect the perception of general dynamics between social groups and the salience of group identification in specific social situations. More specifically, women’s general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) positively affects their perception of the extent of the general status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce. General preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) also positively predicted the salience of gender identification in the specific situation.

As far as the perception of general status-discrepancies between the genders are concerned, the evidence showed that greater general preference for collective/social change action makes the intergroup conflict and the status-discrepancies between the genders in the workforce more prominent. This suggests that as much as the individuals have faith in collective processes, the more sensitive they are to the social
position of ingroups and to the status-discrepancies between ingroups and other groups. Also, they are more likely to perceive the involvement of social identity dynamics in specific situations and to identify with social group/ category memberships in these situations. Thus, the individuals' social representations of collectivism are found to affect perceptions relevant to the dynamics of social groups.

These findings are in accordance with the predictions made in the general introduction of this series of studies that collective/ social change and individual mobility strategies, as belief-systems, can affect the perception of intergroup dynamics and the salience of social identity dynamics. As discussed in the general introduction of this series of studies, these assumptions can be drawn from Tajfel’s & Turner’s (1979) original article on intergroup relationships, as far as collective/ social change and individual mobility strategies are seen as belief-systems and are not confused with the social structure of the intergroup relationships.

Moreover, it is essential that these belief-systems are theorised within an integrative framework of Social Representations and Identity Process theories, as subject both to the social/ collective processes that underlie social ideologies and social belief-systems and to identity dynamics and individual differences. In general terms, neither a focus on cognitive categorisation processes (SIT), nor cultural factors (i.e. Triandis, 1989), nor personality-trait (i.e. Hui, 1988), nor social representational explanations of contextual salience can exclusively explain the 'social/ collective' and the 'individual differentiation' dynamics underlying perception of intergroup dynamics and the salience of social identities.
It should also be taken into account that the relationships between general preference for collective/social change strategy and the perceived general status-discrepancies and contextual salience proved strong in the case of women who did not perceive discrimination against women in the police profession. To recap, General Preference for Voice did not affect Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce or Gender Salience in the case of women who perceived discrimination against women in the police profession. Moreover, it should be remembered that both the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce and salience of gender identity in the specific occupational context is relatively low for the present group of women who did not perceive discrimination against women in their profession.

Therefore, it can be argued that general preference for collective/social change strategy affects salience of social identity and perception of group dynamics at a general level, by encouraging perception of self as a member of a group and facilitating representations of status-discrepancies between this ingroup and other groups in general contexts. It is possible that when extreme status-discrepancies between groups are perceived in specific contexts, the individual’s general preference for a collective/social change strategy has little to offer in the explanation of this perception of extreme intergroup status-discrepancies and contextual salience.

In this context, it should be remembered that in the case of women who perceived discrimination against women in the police profession, the extremity of the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce negatively affected preference for collective/social change action in the specific situation. Thus, there is
a substantial difference between the way the individual’s general preference for collective/ social change action is linked to the perception of general intergroup dynamics and the way these dynamics are linked with preference for this strategy in the specific situation.

4.4. Self-Efficacy

As presented, Global Self-Efficacy, apart from positively affecting specific self-efficacy at the workplace (both general and social), negatively predicted preference for mobility action not only at the specific, but also at the general level (General Preference for Exit). These findings indicate that identity dynamics such as self-efficacy not only influence preferences for action within the constraints of specific situations, but are also related to the individuals’ general positions within the social representational fields of social enhancement ideologies. More specifically, the higher the individuals’ self-efficacy, the less likely they are to prefer individual mobility as a social enhancement strategy in general.

According to the predictions of this series of studies, self-efficacy was expected to positively affect both types of social enhancement strategies. Moreover, for social-identity theorists, individuals will first attempt individual mobility on the basis of their competency. The more efficacious minority members will follow this strategy. Nevertheless, there is empirical evidence for the opposite phenomenon, that is that the less efficacious minority members will attempt upward mobility (Moghaddam &
Perreault, 1991). Apparently, the present findings indicate a similar phenomenon, since global self-efficacy is negatively related to general and specific preference for individual mobility.

Nevertheless, in order to interpret the present findings, it has to be taken into account that self-efficacy dimensions (and especially global self-efficacy) did not directly affect preferences for the two strategies in the case of perceived discrimination. Job General Self-Efficacy negatively affected the perception of the extent of status-discrepancies in the profession and the perceived extent of these discrepancies positively enhanced preference for individual mobility in the specific situation. The interpretation of the latter relationship was suggested in terms of the individuals’ perception of the feasibility of diminishing the status-discrepancies and as such being influenced by the individual’s job-general-self-efficacy. Moreover, in the 'real' threatening situation, global self-efficacy determined the undertaking of social enhancement action as opposed to inaction, rather than directly differentiating between preferences for types of social enhancement strategy. It was rather the general preferences for the types of strategies that regulated this choice. In the hypothetical situation, within which preferences for the social enhancement strategies are perhaps more idealised, individual mobility is predicted on the basis of low-self-efficacy rather than that of the individual’s general preference for individual mobility. In other words, the only justification of choosing individual mobility is in terms of the individuals’ lack of self-efficacy to choose another strategy. However it should be remembered that this happened only in the hypothetical situation of discrimination.
In general, it becomes again apparent that, although they are in a close relationship, it is important not to confuse the effects of global self-efficacy with the effects of job general self-efficacy. In the present series of studies, it seems that the latter variable is more connected with how women perceive the status-discrepancies between women and men in their profession and thereby their choice of strategy, whereas global self-efficacy is more generally related to the social enhancement strategies as belief-systems. Consequently, a distinction between global self-efficacy as a general self-concept dimension and the specific self-efficacy which is concerned with specific environments and activities is necessary at a theoretical level and in relation to specific predictions for action. (For a similar discussion see also Chapter Six).

4.5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings from this study support the operation of individuals’ social representations of the social enhancement strategies, but also the direct operation of the perceived social ideologies (Perceived Collectivism) in strategy-relevant action in case of hypothetical discrimination against the ingroup. It was also demonstrated that the absence of specifically perceived structural elements of the situation has implications for the predictive power of both of the general preferences for the social enhancement strategies. Moreover, general preference for collective/social change strategy was found to influence one’s contextual identification as a member of a group (salience) and the perceived status-position of this group in the society. Also, self-efficacy dimensions were found to directly predict preference for individual mobility strategy. In the light of this, these findings also support the need for an integrative theoretical context for the analysis of individual action in intergroup conflict situations.
CHAPTER EIGHT: TEST OF THE INTEGRATIVE MODEL OF WOMEN'S ACTION IN HYPOTHETICAL WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN THE NURSING/ MIDWIFERY PROFESSION.

1. INTRODUCTION

Female nursing/ midwifery students who did not perceive (or were not sure if there is) discrimination against women in their profession (N = 85), were asked to rate their preferences for coping action in the hypothetical case of discrimination against women in their profession. The data from this sample was analysed by the method of hierarchical regression analysis of sets (see introductory sections of Chapter Six and Seven), in order to test the model of preferences for action in hypothetical workplace discrimination against women (Figure 7.1. in Chapter Seven). The classification and the ordering of the variables followed the hypotheses made earlier regarding the priority of the variables (see introductory sections of Chapter Six and Seven). To recap, the same rationale, used in the variables' classification and ordering for the case of perceived discrimination was also used for the hypothetical situation of discrimination with the exception that dimensions concerned with the perception of the actual status-discrepancies between genders in the profession were excluded from this model.
2. REGRESSION RESULTS FOR THE OUTCOME VARIABLES OF THE MODEL.

2.1. Distribution statistics and correlations between the variables.

Before the presentation of the regression results, the distribution statistics for the variables of the model are presented in Table 8.1. Also, the zero-order correlations of the variables are presented in Table 8.2. These tables are concerned with the variance emerged from the responses of the female nursing/ midwifery students who did not perceive (or were not sure if there is) discrimination against women in their profession and have scores in all dimensions of the model (N = 61).

| Table 8.1. Distribution statistics for the variables of the model of action in hypothetical discrimination. Nursing/ Midwifery students (N= 61). |
|--------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|
|                    | Mean | Std. Dev. | Kurtosis | Skewness | Variance |
| GEF                | 5.70 | 2.12      | 0.55     | 0.85     | 4.51     |
| GE1                | 2.82 | 1.20      | -1.11    | 0.06     | 1.45     |
| GE3                | 2.42 | 0.99      | -0.42    | 0.42     | 0.98     |
| EXIT               | 45.93| 8.03      | 0.56     | -1.05    | 64.52    |
| VOICE              | 27.91| 7.84      | 1.09     | 0.73     | 61.51    |
| SPGEF              | 18.78| 4.73      | 0.76     | 0.48     | 22.43    |
| SPSEF              | 6.27 | 1.95      | 0.13     | 0.36     | 3.80     |
| SALIEN             | 18.45| 3.82      | -0.08    | -0.04    | 14.65    |
| PEDIWF             | 8.41 | 2.76      | 0.27     | 0.48     | 7.64     |
| STRHYP10           | 4.01 | 1         | 0.34     | -0.94    | 1.01     |
| STRHYP3            | 3.49 | 1.04      | -0.41    | -0.38    | 1.08     |
| CHAHYP             | 18.60| 4.88      | -0.21    | 0.13     | 23.84    |
| INACTHYP           | 11.32| 1.93      | 0.35     | -0.19    | 3.72     |
### Table 8.2. Correlation matrix for the variables of the model of action in hypothetical discrimination. Nursing/Midwifery students (N=61).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GE1</th>
<th>GE3</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDWF</th>
<th>STRHYP10</th>
<th>STRHYP3</th>
<th>CHAHYP</th>
<th>INACTHYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>-0.33**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.59***</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>0.45***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDWF</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAHYP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
All coefficients are statistically insignificant except for * p < 0.05
** p < 0.005
*** p < 0.0005

2-tailed

In the following section, the results concerned with the regression of each outcome variable of the model will be presented. A summarised presentation of the main findings will follow this analytical presentation.
2.2. The relationship of the general preferences for social enhancement strategies with global self-efficacy and perceived societal individualism and collectivism.

Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism explained approximately 15% \((R^2 = 0.15, F = 3.61, p < 0.05)\) of the variance in General Preference for Exit. From the three variables, Perceived Collectivism had a statistically significant effect \((\text{Beta} = 0.32, \text{T} = 2.48, p < 0.05)\). According to this effect, the more that the nursing/ midwifery students perceived their society as a collectivistic one, the stronger their general preference for the exit strategy was.

As far as General Preference for Voice is concerned, only 9% \((R^2 = 0.09, F = 2.03, \text{n.s.})\) of the variance was accounted for by the predictor variables of this model (Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism). None of the separate direct effects of these variables was statistically significant. The largest effect was that of Global Self-Efficacy \((\text{Beta} = 0.23, \text{T} = 1.86, \text{n.s.})\).

2.3. Global Self-Efficacy and Specific Self-Efficacy at the workplace.

Both dimensions (general and social) of the specific (job-related) self-efficacy were regressed on Global Self-Efficacy and the other variables in that set. At the second step, the two variables of specific self-efficacy were regressed on the general preferences variables.
Overall, 34% (R² = 0.34, F = 5.73 p<0) of the variance in Job General Self-Efficacy was accounted for by the model. At the first step of the regression analysis, Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism explained 27% (R² = 0.27, F = 7.17 p<0.005) of the variance in Job General Self-Efficacy. Global Self-Efficacy had the only statistically effect at this step (Beta = 0.51, T = 4.57 p=0). The effect of Global Self-Efficacy decreased but remained statistically significant (Beta = 0.45, T = 3.94 p<0), when the general preferences entered the equation. At this step, the R² considerably increased (R²change = 0.07) and remained statistically significant (R² = 0.34, F = 5.73 p<0). General Preference for Voice also had a statistically significant effect (Beta = 0.27, T = 2.37 p<0.05).

In explaining variance in Job Social Self-Efficacy, the R² of the regression equation of Global Self-Efficacy, Perceived Individualism and Perceived Collectivism was very small (R² = 0.01, F = 0.35 n.s.). None of the separate effects of these variables was statistically significant. The R² considerably increased (R²change = 0.13) but remained statistically insignificant (R² = 0.14, F = 1.79 n.s.), when the general preferences entered the equation. General Preference for Voice had the only statistically significant effect (Beta = 0.35, T = 2.62 p<0.05). Overall, the model accounted for 21% (R² = 0.21, F = 4.72 p<0.005) of the variance in Job Social Self-Efficacy.

In conclusion, General Preference for Voice was found to be strongly and positively associated with both the specific self-efficacy dimensions. However, there is not a theoretical basis to accept these regression results as confirming an impact of General Preference for Voice upon specific self-efficacy dimensions. Global Self-Efficacy (general factor), however, was found to positively affect the general factor of the
specific self-efficacy one has for doing one's job, as was predicted. Global Self-Efficacy did not have a statistically significant effect on Job Social Self-Efficacy. This was expected, since it is known by previous studies that the general and the social factors of self-efficacy are independent to each other.

2.4. General belief-systems and salience of women's gender identity at the workplace.

Gender Salience was regressed on the two higher level sets of variables - Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, Global Self-Efficacy (set A) and General preferences for Exit and Voice strategies (Set B). Only 5% ($R^2 = 0.05, F = 0.63$ n.s.) of the variance in Gender Salience was explained by the model. None of the variables of the two sets had a statistically significant effect at any step of the regression analysis. Nevertheless, at the last step of the regression analysis (general preferences for Exit and for Voice), the $R^2$ slightly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.03$) and the largest (but not statistically significant) effect was that of General Preference for Voice ($\text{Beta} = 0.18, T = 1.31$ n.s.).

2.5. Perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce.

Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce was regressed on the two higher level sets of variables - Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism, Global Self-efficacy (set A) and General preferences for Exit and Voice (Set B). Overall, 11% ($R^2 = 0.11, F = 1.39$ n.s.) of the variance in the perception of the discrepancies in the workforce
was explained by the model. None of the separate effects of the variables of the two sets was statistically significant, at any step of the regression analysis. In both steps, the largest effect was that of Perceived Individualism (Beta = 0.24, T = 1.86 n.s. and Beta = 0.27, T = 1.93 n.s. successively). The $R^2$ negligibly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.01$) with the entrance of the general preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies.

2.6. Preferences for action in hypothetical discrimination against women in the nursing/ midwifery profession.

Each of the strategies was regressed on the three higher level sets of variables: (a) Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-efficacy (Set A), (b) General preferences for Exit and for Voice strategies (Set B) and (c) Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce (Set C).

2.6.1 Collective/ Social Change Strategy

In the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the nursing/ midwifery profession, approximately 44% ($R^2 = 0.44$, $F = 4.59$ p < 0) of the variance in Hypothetical Preference for Change (preference for collective/ social change strategy) was accounted for by the model. Statistically significant effects occurred by predictors in all steps of the regression analysis. For this reason the regression results will be presented analytically.
The regression equation of Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy accounted for 9% ($R^2 = 0.09$, $F = 2.06$ n.s.) of the variance in Hypothetical Preference for Change. Global Self-Efficacy had the only statistically significant direct effect ($\beta = 0.28$, $T = 2.29$ $p < 0.05$).

The $R^2$ dramatically increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.29$), when the general preferences entered the equation, and became statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.38$, $F = 6.94$ $p = 0$). General Preference for Voice had a statistically significant direct effect ($\beta = 0.56$, $T = 5.05$ $p = 0$). At this step, the effect of Global Self-Efficacy considerably decreased and became statistically insignificant ($\beta = 0.16$, $T = 1.45$ n.s.).

At the last step (Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce, Gender Salience, Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy), the $R^2$ moderately increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.06$) and remained statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.44$, $F = 4.59$ $p = 0$). The effect of General Preference for Voice slightly decreased, and remained statistically significant ($\beta = 0.54$, $T = 4.44$ $p = 0$). Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce also had a statistically significant direct effect upon Hypothetical Preference for Change ($\beta = 0.24$, $T = 2.11$ $p < 0.05$).

These findings indicate that, when discrimination against one’s group is hypothesised and in the absence of perceived structural elements of the situation, the choice of collective/ social change strategy in this situation rely primarily upon one’s general preference for this strategy. Moreover, in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the nursing/ midwifery profession, the perceived discrepancies
between genders in the workforce positively predicted women’s choice of collective/social change strategy. Women who do not perceive discrimination against their gender in the nursing/midwifery profession, are more likely to choose collective/social change strategy in order to cope with hypothetical discrimination against women in their profession insofar they perceive great general discrepancies between genders in the workforce.

2.6.3. Individual Mobility Actions

Two items were selected to represent individual mobility, as the analyses did not result in a reliable scale. The two items were regressed separately on the three higher level sets of variables.

A) Item STRHYP10: "I would try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job."

Overall, 21% \( (R^2 = 0.21, F = 1.50 \text{ n.s.}) \) of the variance in preference for STRHYP10 was explained by the model. Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy accounted only for 4% of the variance in preference for STRHYP10 \( (R^2 = 0.04, F = 0.93 \text{ n.s.}) \). At this step, none of these variables had a statistically significant effect.

The inclusion of the general preferences for social enhancement strategies (Exit and Voice) in the equation slightly contributed to the prediction of this individual mobility action (STRHYP10) \( (R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.07, R^2 = 0.11, F = 1.41 \text{ n.s.}) \). However, none of the direct effects of the variables was statistically significant.
Job General and Job Social Self-Efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce also contributed to the overall variance explained ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.10$, $R^2 = 0.21$, $F = 1.50 \text{ n.s.}$). However, it was General Preference for Voice that had a statistically significant effect in this last step of the regression analysis for the individual mobility action ($\beta = 0.30$, $T = 2.10 \text{ p} < 0.05$).

B) Item STRHYP3: "I try to prove that I am different from other women."

In general, only 13% ($R^2 = 0.13$, $F = 0.89 \text{ n.s.}$) of the variance elicited for STRHYP3 was accounted for by the model. None of the predictors of the model had a statistically significant effect upon preference for this action, at any step of the regression analysis.

The $R^2$ of the regression equation of Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy in predicting variance in STRHYP3 was almost zero. The $R^2$ slightly increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.02$), when the variables of general preferences entered the equation and remained statistically insignificant ($R^2 = 0.02$, $F = 0.30 \text{ n.s.}$). As the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General, Job Social Self-efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), the $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.11$) but remained statistically insignificant ($R^2 = 0.13$, $F = 0.89 \text{ n.s.}$).
2.6.3. Preference for Inaction

Overall, the model accounted for 30% ($R^2 = 0.30, F = 2.51, p < 0.05$) of the variance in female students' preference for inaction in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession. Statistically significant effects occurred by predictors in all steps of the regression analysis. For this reason the regression results will be presented analytically.

At the first step, 9% ($R^2 = 0.09, F = 2.10, n.s.$) of the variance in Hypothetical Preference for Inaction was accounted for by Perceived Individualism, Perceived Collectivism and Global Self-Efficacy. Global Self-Efficacy had the only statistically significant effect (Beta = -0.28, T = -2.23, p < 0.05) upon Hypothetical Preference for Inaction.

The $R^2$ considerably increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.13$), when the general preferences entered the equation, and became statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.22, F = 3.14, p < 0.05$). Only General Preference for Voice had a statistically significant direct effect (Beta = -0.28, T = -2.27, p < 0.05). The effect of Global Self-Efficacy considerably decreased and became insignificant (Beta = -0.17, T = -1.38, n.s.) in the presence of general preferences.

As the third set of variables entered the equation (Job General and Job Social Self-efficacy, Gender Salience and Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce), the $R^2$ increased ($R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.08$) and remained statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.30, F = 2.51, p < 0.05$).
The direct effect of General Preference for Voice remained statistically significant (Beta = -0.30, T = -2.23 p < 0.05). Gender Salience also had a statistically significant effect (Beta = 0.27, T = 2.17 p < 0.05).

Summarising these results, 30% of the variance in hypothetical preference for inaction was accounted for by the model. Inaction was negatively predicted by General Preference for Voice. That is, a negative general relationship with collective/social change strategy leads to stronger preference for inaction in this specific case of hypothetical discrimination against the ingroup. Also, Gender Salience positively affected preference for Inaction. The stronger the salience of gender in the workplace, the stronger the preference for inaction in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession. Finally, in the absence of general preferences, Global Self-Efficacy negatively predicted inaction.

3. SUMMARIZED PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTANT PATH ANALYTIC MODEL OF WOMEN’S ACTION IN HYPOTHETICAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN THE NURSING/ MIDWIFERY PROFESSION.

The resultant path diagram for female nursing/midwifery students' preferences for coping action in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in their profession is presented in Figure 8.1. Only statistically significant paths are shown in the illustrated diagram. The $R^2$ of the regression equation of each outcome variable is listed in the summary of sub-analyses under the diagram. Moreover, the overall effect ($R^2$) of each set of variables upon each outcome variable is listed in Table 8.3.
Figure 8.1. Path diagram resulting from the regression analyses: Preferences for action in hypothetical discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession. (N= 61).

Summary of sub-analyses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>CHAHYP</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>INACTHYP</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDIWF</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.3. Overall effects ($R^2$) of each set of variables upon each outcome variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome variables</th>
<th>EXIT</th>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>SPSEF</th>
<th>SPGEF</th>
<th>SALIEN</th>
<th>PEDINF</th>
<th>STRHYP10</th>
<th>STRHYP3</th>
<th>CHAHYP</th>
<th>INACTHYP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sets of predictors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.38***</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPGEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDINF</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44***</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

All $R^2$ are statistically insignificant except for *$p< 0.05$

**$p< 0.005$

***$p< 0.0005$

In summary, the proposed model of preferences for coping action accounted for 44% of the variance in preference for collective/social change strategy, 21% of the variance for a specific individual mobility action (item STRHYP10) and 13% of the variance elicited for another individual mobility strategy action (item STRHYP3). Finally, the model explained 30% of the variance in preference for inaction.
As can be seen from Figure 8.1, in this case of hypothetical discrimination against one’s group, the choice of collective/social change strategy was positively predicted by one’s general preference for this strategy (General Preference for Voice). Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce also positively predicted preference for this strategy in the specific situation.

Preference for the specific individual mobility action described by STRHYP10 (behave like a man) was positively predicted by General Preference for Voice. This finding is difficult to interpret. Furthermore, the model accounted only for the 13% of the variance in preference for the other individual mobility action (item STRHYP3), which was describing effort to differentiate self from other women. None of the variables of the model statistically significantly predicted this action.

Finally, inaction was negatively predicted by General Preference for Voice and positively predicted by Gender Salience. The latter finding indicates that the more salient gender is for a woman in the nursing/midwifery profession, the more likely she is to choose inaction in order to cope with hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession. This finding contradicts the predictions of this study that salience would positively predict preference for collective strategy and negatively individual mobility and inaction. Possible interpretations of this finding will be discussed later.
Overall, in the present study, trainees' general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) was found to affect preferences for all types of coping action. In contrast, general preference for individual mobility strategy (Exit) does not appear to affect action in this hypothetical situation in any way. As was interpreted in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the police profession, the absence of any effects of General Preference for Exit in a hypothetical situation may well be due to the absence of perceived structural elements of this situation.

Moreover, in this case, General Preference for Exit was positively affected by Perceived Collectivism. According to this effect, the more that the nursing/midwifery students perceive society as a collectivistic one, the stronger their general preference for individual mobility is.

Moreover, female nursing/midwifery students’ Global Self-Efficacy, apart from affecting specific self-efficacy at the workplace (general factor), does not appear to predict preference for coping action in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in their profession. However, Global Self-Efficacy had statistically significant effects upon Hypothetical Preference for Change and Inaction in the absence of the effects of the general preferences for social enhancement strategies.
4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Perceived social ideologies.

In the case of female nursing/midwifery students, the perceived societal collectivism positively predicted individual general preference for individual mobility strategy (Exit). That is, the more that the female nursing/midwifery students perceive society as a collectivistic one, the stronger their general preference is for individual mobility as a social enhancement strategy. Although this relationship between the dimensions can be seen as an individuals’ opposition to a general collectivistic tendency, it still demonstrates the attachment of individuals’ general preferences for type of social enhancement strategy to the social representational fields of these strategies (see also the discussions in Chapters Six and Seven). This finding also contributes to the confirmation of one of the major hypotheses of this study regarding the foundation of individuals’ general preferences for the types of social enhancement strategies within the relevant social representational fields created by social ideologies.

More particularly, these findings demonstrate a different example of the manifestation of the operation of the social representational fields than those noted in the previous studies. This ‘reactive’ manifestation demonstrates individuals as dynamic elaborators of social representations and not passive recipients. To recap, within SRT, although individuals are recognised as dynamic agents of social representations, only their social positions and group memberships that are acknowledged as sources of differentiation when possible links with SIT are suggested. According to Breakwell
(1992a; 1993) and as discussed in Chapter Three of this thesis and demonstrated in the previous studies, other identity dynamics can be sources of individual differences in the individuals' elaboration of social representations and positions within social representational fields.

Moreover, perceived societal individualism was not found to affect individual general preferences for social enhancement strategies, or any other dimension of the model. Indeed, perceived societal individualism did not appear to affect action in any of the three studies that have been presented. As has been argued before, a possible interpretation is that preferences for coping action in case of discrimination against an ingroup are based upon alternative than the dominant ideologies for social enhancement (i.e. individualism). (See also the discussions in Chapters Six and Seven.)

4.2. General preferences for the social enhancement strategies.

For the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession, general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) appears to affect all types of coping action. General Preference for Voice was found to positively predict preference for collective/social change action in the specific hypothetical situation and preference for the action described by STRHYP10 ('...behave like a man would, if he was doing the job'). General Preference for Voice was also found to negatively predict preference for inaction.
As far as the effect of the General Preference for Voice upon item STRHYPIO is concerned, it should be taken into account that this item was loaded as an inaction item in the factor analyses concerned with the sample of nursing/midwifery students. Although the absence of a separate individual mobility factor is generally evident in both occupational samples, this item did represent individual mobility for the police officers trainees (i.e. it was positively affected by their general preference for individual mobility). Nevertheless, it seems that in the frame of a female typical occupation, behaving like a man would if he was doing the job when discrimination against women is perceived, has a different meaning than representing an attempt to dissociate self from the ingroup (women) and to 'pass' in the advanced group. Due to the general social representations associating the nursing/midwifery job with female qualities (for a review see Chapter One and Chapter Five), it is possible that for these trainees, 'discrimination against women' is not related to an unfavourable towards women comparison between genders in terms of the 'abilities' or the 'behaviours' required by the nature of the job. Therefore 'behaving like a man would, if he was doing the job' does not represent an effort to 'pass' to the advanced group in terms of individual mobility strategy.

As far as the effects of the general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) are concerned, this dimension proves again an important point of reference for individual action. Therefore, taking into account the findings from the last two studies on hypothetical discrimination against women, it can be argued again that (a) general preference for collective/social change strategy (Voice) operates regardless of the specifically perceived structural elements of the situation and (b) preference for
collective/ social change action is directly predicted by one’s general preference for this strategy without the mediation of the perceived structural elements, either in the case of perceived or hypothetical discrimination against ingroup.

General preference for individual mobility (Exit) did not affect any type of coping action in this hypothetical situation of discrimination. Taking into account the findings for the case of perceived discrimination, it could be argued that preference for individual mobility action in a specific situation is to some extent linked with the perception of the structure of this particular situation. Therefore, for (both) the hypothetical situation(s), it could be argued that general preference for individual mobility (Exit) did not affect action because of the absence of perceived structural elements of the situation.

As has been argued before (see previous discussions), by interpreting these findings, it can be assumed that within an individualistic ideology, an individual’s social enhancement depends upon his adjustment to the specific situation. Therefore, when discrimination is perceived, the elements of the situation come to play a more important role in determining involvement with mobility actions. General preference for collective/ social change strategy better predicts the choice of collective/ social change strategy action when the minimum condition of discrimination against an ingroup is met in a situation, than the perception of any structural facts. The situation has to change for all the ingroup. Therefore, the findings support the arguments made in the discussions of the previous studies that individual mobility and collective/ social change strategies are not only different dimensions, but they are shaped and they operate following different paths.
Thus, the findings of this study also demonstrate the involvement of social representations of social enhancement strategies in individual action in specific intergroup situations. However, they did not confirm the predictions that general preferences for social enhancement strategies affect the perception of the general situation between the social groups in the workforce and the salience of group identification in the specific occupational situation. Nevertheless, the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce and the salience of gender identification in the specific situation were found to affect preference for coping action in the hypothetical situation of discrimination against women in the nursing/ midwifery profession. For the interpretation of these findings both the specific occupational context and the nature of gender salience in this context should be taken into account.

4.3. **Perceived general dynamics between social groups.**

In the present study, the hypothetical discriminatory situation against women in the profession was suggested in the context of a typical female profession. In this context, Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce positively predicted choice of collective/ social change strategy as a coping action. In other words, in this hypothetical case, it was not only the general preference for collective/ social change strategy (Voice) that determined choice of collective/ social change action, but also the perception of the general status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce: The greater, the female nursing/ midwife students perceive these general discrepancies to be, the more likely they are to choose a collective/ social change strategy in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in their profession.
First, this finding demonstrates the effect of the perceived general dynamics between social groups on individual action in specific and contextually defined intergroup relationships, even when this situation is artificial (hypothetical). Actually, since discrimination against women is not perceived in this occupational context, it can be assumed that it is the perceived general dynamics between genders in the workforce that is the source of experience of gender intergroup conflict that this group is using in order to respond to hypothetical discrimination against women in their profession. In this way, in accordance with the predictions of SIT, greater perceived discrepancies led to greater preference for collective/social change strategy. On the other hand, such an effect did not happen in the hypothetical case of discrimination against women in the police profession which is a gender atypical one. It should also be remembered, that the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the workforce had the opposite effect in the case of actually perceived discrimination against women in the police profession. The stronger the general status-discrepancies that the female police officers trainees perceived, the less likely were to choose collective/social change strategy in order to cope with perceived discrimination. Thus in the actually perceived discriminatory situation against women in the gender atypical occupation, the perceived general status-discrepancies served as inhibiting attempts for change.

From these findings, it can be inferred that perceived general dynamics between social groups do affect individual action relevant to these groups’ dynamics in specific and contextually defined situations, but that this effect varies. As criticised in the introduction of this series of studies, research within SIT, using mainly experimental methodology, does not distinguish between the perceived broader social group
dynamics and the contextually defined intergroup conflict situation. When theorising about the perceived intergroup status dynamics, SIT treats these two dimensions as being the same. ’Context’ is both the broader society and the specific situation. In the present series of studies, the perceived broader social dynamics have been found to affect action in artificial (hypothetical) and natural (perceived gender workplace discrimination) specific contexts, in different and actually opposing ways.

4.4. Salience of gender identity in the profession.

Salience of gender identity at the workplace positively predicted inaction in this hypothetical situation of discrimination against women. Thus, the more salient gender is for a woman in the context of the nursing/ midwifery profession, the greater is her preference for inaction in order to cope with hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession. This finding contradicts the predictions that salience would positively predict preference for collective/ social change action and negatively individual mobility and inaction.

Nevertheless, these results could be interpreted as showing the effects of the strength of the association of the nursing/ midwifery profession with the dominance of the female gender. In other words, when discrimination against women is suggested in this context, the women who appear less willing to actively react, are the ones who more strongly perceive their gender identity to be connected with their career development in this profession and probably are the ones to whom the possibility of discrimination against women in this profession is more inconceivable.
Thus, salience of group/ category identification does not necessarily lead to action when discrimination against the ingroup is perceived. Moreover, it should be remembered that salience of gender in the police profession positively affected (indirectly) preference for individual mobility. Therefore, it can generally be said that salience of social identification is connected in various ways with the different types of social enhancement action and is not necessarily positively connected with collective/ social change action, as SIT implies.

Taking into account the findings (see Chapter Five) that the nurses/ midwives hold stronger representations in favour of collective strategies as part of their professional identity, it can be argued that preference for collective/ social change strategy is based upon these representations and not upon the extent of salience of gender identification at the workplace. This interpretation is reinforced by the findings that the ratings for salience of gender identity and preference for inaction are negatively skewed for this sample, whereas specific preferences for collective/ social change strategy are positively skewed (see Table 8.1). In other words, among the sample, there are more women believing that their gender does not affect their working life, whereas there is a general tendency against inaction in the case of hypothetical discrimination and in favour of collective strategies.
4.5. Self-Efficacy

In the present study, Global Self-Efficacy was found to affect students’ specific self-efficacy at the workplace (general factor). Also, Global Self-Efficacy had statistically significant effects upon preference for collective/social change strategy (positive) and inaction (negative), but only in the absence of general preferences for social enhancement strategies. In the presence of these explanatory variables, self-efficacy dimensions (both general and specific) were not found to affect preferences for coping action in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the nursing/midwifery profession. In fact the absence of such an effect is the most prevalent difference between action in the hypothetical situations of discrimination against women in the police profession and women in the nursing/midwifery profession.

As far as preference for collective/social change action is concerned, the effect of global self-efficacy is similar to the previous study. Global self-efficacy positively affects preference for collective/social change action, but at the end this effect is obscured by general preference for this strategy. As far as preference for inaction is concerned, global self-efficacy negatively affects it but finally the negative effect of general preference for collective/social change action proves stronger.

Moreover, in the previous hypothetical study of action in the hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession, global self-efficacy directly affected individual mobility action. More specifically, it affected item STRHYP10
describing attempt to behave like a man would if he was doing the job. As discussed earlier in section 4.2. of this chapter, this action probably does not represent an individual mobility type of strategy for the nursing/midwifery students.

As became apparent in the previous studies, the effects of self-efficacy on this type of action, are to some extent linked with the perception of the specific occupational status-discrepancies between genders. Although status-discrepancies between genders are perceived equally by the two occupational populations, it is probable that due to the female typicality of the nursing/midwifery profession, the status-discrepancies are not connected with comparisons against women and in favour of men in terms of job abilities and behaviour, as they might be in the case of women in the police profession. Consequently, self-efficacy does not operate in the case of nursing/midwifery students in relation to the feasibility of diminishing status-discrepancies which are due to masculine occupational stereotypes of job behaviour, as it happens in the case of the police officers trainees. In this way, it does neither operate in attempts to 'escape' discrimination by behaving in terms of an 'accepted' male behaviour.

Moreover there are indications that nursing/midwifery students have in general strong collective tendencies in relation to their professional identity (see the comparisons of the two occupational populations in Chapter 5). Therefore, it can be inferred that all types of action in hypothetical discrimination against women in the profession are better explained in terms of these tendencies than by the impact of self-efficacy or the general preference for individual mobility.
Overall, self-efficacy dimensions proved to affect action in intergroup conflict in a number of ways. In general however, self-efficacy dimensions seem to be more strongly involved in regulating preference for individual mobility. Although there were strong positive relationships between self-efficacy and preference for collective social change strategy in specific situations, this preference was more strongly adhered to one’s general preference for this strategy. On the other hand, self-efficacy dimensions seem to affect individual mobility in relation to elements of the specific intergroup status-comparisons and the possibility to change them.

4.6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings from this study also support the operation of the relevant social representational fields in (hypothetical) preferences for social enhancement strategies. The results also demonstrate the impact of the perceived general social dynamics between the involved social groups on artificial (hypothetical) situations of intergroup conflict. Representations of the gender stereotypicality of the profession seem also to regulate the operation of general dynamics such as self-efficacy in affecting coping action in relation to phenomena relevant to the occupational segregation by gender. Finally, the need for an integrative theoretical model that, unlike SIT, allows for a reciprocal relationship between identity dynamics and social representations when analysing individual action in intergroup conflict, is again apparent.
CHAPTER NINE: GENERAL DISCUSSION

1. SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES IN PRACTICE: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY.

The evidence from the presented empirical studies support the assumption that preference for type of social enhancement strategy (individual mobility, collective/social change) in cases of low-status group membership, primarily relies on general preferences for these strategies which operate independently of specific intergroup conflicts. These general preferences are interpreted as individual positions developed within social representational fields concerned with the social enhancement strategies. Preference for type of strategy was also found to be regulated by identity dynamics other than those that group identification produces (i.e. self-efficacy). In general, the evidence promotes an alternative approach to the explanation of social enhancement action which is based upon the operation of culturally available social representations of social enhancement strategies and general identity dynamics, rather than supporting the determining impact of the salience of group identification in relation to the permeability, legitimacy and stability of the segregating social reality (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

More specifically, the evidence shows that women’s engagement in collective/social change action when faced with workplace discrimination against women (perceived or hypothetical, in the police or the nursing/midwifery profession) is not regulated
by the contextual salience of gender identification, the extent of the perceived status-
discrepancies or the perceived permeability, legitimacy or stability of the status of
women in the specific occupational context. These findings contradict the core
assumption of SIT that engagement in collective/social change strategy is the ultimate
result of the perceived rigidity of clear group-status boundaries that make the
individuals realise the implications of their social group/category memberships and
give them no option to improve their personal status using individual mobility.

To be more precise on the basis of the gathered evidence for women’s action in the
case of perceived discrimination, it can be said that since all women in this group
perceive discrimination against women, salience of intergroup status-discrepancies is
prominent for the whole of these respondents. However, the intensity of the perceived
status-discrepancies (related positively to the contextual salience of gender and
negatively to the perceived permeability and legitimacy of the status-relationships),
increased preference for individual mobility (behave like a man would) rather than
preference for collective/social change action. Within the framework of SIT, the
opposite results would be expected, since perceived rigid intergroup status-boundaries
should increase preference for collective/social change action and perceived flexible
ones should increase preference for individual mobility.

Similar findings are reported by Kawakami & Dion (1993). In their quasi-
experimental study, the researchers manipulated the salience of the personal (the
student’s) versus social identity (this was connected with the tutorial group) and the
outcomes of intra-group and inter-group inequalities (i.e. grades). It was found that
people whose group rather than personal identity was salient were more likely to undertake collective action than the people whose personal identity had been made salient. However, unexpectedly, subjects who were told that large inter-group inequalities existed were less likely to undertake collective action than subjects who were told that small inter-group inequalities existed. The authors suggest that the effect of the extent of the intergroup discrepancies probably is mediated by the feasibility of particular actions being successful in decreasing the gap between the groups' status positions.

A number of authors (i.e. Ellemers et al., 1993; Kelly, 1993; Kelly & Breinlinger, 1996) recently focus on the feasibility of succeeding in bringing about social change as regulating preferences for collective/social change action. However, this variable is mostly conceptualised as a individualistic decision-making process whereby the individuals' weigh up the costs and benefits involved in the undertaking of collective action. Moreover, Kelly & Breinlinger (ibid) provide some evidence that this process is moderated by the strength of group identification, that is, it is more evident in the decision-making of weak-identifiers than of strong-identifiers. Nevertheless, if one accepts that the feasibility of success explains the positive relationship between extent of perceived status-discrepancies and preference for individual mobility, then the findings from the present series of studies indicate that this process is also related to one's self-efficacy. As presented in Chapter Six, the lower a woman's job-general-self-efficacy is, the more likely she is to perceive greater status-discrepancies between genders in the police profession. Thus, if perceiving greater status-discrepancies leads to greater preference for individual mobility because of the small feasibility of
succeeding change, this may be better explained as the result of the individuals’ low-self efficacy rather than on the basis of people’s *individualistic* calculations of the situation.

Ellemers et al. (1993) studies also discusses the effects of the feasibility of succeeding change upon choice of social enhancement strategy. These authors conceptualise this variable in terms of Tajfel and Turner’s notion of ‘cognitive alternatives’ or ‘stability security’ of the status-quo (the two latter terms have been used interchangeably by social-identity theorists). The point that the present thesis stresses is that predictors such as cultural availability of, efficaciousness of, or general preference for the social enhancement strategies rely upon the individuals’ social representations which, although also regulated by identity dynamics, depend upon interaction and communication with sources of social influence. They are not isolated cognitive outcomes that result in automatic reactions to the structure of the social situation as SIT suggests.

As discussed in Chapter Two, SIT focuses on the dynamics of the structure of the intergroup situation, such as the permeability of the intergroup boundaries, the legitimacy and stability of the status-relationships and has paid little attention to the ways in which people construct their perception of the intergroup situation and refer to social belief-systems or systems of social practices in order to cope with it. Such theorising is largely the result of isolating individual (psychological) processes from the dynamics of the social environment. Thus, the social enhancement strategies are
seen by SIT as the result of a need to positively enhance the negative personal self-esteem deriving from low-status group membership. It follows that individuals will first attempt individual mobility unless, the situation is so impermeable that the only way to enhance self-esteem is to enhance the image or the position of the ingroup.

SIT assumes the priority of preference for individual mobility action, mainly because it tried to base individuals’ social enhancement action upon personal self-esteem, a process that internally concerns the individual. Although SIT attempted in this way to connect social with psychological processes, it basically segregates them. The assumption of self-esteem as the primary motive for the undertaking of action jeopardises even the importance of a notion such as 'social identity'. As Moghaddam & Perrault (1991) note, SIT has underestimated the importance of the individuals’ attachments and loyalties to their group, by not moving beyond the need for positive personal self-esteem. In the present series of studies, the evidence that people’s preference for individual mobility increases as a result of perceived large status-discrepancies that constrain the perceived possibility of change, indicate that individual mobility is not automatically the most preferred strategy to first be attempted. The findings rather demonstrate that people consider both strategies in order to undertake action in a specific situation. This happens in relation to their social representations of social enhancement strategies and identity dynamics such as self-efficacy and not only a unilateral need for the enhancement of personal self-esteem.
Also, SIT’s conceptualisation of the social enhancement strategies as automatic reactions to the negative self-esteem deriving from low-group membership, and not as systems of social beliefs of practices, led to an assumption that the individuals will necessarily choose one of these strategies when they are faced with low-status group membership. Nevertheless, the demonstrated effects of self-efficacy on action especially in the case of actual discrimination against the ingroup indicate that the individuals’ self-efficacy has the power to exclude them from both types of social enhancement strategy and lead them to inaction. In this way, this finding also demonstrates that the strategies do not exclusively originate in automatic psychological processes related to the individuals’ group identification and personal self-esteem, but are based on social belief-systems, systems of social practices and the social representations they create as well as other identity dynamics.

As far as this suggested alternative route to the social enhancement strategies is concerned, (through social ideologies) the findings of this series of studies have some further implications. More specifically, as far as the effects of individual mobility as the dominant ideology are concerned (Taylor & McKirnan, 1984), the findings from the present studies consistently show that people’s estimations of the preference of their society for this type of strategy do not (at least linearly) affect their preferences for social enhancement strategies at either a general or a specific level.

Some empirical studies report general tendencies of the British population to follow individual mobility (see Kelly & Breinlinger, 1996). In the present series of studies such a tendency was not apparent. On the contrary, women had difficulties in
articulating a coherent preference for individual mobility actions. Secondly, all groups' general preference for the individual mobility strategy was negatively skewed (indicating less preference for this type of strategy), whereas preference for collective social change action was more normally distributed. On the other hand, involvement with collective/social change action was slightly negatively skewed in the case of perceived discrimination, and more evenly distributed in the cases of hypothetical discrimination, where preference for action is probably more idealised. Also, general preference for collective/social change strategy had the largest effects in both hypothetical cases, whereas general preference for individual mobility had none. These results indicate that it is not the dominant ideology of individual mobility that primarily guides social enhancement action in cases of low-status group memberships, but as discussed, choice of this strategy is rather related to the 'constraints' of the situation and self-efficacy.

Moreover, the evidence also supports assumptions that individual mobility and collective/social change action are not mutually exclusive strategies that reflect the extent of the individuals' group identification. The findings rather indicate even when identification with the group in a discriminatory situation has been established, both general preferences act to determine action.

In relation to group identification, Kelly & Breinlinger (1996) found that this plays a moderating role between various belief systems (such as for example, the feasibility of succeeding change) and their effect on whether or not collective action is undertaken. From the evidence in the present series of studies, it could be argued that
the contextual salience of gender identification, in one sense does have a moderating role, since it is related to the dichotomy of whether or not discrimination against women (i.e. in the police profession) is perceived. Women that believe that their gender affects their career development (strong gender identification) are also the ones that perceive discrimination against women in the police force and therefore they are more likely to undertake action any way. Nevertheless, as already discussed, this salience leads to individual mobility rather than collective/social change action and sometimes (such as in the case of nursing/midwifery trainees) to inaction. These result stress the importance of an independent preference for the strategies per se, rather than the effects of 'strength' of group identification.

As already discussed in Chapter Two, Kelly & Breinlinger’s findings for the determining effects of women’s strength of gender identification upon participation in collective action are unusual. Especially as far as women’s gender identification is concerned, most empirical studies (i.e. Condor, 1986; Gurin & Markus 1989) show that this identification is not linearly related to beliefs that promote collective action or social change of the status-position of women in society. A possible explanation of the discrepancy between empirical evidence is that Kelly & Breinlinger’s studies deal with the action of women that participate in women’s groups and by virtue of this they are already following collective/social change strategy, even if participate in collective actions to various degrees.
Thus, the question of how people come in the first place to identify with such groups or collective/social change ideologies is therefore the central one. From interview data, Kelly & Breinlinger (1996) suggest that women base their identification with feminist groups or ideologies (which in general advocate collective/social change action in relation to the subordination of women) upon their experiences of discrimination in the family or at the workplace. Nevertheless, as already argued in Chapter Two of this thesis it would be misleading to explain people’s preferences for type of social enhancement strategy upon their life-events per se. Even in the unlikely event that it is only the women that identify with feminist groups or ideologies that have been victims of subordination and discrimination and not the rest of the female population it would be a-historical to claim that women have only been victims of subordination in this century when feminist ideologies have been developed. What this thesis argues is that how people experience or interpret events or situations is not a process isolated from their specific social environment, the belief-systems that circulate in this environment or people’s social interactions and communications.

In relation to this argument, the findings from the present series of studies show that women’s interpretation and characterisation of the occupational intergroup situation and perception or denial of discrimination does not necessarily depend on their working experience and therefore on their direct perception of the situation. The perception of discrimination against women in their profession is rather based on more widespread social representations associating genders with specific status positions in these professions. It became also apparent in the present series of studies that identity dynamics such as self-efficacy affect the endorsement of such representations and constrain women’s options for type of social enhancement strategy.
The implications of the latter findings for SRT will be discussed in the next section. What it should be stressed as far as SIT and its assumptions for the social enhancement strategies are concerned is that overall, from the findings of the presented empirical studies, a 'social representational and identity' explanation of people’s intergroup perception and social enhancement action is promoted. As discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis, although SIT was considered as a theory that connects psychological processes with macro-social phenomena, in fact it focused on an intra-individual level of explanation of action (automatic cognitive and motivational reactions) in the context of the given social structure. The findings from the present series of studies demonstrate that individuals do not simply 'react' to a given social context, but to some extent construct this social context and act in relation to it on the basis of interpretations and action-practices that are available in their society. In that respect, SRT is the most readily available social-psychological theory that attributes people understanding of reality to processes that are neither excluding or exclusive either to the individual or to his/ hers social environment. Nevertheless, as will be discussed in the next section, although this might be claimed from a theoretical point of view, the research practice within SRT has paid little attention to empirically substantiating it.
2. SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS AND INDIVIDUAL ACTION: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS THEORY.

In considering the implications of the findings for SRT, it has first to be noted that the present series of studies did not aim at 'proving the existence' of social representations. As other authors (i.e. Duveen, 1994, p.207) argue "...we cannot prove that [social] representations exist, we can only demonstrate the power of this concept through the interpretations we can offer of social phenomena." Similarly, in this thesis, SRT is used to contribute to an alternative social-psychological explanation of individuals' social enhancement action which is based upon the operation of relevant social belief-systems or systems of social practices and not upon a behavioural reaction to the conditions of the social situation.

Furthermore, it was suggested that SRT can potentially offer such an explanation for the operation of ideological social belief-systems or systems of social practices that allows an assumption that individuals hold general preferences for types of social enhancement strategies (individual mobility- collective/ social change) which are created within social representational fields concerned with these strategies. Thus, the findings from the first empirical study although they can only demonstrate that individuals vary in their preferences for type of social enhancement strategy regardless of systematic variations of intergroup conditions, these general preferences were assumed and interpreted on the basis of a social representational approach.
As discussed in Chapter Three of this thesis, SRT assumes that individual action can be explained on the basis of the social representations that circulate within a specific society. Individuals do not simply react to a situation using only their own isolated cognitive function, but they understand and cope with a reality on the basis of social representations of this reality which are created during the course of social communication and interaction. In that respect, the empirical studies give empirical support to these assertions: Individuals act in the discriminatory situations according to general preferences they have for the strategies as a result of the social representational fields of social enhancement strategies established in their societies. Nevertheless, if diversity had not been taken on board such relationships would not have been demonstrated.

Although a strong relationship between these general preferences and the undertaking of type of social enhancement action in specific intergroup situations was demonstrated in the present series of studies, it, nevertheless, contradicts SRT's opposition to an artificial separation of action from social representations. As discussed in Chapter Three, SRT conceptualises social representations as the independent variables which determine both the perception (its direction) and the character of a stimulus within reality, as well as the response it elicits. Thus, Moscovici and other advocates suggest that studying the social representation about an object of reality will provide social psychologists with an explanation of people's understanding of this reality, the way people are treating this reality and therefore their action in relation to this reality. Furthermore, it has been very forcefully argued (i.e. Wagner, 1993; 1994) that the search for a relationship between social
representation and individual action (and consequently their separation) draws social psychology back to the traditional cognitive models of 'individual beliefs-causing-action' and move it away from SRT. Here it is argued that, as far as SRT-researchers focus on describing the specific shared or common social representation, action can be explained only in terms of the collectivity or the group and not at the level of the individual.

Nevertheless, apart from an epistemological debate over the 'better' way to explain action (at the collective or at the individual level), the assertion that revealing the content of a social representation explains the way people are thinking about this reality and how they act within it, has implications for assumptions concerned with the operation of social representations per se. First, this methodological assertion implies that each social representation has singular effects as if it operates in isolation from others. Nevertheless, as was evident in this series of empirical studies, women's perception of the genders' status-positions in their professions (the 'social representation' of the reality within action is taking place and action is concerned with) does not alone explain choice of type of social enhancement action. Neither its 'anchoring' to women's 'social representation' of individual mobility or to women's 'social representation' of collective/social change strategy alone explains action. Each of the 'three social representations' is independently related to action that takes place 'as a part' of one of them. Thus, if one wants to understand how people think, feel or act within this occupational reality, the analysis of the content of its representation would not have led to a complete understanding of people's action within this reality.
Secondly, even if social-representations-theorists consider it inappropriate to provide explanatory models of action at the level of the individual (since action is embedded in social representations and does not result from the individual's 'universal psychological functioning'), it, nevertheless, assumes that all individual perceptions, thoughts or actions are based on social representations. If this is the case, then, diversity also has to be explained; not only the consensual social representations to be revealed. In the present series of studies, both consensus and diversity have been illustrated. For example, trainees were found to hold affirmative points of view about the gender status-relationships in the professions which they are trained for, regardless of their immediate working experience in these occupational environments. In other words, it was possible both for women that did not have experience and for women who had long experience to answer in the same way whether there is discrimination against women in these professions. These points of view cannot but be based on more widespread representations of the gender dynamics in these occupational realities that circulate in the individuals' society. On the other hand, however, people hold different (even opposite) representations regarding the same occupational reality. The question is if there are systematic sources of variation in such discrepancies in the individuals' representations or endorsement of social representations.

There are a number of different explanations that could be given for this diversity. The difference could be attributed to the individuals' different social interactions, communications or experiences. It can also attributed to differences in the prior representations or belief-systems which the new representations anchor to. For example in the present series of studies, mean-differences in the individuals' general
preferences for collective/social change strategies and their perception of societal individualism were found to slightly contribute to the explanation of their opposing representations of discrimination against women in the police profession. Thus, it could be argued that different positions within the social representational fields of individualism and collectivism affect the anchoring of representations of the occupational reality.

However stronger explanations of the differentiation of women’s representations of the status-discrepancies between the genders in their profession emerge from a focus on identity dynamics. In the present series of studies, women’s self-efficacy was found to affect their representations of the status-discrepancies between the genders in the police profession. High self-efficacious people were less likely to hold representations of large status-discrepancies between the genders and low-self efficacious ones were more likely to hold representations of more marked/intense status-discrepancies. As previously discussed, this relationship between self-efficacy and the representation of the situation can be explained in terms of a tendency of self-efficacious people to feel that ‘things can be done’ so that the intergroup status-discrepancies are not perceived as unbridgeable.

Also, among the women who do not perceive discrimination against women in the police profession, self-efficacy was found to be negatively related with general preference for individual mobility strategy. Therefore, self-efficacy does not only constrain options for action in the specific situation (as happened in the case of perceived and hypothetical discrimination against women in the police profession), but
also is related to the general positions of the individuals in the social representational field of this type of social enhancement strategy. In other words, the extent to which these women feel *themselves* to be self-efficacious affects the representation they have of individual mobility as an appropriate social enhancement strategy.

As discussed in Chapter Three, taking into consideration identity dynamics other than those produced by social group memberships does not necessarily advocate reductionist approaches to individual action. On the other hand, even if one considers that individuals describe or understand self in terms of relevant social representations circulating in their society (i.e. Doise & Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1991; Doise, 1995) it does not mean that identity should not be treated as a particular entity with its own dynamic characteristics which have the power to affect the individual’s processing of social representations. As noted earlier in Chapter Three, IPT provides a definition that allows for identity to build up upon the processing of social experiences or social representations, but also to be underlined by particular dynamics which should be taken into consideration in social-psychological theorising and research. The evidence from this series of studies shows that taking into consideration self-concept dynamics such as self-efficacy helps to reveal sources of individual variation in the endorsement of social representations, people’s understanding of this reality and their action within this reality.

As far as identity is recognised as a regulator of the individuals’ social representations, social identity (group membership) dynamics can also be considered as potential regulators of (or regulated by) social representations. In the present series
of studies, the salience of identification with gender category within the occupational context was found to be in close relationship with the representations of the status-positions of genders in these occupations. Also, this salience was found to be related to the extent that the individual accepts collectivistic social representations (i.e. it was affected by general preference for collective/social change strategies). Although these findings are more related to the role of social representations in the emergence of social identity dynamics, they demonstrate ways that social representations can be connected to social identity dynamics other than simply the differences between the social representations of different groups of people and the consensual construction of social representations by groups (for a discussion see also Chapter Three).

In general, these studies demonstrate that the explanatory value of social representations does not necessarily lie in a search for the shared aspects of social representations. Whereas social representations are 'not necessarily identifiable in the minds of particular individuals', what social-psychological research always reaches is the individuals' social representations, beliefs, opinions or attitudes. Statistical techniques to reveal the consensual aspects of the individuals' social representations are not enough to theoretically substantiate the operation or even more importantly the construction of a social representation. Alternatively, the notion of social representational fields can be used so that research on social representations could focus on other areas of empirical investigation (such as diversity) rather than on the shared aspects of the individuals points of views.
In this thesis, on the basis of the notion of social representational fields, it was assumed that points of view and preferences for action can be both distributed among individuals and based upon the social ideologies of the individuals' society. In accordance with these assumptions, it was demonstrated in the course of the empirical studies that individual preferences for social enhancement action (general or specific) are strongly related to what the individuals believe to be the preferences of their society, particularly when the individuals are confronted with a real threat rather than a hypothetical one. More specifically, perceived societal collectivism was found to be positively correlated with general preferences for collective/social change strategy, negatively with inaction in the case of perceived discrimination against women in the police profession and with individual mobility in the case of hypothetical discrimination in this profession. As analysed in the discussions of the three last empirical studies, these findings indicate that individuals form representations of appropriateness and utility of social enhancement strategies in relation to what is accepted by their society. Consequently, they form their preferences on the basis of social communication and interaction, as suggested by SRT.

On the other hand, individual preferences were not always found in a positive relationship with estimations of what is believed being promoted by society. The relationship between individual and estimated societal preferences was rather modulated by the particular situation within which the individuals had to make their choices for action. This finding supports Doise's (1978, 1984, 1990) arguments that general representations interfere in specific intergroup situations but their operation
is also modulated by these specific situations (see also Chapter Two). In general, such findings promote explanations of action on the basis of SRT, without undermining either the active role of the individual or the society and its ideologies.

In conclusion, the evidence from this series of studies demonstrate that SRT can be a powerful theoretical tool for the construction of explanatory models of individual action. Even if the heuristic value of SRT is broadly considered to be a search for the social representation per se and how this is structured or constructed (e.g. De Rosa, 1994), this does not mean that SRT cannot be used in order to contribute to non-reductionist explanatory models of individual action. Nevertheless, not only social representations but also identity dynamics have a prevalent role in the explanation of action, including the elaboration of social representations. In that respect, an integration of SRT and IPT and consequently a joint focus on social representations and identity dynamics (including social identity dynamics) could lead to more comprehensive explanations of individual action.

3. WOMEN'S SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT ACTION IN RELATION TO OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION BY GENDER: IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY.

As stated in the introduction, the empirical drive of this thesis was to investigate from a social-psychological perspective, women's perceptions and social enhancement action in relation to the occupation segregation by gender which induces career status-discrepancies between women and men. Apart from a socio-economical analysis which
informs us about these discrepancies, the question posed is how women perceive career status-discrepancies between men and women in their professions, and which are those dynamics that influence their choice of coping action.

As far as the perception of status-discrepancies between genders in specific professions are concerned, the first thing to note is that this is based upon widespread social representations associating gender identities (and consequently gender intergroup dynamics) with specific occupations/professions. For example, although there is evidence that men in the nursing profession are found in high positions proportionally more often than women (Williams, 1994), the vast majority of trainees in this profession do not perceive discrimination against women in it. Apart from explanations that are concerned with the effects of female typicality and the numerical dominance of women in the profession, in the present series of studies it became apparent that the trainees drew on widespread social representations in forming an opinion as to whether there is discrimination against women in their profession, rather than on situations that they have confronted themselves during their working experience.

The same applies to police officers trainees. Widespread social representations of the gender status-positions in their profession apparently also form their responses, but the picture is more complicated here. Women's points of views are more differentiated, although they all have a more or less equivalent length of experience in the profession, and all live in the same society where widespread representations about the gender dynamics in their profession circulate. In the present series of
studies, an attempt to identify which factors contribute specifically to the differentiation of the perception of unfair discrimination against women was uninformative. More specifically, the dimensions that more clearly differentiated the perception of discrimination were the legitimacy and the extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession. Nevertheless, this finding basically indicates that the perception of discrimination goes along with the perception of legitimacy and the extent of the intergroup status-discrepancies does not inform about why these perceptions differ. As far as the groups’ differentiated responses (perceive/deny discrimination) in the measurement of salience of gender identification at the workplace are concerned, it is possible that this is closely related to the extent of the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in the profession, so neither this finding is informative.

Nevertheless, the perceived status-discrepancies between genders in general in the workforce were found to significantly discriminate the two groups of the respondents. In other words, the women who perceive discrimination against women in the police profession also had representations of stronger status-inequalities for women in general in the workforce. Before we proceed in any further discussion, it has to be noted that women’s type of profession (gender typical or atypical) was not associated with their representations of the status-inequalities between genders in general in the workforce. Thus, these representations do not depend on the profession that women are in. Since these representation are independent of the specific profession and are more general, then it can be said that they might predispose women’s endorsement of representations of discrimination against women in their own profession which widely circulate in society.
Women’s representations of individualism in their society and their general preference for collective/social change strategy also slightly contribute to the discriminant function of these two groups of women. Nevertheless, a direct prediction of the variance in women’s perception of the status-discrepancies between genders in the police profession comes from an investigation of their identity and more specifically their self-concept dynamics. There is no need to repeat here the effects of self-efficacy. What it is interesting to stress is the potential importance for activist groups of women to focus on women’s self-efficacy, beyond a simple encouragement for engaging in collective action. The evidence of this series of studies show that women’s self-efficacy in actually doing their job is largely connected with the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies between the genders in their profession. That means that women’s self-efficacy should be looked at a more general level than its connection with the undertaking of action and more specifically it should be looked at the level of its connection with doing job in specific professions and the perception of the status-discrepancies between women and men in these professions.

More specifically, as it became apparent in the present series of studies this focus should be more prominent in women in gender atypical jobs. Women’s self-efficacy in doing a gender atypical job proved essential in relation to the perceived career status-discrepancies between men and women in the profession and their choice of strategy when they perceive discrimination against women. Moreover, women’s global self-efficacy affected their choices of action in the case of hypothetical discrimination against women in the gender atypical job, whereas this was not true for women in the nursing/midwifery profession. As discussed in Chapter Eight, the negative
relationship of job related self-efficacy with the perceived status-discrepancies and attempts to behave like a man would if he was doing the job, is rather connected with the effects of occupational stereotypes associating gender identities with specific occupations and the extent to which women perceive that these stereotypes which provide comparisons against them and in favour of men in terms of job behaviour can be eliminated. Consequently, in order to diminish the effect of these comparisons it is essential to focus on women's self-efficacy in doing gender atypical jobs.

Moreover, attention should be paid to the implications of emphasising status discrepancies. Following SIT's assumptions for the emergence of social enhancement strategies, one would expect that as far as the status-discrepancies between two groups are made salient and marked, people will be more willing to engage in collective strategies aiming at social change. A focus on the extent of the problem that calls for collective action is not only stressed by SIT but also the messages of any activist group. Ecological groups will stress the extent of the destruction of the environment, feminist groups will stress the extent that women are unfairly discriminated against at the workplace. But is this the way that groups of activists will attract more people to collective action? As presented, in this series of studies women's focus on the extent of the status-discrepancies between genders had the opposite effects upon their choice of social enhancement action in case of perceived discrimination against women: The greater the women perceived the status-discrepancies to be, the more likely they were to choose individual mobility as a coping strategy.
Furthermore, as indicated in the first section of this chapter, the findings from the present series of studies move away from a unilateral focus of SIT on 'group identification' and the individuals' 'awareness' or 'consciousness' of their group memberships and the status-position of the their groups as a precursor of the arousal of collective / social change action (for a more detailed discussion of this argument also see Condor (1989)). In the present series of studies, collective/ engagement in collective action was not found to be affected by women’s awareness of the significance of their group membership in the particular occupational contexts (salience of group identification). In fact, as this awareness was closely related to the perceived extent of the status-discrepancies between genders in the profession, it actually positively contributed to preference for individual mobility.

As argued before, the findings from this series of studies also indicate the importance of the operation of social representations which are concerned with social enhancement strategies. As demonstrated, these social representations are used as points of reference for preference for social enhancement action and especially as far as collective/ social enhancement action is concerned. Individual general preferences act as a precondition of the preferences for social enhancement strategies which are used in order to cope with specific situations. Also, both general and specific preferences are affected by the individuals’ estimations of the preferences of their society for these strategies. That means that people form their opinions and preferences for action in the context of social interaction and communication.
In other words, as argued before social representational fields of social enhancement strategies should be established in order for people to articulate preferences for specific social enhancement strategies and be engaged in strategy-related action. In terms of women’s social enhancement action at the workplace that would mean that the focus should turn to the prominence of social representations of appropriateness or availability of types of social enhancement strategies through everyday interaction and communication. However, this should focus not only on the specific strategies available to women in relation to workplace gender discrimination but should also focus on social enhancement strategies at a more general level: People do not act only on the basis of the specific situations that are involved at a fragment of time but use as points of reference much more general representations of the appropriateness or the availability of the social enhancement strategies, based on both perceived social ideologies and individual dynamics.
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Appendix 1
The present questionnaire is part of a research project conducted by a PhD student within the Department of Psychology at the University of Surrey. The research aims to explore aspects of the social psychological processes related to human action and social change. In particular, we are interested in the way people think and react in situations where they feel themselves or their group to be at a disadvantage.

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is invaluable to our research. Your answers will make an important contribution to our understanding of the factors involved in the process of social change. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. We are simply interested in the way you think you would react in the situations described in the questionnaire. There is no need to put your name on the questionnaire; all your answers will be entirely anonymous and the information you give will be treated with complete confidentiality.

Thank you very much for your help.

WHEN COMPLETED, PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE INTO THE BLUE BOX LABELED H.A.S.C, WHICH IS PROVIDED IN THE FOYER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY.

(Do not mark the following grids. For office use only)

Q.1 Case No : 0123456789

Q.2 Condition: 0123456789

1

serial

Box

survey

page
In this section, I would like you to think about a group to which you belong, one that is particularly important to you. The type of group you could choose might be a political party, a sports team, a network of friends, or, a racial, religious or national grouping.

G.1 Please state here what group you are thinking about (remember it should be one which is very important to you).

(Do not mark the following grid. For office use only)

G.2 Do you experience discrimination as part of this group? (Please, mark with a cross (X) the appropriate box.)

Yes   No
☐     ☐

Now I would like you to consider how you would feel and what you would do if you found that this group was being discriminated against by an other group. Please rate how you believe that you would react on the list of items below. You are asked to say how likely you think it is that you would react in the way described on the basis of a five point scale:

1=Very Unlikely, 2=Unlikely, 3=Unsure, 4=Likely, 5=Very Likely.

Please mark with a cross (X) the box which corresponds to the number that best reflects how you would react.

Note that all sentences start:
If the group was being discriminated against, ...

L.1 I would act in such a way as to avoid being categorised as a member of that group.

L.2 I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing that it possesses additional or different characteristics not previously recognised.

L.3 I would try to persuade others, outside my group, to protest for the rights of my group.
If the group was being discriminated against, ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L.4 I would try to ally my group with other more powerful groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.5 I would never hide the fact that I was a member of that group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.6 I would try to persuade others, outside my group, that such discrimination is unfair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.7 I would not try to change the way the group is perceived.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.8 I would try to change the balance of power between the groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.9 I would leave the group if I could.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.10 I would argue for equal treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.11 I would pretend, when necessary, not to be a member of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.12 I would campaign for equality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.13 I would not try to become a member of other more advantaged groups at the same time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.14 I would keep away from other members of my group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.15 I would not emphasize the relative advantages of my group through attempts to compare it favourably with groups of inferior status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.16 I would try to become famous as a representative of the group in order to gain personal acceptance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.17 I would find ways to prove discrimination was counterproductive for everyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.18 I would seek to isolate my group from those who discriminate against it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.19 I would try to get into a position in the group which was of high status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the group was being discriminated against, ...

L.20 I would try to show the power of my group.  
L.21 I would argue that my group should be treated as different from but equal to other groups.  
L.22 I would try to change the way the group is defined by challenging the characteristics which members are believed to share.  
L.23 I would try to prove that I am different from the other members of the group.  
L.24 I would encourage other members of my group to use the symbols of their group membership at all times.  
L.25 I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the criteria used for evaluating it.  
L.26 I would find ways of showing the discrimination was unfair.  
L.27 I would try to become so famous in my own right that people did not treat me like a member of the group.  
L.28 I would try not to think about being a member of that group.  
L.29 I would try to change the way the group is perceived by comparing its characteristics with those of groups that were not discriminated against.  
L.30 I would argue that the characteristics of my group were valuable.  
L.31 I would leave it and ensure everyone connected with me left it.  
L.32 I would try to increase the actual objective power of my group.  
L.33 I would not argue that the group possesses qualities lacking in other groups just to change the way it is perceived.
1=Very Unlikely, 2=Unlikely, 3=Unsure, 4=Likely, 5=Very Likely.

If the group was being discriminated against, ...

L.34 I would use whatever power the group possessed to change the relationships between groups. 1 2 3 4 5
L.35 I would not hesitate to use physical force to oppose physical force if it was used by those who discriminated against us. □ □ □ □ □
L.36 I would not stand up for the rights of my group. □ □ □ □ □
L.37 I would avoid contexts where that group membership led me to be discriminated against. □ □ □ □ □
L.38 I would emphasize in my own dress, etc, the fact that I was a group member. □ □ □ □ □
L.39 I would retaliate against discrimination. □ □ □ □ □
L.40 I would encourage the group to make a territory for itself (i.e. a space for itself). □ □ □ □ □
L.41 I would not tell anyone I was a member of that group. □ □ □ □ □
L.42 I would not retaliate against someone attacking my group. □ □ □ □ □
L.43 I would challenge the right of any group to discriminate against my group. □ □ □ □ □
L.44 I would take every opportunity to attack our opponents verbally. □ □ □ □ □
L.45 I would minimise the importance of that group membership when thinking about myself. □ □ □ □ □
L.46 I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the value attached to the characteristics associated with group members. □ □ □ □ □
L.47 I would defend my group from attack with any means available. □ □ □ □ □
L.48 I would try to persuade others, outside my group, about the right of my group. □ □ □ □ □
1=Very Unlikely, 2=Unlikely, 3=Unsure, 4=Likelv, 5=Very Likely.

If the group was being discriminated against, ... 1 2 3 4 5

L.49 I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing that my group is not different, even if it is powerless. □ □ □ □ □

L.50 I would try to act in such a way that others would not attribute to me the characteristics thought to be common to members of my group. □ □ □ □ □

R.1 If you belong to any group or groups that are discriminated against, please tell us what they are.

(Do not mark the following grids. For office use only)

R.2

R.3

R.4 123456789

serial survey

Box page

ScanITX by Formic Ltd, London (071) 373 9292
Please answer to the following questions.

D.1 Which is your course? ...............................

(Do not mark the following grid. For office use only)

D.2 What is your age?  

D.3 What is your sex? (X) Male □ Female □

D.4 What is your nationality? ...........................

(Do not mark the following grid. For office use only)

D.5 Which of these ethnic groups do you belong to? (X)

African origin □ English origin □
Caribbean origin □ Northern Irish origin □
Chinese or Hong Kong origin □ Welsh origin □
East African Asian origin □ Eire origin □
Indian origin □ Other European origin □
Pakistani origin □ Some other origin □
Scottish origin □ (please say what)
I prefer not to say □

D.6 Which is your religion? (X)

Anglican Christian □
Protestant Christian □
Roman Catholic Christian □
Greek Orthodox Christian □
Other Christian □
Muslim □
Hindu □
Buddhist □
Agnostic □
Atheist □
I prefer not to say □
Other (please say what) □
Appendix 2
THE COPING STRATEGIES QUESTIONNAIRE

The present questionnaire is part of a research project conducted by a PhD student within the Department of Psychology at the University of Surrey. The research is concerned with the strategies people adopt in order to improve their position in society. More specifically, this questionnaire focuses on the way people think and react in situations where they feel themselves or their group to be at a disadvantage. The second part of the questionnaire is particularly concerned with women at work. For this reason we particularly address this questionnaire to women.

Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is invaluable to our research. Your answers will make an important contribution to our understanding of the factors involved in people's coping strategies. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions. There is no need to put your name on the questionnaire; all your answers will be entirely anonymous and the information you give will be treated with complete confidentiality.

Thank you very much for your help.

K. Mavridi

No:--------
PART I

I. In this section, I would like you to think about a group to which you belong, one that is particularly important to you. The type of group you could choose might be a political party, a sports team, a network of friends, or, an age, racial, religious or national group.

Please state here what group you are thinking about: . . . .

Now I would like you to consider how you would feel and what you would do if you found that this group was being discriminated against by an other group. Below there is a list of statements referring to different ways in which people may react under such circumstances. You are asked to rate how likely it is that you would react in the way described by each statement.

1=Very likely 2=Likely 3=Unsure 4=Unlikely 5=Very unlikely

Please circle the number which best reflects how you would react alongside each statement.

Note that all statements start:

If the group was being discriminated against, ...

1. I would act in such a way as to avoid being categorised as a member of that group. 1 2 3 4 5

2. I would try to persuade others, outside my group, to protest for the rights of my group. 1 2 3 4 5

3. I would never hide the fact that I was a member of that group. 1 2 3 4 5

4. I would try to change the balance of power between the groups. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I would leave the group if I could. 1 2 3 4 5

6. I would argue for equal treatment. 1 2 3 4 5

7. I would pretend, when necessary, not to be a member of the group. 1 2 3 4 5

8. I would campaign for equality. 1 2 3 4 5

9. I would keep away from other members of my group. 1 2 3 4 5

10. I would not try to persuade others, outside my group, that such discrimination is unfair. 1 2 3 4 5
1. I would find ways to prove discrimination was counterproductive for everyone.  

2. I would argue that my group should be treated as different from but equal to other groups.  

3. I would try to prove that I am different from the other members of the group.  

4. I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the criteria used for evaluating it.  

5. I would find ways of showing the discrimination was unfair.  

6. I would try to become so famous in my own right that people did not treat me like a member of the group.  

7. I would try not to think about being a member of that group.  

8. I would leave it and ensure everyone connected with me left it.  

9. I would try to increase the actual objective power of my group.  

10. I would use whatever power the group possessed to change the relationships between groups.  

11. I would not tell anyone I was a member of that group.  

12. I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the value attached to the characteristics associated with group members.  

13. I would try to persuade others, outside my group, about the rights of my group.  

14. I would try to act in such a way that others would not attribute to me the characteristics thought to be common to members of my group.
II. Below there is a list of statements concerned with what is believed in Britain today regarding people’s advancement. I would like you to indicate how much you agree or disagree that each of these statements reflects what is generally believed in Britain today.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

Please circle the number which best reflects your answer alongside each statement.

Note that the following statements start:

In Britain today, ...

1. ...individual action is considered the best way for people to improve their position.
2. ...it is believed that joining a social movement is the appropriate way for people to stand up for their rights.
3. ...collective action is considered the best way for people to improve their position.
4. ...it is believed that people’s advancement does not depend upon their family background.
5. ...it is believed that one’s position in society does not depend on one’s own merits.
6. ...it is believed that any person who works hard will succeed.
7. ...it is believed that it is very difficult for a person who belongs to an underprivileged group to succeed.
8. ...it is believed that success depends on one’s own competence.
9. ...it is believed that people use the fact that they do not belong to a privileged group as an excuse when they fail.
III. This section is concerned with your views about yourself. You are asked to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

(Please circle the number which best reflects your answer)

1. If I cannot do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I give up easily. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I seem to be capable of dealing with most problems that come up in life. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I find it easy to make new friends. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I do not know how to handle social gatherings. 1 2 3 4 5
PART II

IV. This part of the questionnaire is concerned with your beliefs about the status of women at work. You are asked to indicate how far you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

(Please circle the number which best reflects your answer)

Please note that the following statements are concerned with the status of women in the work place in general.

Note that these statements start:

In general, (PDG)

1. ...women usually work in different types of jobs from men. 1 2 3 4 5

2. ...at least half of the people who work in high status jobs are women. 1 2 3 4 5

3. ...not as many women as men are promoted to high positions in most professions. 1 2 3 4 5

4. ...women have different career options from men. 1 2 3 4 5

5. ...there are as many women as men in managerial positions in most professions. 1 2 3 4 5

6. ...there are as many jobs for women as for men. 1 2 3 4 5

7. ...there are professions thought to be typical for men and there are professions thought to be typical for women. 1 2 3 4 5

8. ...not as many women as men hold highly paid jobs. 1 2 3 4 5

9. ...women are employed in every kind of job. 1 2 3 4 5
Please note that the following statements are concerned with the status of women in your own profession (or the profession that you are being trained for).

Note that these statements start:

In my profession, ...

1. ...women have the same opportunities to advance as men.  
2. ...women are working in different departments from men.  
3. ...not as many women as men are promoted to high positions.  
4. ...women have different career options from men.  
5. ...women have access to every kind of post.  
6. ...the same proportion of women and men is promoted to managerial positions.  
7. ...women are consistently asked to do different kinds of tasks from men.  
8. ...women are paid the same as men.  
9. ...there are tasks thought to be typical for men and there are tasks thought to be typical for women.  
10. ...women will continue to have the same chances of promotion in the near future.  
11. ...the proportion of women and men in high positions will not change in the near future.  
12. ...the status of women can easily change.  
13. ...women will continue to do mainly the same kinds of tasks in the near future.  
14. ...women will continue to be treated in the same way in the near future.  
15. ...the status of women is justified.
16. ...women are not unfairly discriminated against. 1 2 3 4 5
17. ...the evaluation of work performance is not affected by the employee's gender. 1 2 3 4 5
18. ...decisions about promotion are affected by the candidate's gender. 1 2 3 4 5
19. ...no matter what her abilities are, a woman is not usually assigned to typical male tasks. 1 2 3 4 5
20. ...no matter what effort she makes, a woman will not be treated as equal to a man. 1 2 3 4 5
21. ...there are many examples of women who hold typical male positions. 1 2 3 4 5
22. ...a woman's access to typical male positions depends on her abilities. 1 2 3 4 5
V. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

(Please circle the number which best reflects your answer)

1. The way I am treated at work is not affected by my gender. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The kind of job I am doing is typical for someone of my gender. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The way my work performance is evaluated is affected by my gender. 1 2 3 4 5
4. My gender has an influence on what tasks I am asked to do. 1 2 3 4 5
5. My gender has an influence on the kind of positions I am assigned to. 1 2 3 4 5
6. My chances of promotion are not affected by my gender. 1 2 3 4 5

VI. Now, I would like you to tell me how often you have actually felt discriminated against at work as a woman, in the last year, using a five-point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(PEROS)

Please indicate how often you have actually felt discriminated as a woman, regarding:

1. The way you are treated by your colleagues. 1 2 3 4 5
2. The evaluation of your work performance. 1 2 3 4 5
3. The tasks that you are asked to do. 1 2 3 4 5
4. The positions that you are assigned to. 1 2 3 4 5
5. Your chances of promotion. 1 2 3 4 5

VII. Do you feel that women employees are discriminated against in your profession?

Yes ( ) Not sure ( ) No ( ) (Please tick)

If your answer to the previous question is either 'not sure' or 'no', please leave the next section (VIII) and go to section IX.

If your answer to the previous question is 'yes' please complete the next section (VIII) but not section IX.
VIII. (To be completed if you feel that women employees are discriminated against in your profession.) In this part of the questionnaire, we are interested in the strategies you adopt in order to cope with the discrimination that women face in your profession. You are asked to say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

1. I try to persuade my superiors that I personally can do the job as well as a man would do it. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I campaign for gender equality in the work place. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I try to prove that I am different from other women. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I talk to my female colleagues about strategies we can use to confront the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I ignore the discrimination. 1 2 3 4 5
6. I argue that women have different but equally valuable abilities for the job. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I never try to disguise my femininity. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I say to myself that there is nothing I can do about the discrimination. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I have nothing to argue about how women's work performance can be evaluated. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I actively support an organisation that stands for the rights of women at work. 1 2 3 4 5
12. I argue that women have some additional qualities to men, which are more useful to the job. 1 2 3 4 5
13. I do not get involved in protests to establish a fair policy for the women in my job. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I try to organise my female colleagues to do something about the discrimination. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I argue that many women are better for this job than some men. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I might quit the job. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I have learned to live with the discrimination. 1 2 3 4 5

other: . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
IX. (To be completed if you do not feel that, or you are not sure whether women are discriminated against in your profession.) Please indicate how you believe you would react if you felt that women employees were discriminated against in your profession. You are asked to say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

1. I would try to persuade my superiors that I personally can do the job as well as a man would do it. (STRHYP)

2. I would campaign for gender equality in the work place.

3. I would try to prove that I am different from other women.

4. I would talk to my female colleagues about strategies we can use to confront the situation.

5. I would ignore the discrimination.

6. I would argue that women have different but equally valuable abilities for the job.

7. I would never try to disguise my femininity.

8. I would say to myself that there is nothing I can do about the discrimination.

9. I would have nothing to argue about how women's work performance can be evaluated.

10. I would try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job.

11. I would actively support an organisation that stands for the rights of women at work.

12. I would argue that women have some additional qualities to men, which are more useful to the job.

13. I would not get involved in protests to establish a fair policy for the women in my job.

14. I would try to organise my female colleagues to do something about the discrimination.

15. I would argue that many women are better for this job than some men.

16. I would quit the job.

17. I would get used to live with the discrimination.

other: ..........................
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1=Strongly agree 2=Agree 3=Unsure 4=Disagree 5=Strongly disagree

(Please circle the number which best reflects your answer)

1. I can do my job efficiently. .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
2. I can handle any problem regarding my job. ................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
3. When I am assigned tasks, I complete them successfully most of the time. .................. 1 2 3 4 5
4. If I cannot do something regarding my job the first time, I keep trying until I can. ......... 1 2 3 4 5
5. When I am training in something new about my job, I soon give up if I am not initially successful. 1 2 3 4 5
6. When unexpected problems occur in my job, I do not handle them well. ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
7. I avoid trying to learn new things about my job when they look too difficult for me. ........ 1 2 3 4 5
8. Failure in my job just makes me try harder. ............................................... 1 2 3 4 5
9. I feel insecure about my ability to do my job. .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in my job. ............... 1 2 3 4 5
11. It is difficult for me to make friends in my work place. .................................... 1 2 3 4 5
12. If I see a colleague I would like to meet, I go to that person instead of waiting for him or her to come to me. 1 2 3 4 5
13. When I am trying to collaborate with a colleague who seems unwilling at first, I do not give up easily. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I do not handle myself well in social gatherings at my work place. .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I have good relationships with my colleagues because I know how to get on well with other people. 1 2 3 4 5
Please state:

1. Your age:____  2. Your sex:____

3. Are you:  Single ( )
               Married ( )
               Living Together ( )
               Divorced/ Separated ( )
               Widow ( ) (Please tick)

4. Do you have any children? Yes ( ) No ( )

5. What is the highest educational qualification you have already attained?

6. Your profession (or the profession that you are being trained for):

7. If you are a trainee, do you have any work experience in this profession? Yes ( ) No ( ) (Please tick)

8. If you have answered yes to the previous question, please estimate how much time in years and months you have been in a work setting in this profession. ___years ___months

9. What is your present area of duty? __________________________

Please write below any comments you might have.
Appendix 3
SCALES USED IN THE LAST THREE STUDIES

1) GENERAL PREFERENCES FOR SOCIAL ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIES (GP).

(a) GENERAL PREFERENCE FOR EXIT (Factor 1)

\[ \text{a} = 0.85 \]

GP17. I would try not to think about being a member of that group. 0.76
GP21. I would not tell anyone I was a member of that group. 0.76
GP16. I would try to become so famous in my own right that people did not treat me like a member of the group. 0.71
GP24. I would try to act in such a way that others would not attribute to me the characteristics thought to be common to members of my group. 0.67
GP7. I would pretend, when necessary, not to be a member of the group. 0.67
GP18. I would leave it and ensure everyone connected with me left it. 0.66
GP1. I would act in such a way as to avoid being categorised as a member of that group. 0.64
GP9. I would keep away from other members of my group. 0.59
GP5. I would leave the group if I could. 0.57
GP13. I would try to prove that I am different from the other members of the group. 0.55
GP3. I would never hide the fact that I was a member of that group. -0.48
(b) GENERAL PREFERENCE FOR VOICE (Factor 2)  
a = 0.83

GP20. I would use whatever power the group possessed to change the relationships between groups. 0.68
GP22. I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the value attached to the characteristics associated with group members. 0.67
GP19. I would try to increase the actual objective power of my group. 0.65
GP15. I would find ways of showing the discrimination was unfair. 0.65
GP23. I would try to persuade others, outside my group, about the rights of my group. 0.65
GP4. I would try to change the balance of power between the groups. 0.62
GP11. I would find ways to prove discrimination was counterproductive for everyone. 0.60
GP2. I would try to persuade others, outside my group, to protest for the rights of my group. 0.58
GP14. I would try to change the way the group is perceived by arguing about the criteria used for evaluating it. 0.58
GP8. I would campaign for equality. 0.57
GP6. I would argue for equal treatment. 0.48
GP10. I would not try to persuade others, outside my group, that such discrimination is unfair. -0.41

2) GLOBAL SELF-EFFICACY (GSE).

(a) GENERAL (Factor 1) a = .6607

GSE3. I give up easily. 0.84
GSE2. I avoid trying to learn new things when they look too difficult for me. 0.76
GSE1. If I cannot do a job the first time, I keep trying until I can. -0.69
3) SPECIFIC SELF-EFFICACY (SPSE).

(a) JOB GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY (Factor 1)

\( a = 0.83 \)

SPSE4. If I cannot do something regarding my job the first time, I keep trying until I can.  
-0.79

SPSE5. When I am training in something new about my job, I soon give up if I am not initially successful. 
0.78

SPSE3. When I am assigned tasks, I complete them successfully most of the time. 
-0.72

SPSE1. I can do my job efficiently. 
-0.65

SPSE10. I do not seem capable of dealing with most problems that come up in my job. 
0.62

SPSE7. I avoid trying to learn new things about my job when they look too difficult for me. 
0.61

SPSE8. Failure in my job just makes me try harder. 
-0.60

SPSE9. I feel insecure about my ability to do my job. 
0.51

SPSE6. When unexpected problems occur in my job, I do not handle them well. 
0.47

SPSE2. I can handle any problem regarding my job. 
-0.43

(b) JOB SOCIAL SELF-EFFICACY (Factor 2)

\( a = 0.72 \)

SPSE15. I have good relationships with my colleagues because I know how to get on well with other people. 
-0.78

SPSE11. It is difficult for me to make friends in my work place. 
0.77

SPSE14. I do not handle myself well in social gatherings at my work place. 
0.75
4) PERCEIVED STATUS DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN GENDERS IN GENERAL IN THE WORKFORCE (PDG).

(a) PERCEIVED 'VERTICAL' STATUS DISCREPANCIES (Factor 1) 
  \( a = 0.74 \)

(In general, ...)  
PDG8. ...not as many women as men hold highly paid jobs. \(0.78\)  
PDG2. ...at least half of the people who work in high status jobs are women. \(-0.71\)  
PDG5. ...there are as many women as men in managerial positions in most professions. \(-0.65\)  
PDG3. ...not as many women as men are promoted to high positions in most professions. \(0.64\)

5) SALIENCE OF GENDER IDENTITY AT THE WORKPLACE (Factor1) 
  \( a = 0.78 \)

SAL5. My gender has an influence on the kind of positions I am assigned to. \(0.83\)  
SAL4. My gender has an influence on what tasks I am asked to do. \(0.78\)  
SAL3. The way my work performance is evaluated is affected by my gender. \(0.73\)  
SAL1. The way I am treated at work is not affected by my gender. \(-0.70\)  
SAL6. My chances of promotion are not affected by my gender. \(-0.59\)

6) PERCEIVED STATUS DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN GENDERS IN THE PROFESSION (PDP).

(a) PERCEIVED 'HORIZONTAL' STATUS DISCREPANCIES (Factor 1) 
  \( a = 0.69 \)

(In my profession, ...)  
PDP4. ...women have different career options from men. \(0.74\)  
PDP2. ...women are working in different departments from men. \(0.68\)  
PDP5. ...women have access to every kind of post. \(-0.65\)  
PDP7. ...women are consistently asked to do different kinds of tasks from men. \(0.55\)  
PDP9. ...there are tasks thought to be typical for men and there are tasks thought to be typical for women. \(0.41\)
7) PERCEIVED STABILITY OF THE STATUS DISCREPANCIES
(a= 0.68).

(In my profession,...)
PDP11. ...the proportion of women and men in high positions will not change in the near future.
PDP12. ...the status of women can easily change.
PDP13. ...women will continue to do mainly the same kinds of tasks in the near future.
PDP14. ...women will continue to be treated in the same way in the near future.

8) PERCEIVED LEGITIMACY OF THE STATUS DISCREPANCIES
(a= 0.70).

(In my profession,...)
PDP15. ...the status of women is justified.
PDP16. ...women are not unfairly discriminated against.
PDP17. ...the evaluation of work performance is not affected by the employee's gender.
PDP18. ...decisions about promotion are affected by the candidate's gender.

9) PERCEIVED PERMEABILITY OF INTERGROUP BOUNDARIES
(a= 0.61).

(In my profession,...)
PDP19. ...no matter what her abilities are, a woman is not usually assigned to typical male tasks.
PDP20. ...no matter what effort she makes, a woman will not be treated as equal to a man.
PDP21. ...there are many examples of women who hold typical male positions.
10) PERSONAL DISCRIMINATION (One factor) a= 0.90

(Please indicate how often you have actually felt discriminated as a woman, regarding:)

PERDIS4. The positions that you are assigned to. 0.89
PERDIS5. Your chances of promotion. 0.87
PERDIS3. The tasks that you are asked to do. 0.86
PERDIS2. The evaluation of your work performance. 0.84
PERDIS1. The way you are treated by your colleagues. 0.79

11) COPING ACTION IN PERCEIVED WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (STRA).

(a) COLLECTIVE/ SOCIAL CHANGE STRATEGY (Factor 2. Two-factor solution.) a= 0.69

STRA14. I try to organise my female colleagues to do something about the discrimination. 0.83
STRA2. I campaign for gender equality in the workplace. 0.67
STRA4. I talk to my female colleagues about strategies we can use to confront the situation. 0.65
STRA11. I actively support an organisation that stands for the rights of women at work. 0.62
STRA15. I argue that many women are better for this job than some men. 0.44
STRA6. I argue that women have different but equally valuable abilities for the job. 0.39
STRA12. I argue that women have some additional qualities to men, which are more useful to the job. 0.33
STRA13. I do not get involved in protests to establish a fair policy for the women in my job. -0.32

(b) INACTION (Factor 1. Two-factor solution) a= 0.85

STRA8. I say to myself that there is nothing I can do about the discrimination. 0.83
STRA17. I have learned to live with the discrimination. 0.74
STRA5. I ignore the discrimination. 0.72
12) COPING ACTION IN HYPOTHETICAL WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (STRHYP).

(a) COLLECTIVE/ SOCIAL CHANGE STRATEGY (Factor 1. Two-factor solution.) $a = 0.74$

STRHYP14. I would try to organise my female colleagues to do something about the discrimination. 0.73

STRHYP2. I would campaign for gender equality in the work place. 0.64

STRHYP11. I would actively support an organisation that stands for the rights of women at work. 0.63

STRHYP15. I would argue that many women are better for this job than some men. 0.62

STRHYP4. I would talk to my female colleagues about strategies we can use to confront the situation. 0.60

STRHYP12. I would argue that women have some additional qualities to men, which are more useful to the job. 0.57

STRHYP6. I would argue that women have different but equally valuable abilities for the job. 0.44

STRHYP13. I would not get involved in protests to establish a fair policy for the women in my job. -0.38

(b) INACTION (Factor 2. Two factor- solution) $a = 0.55$

STRHYP8. I would say to myself that there is nothing I can do about the discrimination. 0.67

STRHYP17. I would get used to live with the discrimination. 0.55

STRHYP5. I would ignore the discrimination. 0.52

The following items were selected to represent:
(a) Perceived Societal individualism. Item GE1:
"In Britain today individual action is considered the best way for people to improve their position."

(b) Perceived societal collectivism. Item GE3:
"In Britain today collective action is considered the best way for people to improve their position."

Two items were selected to separately represent Individual Mobility type of action in perceived and hypothetical situation of discrimination. One of the items referred to individual differentiation from the ingroup and the other one to engagement in stereotypical male behaviour (upward mobility). These items are:

STRA3 - [STRHYP3]: "I [would] try to prove that I am different from other women."

STRA10 - [STRHYP10]: "I [would] try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job."
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SHORT CHARACTERISATIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS OF THE VARIABLES USED IN THE LAST THREE STUDIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALES/ INDICES</th>
<th>ABBR*</th>
<th>CHARACTERISATIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General preference for individual mobility</td>
<td>EXIT</td>
<td>General Preference for Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General preference for collective/ social change strategy</td>
<td>VOICE</td>
<td>General Preference for Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Self-Efficacy (general factor)</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (job-related) Self-Efficacy; (general factor)</td>
<td>SGEF</td>
<td>Job General Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (job-related) Self-Efficacy (social factor)</td>
<td>SPSEF</td>
<td>Job Social Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status discrepancies between genders in the workforce (Vertical)</td>
<td>PEDIW</td>
<td>Perceived Discrepancy in Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salience of gender identity at the workplace</td>
<td>SALIEN</td>
<td>Gender Salience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status discrepancies between genders in the profession (Horizontal)</td>
<td>PEDIPR</td>
<td>Perceived Discrepancy in Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived permeability of intergroup status-boundaries for women in the profession</td>
<td>PERME</td>
<td>Perceived Permeability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived legitimacy of status discrepancies between genders in the profession</td>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>Perceived Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived stability of status discrepancies between genders in the profession</td>
<td>STAB</td>
<td>Perceived Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Discrimination</td>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>Personal Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective /Social Change strategy (perceived discrimination)</td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaction (perceived discrimination)</td>
<td>INACTION</td>
<td>Inaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective /Social Change strategy (hypothetical discrimination)</td>
<td>CHAHYP</td>
<td>Hypothetical Preference for Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaction (hypothetical discrimination)</td>
<td>INACTHYP</td>
<td>Hypothetical Preference for Inaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Individual items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL ITEMS</th>
<th>ABBR*</th>
<th>CHARACTERISATIONS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In Britain today, individual action is considered the best way for people to improve their position.&quot;</td>
<td>GE1</td>
<td>PERCEIVED INDIVIDUALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In Britain today collective action is considered the best way for people to improve their position.&quot;</td>
<td>GE3</td>
<td>PERCEIVED COLLECTIVISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I try to prove that I am different from other women.&quot;</td>
<td>STRA3</td>
<td>STRA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job.&quot;</td>
<td>STRA10</td>
<td>STRA10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would try to prove that I am different from other women.&quot;</td>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
<td>STRHYP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would try to behave like a man would, if he was doing the job.&quot;</td>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
<td>STRHYP10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Abbreviations are used in the tables of results. Characterisations are used in the explicit presentation of the results.