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Abstract

This investigation uses social identity and self-categorisation theories as the theoretical framework from which to investigate levels of European identification in a British-English population. This investigation focuses mainly on superordinate identification and subgroup distinctiveness threat. The aim is to identify processes that may be implicated as moderators of European identification. This was approached in two main ways. Firstly, the investigation explores how, within the context of European categorisation, the magnitude of national distinctiveness threat is related to the criterial value placed upon national attributes that may be lost or diluted due to European integration. To this end, the first phase of the research focused initially on identifying different national identity content. Using questionnaire methods, the first two studies were mainly concerned with developing, exploring and investigating different national identity content. To this end, research from sociology, political science and social psychology were integrated and reinterpreted in order to generate two descriptive (traditional-cultural and civic) and two prescriptive (group conformity and critical evaluation) dimensions of national identity content.

Using a quasi-experimental design the research then explored, and provided evidence for, how content-relevant threats to criterial group attributes can instigate national group distinctiveness threat. This distinctiveness threat is then implicated as a factor in the extent to which, (i) one identifies with the European category, and (ii) the two cross-level identities, national and European, are seen as compatible.

The second phase of the research again employed quasi-experimental designs to explore how levels of European identification are affected by: (i) perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness (between Britain and other EU nation-states), (ii) the use of different social comparison
strategies, and (iii) how (i) and (ii) interact with distinctiveness threats to national group attributes in their effect.

The findings suggest that European identification is both facilitated and impeded by intersubgroup similarity. What determines the direction of this effect is the perception of distinctiveness threats to national attributes. At lower levels of threat intersubgroup similarity facilitates European identification, at higher levels of threat intersubgroup similarity functions as a barrier.

The investigation of different social comparison strategies in the final study, was an attempt to explore potential strategies that may help elevate British-European identification. Three strategies were explored that involved engaging in social comparisons between (i) Britain and other EU nation-states, (ii) Britain and non-EU nations, and (iii) a positive post-integration image of Europe and a negative pre-integration image. The only strategy that appeared to facilitate European identification was the intersubgroup comparison strategy detailed in (i) above. However, this strategy was only effective in the absence of distinctiveness threats to national group attributes.

At a practical level, the findings of the research reported in this thesis are discussed in terms of the potential role powerful anti-EU discourses have in accentuating perceptions of incompatibility between British national and European identities, and levels of national identity threat. At a theoretical level, the findings are discussed in relation to the utility of including identity content in cross-level social identity investigations, the distinction between intergroup distinctiveness threat and group distinctiveness threat and the structural representations used to symbolise the relations between cross-level identifications.
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CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW

“The Union shall respect the national identities of its Member States”
(Article 6, Treaty on European Union).
Chapter 1: Overview

The British-European relationship is all at once political, economic and historical but it is a social psychological one, too. It would be a matter of some understatement and over simplification to simply describe Britons' attitudes towards being European as ambivalent. Yet the monitoring of citizen's attitudes towards European unification continues to be seen as an important yardstick of political change, however, attitude measurement alone does not reveal the process of their psychological construction.

The central themes of this thesis are how changing circumstances in a geopolitical social environment impacts social identification, and the social psychological processes by which a contested membership category is assimilated and accepted into, or excluded and rejected from, individuals' existing identity structures. The focal interest is on the psychological adjustments made by members of one particular large-scale social grouping — Britain — as they confront the adoption (or perhaps imposition) and maintenance of a European social category that demands a recasting of their identity relationship with the national group.

Chapter 2

This chapter sets out the context of the thesis and introduces the theoretical approaches guiding the subsequent research and empirical studies. It begins with a review of existing public opinion, attitude and social psychological research into British attitudes towards the European Union (EU). The evidence shows Britons’ attitudes are characterised by a persistent ambivalence between desires for Britain to remain in the EU tempered by low levels of identification with the “European” social category. In part 2, the discussion introduces and reviews potential social psychological theories and explanatory concepts for the trend of low European identification. In describing why and how these barriers to identification exist, the relevant research from the following theoretical perspectives and explanatory concepts are drawn upon: Social Identity Theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979);
Self-Categorization Theory (Turner, 1987); representations of multiple identities and their interaction and; perceptions of relative similarity and distinctiveness.

Chapter 3
This chapter presents a critical discussion of the content of British national identity from theoretical perspectives to be found in the sociological and political science literature. Following a critical discussion of Kelman’s (1997) theory of personal involvement with the nation and Staub’s (1997) theory of constructive and blind patriotism, commonalities between the theories are drawn together under a Social Identity Theory framework. It is argued that sources of attachment to the nation, central to Kelman’s theory, are actually descriptive group norms that represent traditional-cultural and civic beliefs about the national group. Similarly, Staub’s theory of blind and constructive patriotism is recast in terms of reflecting prescriptive norms that are used to sustain and reinforce group identification. The conceptual framework developed in this chapter guides the empirical investigations described in chapter 5.

Chapter 4
This chapter signifies the beginning of the empirical work. This initial investigation explores Kelman and Hamilton’s (1989a) approach to national identification through Kelman’s (1997) ‘patterns of personal involvement in a national group’. Using survey methods, the study explores to what extent the ‘patterns of personal involvement in a national group’ identified by Kelman (1997) are evident in a British sample, and whether different demographic factors help discriminate between the three orientations. In addition, the study presented here explores the relationship between levels of national and European identification.

Some support was obtained for the different ‘patterns’ of personal involvement in the nation in that seven factors were evident from the data
that more or less corresponded to the six patterns identified by Kelman. No evidence was obtained to support the influence of demographic factors in the expression of different forms of orientation. Although principal components analyses resulted in reliable scales, problems relating to the relevance of the items to current constructions of national identity meant the validity of the scales was questionable. Potential explanations for these findings are discussed.

Chapter 5
This chapter reports a study that explores the content and factor structures of British national identity for the purpose of generating reliable scale measures. In doing so, the study addresses some of the issues, identified in the previous study, concerning the conceptual and empirical weaknesses of scales derived from Kelman’s theoretical framework. The specific objective was to construct measures of descriptive and prescriptive norms of relevance to a British national identity. Using a sample of British participants (n=102), a pool of items, based on the attachment and patriotism research, was submitted to a series of factor and reliability analyses. From the analyses, two broad content domains were identified each comprising of two orthogonal factors: civic and traditional-cultural; and group conformity and critical evaluation. The former pair comprised of items that stressed descriptive normative content of British identity and the latter pair prescriptive behavioural expectations and adjustment. The correlation amongst all four factors was low to moderate and each scale had acceptable levels of internal reliability.

Chapter 6
This chapter addresses the extent to which threats to national identity content and distinctiveness act as barriers to European identification. A model is proposed and tested which examines the relationships amongst three classes of variables that influence levels of European identity: the content domains of national identity (i.e. prescriptive and descriptive
norms); a generalised perception of threat to national group distinctiveness; and identity compatibility. Data collection was conducted with a British sample (n=244) using a correlational design. A cover story describing what effects EU integration might bring was used to manipulate specific threats on each of the prescriptive and descriptive British national norms (civic, traditional-cultural, group conformity and critical evaluation). Measures were then taken of national distinctiveness group threat, identity compatibility and level of European identity. Data analysis and model building was conducted through a series of multiple regressions and path analyses. There was no evidence to suggest that threats to prescriptive and descriptive national-group norms impact directly upon levels of EU identity. Instead, the effect of the specific threats were mediated through a generalised threat to national group distinctiveness that, in turn, had a direct impact on European identity but also was weakly mediated by identity compatibility. Taken together, the results indicate that national distinctiveness threat directly affects group members' beliefs that they can simultaneously be a member of their nation and the European Union.

Chapter 7
The study presented in chapter seven focused on the two forms of distinctiveness threat, i.e. one related to possessing a distinct social identity and one relating to the quest for intergroup distinctiveness. It explored how these interconnected threats may work together to impede European identification. The potential loss of valued national attributes through European integration was measured, and the potential loss of the national group's independent existence was manipulated by presenting inter-EU nation-state similarity as a consequence of European integration.

The study employed a 2 (attribute threat: low vs. high) by 3 (condition: maintaining distinctiveness, induced similarity & control) independent groups design. The results indicate that perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and subgroup attribute threat both affect levels of European identification. When Britons believed they could maintain intersubgroup
differences, the effect of attribute threat had a much weaker impact on levels of European identification. The pattern of the results provide some support for the mutual intergroup differentiation model.

**Chapter 8**
The study reported in this chapter explores the relationship between social comparison strategies and European identification. It addresses the general questions: when group members pursue national group distinctiveness, does focusing on intersubgroup comparisons act as a barrier to European identification? And, can other forms of social comparison elevate British-European identification?

The study incorporated a 2 (threat: low vs. high) by 4 (comparison strategy) independent groups design. The comparison strategies assessed were (i) Britain and other EU nation-states, (ii) Britain and non-EU nations, and (iii) a positive post-integration image of Europe and a negative pre-integration image. The design also incorporated a control condition. The results indicated that only strategy (i) was effective and only in the absence of national attribute threat.

**Chapter 9**
The final chapter presents a general discussion and conclusion to the thesis. In this chapter, the observations from the empirical work are discussed in conjunction with the theoretical issues raised throughout the thesis. These issues include such things as the utility of including identity content in cross-level social identity investigations, the distinction between intergroup distinctiveness threat and group distinctiveness threat, the use of social creativity strategies to counter distinctiveness threats, and the structural representations used to symbolise the relations between cross-level identifications. The limitations of the current work are acknowledged and suggestions for further research are made.
CHAPTER TWO: EUROPEAN IDENTITY IN BRITAIN

“It is not a time to opt out of voting, or to opt out of Europe”
(Margaret Thatcher, June 1975)

“In my lifetime all the problems have come from mainland Europe and all the solutions from the English-speaking nations of the world”
(Margaret Thatcher, October 1999).

“I support withdrawal from the EEC”
(Tony Blair, April 1982)

“I have fought to persuade my party to become a party of Europe ... I have no doubt at all that the future of my country lies in being at the heart of Europe”
(Tony Blair, May 1995)

“In Europe, not run by Europe”
(William Hague, 1999 – 2001)
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2.1 **Introduction to the Problem**

In Britain there is substantial uncertainty amongst citizens regarding Britain's membership in the European Union (EU). The issue for the British is *not* whether Britain should remain in the EU; opinion polls have clearly shown that the majority of British people want to remain EU members (Jowell et al., 2000); rather the issue is one of comparatively low identification with *being* European (Eurobarometer, 2000, 2002a; Cinnirella, 1997). British citizens remain ambivalent.

Enshrined in the European constitution is the explicit statement that “The Union shall respect the national identities of its Member States” (Article 6(3) Treaty of the European Union). Although European citizenship does not replace national citizenship, the coexistence of this dual-citizenship status has been observed to be problematic for the British. In the media and in the research literature Britain’s membership in the EU has been portrayed as stereotypically Eurosceptic; Britons themselves have admitted to being ‘reluctant’ Europeans (Hewstone, 1986) and historically, have been perceived by other nation-states and their citizens in the same manner (Eurobarometer, 1984). For the British, there appears to be an area of conflict in the coexistence of national and supranational loyalties (Cinnirella, 1997). Moreover, research that has examined British newspapers reveals discourses of perceived threat to British national identity resulting from the EU membership (e.g. Sotirakopoulou, 1991). Public opinion polls that have examined Briton’s fears in this domain have identified, as pivotal elements, the perception that EU membership results in the erosion of British national identity and culture, this has been compounded by the fear that Britain – as an independent country – will cease to exist (Eurobarometer, 2000, 2002a). Although this link has been described, there is a paucity of social psychological research examining the nature of the inter-relationships between national and European social identities: little has been devoted to the examination of the actual identity processes and content involved. Instead much of our knowledge regarding
the antecedents and consequences of European identification amongst the British relies upon either opinion polls (e.g. the Eurobarometer surveys & British social attitude surveys) or attitudinal research (Hewstone, 1986, 1991; Pinder, 1991). This thesis aims to make a contribution to this area by addressing the inter-relationships between these two identities and by examining the content and processes of these joint identifications.

The investigation of the concept of European identification has received increasing attention from social psychologists in the last two decades, although research in this area from this approach is somewhat limited. However, social psychological research on many aspects of identity and identification is a rich and diverse area: the most pertinent research is reviewed in this chapter. The purpose of this chapter is to introduce by way of review:

1. British public opinion and attitude research on European Unification, and to examine how this may relate to the comparatively low levels of European support and identification expressed by the British population. This section draws mainly from the Eurobarometer surveys as they are the most comprehensive surveys available relevant to this area.

2. Social psychological research in the area of multiple social identifications and discuss how it relates to the current problem of relatively low British-European identification.

I begin with a review of public opinion and attitude research in order to: (a) establish a historical and comparative image of British perceptions of European Unification, and (b) to explore potential explanations for emergent trends.
2.2 PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS AND ATTITUDE RESEARCH

2.2.1 Trends in Support for the European Union

The extent of British support for European Union membership has a mixed history. In 1973, when Britain joined the European Community, only 37% of Britons supported unification (Inglehart & Reif, 1991). Up until 1991, public opinion had shown a relatively consistent increase in support (Eurobarometer, 1981, 1991). Since then, however, it has been on a steady decline going from over 50% in 1991 to 32% in 2002 (Eurobarometer, 1991; 2002a, see also figure I). The most recent figures indicate that 31% of the British public support Britain's EU membership (Eurobarometer, 2002b). In comparison with the average support levels across all fifteen EU nation-states (EU15) levels of support in the British have been consistently lower (see also figure I); indeed amongst the EU15, UK citizens consistently express the lowest levels of support.

While the headline figures from the Eurobarometers suggest ‘support’ is declining, the nature of this support has been addressed by Hewstone (1986; 1991), who in his studies of British attitudes on European unification, has argued that although there does not appear to be a “reliable reservoir of support” (Hewstone, 1991, p.82) the British are not opposed to membership in the EU. The lack of support expressed by the British public does not appear to extend, or indeed reflect, desires to forfeit membership. These observations are supported by other surveys: Michalski and Tallberg (1999) asked Britons how they would vote ‘if a referendum on the EU were held tomorrow’, 52% responded ‘to stay’ and 30% ‘to leave’; in a more recent survey when asked what Britain’s long-term policy on the EU should be, only 13.5% of Britons responded ‘to leave the European Union’, the majority (42.6%) favouring ‘to stay in the EU and try to reduce the EU’s powers’ (emphasis in the original, Jowell et al., 2000). This finding is compatible with Michalski and Tallberg’s (1999) position that the British are highly reluctant to transfer the jurisdiction of decision-making powers to the EU,
preferring instead to retain these at the national level. What appears to be at stake, and underlying this preference, is a perceived threat to national sovereignty.

Figure I: British Support for EU Membership

The existence of this perceived threat has been noted by a number of researchers (see for example: Jowell & Hoinville, 1976; Hewstone, 1986; Cinnirella, 1993; Sotirakopoulou, 1991), and is supported by evidence from the Eurobarometer surveys (e.g. Eurobarometer, 2002a, 2001): “on [questions] concerning sovereignty [Britons] showed an unwillingness to cede authority to the EU on a number of issues” (Eurobarometer 57 Executive Summary, 2002: p.5). Indirect evidence comes from Jowell and Hoinville (1976) and Hewstone (1986), who do not supply their own direct empirical evidence to support their suggestions of perceived threat to national sovereignty; the basis of their claims is on indicators such as preferred national level decision-making (e.g. from the Eurobarometer surveys, Hewstone, 1986: p.38). The most direct evidence comes from Cinnirella (1993) and Sotirakopoulou (1991) who adopt a social psychological approach to their work, and conducted both quantitative and
qualitative studies in support of underlying threat to sovereignty. Their research will be reviewed in a subsequent section (2.3).

In general, results from the Eurobarometer 57 indicate that in the UK there is a low level of trust in, and knowledge of, the EU and its institutions, little attention is paid to news regarding the EU and only one third of UK citizens have a positive image of the EU (Eurobarometer 57 Executive Summary, 2002: p.5). Furthermore, the UK has been positioned as the "don’t know' capital of the EU” reflecting the high level of these responses to Eurobarometer questions (Eurobarometer 57 Executive Summary, 2002: p.2). The British are however, less sceptical to European integration in terms of political integration alone (45% for and 19% against: Michalski & Tallberg, 1999) and in this regard are on a par with the EU average (Michalski & Tallberg, 1999: p.29). However, there does appear to be an underlying perception that even this form of EU membership may lead to a loss of national sovereignty. The image presented so far, from the public opinion surveys and attitudinal research, is a complex and somewhat confusing one: while levels of support for Britain’s EU membership are relatively low this is coupled with a desire to remain part of the EU.

2.2.2 European Identification

In order to gauge whether nominal European citizens construe themselves as European, the Eurobarometer surveys asked respondents whether in the near future they see themselves either as European, in terms of their nationality, or both. Results from this question indicate that the majority of Britons (between 62% - 71%) consistently define themselves solely at the national level (see also figure II and Eurobarometer, 1998, 1999b, 2000, 2001, 2002b), well above the EU15 average of 38%. In 2002, 56% of the EU15 considered themselves as both European and in terms of their nationality; the British on the other hand display a comparatively low willingness to adopt even a dual definition (30%).
In addition to the apparent resistance to a European self-definition, Britons appear to feel threatened by European integration. When asked about their fears from the building of the European Union, ‘the united Kingdom is the only country where the fear [of losing] their national identity and culture [between 61% - 68%] and the fear that the country will cease to exist [60%] make the top three” (Eurobarometer, 1999a, 2000; 2002a: p.58). These observations are supported by MORI/Socioconsult polls, who aim to track and identify underlying trends in Britain (Mortimore, 2000). These polls have identified an increasing current of ‘national superiority’, where respondents express a belief that “Britain is different through its unique culture and heritage and in many ways better than other nationalities” (Mortimore, 2000: p.2). Their results indicate that 49% of Britons polled believed it was important that the British remain very different from other nationalities; moreover only 18% of these individuals supported Britain’s involvement in the European Union. The author argues: “most of the [British] public seem to feel that pro-EU sentiment is diametrically opposed to a distinctive national identity” (p.2).
In summary, this review of public opinion surveys and attitude research has indicated that the British express comparatively low levels of both European identification and support for Britain's EU membership. It has also suggested that the British fear European Integration may result in the loss of national identity, culture, and sovereignty. Given this evidence it would be beneficial to examine more closely the relationship between national and European identities, and in particular perceptions of national threat from European integration. In the next section I review social psychological research on European and national identification which focuses on these particular concerns.

2.3 Social Psychological Research

2.3.1 National Identity

Hopkins and Reicher (1996) portray the social category of the nation as an important and powerful element of identity and self-definition endowed with the capacity to unite us with 'unseen' others and transcend our mortality. The powerfulness of national ideologies is not a new conceptualisation, Scott (1965) for example proposed that national images may embody citizens' worldviews, providing ideologies with which to understand or interpret our everyday experiences. Breakwell (1986) argues that large scale social categories (such as the nation) may be more influential in the development of individual identity as "they have historical continuity and social significance not equalled by many smaller-scale groups" (p.36).

Over thirty years ago Tajfel (1970) suggested that any research involving nationalism should include the collective representations of the group. In other words, Tajfel was directing us to consider how the nation is conceptualised collectively by its members. Some scholars have explored this: for example Anderson (1983) conceives of the nation as an imagined community (see also Billig, 1996) and as such it gives rise to different
interpretations. Kelman (1969) argues that the manner with which the nation is conceptualised prescribes one's relationship to the nation and justifies its very existence. For him this relationship can either be affective and based in an ethnic conceptualisation of the group (sentimental attachment) or it can be based in the notion of civic allegiance, involving rights and obligations (instrumental attachment). However, since this early theorising, little has been done to explore the particular ways that identification with the nation occurs. This is an issue that will be taken up in more detail in chapter three.

Research on national identity has mainly used measures of identity strength to make comparisons between national identifications and other 'place' related identifications. In the case of a supranational categorisation such as 'European', some researchers have proposed that the identification process may be mediated by other social identities, such as national identity (Huici, Ros, Cano, Hopkins, Emler, & Carmona, 1997; Cinnirella, 1996b). It is therefore important to consider the possible mediating role that national identity may play in identifying as a European. This "essentially involves the social representations of one social category or group having consequences for other social groupings" (Cinnirella, 1996b, p.257). In this way the focus is on how shared conceptualisations of different social groups, and their concomitant social identifications, interact with one another, and what consequences may result from these interactions. Given that European citizenship is granted on the basis of citizenship in an EU member-state, this approach is particularly pertinent when researching European identity. As pointed out by Chryssochoou (1996: p.307) "European identity is always conceived of with reference to national identity", a conclusion based on qualitative interview data from a study exploring the construction of national and European identities in the citizens of two EU nation-states (Greece and France).
2.3.2 European Identity and the British

The review of public opinion and attitudinal research earlier established the consistent pattern of comparatively low European identification in the British and this has been supported by two social psychological studies that have explored this area. Cinnirella (1996b) compared levels of European identity in British and Italian citizens, while Huici et al (1997) compared British (Scottish) and Spanish (Andalucian) samples: results indicated that European identity levels were significantly lower in the British samples when compared to both these groups. In both the Italians and the Spanish significant positive correlations were observed between national and European identities but this was not the case in either British samples: Cinnirella's (1996b; 1997) British respondents manifested a low (r=-0.26) but significant negative correlation, while no significant relationship was observed in Huici et al's (1997) respondents (r=0.01).

Huici et al's (1997) interpretation of their results was that in the Spanish there is a pattern of harmoniously nested multiple identities that is not observed in the British. A similar conclusion was drawn by Cinnirella (1997) who offered further support for his conclusions with qualitative interview data: he argues that Italians perceive national and European identities as compatible because they have constructed European identity as an intercontinental identity allowing it to be construed at a different level of self-abstraction. The British, on the other hand, construct the two identities as incompatible and at the same level of abstraction, leading to a perceived need to choose between the two identities.

While increasingly more work is conducted on how EU citizens from different EU nation-states identify with Europe, much of this work is conducted on groups that are more highly identified with Europe when compared to the British (e.g. Chryssochoou, 1996; Licata, Klein, Casini, Coscenza, & Azzi, 2003; Medrano & Gutierrez, 2001; Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996). Others who have explored British-European identification have
either taken a “cross-national” approach (Cinnirella, 1996b, p.256) or focused on Scottish samples (e.g. Huici et al., 1997; Rutland & Cinnirella, 2000). However, while there is evidence that European identification may be higher in the Scots when compared to the British, others have argued that this may be because “Scottish nationalism often represents the English as different from the Scots and Scotland as closer to Europe and other Continental European nations” (Rutland & Cinnirella, 2000; p.499, but see also Hopkins & Reicher, 1996). Given that the focus of this thesis is to investigate possible barriers to European identification, the investigations conducted focused solely on British national and European identification in the English.

2.3.3 Multiple Identities

This section explores some of the research that may help explain the apparent incompatibility between national and European identities in the British. It explores how theorising on the relationships between multiple identifications may help identify possible barriers to European identification. I begin with a discussion on the concept of nested identities.

2.3.3.1 Nested Identities

In this first section, research on nested identities is used to explore how the introduction of the new superordinate category ‘European’ provides an additional context within which lower order identities such as ‘national’ need to be (re)defined. It examines how comparison processes involved in self-categorisation and psychological group formation may contribute to a perception of incompatibility between the two identities, which ultimately may act as a barrier to European identification.

The concept of nested identities has its origins in self-categorisation theory (Turner, 1985; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). The self-
categorisation theory approach views variations in self-categorisation as a function of fit (comparative and normative), and accessibility (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994; McGarty, 1999). Accessibility refers to perceiver readiness, i.e. the manner with which perception is biased to reflect the aims, goals and needs of the perceiver (Oakes et al., 1994; McGarty, 1999). Comparative fit is defined on the basis of the metacontrast ratio and involves assessing the relative similarity between individuals in a group, and comparing them to the remaining non-ingroup members, on a given dimension of comparison. The likelihood that a set of people will be perceived as a separate entity is determined by the extent to which the perceived differences between groups exceed the perceived differences within groups. Normative fit, on the other hand, allows the use of prior knowledge and information on the social meaning of relevant dimensions of comparison to be taken into consideration. For example, in the social context provided by the European Union, there are a number of dimensions which can be used for comparison purposes (such as personal traits, symbolic values, laws, etc.). As accessibility to the numerous dimensions is guided by the aims, goals and needs of the perceivers, the dimensions used will reflect these.

If the aims, goals and needs of the perceivers involve the desire to form a strong political entity then a relevant dimension for comparison may be 'nations that are willing to cooperate on this level'. Prior knowledge that fifteen nation-states have signed agreements to this end will facilitate the grouping of these elements as a single entity: the perceived similarities on this dimension outweigh the perceived differences. If on the other hand, the aims, goals and needs of the perceivers involve the desire to retain national currency, the relevant dimension for comparison may instead be which nation-states have joined the single European currency (the Euro). Countries like Britain, Denmark and Sweden (who have not joined the Euro) on one side, and the remaining twelve countries (who have joined) on
the other, would result in a perception of the three ‘opt-out’ countries as separate entities.

These examples are highly simplified illustrative examples and comparison dimensions used are likely to be more complex: both in terms of quantity and in terms of the value placed upon them. However, one can see how a proportionally greater number of higher-level relevant similarities effectively facilitate the perception of a single entity, while a proportionally greater number of lower-level relevant differences facilitate the perception of separate entities. Furthermore, these examples illustrate how categorisations are actively and socially constructed in a manner that allows the wealth of information on the social and historical context of the grouping to be taken into consideration as well as the strategic aims of the categoriser. The subjective definition of which features and attributes are categorical (i.e. crucial to the distinctive definition of the group) and which are supplementary should depend on the aims, goals and needs of the perceiver and on the comparative context (Abrams & Hogg, 2001). A criticism that is often levied at self-categorisation theory is that it assumes unitary definitions of categorisations and their concomitant identities (e.g.: Deaux, 1992; Potter & Wetherell, 1998). However, I would argue that this is more a function of the manner with which the theory has been applied and interpreted rather than an inherent fallacy (an argument which I shall return to later).

Self-categorisation theory regards self-categorisations as part of a hierarchical system of classification i.e. identities are nested within each other. Each level of abstraction reflects the inclusiveness of the category. Turner et al (1987) make a distinction between three major levels of self-abstraction: personal, social and human, and proposes that there are ‘finer graduations of self-categorisation within [these] broad levels of inclusiveness’ (p.46). Self-categorisations at each level of abstraction are formed with respect to the next higher-order level, thereby providing the
context within which the lower-order categorisations can be defined. Self-categorisation theory therefore states that perceived higher-order similarities (i.e. at a superordinate level of categorisation) define the context within which intergroup comparisons are made at the lower-level.

Given the rationale from self-categorisation theory, the superordinate categorisation which frames any intergroup comparisons between national groups must therefore be in some way international. The creation of a 'new' superordinate group, such as the European Union, ultimately leads to a new and additional context within which sub-groups (i.e. the nation-states of the EU) are (re)defined. This occurs in such a way that individuals and groups from across the EU may be required to redefine their social norms and belief systems with reference to the new superordinate categorisation (Breakwell, 1996) – a process that challenges the existing group boundaries and the manner with which identities are structured (Chrysssochoou, 2000).

Deaux (1996) argues that while categorisations per se may remain very stable how a category is defined in terms of its associated attributes and meaning is subject to considerable variation both within and across individuals. In other words, this meaning and evaluation varies depending on the comparison others and the social context (Abrams & Hogg, 2001; Deaux, 1996). For example, the fact that a person classifies themselves as British may not change, but the meanings attached to this category may vary depending on who the comparison group is and the social context within which the comparison is made.

Thus, knowing how an individual construes a subordinate-superordinate social identity relation, in this case national-European, as well as which subordinate attributes are important sources of intersubgroup difference, may help us discern whether two identities will be perceived as compatible. This issue of identity compatibility will be further discussed in subsequent sections and examined empirically in chapter six.
The discussion presented above highlights the importance of considering how multiple identities interact, both in terms of their content and the manner with which they are represented structurally. In the next section research that has considered the structural representation of social groups is discussed in more detail.

2.3.3.2 Structural Representations of Social Groups

One aspect of the investigations conducted in this thesis is the exploration of how compatible or incompatible national-European structural representations may facilitate or hinder European identification. Although the empirical work of this thesis was constrained to such compatibility perceptions, recent work on individual structural representations offers new and promising theorising in this area that may help explain some of the empirical findings of this thesis. In this section this new theorising is reviewed.

While the process of categorisation within simple dichotomous groups produced in the laboratory is well researched, there is very little research on multiple level group memberships in interaction, i.e. hierarchical or nested groups. Some research does deal with cross-cutting categories (e.g. van Oudenhoven, Judd, & Hewstone, 2000; Mullen, Migdal, & Hewstone, 2001; Vanbeselaere, 1987; Deschamps, 1977) where two simultaneously salient identities are considered. In essence, the social context of cross-cutting categories contains a double ingroup (individuals are members of both social groups), two single outgroups (individuals are members of only one group) and a double outgroup (individuals are not members of either group). However, the categories considered here are lateral categories, residing at the same level of abstraction, rather than cross-level categorisations. Recently, Roccas and Brewer (2002) introduced their concept of identity complexity which makes some allowance for hierarchies between social identities.
The identity complexity approach details four different forms of identity structure that are determined through considerations of overlap between social groups in terms of their constitution, characteristics, and meaning. These are discussed here using examples based on the Italians in Cinnirella’s (1997) study, who were found to have harmoniously nested European and national identities, in this way we can see how the identities may be represented by all the structural forms detailed by identity complexity.

Firstly, *intersection* describes an identity structure that uses the perceived overlap between groups to form a new exclusive group and the ingroup is defined in terms of individuals who must share both identities. The Italians in Cinnirella’s study then would form an exclusive group of Italian-Europeans; anyone who is not a member of both these groups is therefore an outgroup member. In the context of European integration such a representation would indicate that while ingroup members define themselves as being both Italian and European they would still perceive non-Italian Europeans as outgroup members. Such a structure may not facilitate harmonious relations between the EU nation-states and may not, at a practical level, facilitate intergroup co-operation.

Secondly, *dominance* is a structure characterised by the supremacy of one identity over all others. In this case the ingroup is defined in terms of that single identity and all other identities are seen as either characteristics of intragroup difference or they are not seen as social identities at all. Using this structural representation, the Italians would define themselves as primarily European, including all Europeans as ingroup members – irrespective of nationality; being Italian is viewed as a characteristic of intragroup difference rather than as a social identity in its own right. This is similar to self-perception at the European level as determined by self-categorisation theory.
The third form, compartmentalisation, on the other hand, is when identities are kept separate and activated as and when the context is appropriate. This form of identity structure is essentially similar in its conceptualisation to the social identity approach, and indicates context dependent changes in self-perception. One defines themselves, for example, either as European only or Italian only, depending on the context.

The final form, merger, is detailed as an all inclusive structure in which ingroup status is extended to anyone sharing any of the individual's important membership groups. Such a representation implies that an individual will mainly focus on the social identities that make them similar to others. Thus irrespective of whether the European Italian finds him/herself in the presence of other Italians or other non-Italian Europeans both will be considered equally as ingroup members.

Roccas and Brewer's (2002) approach deals with how an individual represents their membership groups. The hierarchy of membership groups is determined by the individual and as such is indicative of the centrality of various identifications in an individual's identity repertoire. The interrelationships between multiple identities can vary by context and different 'sets' of multiple identities can have different structures. However, this does not necessarily imply that the structure is not influenced by collective understandings of what is an appropriate structure. This approach has the advantage of including the constitution, characteristics and meaning of social groups in its formulation. Although the identity complexity approach focuses on how the individual represents their multiple identities, it deals with the collective self in that it is a cognitive representation of one's social groups.

A possible extension to their typology of structures may be to consider the addition of a structure akin to the extended subgroups structure suggested by Hornsey and Hogg (2000c). These researchers theorise that subordinate-
superordinate social identity relations may be represented as nested – akin to Roccas and Brewer's dominance pattern, or as extended subgroups – where subgroup identities “extend beyond the realm of the superordinate category” (p.253). This may be thought of as a structure that combines aspects of both the dominance and compartmentalisation structures. Rather than conceiving the ‘dominant’ identity as resulting in other social identities being represented as either attributes of intragroup variation or not as social identities at all (dominance structure), an individual may conceive the extended subgroup structure as self-definition in terms of the ‘dominant’ identity resulting in other social identities being represented as attributes of intragroup variation and as social identities that are appropriate for different social contexts (as in the compartmentalisation structure). In this way the example European Italian would include all Europeans as ingroup members irrespective of nationality, but will simultaneously be aware that he/she differs from them in terms of the attribute ‘nationality’ which, under different conditions, is a valued social identity in its own right.

Roccas and Brewer's approach offers a very promising new approach in multiple level identity research. However, in focusing on how individuals' represent their social identities, this approach considers only those group memberships which an individual includes as part of their self-definition. Roccas and Brewer acknowledge that there may be discrepancies between how an individual defines him/herself and how they may be categorised by others (footnote 2, p.90).

From this approach it is unclear how membership groups which one does not acknowledge are represented or dealt with. In other words, this approach includes only an individual's positive reference identity groups but excludes both their membership groups – i.e. groups within which one is objectively categorised but which are not used for self-definition, and their negative reference identity groups – membership groups that the individual
uses to define who they are not (Turner, 1991). Whether we should include such membership groups in our theorising is an area of some contention between identity theorists (see for example: Deaux, 1992; Doise, 1997). In the context of British-European identification it is difficult to imagine how this can be avoided. The European Union is a group with which Britons appear to express relatively low levels of identification (see section 2.3 of this chapter). The European group appears to be a membership group that will not necessarily constitute a positive reference identity group for Britons. However, this does not necessarily mean that Britons do not consider how their identities will be restructured by the creation of the new category with which they are expected to identify.

One possible way forward may be to consider what forms of structural representation Britons expect will result from the social changes instigated by European integration. The way this relationship is construed may have implications in terms of whether Britons are willing to consider self-categorisation and identification with the European category. The different identity structures detailed by the social identity complexity approach and the extended subgroups representation are equally applicable to the Britons as they are to the Italians used in the examples above. However, when these are considered as structures that individuals believe they are expected to adopt the implications may be very different. If for example, the representation is a fully nested dominance one, this may encourage a perception that national categories will be subsumed by the superordinate category and therefore instigate fears regarding the potential loss of national identity. On the other hand, an extended subgroup structure may allow individuals to conceive of themselves as European without instigating such fears.

Although the examination of such individual structural representations is beyond the scope of this thesis, other processes that are examined in this thesis (e.g. perceptions of intergroup similarity and national identity threat)
may be a function of such underlying structures. The relatively new ideas discussed in this section are therefore used to extend the results from the empirical studies.

2.3.3.3 Category Meanings, Attribute Threat and Multiple Identifications

For the British, low, or even no, expressions of European identity may be a result of perceived repercussions to other important identities—such as national identity. In this section the manner with which subordinate and superordinate identities are defined is considered in terms of the potential impact this may have on both the perceived compatibility between the two identities and the extent to which one is willing to accept membership in the new European category.

Conventionally, identification with a social group is measured using quantitative measures of identity (e.g. Hinkle, Taylor, Foxcardamone, & Crook, 1989). Such methods often incorporate components that are thought to characterise identification in any social group, such as the knowledge, value and emotional significance of group membership (Tajfel, 1981b). Some researchers (e.g. Chryssochoou, 1996; Deaux, 1992) however, argue that such an approach disregards the subjective meaning associated with social identities and assumes that “a social identity is claimed by all who fall in a defined category” (Deaux, 1992, p.19).

The social identity approach however, argues that the “meaning, level and content of self-categorisation are not determined by the category label, but by the comparison categories with which they are linked in memory and in the particular context” (Abrams & Hogg, 2001, p.436). Using crude racial categories to form an example, one can see that the meaning and content associated with the category ‘black’ is very different when the comparison is in terms of black/white, and the context is finding oneself involved in a discussion on ‘Britishness’ at a BNP (British National Party) rally, or when
the context is choosing sunscreens. One can also see how the level can change depending on whether one is comparing Britain to France (European or international) or Britain to the USA (intercontinental or international).

Through social comparison and the concepts of fit (comparative and normative) the self-categorisation theory approach to category formation allows the historical and social meanings of categories to be taken into account while also considering their embeddedness in the social structure. In addition, through the concept of accessibility, the strategic and subjective aims, goals and needs of the perceiver also feature highly in the process “two major determinates of accessibility are past learning [...] and the person's current motives” (Turner et al., 1987, p.55). The theory does not assume “the general myth that there is always a single valid definition for any given identity” (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001, p.ix), a myth that Reicher and Hopkins expertly discuss in terms of its pervasiveness and strategic use within psychology and society.

It is the case however, that ambiguity in the formulation of self-categorisation theory allows the categorisation process to be interpreted as an individual intrapsychic process. Although limited in its application, measuring expressed levels of identification with a ‘named’ category is an indication of how much an individual ‘claims’ an identity with that label, and is an acceptable method to adopt; it allows ‘expressed strength’ comparisons to be made. Where caution should be exercised is in the assumption that a category label, without content elaboration, means the same thing to all individuals who fit certain objective criteria. Many scholars have cautioned us in this regard. Breakwell (1996) for example draws our attention to the fact that conceptualisations of both national and European identities vary, both between and within nations, Reicher and colleagues have shown how conceptualisations of stimuli labelled in the same manner can have very different subjective meanings (Reicher & Hopkins, 1996a; Reicher, 2001), and Antaki, Condor, & Levine (1996) have
shown how the same identity can assume different forms even within a single conversation.

These debates involve arguments regarding the primacy of identity content versus identity processes and the specific versus the general. There is both room and a need for all perspectives and levels of analyses: “by understanding both the specific contents and the general processes of social construction, our ability to address significant social phenomena will be greatly enhanced” (Jost & Kruglanski, 2002, P.181). Some scholars (e.g. Antaki et al., 1996; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001) have already successfully begun to bridge the divide between these two approaches.

Ultimately these perspectives are inherently related. Billig (1987), for example, eloquently argues that focusing on the categorisation process alone predisposes us to “one-sided assumptions” which ultimately result in “a one-sided image of the person” (p.160). Highlighting the human capacity to differentiate and specify – what Billig refers to as particularisation, as well as to classify and generalise (i.e. categorisation), he argues for research to consider both these interrelated processes. He further argues: “if we have a choice of ways of categorising the stimulus arrays with which we are faced, then selection is involved in arriving at one appropriate categorisation; this sort of selection is akin to what we have been calling particularisation” (p.163). For Billig category formation is a social negotiation where categories are disputed: “one might dispute whether the particular resembles the sort of thing which is normally categorised in this way, or one might dispute the general meaning or legitimacy of the category itself. In short, the essence of the particular and the essence of the category can become matters of controversy” (p.171-172).

His point is well taken. However, Billig’s theorising is not antinomic with self-categorisation theory per se, but with its focus on the categorisation process – at the expense of particularisation – and relatedly on the
assumption that category meanings are unitary. There is room in self-categorisation theory to include Billig's arguments. Normative fit inherently ties salience and category formation to social meaning: meaning that has been socially negotiated. "Analyses of category salience which tie categorisation to reality can be vulnerable to overly mechanical readings unless they explicitly treat the definition of that reality as other than a non-problematic 'given'" (Hopkins & Reicher, 1996: p.74, emphasis added).

If we avoid a priori assumptions of homogeneity of meaning, and consider the potential differing conceptualisations that can be applied to categories, we begin to allow a more 'two-sided' image of the person to emerge.

In the context of the current study, one implication of the above discussion is that variations in the meaning and conceptualisation of the superordinate category 'European' may be implicated in its variable acceptance as a self-defining category by different EU citizens. Mlicki and Ellemers (1996), for example, argue that Polish citizens, who expressed high levels of European identity, may be motivated in their identification by a desire to belong to a European supranational group that is constructed in a different manner to their forced membership in a "communist Europe". Medrano and Gutierrez (2001), on the other hand, draw our attention to the relationship between the constructions of both the lower-order and higher-order categories. They argue that the conceptualisations of these categories must make them compatible in order for identification with both to occur: if either is threatened by the other then an incompatibility between the two will be perceived and identification with one category will suffer. Within the hierarchical category structure of self-categorisation theory, "a category at one level of abstraction is an attribute at a superordinate level" (Abrams & Hogg, 2001, p.437; see also: Turner et al., 1987), an attribute that is itself imbued with meaning and associations to other attributes and categories.
Using the example of belonging to the national group 'Turkish' in the context of the European Union, even if it was agreed at the political level that Turkey could join the EU, a construction of the EU category as a group strongly associated with Christian beliefs may result in an incompatibility (for some) between the criterial attribute 'Muslim' of the Turkish group (or attribute in the context of the superordinate categorisation) and the Christian dominated EU category. Such an incompatibility may indeed constitute a threat to a distinctive criterial attribute associated with the lower-order category Turkish; this in turn may result in an unwillingness to self-categorise at the European level. In self-categorisation theory different self-categorisations imply one another when they are framed by a superordinate categorisation (Turner et al., 1987; Abrams & Hogg, 2001).

There is empirical evidence that valued and distinctive elements of British identity are threatened by EU integration – this comes both from analyses of media discourses (Sotirakopoulou, 1991), and from qualitative interviews with British respondents (Cinnirella, 1997). Examples from British newspapers reveal a perception of homogenisation of the nation-state subgroups, attacks on valued national group attributes, and prescription from the rules and values of the superordinate group. Homogenisation and prescription from such things as the guidelines of the European social charter, and the charter of human rights (see for example: The Guardian, April 5, 2000); and perceived attacks on valued national group attributes from such things as the EU directive in the use of metric measurements: essentially making it a legal offence to use imperial measurements (see for example: Daily Mail, April 10, 2001). These examples are congruent with the findings of the public opinion and attitude research presented earlier regarding British fears of losing their national identity and culture. It appears that the British fear losing the very attributes that provide them with a distinctive self-definition.
In chapter six the relationship between perceived threats to valued attributes of British national identity and compatibility perceptions between national and European identities are explored along with the relationship between these two variables and levels of European identification.

2.3.3.4 Intergroup Distinctiveness

The preceding discussion focused on threats to distinctive national attributes and how this may have repercussions in terms of self-definition. However, from a social identity approach group distinctiveness is generally conceived of in terms of intergroup distinctiveness and the desire to positively differentiate the ingroup from outgroups. Recently, in their analysis of social identity threat, Branscombe et al (2000) differentiated between two complementary distinctiveness threats: one related to possessing a distinct social identity for self-definition (as discussed in the preceding section) and one relating to the quest for intergroup distinctiveness. The latter may prove to be important in the context of European integration where historically distinct nations are categorised together.

This section discusses the research that argues that there are different forms of group distinctiveness; in so doing it also explores the notion that the pursuit for group distinctiveness is an identity motivation in itself that is not necessarily related to the maintenance of self-esteem.

Social identity theory argues that the fundamental motivating force for identification is the desire to achieve positive distinctiveness from other relevant outgroups, which in turn benefits group evaluation and ultimately self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). However, others have argued that the role of distinctiveness should not be subordinated to self-esteem in this manner, rather it should be considered as an identity motivation in its own right (Breakwell, 1986, 1993; Brewer, 1991, 1993).
Indeed there is increasing evidence that the need for distinctiveness is a pervasive human need that is important for meaningful self-definition (Brewer, 1993; Vignoles, Chryssochoou, & Breakwell, 2000). In addition, recent work has shown that “distinctiveness may be constructed in multiple ways, using dimensions of position, difference, and separateness” (p.346, Vignoles et al., 2000; Vignoles, Chryssochoou, & Breakwell, 2002). Research by these scholars has shown that identification with a social category is not necessarily solely motivated by a need for self-esteem, and that distinctiveness functions as a motivation in its own right.

In the context of European integration, Cinnirella’s (1996b) studies have indicated that, although Britons strongly endorsed group distinctiveness as one of the top three motivations linked to British identity, the self-esteem motivation was endorsed significantly less frequently, moreover it was among the least important motivations included by British participants (for a more in-depth discussion over the ambiguous role of self-esteem in social identity theory see: Abrams & Hogg, 1988).

The empirical evidence discussed here has shown that the need for positive distinctiveness may not be universal. Further evidence is apparent from a series of studies investigating national and European identities in Polish and Dutch participants (Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996). These researchers observed that Polish national identity was largely based on negatively evaluated traits while Dutch identity was largely based on positive ones (evaluated in this manner by both the Polish and the Dutch participants). However, the Polish participants were more motivated to accentuate the distinctiveness of their group along their national traits than the Dutch participants. Moreover, even when given the opportunity to achieve positive distinctiveness through the positive evaluation and application of other traits to their ingroup, the Polish participants did not engage in this strategy. The researchers argue that their data show that negative distinctiveness is preferable to no distinctiveness (Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996).
In other words, it appears that distinctiveness can function as a motivational force in itself without the need to 'be better': simply achieving distinctiveness for one's group appears to be a motivation in itself. This is an important finding: it suggests that in some contexts the motivation for a distinct social identity supersedes the motivation for a positive social identity and supports the proposition regarding multiple identity motivations.

Breakwell (1986) for example, argues – through Identity Process Theory, that identity integrity, i.e. a satisfactory and unimpaired self-image, is dependent on the satisfactory state of four motivating 'identity principles': self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and self-efficacy1 (Breakwell, 1986, 1992). If disruption occurs in the equilibrium of any of these, the individual is motivated to rectify the situation. Lyons (1996) extrapolates to argue that the same processes that operate at the individual identity level are likely to operate at the group identity level. In the case of a disruption (or threat) to group distinctiveness then, the group would be motivated to restore or protect the equilibrium.

It may be the case that for the Polish participants in Mlicki and Ellemers study (1996), the maintenance of the national group's distinctiveness needs to be satisfied (at least to some extent) in the particular context of European integration – perhaps as the authors argue, due to their historical "forced membership" in a "communist Europe" (p.111). Group members may be strongly motivated to differentiate their group from other groups under the same superordinate categorisation – even at the expense of a negatively evaluated social identity. Their positive group image or self-esteem needs

---

1 Originally three principles were identified – self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, the efficacy principle was a latter addition to identity process theory (Breakwell, 1992)
may be satisfied through other social contexts and/or comparisons with other groups. In addition, although the most typical Polish characteristics were evaluated as generally negative characteristics by both Polish and Dutch participants, this does not discount the possibility that these characteristics can be constructed more positively when required. For example, the top two (negative) Polish characteristics 'dipsomaniacal' and 'quarrelsome' may indicate an ability to 'relax and have fun' and 'a willingness to challenge and debate' respectively. As social identity theory proposes, groups can redefine the value associated with negative criterial group attributes in order to achieve positive group distinctiveness (Mummendey & Schreiber, 1984a; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, this strategy together with other collective strategies will be discussed further in chapter three).

It appears then, that in some contexts the motivation for intergroup distinctiveness supersedes the need for a positive social identity. Given that the British fear that European integration will cause their country to cease to exist (see section 2.3.2) they too may be similarly motivated.

2.3.3.5 Functional Antagonism

As with the Italians in Cinnirella's (1997) study, a further observation made by Mlicki and Ellemers' (1996) was that Polish participants expressed high levels of both national and European identity which, perhaps, indicates that their national and European identities were harmoniously nested. However, the researchers do not interpret their results in this manner. Rather, they argue that the "joint occurrence of strong national and European identities" is evidence that the 'functional antagonism' between the levels of self-categorisation, as proposed by Turner and colleagues (1987: p.42-67), "is not a necessary phenomenon" (p. 111).

Mlicki and Ellemers' conclusion however, seems somewhat at odds with Turner et al's (1987) original definition of functional antagonism.
Functional antagonism refers to the inverse relationship between levels of self-categorisation in terms of salience not magnitude of identification. The higher-order categorisation provides the context within which lower-order categorisations become salient so that when expressing a Polish identity, national identity is salient within the context provided by the higher-order category 'European' (or another superordinate categorisation). It follows that when European identity is salient the context must be at a higher level still, perhaps international or intercontinental. This allows simultaneous high levels of identification across a variety of nested categories. These shifts in salience do not imply that multiple categorisations cannot be considered together rather they indicate a rapid alternation between levels of self-conception. As others have argued "self-categorisation is such a rapid and flexible process [...] as the social context shifts, so will the categories that provide the best levels of fit, as determined by the meta-contrast ratio. Different categories may become salient, causing a variety of social identities to emerge and then recede" (Moreland, Levine, & Cini, 1993: p.121).

As indicated by the Polish, Spanish and Italian participants in Mlicki and Ellemers' (1996), Huici et al's (1997), and Cinnirella's (1997) studies respectively, harmoniously nested self-categorisations do facilitate identification at various levels of self-abstraction. Provided these levels are nested within a valid and subjectively logical structure, identification at various levels of self-abstraction should be reasonably unproblematic. Also indicated by the latter two studies and their British participants, is the disruption that occurs when these categories are perceived as either incompatible or when the higher-order categorisation threatens the distinctiveness of lower-order one. The next section examines research that has examined how superordinate categorisation may affect lower-order categorisations.
2.3.3.6 Superordinate Categorisation, Subgroup Relations & Subgroup Threat

There is a fundamental paradox in the social identity approach: while superordinate categorisation can bring members of subgroups together, it can also be a source of threat to the distinctiveness of the subgroup. This paradox is not explicitly dealt with within the theory itself. The discussion below explores both the work in this area and how it may be relevant to the current thesis.

Although the paradox is not explicitly dealt with within social identity theory, other scholars have used the theory as a framework from which to explore potential solutions to problems such as intergroup cooperation and intergroup bias. These may also inform the issue of identification with multiple cross-level categories.

Two theoretical extensions of the social identity approach that have tackled the issues above are the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993; Gaertner, Dovidio, Nier, Ward, & Banker, 1999) and mutual intergroup differentiation model (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hewstone, 2000). The common ingroup identity model argues that a superordinate categorisation serves to change perceptions of the structural context from a two group representation - ingroup and outgroup, to a one-group representation - ingroup only: thereby improving group relations. In essence, the common ingroup identity model is arguing for a change in the social context from intergroup to intragroup - from lower-order subgroup to higher-order superordinate group.

Empirical studies have shown, and advocates of this model accept, that the model works reasonably well in the experimental context but the effects may be transient and not necessarily generalisable outside the cooperative environment (Gaertner et al., 2000; Gaertner et al., 1993). Brewer & Gaertner (2001) propose that the restructuring of the social environment in
the manner advocated by the model results in a dissolution of category distinctions which are either resisted or re-established over time. Brewer's (1991) optimal distinctiveness theory provides one possible explanation for these observations. This theory proposes that social identity is motivated by two competing needs – for similarity and distinctiveness (or inclusion and differentiation); "in order to satisfy both these motives simultaneously individuals seek inclusion in distinctive social groups where the boundaries between those who are members of the ingroup category and those who are excluded can be clearly drawn" (Brewer & Gaertner, 2001, p.460). Such groups provide a comfortable equilibrium between the two needs; over-inclusive superordinate groups do not fulfil the distinctiveness needs and over-exclusive groups do not fulfil the inclusiveness needs. Brewer (2001) has also argued that social identification is facilitated with groups that allow the conflict between the two competing needs to be resolved (see also: Brewer & Roccas, 2001; Brewer & Schneider, 1990).

The mutual intergroup differentiation model shares the basic propositions of the common ingroup identity model, but also emphasises the preservation of subgroup boundaries and the minimisation of subgroup threat as a strategy to reduce intergroup bias. By encouraging intergroup cooperation in the pursuit of superordinate goals through distinct but complementary subgroup pursuits, this model allows group members to maintain both their subgroup identities and positive subgroup distinctiveness (Brown & Wade, 1987; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validzic, 1998). Furthermore, a link between positive subgroup relations and superordinate identification has also been observed (Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996; H. J. Smith & Tyler, 1996). Together these findings suggest that the strategy proposed by the mutual intergroup differentiation model may induce a perceived compatibility between levels of self-categorisation: one can be both similar and different at the same time (Brewer, 2001).
It may be then, that perceived threat to subgroup distinctiveness has a crucial role in determining identification with superordinate categories; an observation forwarded and supported by both Medrano and Gutierrez (2001) and Cinnirella (1997) in the context of European identification. This is compatible with social identity theory which argues that the need for intergroup differentiation is amplified when intergroup boundaries are "blurred" (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002: p.402), become unclear, or the groups distinctiveness is threatened (Brown & Abrams, 1986). This provides a possible explanation to the (arguably) somewhat excessive reactions from the British, and in particular from the British media, to perceived EU encroachments on national sovereignty and symbols (see for example: The Express, June 26, 2002; The Independent, February 2, 1996). However, there appears to be very little research that examines the subgroup boundary preservation strategy forwarded by the mutual intergroup differentiation model in terms of its potential explanatory utility in predicting superordinate identification.

One rather complex study, conducted by Hornsey and Hogg (2000c: experiment 1) however, has measured identification with both a higher-order group (university group) and a lower-order group (faculty) across various conditions: the salience of the superordinate category and the category structure were manipulated in a manner that allowed either or both categories to be salient. Although these researchers did not measure levels of perceived subgroup threat, they assumed that denying the subgroup identity in favour of a superordinate one, would lead to perceptions of threat (as they are denying the subgroup's distinctive existence) – which in turn would result in elevated subgroup identity levels as the group attempts to assert itself. The results were generally supportive: participants for whom the superordinate categorisation had been made salient expressed significantly higher levels of subgroup identity when compared to participants for whom it had not. Levels of superordinate identification however, did not differ significantly between the two groups.
In experiment two, Hornsey and Hogg (2000c) used the concept of category structure to examine levels of identification with superordinate and subordinate groups. As in experiment one the researchers manipulated the salience and structural representation of the higher- and lower-order categories in an attempt to induce participants to form an image of the inter-relationships between the categories. These inter-relationships represented either a nested structure or cross-cutting structure: i.e. the subgroups were either entirely enclosed within the superordinate category, or were overlapping with the superordinate category. Their results indicated no significant differences in identification levels with either the higher or lower level groups, the manipulation of the structural representation had no effect.

From these two experiments it would appear that magnitude effects on identification from perceived structural relations are either unidirectional in the sense that they affect only the subgroup identification by elevating it (experiment one), or unstable as the results were not replicated in experiment two. However, a different potential explanation may lie in the extent to which the subgroup’s distinctiveness was actually threatened by the experimental manipulation. Given that students from various faculties within a university system would also expect to be affiliated with a given institution, it is difficult to imagine why they would feel threatened by the superordinate categorisation. The participants' everyday experiences or familiarity with the category relationships may indeed negate any attempts to induce subgroup threat. Students will be aware of the university procedures that are usually in place that ensure their various faculties are well represented at the university level. In reality there may not be any reasons for faculty students to feel threatened by a superordinate categorisation in terms of their university in that the superordinate categorisation is both logical and legitimate. Without measuring perceptions of subgroup threat it is impossible to draw any conclusions in this regard.
A further potential problem may lie the unspecified nature of the potential threat. When dealing with threats to specific social identities it becomes even more imperative that we also consider identity content in our theorising. What gives a group its distinctiveness in a particular context? What attributes or characteristics are valued in this regard? Are these valued attributes threatened by the superordinate categorisation? These questions are highly important in this domain and answering such questions will allow us to identify which dimensions are used to make intergroup comparisons – dimensions that are used to gauge the similarities and differences between elements in a given frame of reference, and thus, potentially leading to the categorisation of elements as either a single entity or as separate entities.

This line of theorising has the potential to resolve the issue regarding why some subgroups express high levels of identification with both superordinate and subordinate categories (such as the Polish, Spanish and Italian participants in the studies detailed earlier), while others (such as the British) do not.

Rather than determining nested and cross-cutting categories in terms of salience one could use social identity content instead. Dealing with people’s conceptualisations or definitions of social groups effectively ties them to social reality. Overlaps between groups then become a matter of actual harmonious or conflicting group-related qualities.

People are aware that their social groups do not define them entirely. This is inherent in self-categorisation theory and in the evaluation of perceived similarities and differences. The categorisation of a number of (individuals who belong to) subgroups as a single entity therefore involves a “perceptual discounting” (Turner et al., 1987: p.49) of the differences between classes that exist at that level, for example between the nation-states of the EU, and a perceptual discounting of the similarities that exist at a higher level,
for example between the EU and the USA. When categories are harmoniously nested it is an indication that in a particular context and on particular dimensions intercategory similarities do not conflict with the distinctiveness needs of the subgroup.

For example, in the context of the European Union, the relevant comparison dimensions might be attitudes to human rights, legal provision, standardised use of metric measures, and a single European passport. The British (European) subgroup could perceive themselves to be more similar to rather than different from other EU subgroups on these dimensions. If so, then their British and European identities would be harmoniously nested – allowing them to identify with both categories. If on the other hand, the British perceived some of these dimensions as important areas of national identity and important sources of difference between themselves and other EU subgroups, they would not want to be perceived as similar to other groups in these areas.

It is not simply a matter of additive similarities and differences (i.e. more or fewer areas), rather each dimension is weighted in terms of its value (similar in its conception to the weighted averaging model of impression formation N. H. Anderson, 1974). As categories are most strongly associated with specific attributes that are criterial for any given categorisation (Abrams, 1999; Abrams & Hogg, 2001), we would expect the involvement of criterial attributes to be most influential. Therefore one can imagine that even if only a single criterial attribute is involved, the threat to subgroup distinctiveness may still be enough to pull the subgroup away from the superordinate category. The important factor, therefore, is likely to be that the areas of perceived similarity that are important to superordinate category formation, should not conflict with the criterial attributes that are important to the subgroup’s continued perception of distinctiveness. However, according to social identity theory, this attempt to obscure subgroup borders would amplify the need for group
distinctiveness and therefore lead to an accentuation of subgroup differences. The result would be proportionally higher perceived differences compared with similarities. Ultimately this would result in cross-cutting categories across levels of abstraction. Attempts to stress or impose subgroup similarity in these areas would then be interpreted as a threat to subgroup distinctiveness and self-categorisation at the superordinate level would be resisted. The effects on European identification from perceived intersubgroup similarity/distinctiveness and perceived threats to subgroup distinctiveness will be explored empirically in chapter seven.

In summary, the criterial attributes involved in a given construction of a social identity are important to a group's distinctive definition in a given context, and important for intergroup comparisons. The inconsistent effect observed from superordinate categorisation reflects the type of criterial attributes involved in forming the superordinate group. For some lower-order groups a superordinate categorisation leads to perceptions of lower-order social identity threat while for others it does not. The next section reviews research that has used a social identity approach to explore different constructions of similarly labelled social identities. It discusses on the role of group norms in the social identity approach and the distinction in the form and function of descriptive and prescriptive norms.

2.3.4 Defining & Maintaining Social Identities

The importance of group norms is inherent in both social identity theory and self-categorisation theory, although the focal concepts and processes of the theories differ. Social identity theory focuses primarily on intergroup relations and on phenomena such as ingroup bias and social conflict, the underlying basis of which is the need for positive social identity through the achievement of positive group distinctiveness (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, 1986). Achieving positive distinctiveness for the group entails the involvement of group norms as they represent the consensually defined characteristics of
the group (Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1996; Marques, Abrams, Páez, & Martinez-Taboada, 1998a).

Self-categorisation theory, on the other hand, subsumes the motivational propositions of social identity theory (see for example: Turner et al., 1987, p.57), but is concerned primarily with psychological group formation and variations in levels of abstraction or self-perception (Turner & Reynolds, 2001). The theory “has made the normative basis of group behaviour much more central” (Jetten et al., 1996, p.1222). In intergroup contexts people will form a cognitive representation, or prototype, of the ingroup and outgroup. A prototype is a set of defining features and appropriate behaviours that is used to cognitively represent a social category in a given context. It is the point of maximum family resemblance amongst the elements of a category (Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1998).

In self-categorisation theory when the self is included as a group member of a social category, self-definition is transformed in that the defining features of the social category form the basis of self-perception. That is the theory argues that the individual is psychologically and behaviourally depersonalised in terms of the group prototype, and that this is a context dependant process. Depersonalisation here does not mean loss of self, rather it refers to the change in self-perception from the personal to the social level of identity (Turner et al., 1987). Group prototypes are highly flexible and inextricably linked to the group member's perceptions of the social context. The prototypical group position is defined using the meta-contrast principle (see earlier discussion). For any given comparative dimension (attitude, belief, behaviour, etc.) the prototypical position of a group is defined as the position of an individual (real or imagined) who simultaneously best embodies the normative characteristics of the ingroup while maximally differing from the normative characteristics of the outgroup. This depersonalisation is thought to be the fundamental
mechanism responsible for many group phenomena, such as group solidarity, collective behaviour and social stereotyping.

Through a single social influence process, referent informational influence (Turner, 1982), group members come to know the group norms that are encapsulated in the group prototypes. In contrast to interpersonal conceptualisations of social influence (for example the dual-process model: Deutsch & Gerard, 1955) Turner argues that it is one's membership in a social group that is at the heart of social influence. Group norms are formed by the categorisation process in a manner that simultaneously accentuates the similarities within the group and the differences between the group and others who are not group members (such as outgroups). Categorisation then results in the stereotyping of both the ingroup and outgroups. Group norms or stereotypes are therefore internalised cognitive representations of group defining features and appropriate behavioural standards which are applied to oneself resulting in conformity to the group’s norms (self-stereotyping).

Referent informational influence differs from the dual process model in four main ways: in the nature of the source, vehicle, enhancing conditions, and standards conformed to in influence situations (Abrams, Wetherell, Cochrane, Hogg, & Turner, 1990; Turner, 1982). While normative and informational influence see the source of influence as individuals who can reward or punish, or who can supply information about physical/social reality per se, referent informational influence stems from people who can provide information on the criterial ingroup norms, usually ingroup members but can also be outgroup members (Turner, 1982). The vehicle or medium for influence is identification (conceiving oneself in terms of one’s social identity), rather than group pressure (normative influence) or social comparison (informational influence). Conformity is enhanced when social identity is salient – as opposed to when one is under surveillance (normative influence), or when there is ambiguity in physical/social reality (informational influence). Lastly, conformity is to a cognitive representation
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of the ingroup norm, rather than the observable behaviour of other ingroup members.

Turner's (1982) theorising moves the causal emphasis for conformity away from interpersonal dependence between group members, to categorisation and identification. This ties together the cognitive process of categorisation to the forming of group norms and stereotypes, and makes the social influence process underlying conformity a group process rather than an interpersonal process. In implicating the psychological group in this manner Turner highlights the self-defining nature of group norms, which simultaneously define the ingroup (what the self is) and differentiate it from outgroups (what the self is not). Moreover, considered alongside social identity theory's motivational drive for positive group distinctiveness and self-evaluation, this approach to norm formation, conformity and social influence has the ability to explain why ingroup evaluations tend to be more favourable than outgroup evaluations (Reynolds, Turner, & Haslam, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Empirical evidence for the explanatory utility of referent informational influence has been obtained in a series of studies that have employed both the autokinetic (Sherif, 1936; Sherif & Sherif, 1969) and Asch (1952; 1955) conformity paradigms (Abrams et al., 1990). These studies demonstrated: (1) that the impact of 'confederates' on norm formation was minimised as their membership in a different category was emphasised (experiment one: autokinetic paradigm); and (2) that surveillance by others does indeed exact conformity – but only when surveillance is by ingroup not outgroup members (experiment two: Asch paradigm).

Groups often incorporate a somewhat wide range of beliefs, behaviours, etc. from which a “normative tendency” is formed (Hogg & Abrams, 1988b: p.174). On the surface, this statement may seem somewhat antagonistic with the position that constructions of social identities with the same label
can vary across ingroup members. However, it is entirely compatible with
the approach assumed in this thesis, and which is eloquently discussed by
identity has to be malleable in order to support an ever changing array of
mobilisations. It has to be portrayed as fixed such that any given
mobilisation may succeed in shaping our world of nations” (p.52).

This thesis assumes the proposals from theorists (e.g. Hogg & Abrams,
1988b; Cinnirella, 1993) who have argued that in large scale social
categories it is likely that multiple prototypes may be formed by groups,
possibly involving a marked disagreement between subgroups. Hogg and
Abrams (1988b) argue such a situation may be more likely to occur in “times
of social change when groups are actively involved in the renegotiation of
their defining characteristics and norms” (p.174). Such a situation is
apparent with the development of the European Union. A crucial function
of norms and stereotypes is to differentiate between groups and, as was
argued earlier, the accentuation of intergroup differences and intragroup
similarities is more pronounced when there is a threat to the group’s
A change in intergroup relations instigates a search for redefinition in the
new context, thus as prototypes are context dependent, new prototypes will
be formed. However, prototypical positions are not simply derived through
simple averaging of ingroup positions, but rather positions that are more
extreme than the mean ingroup position in a direction away from the mean
outgroup position (Hogg & Abrams, 1988a; Abrams et al., 1990; Turner,

When a group’s identity is threatened ingroup members perceive their group
as more homogeneous than the outgroup on the relevant comparison
dimensions (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1993), they attempt to increase group
cohesiveness (for example by punishing ingroup deviants, the so called
'black sheep' effect, Marques & Paez, 1994) and they see themselves as
closer to the group prototype (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1993). It appears that in times of social identity threat there is an attempt to solidify the group’s definition: it becomes more tightly focused and the frame of reference of acceptable normative behaviour and defining characteristics is narrowed. Tightening the group’s definition and standards in the new context may result in a focus on (or polarisation to) different elements (positions) by different subgroups perhaps condensing into two more distinct conceptualisations of the same group. In the extreme this may even result in the separation of the group into two subgroups. Sani and colleagues for example (Sani & Reicher, 1998, 1999, 2000; Sani & Todman, 2002), have shown how schisms can occur within groups in response to a threat to the group’s ‘essence of identity’ (for example the split in the church of England over the ordination of women priests: Sani & Reicher, 1999). Sani & Reicher (2000) argue:

“they [group members] argue over the boundaries, the content and the prototypes of social identity because of the effects of these on who are included as common category members and therefore who acts together; on what is considered as appropriate and inappropriate action by category members and therefore how members act together” (p.98).

Following Billig (1987), these researchers argue that defining a social identity is a group negotiation process that serves the needs of the group in the social world (Sani & Reicher, 2000; Reicher & Hopkins, 1996a, 1996b). For example, in an analysis of anti-abortionist rhetoric, Reicher & Hopkins (1996a) show how a speaker constructs a common category with his audience in an attempt to influence their views on abortion, and ultimately, their behaviour. The speaker, who is addressing an audience of doctors – the ‘caring profession’, first positions himself as a caring and principled individual and therefore a member of a common category with his audience: the common ingroup of caring/principled people. He also provides his audience with an outgroup – of selfish/unprincipled people. Having established his common ingroup status with his audience, his attempts at social influence should be more effective (Turner, 1991). By then drawing parallels between the distinctions ‘abortion versus anti-abortion’ and
‘caring/principled versus selfish/unprincipled’ the speaker highlights an important defining dimension to his ingroup. To this point the speaker has provided his audience with his construction of the social group ‘caring/principled people’ which critically includes an anti-abortionist stance as a defining characteristic. Ultimately the speaker is in essence attempting to influence his audience into accepting an anti-abortionist stance as a descriptive norm of not only the ‘caring/principled’ group but also, as his audience is comprised of doctors, the ‘doctors’ group. In this way he is further providing a potential prescriptive norm in that their acceptance of this descriptive norm would prescribe their behaviour through influencing their willingness to perform abortions.

While this thesis is not concerned with schisms per se, research conducted by Sani, Reicher and Hopkins show that in order to serve the group’s needs in the social world the group actively and strategically negotiate their group’s descriptive and prescriptive norms. Similar processes are likely to be involved as EU nation-states (re)negotiate both their national group norms in the context of the European Union, and those of the European category itself.

More recently, Marques and colleagues (Marques, Abrams, Pàez, & Hogg, 2001; Marques et al., 1998a; Marques, Pàez, & Abrams, 1998b) propose that two processes, category differentiation and normative differentiation, are used simultaneously by group members to “sustain a psychological representation of a cohesive, well-defined and normatively legitimated group [which bolsters] their own sense of subjective reality and self-worth” (Marques et al., 1998a, p.976). They propose that the first process – category differentiation involves primarily descriptive norms which are used to establish intergroup distinctiveness and generate identification with the ingroup. The second process – normative differentiation, on the other hand involves prescriptive norms which are used to “ensure consensus on criteria for positive ingroup evaluation” (Marques et al., 2001: p.411) – helping to
regulate intragroup behaviour and reinforce both the relative validity of the group's norms, and group identification (Marques et al., 1998b; Marques et al., 2001). In essence, these researchers argue that in the same way that intergroup contexts increase the accessibility of norms that aid intergroup differentiation, intragroup deviance within a context may increase the accessibility of prescriptive norms that help to regulate intragroup behaviour. It is important to note that these researchers are not claiming that prescriptive norms are not involved in intergroup differentiation, but that in regulating members' behaviour they are serving primarily intragroup functions.

Marques and colleagues have shown that groups attempt to remove individual deviant ingroup members who contribute negatively to positive intergroup distinctiveness. Counter-normative ingroup members (ingroup deviants) are derogated more strongly than counter-normative outgroup deviants — but only on dimensions that are relevant to a group's distinctiveness in a particular context. In other words, this normative differentiation effect is observed on dimensions that contribute to intercategory differentiation (the 'black sheep' effect: Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988; Marques & Yzerbyt, 1988; Marques, 1990; Marques, Robalo, & Rocha, 1992). This only occurs when the deviation is anti-norm (towards the outgroup position), not when it is pro-norm (Abrams, Marques, Bown, & Dougill, 2002). However, it has also been observed that, compared to antinormative ingroup and outgroup individuals, more favourable evaluations are expressed towards ingroup and outgroup members who are normative in line with ingroup standards. This effect occurs even though this makes the outgroup members counter-normative in terms of their own group's standards and thus contributes negatively to intergroup differentiation. This may indicate that irrespective of ingroup or outgroup status individuals who contribute to the relative validity of the ingroup norms are preferred.
Evidence for the role of prescriptive norms in normative differentiation is provided in the third experiment by Marques et al (1998a). When *prescriptive* ingroup norms were made explicit (compared to implicit) deviant ingroup members were more strongly derogated; in other words, awareness of ingroup prescriptive norms was positively related to normative differentiation. Finally, these researchers (experiment 4: Marques et al., 1998a) found baseline ingroup identification levels were significantly and positively correlated with levels of normative differentiation, which in turn were significantly and positively correlated with post normative differentiation identification levels, indicating that identification is indeed reinforced by normative differentiation (see Marques et al., 2001; and Marques et al., 1998b for an in-depth discussion of the evidence).

Research by Marques and colleagues has shown how groups attempt to remove (or at least punish or derogate) individual deviant members who contribute negatively to positive intergroup distinctiveness and threaten the relative validity of ingroup norms. Sani and colleagues, on the other hand, have shown how more widespread ingroup disagreements and identity contestations can result in group schisms. Although concerned with different group processes, the research on deviance and the research on schisms both contribute to our understanding on the consequences of identity contestations and the processes of social change. Research such as this extends Moscovici's (1976) theorising on the crucial role difference or dissentience can have in social change – even when contestations arise from minorities. Marques, Abrams, Pàez, & Hogg (2001) argue that the same role applies to deviant group members “without [ingroup] deviance social change is not possible” (p. 401). This argument can also be applied to schisms in groups. Although identity theorists generally do not see groups as static and unchanging, the emphasis in identity research, as Billig (1987) points out, is mainly on generalisation rather than particularisation, or to put it another way on consensus rather than dissentience. It is the research on schism and deviance that shows their inter-relatedness.
As was highlighted in the discussion earlier, self-categorisation theory can be susceptible to overly mechanical interpretations unless allowances are made for the potential differing conceptualisations that can be applied to social categories. Working within the framework of self-categorisation theory, Sani and Reicher (2000) have shown how ingroup dissentience and difference can initiate the formation of two subgroups within a single group. While these researchers have focused on the extreme, when difference results in a complete schism in the original group, their work has brought to the fore considerations of differences in the strategic construction of the same social identity. Strategic construction has important implications for the current thesis. In the context of the European Union (re)negotiating the norms of both one's national group and, in conjunction with members of other EU nation-states, the norms of the European group, involves strategic identity objectives. One central objective for nation-states may be to negotiate terms that do not conflict with the distinctive needs of the national group, whether these needs are sentimental needs, such as retaining the queen's head on British currency, or instrumental needs such as controlling national interest rates.

In summary, group norms have a descriptive function: they define the features of the group and therefore the features one shares with their membership groups. They also define the group prototypes and in this way they aid in the differentiation of ingroups from outgroups (Turner, 1991). However, norms are also prescriptive and regulatory: they coordinate members' interactions by providing acceptable behavioural standards.

Norms function to provide internalised frames of reference which group members use to guide their interpretations of, and interactions with, the world. They serve both intragroup and intergroup functions: defining and differentiating the group in terms of acceptable characteristics, attitudes and behaviour, as well as regulating members' normative behaviours.
However, the two forms may also serve somewhat different group objectives. In their descriptive form they serve both intra- and intergroup functions, allowing the generation of group identification and intergroup distinctiveness through defining similarities within and differences between groups. In their prescriptive form they serve primarily intragroup functions by regulating members' behaviour and ensuring the survival of important ingroup standards while, at the same time, reinforcing group identification.

Research on ingroup deviance and dissentience has shown how definitions and constructions of the same ingroup can vary and how, in the extreme, this can result in schisms. This research makes an important contribution to our understanding of the formation of new social groups. However, it also signals a shift in the research concerns of social identity theorists where the meaning of social groups and categories are not treated as unitary and the importance of a distinct social identity is highlighted.

2.4 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The main aims of this chapter were to review and evaluate relevant public opinion, attitude and social psychological research in the context of this thesis. A number of important issues were highlighted and these are summarised below.

2.4.1 European Identification: British Trends and Opinions

The first issue concerns evidence for the apparent problem of comparatively low European identification among the British population. Support for this position was obtained from both social psychological research and public opinion surveys - which have additionally shown consistent long term trends in this regard. Public opinion surveys indicate that these low levels of European identification do not correlate with a desire to forfeit EU membership. Instead, the core concerns appear to be characterised by fears
located at the national level which include such things as the loss of distinctive national identity and culture, and a fear that Britain as an independent country will cease to exist. Importantly, trend tracking polls in Britain have identified a consistent and strengthening desire for Britain to remain a unique and distinctive nation. However, although the European integration process has been linked to British fears at the national level, there is a paucity of social psychological research exploring the possible mechanisms involved. Applying social psychological theory to research has generally supported the relationships observed from public opinion polls.

2.4.2 Social Psychological Issues

In terms of relevant social psychological research and theorising, a number of concepts have been implicated as important concerns.

The first issue concerns the meaning of imposed membership groups and their relevance to self-conception. It was argued that such categories are endowed with meaning through the social and historical context within which they exist. Low identification with such categories gives them oppositional importance: ‘who I am not’ may be qualitatively different, but may also be just as important, as ‘who I am’. Consideration of the potential repercussions to other important social identities from such ‘impositions’ is a notion worthy of further exploration. This is an important consideration in the context of the current thesis. The European Union is, in essence, an emergent imposed categorisation. Furthermore, it is a category with which Britons express low levels of identification, and that appears to be constructed in a manner that results in negative repercussions to national identity.

It was argued that the meaning and definition of categories cannot be assumed to be unitary, instead allowances need to be made for the potentially different understandings that may accompany category labels
and their concomitant identities. Identifying the different content of such identities may assist in the detection of context dependent intergroup comparison dimensions that are used to categorise entities as either separate or a single group(s). Identity content has implications firstly in terms of the perceived compatibility between multiple identifications – such as between national and European identities, and secondly in terms of the perceived threat to valued and distinctive elements of existing identities – such as to national identity from European categorisation. This approach has the capacity to inform theorising on the structural relationships between multi-level identifications. This issue will be discussed further in relation to national and European identities in chapter three.

The second issue concerns the hierarchical system of self-classification adopted in this thesis. Following self-categorisation theory this thesis assumes that each level of self-abstraction reflects the inclusiveness of the category. Self-categorisations at each level are formed with respect to the next higher-order level, thereby providing the context within which lower-order identities are defined. Superordinate categories such as the European Union therefore frame the intergroup comparisons that are made at the subgroup – nation-state level. When categories are harmoniously nested it is an indication that in the context of the superordinate categorisation perceived similarities between subgroups on relevant superordinate dimensions outweigh the perceived differences, and those perceived dimensional similarities do not conflict with the distinctiveness needs of the subgroup. This would imply that engaging in intersubgroup comparisons per se should not negatively affect superordinate identification – provided the dimensions that are important for subgroup distinctiveness are not threatened by superordinate homogenisation.

The final point refers to the central position given to the defining nature of group norms within the social identity approach. A crucial function of norms is to define group stereotypes and prototypes and in so doing define
and differentiate social groups. It is apparent that group norms have a descriptive function; however, norms are also prescriptive. In their prescriptive form they serve primarily intragroup functions where they coordinate members' interactions by providing acceptable behavioural standards. The regulation of members' behaviour ensures the survival of important ingroup standards while simultaneously reinforcing group identification. In times of social change it becomes necessary for groups to re-negotiate their norms. In situations where this involves the emergence of a new superordinate categorisation, as has occurred with European integration, these negotiations must take into account the strategic objectives of both the higher- and lower-order categorisations if the new social structure is to be relatively harmonious.

Having discussed the crucial role that definitions of the lower-order national identity may have in determining European identification, the next chapter reviews research that indicates that national identity may be constructed in different ways by citizens within the same nation. Although the research reviewed is mainly based in interpersonal and intrapsychic approaches, the research is discussed and reinterpreted from a social psychological and group based approach. Following this, the issues highlighted in chapters two and three are brought together and summarised in an explicit statement of the main aims and research questions of the thesis.
"On the one hand, there is a long selection of attempts to list prototypical traits or events or sights which define Britain [...] On the other hand, a whole swathe of commentators argue that there is only individual and local difference, but nothing common that might be called Britishness [...] For us, all of these positions miss the point, because they start from the assumption that singularity and diversity are empirical opposites such that one has to favour either the one or the other or else reconcile them as different levels of description”

(Reicher & Hopkins, 2001, p.101-102)
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3.1 Introduction

In this thesis, national identity is used as the starting point from which to investigate European identification. As was argued in the previous chapter, constructions of and repercussions to national identity have been implicated in peoples' willingness to self-categorise at the European level. The focus of the present chapter is on identifying factors that may influence peoples' constructions of national identity. Research and theorising from sociology, political psychology and social psychology is presented in order to delineate possible images of the national group which may be used by citizens to construct their national identities.

The first section begins with a short discussion of Smith's (1991) work, who as a sociologist does not deal with psychological processes explicitly but instead defines two conceptualisations of modern nation-states: civic-territorial and ethnic-genealogical. The second section considers Kelman's (1997) "social influence analysis" (p.172) of how national identity is incorporated into an individual's self-concept, and parallels are drawn between Kelman's and Smith's conceptualisations. Kelman's approach differs significantly to that assumed in this thesis in that the level of explanation is mainly based in interpersonal and intrapsychic processes. However, it is relevant to the current thesis in so far as it deals directly with constructions of national identity. Kelman conceives national identification as derived from attachments to different forms of defining national attributes and relational orientations, or patriotisms. The section concludes by critically evaluating the model from a social identity approach.

The subsequent section (3.2.3) develops the implications of the various concepts identified by these scholars from sociology and political/social psychology and integrates these with the discussions in chapter two on group norms and social identity. Smith's (1991) two conceptualisations of modern nation-states (civic-territorial and ethnic-genealogical) and Kelman's work on sentimental and instrumental national attachment...
(Kelman, 1969, 1997) are reconceptualised using a group based approach. Drawing again from political psychological research, the concept of patriotism is also reconceptualised. Theorising in this area is mainly guided by the work of Ervin Staub and associates (Staub, 1997; Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999) and their conceptualisations of blind and constructive patriotism. In this thesis however, the work of these scholars is framed within a social psychological and group based perspective. More specifically, in this chapter it will be argued that national attachment can be reconceptualised as reflecting the descriptive norms of the national group and patriotism the prescriptive norms. These arguments are then integrated with the notion that a superordinate categorisation, such as the European Union, would only threaten a lower-order identity – such as those at the national level, when the higher-order category is perceived to negatively affect the distinctive criterial attributes of the lower-order group.

The chapter concludes by explicating and summarising the main aims and objectives of the thesis.

3.2 CONSTRUCTING THE NATIONAL GROUP

As was argued in chapter two, the meaning and definition of categories cannot be assumed to be unitary. Instead allowances need to be made for the potentially different understandings that may accompany category labels and their concomitant identities. Some social psychological and sociological theorists (e.g.: Billig, 1995; Cinnirella, 1993; A. D. Smith, 1991) have argued that this is the case with the nation: that it may be conceptualised in different ways by its citizens, meaning different things to different people. If we accept this proposal then any investigation into national identity should take these different understandings into account.

There are sociological definitions of the nation that may have important implications for how a national group is conceptualised by its members. In
this section I draw upon these, and integrate theorising from political and social psychology, to build two broad dimensions of national identity content that may be used multifariously by citizens to conceptualise their image of their national group and therefore their version of national identity. More specifically, using a social identity approach, I re-evaluate national attachment and patriotism research and theorising which has traditionally been conceptualised within the framework of political psychology.

### 3.2.1 Sociological Definitions

Smith (1991) identifies two models of the nation which he calls civic-territorial and ethnic-genealogical. The focal point of the civic-territorial nation is the political community and membership is based on and circumscribed by juridical definitions of citizenship irrespective of ethnic ancestry. The common 'culture' is based not on some objective or quasi objective genealogical commonality or feature, but on shared components of the political culture such as the rights and obligations of citizenship. On the other hand, the focal point of the ethnic-genealogical nation is genealogy. The route to membership is through descent or ancestry. From this perspective, the common 'culture' is in shared components of 'native' traditions and symbols.

In proposing two theoretically distinct conceptions of the nation, Smith (1991) indicates that the social identity of a national group is not driven by a unitary definition but rather through two routes of demarcation. The clearest example of such a distinction can be found in the difference between the legal account of British group membership and that of the BNP (British National Party). While legally anyone granted citizenship is a Briton, for the BNP this is clearly not the case. They argue: "when we in the BNP talk about being British, we talk about the native peoples who have lived in these islands since before the Stone Age, and the relatively small numbers of peoples of almost identical stock, such as the Saxons, Vikings and
Normans, and the Irish, who have come here and assimilated [...] we mean the bonds of culture, race, identity, and roots of the native British peoples” (British National Party, 2003).

Historically, some social/political psychologists have argued that nationhood and ethnicity were fundamentally tied together: “we generally think of a nation as a group of people who [...] share a common language, a common history, a common tradition, a common religion, a common way of life, a common sense of destiny, and a common set of memories and aspirations” (Kelman, 1997, p.169). This mode of thinking is often referred to as *nationalist* ideology: that functions (amongst other ways) to deny the legitimacy of national membership claims made by anyone who is not of the dominant ethnic/cultural unit (Bar Tal & Staub, 1997, p.5). However, modern nation-states are also civic entities, where “the reality of the nation-state rarely lives up to the ideal model envisioned by nationalist ideology. The composition of most states violates, to a greater or lesser degree, the assumption that the political entity corresponds to a national (i.e. ethnic-cultural) entity”² (Kelman, 1997, p.167). Although the reality of the nation-state may be ethnically heterogeneous, some citizens of multicultural nations may not share this reality, as is evident from the BNP example. Kelman’s theorising on national identification incorporates such issues of national definition. Given the relevance of his work on the construction of national identity the next section examines more closely theorising by Herbert Kelman and his colleagues.

² The terms *nationalist* and *nationalism* are extended by both Bar Tal and Kelman to include ethnocentrism, reflecting the current trend of allocating the terms to the periphery of social behaviour and insinuating that only extremists are subject to nationalism (see for a more in-depth discussion: Gellner, 1994; Billig, 1995).
3.2.2 Social Influence Model of National Identity

3.2.2.1 Basic Assumptions

Kelman's (1997) social influence model of national identity is based on a structural-functional account of society in which individual actions serve to maintain the broader social order. He conceptualises the main motivation underlying identification with the national group as serving an adaptive function for the individual. More specifically, identification with a national group serves two 'primordial' needs: self-protection and self-transcendence. Social phenomena are reduced to the psychological make-up of individuals which is achieved by recourse to intrapsychic dynamics responsible for individual differences (e.g. personal efficacy or competence, authoritarianism, internal/external locus of control, etc.), all of which are a product of socialisation — which itself is dictated by social class and level of education (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989d, 1989c). Furthermore, this approach appears to be based in consensus-structuralist assumptions in that deviation from normative social rules, roles and values are sanctionable.

In direct opposition to this approach, the social identity approach takes a conflict view of society (Hogg & Abrams, 1988b). This approach assumes that there are profound differences in the ideologies, values and beliefs of the various social groups that make-up society. It assumes that society is hierarchically structured and comprised of social groups that stand in power and status relations to one another and which compete for resources (Tajfel, 1981a). Furthermore, it assumes that this social structure is represented cognitively and in a self-referential manner (Turner et al., 1987). The mediating factor between social categories (as aggregate membership groups) and social psychological groups is self-definition, which through the processes of self-categorisation and social comparison gain the capacity to guide behaviour (Turner et al., 1987; Hogg & Abrams, 1988b, see also chapter two).
Kelman's social influence model, on the other hand, has little to say on the psychological processes of identification. There is no elaboration on how social categories (as aggregate membership groups) become psychological groups that are capable of guiding member's behaviours. The model is restricted to the emergence of national groups rather than psychological groups in general, and for Kelman the 'transition' occurs when the group "begins to ideologize [sic] its customs and way of life, that is, it goes beyond the conception of 'this is the way we do things' to a conception of 'there is something unique, special and valuable about our way of doing things'" (p.170, Kelman, 1997). Although Kelman recognises the importance of a distinctive national identity precisely how, and through what psychological processes, a membership group becomes a psychological group is left unanswered. Ultimately Kelman relies on the nebulous idea of a collective consciousness that somehow emerges to bind individuals together and guide their behaviour. National identity is seen as a product of this collective consciousness: "insofar as a group of people have come to see themselves as constituting a unique, identifiable entity, with a claim to continuity over time, to unity across geographical distance, and to the right to various forms of collective self-expression, we can say that they have acquired a sense of national identity" (p.171, Kelman, 1997).

However, notwithstanding the fundamental differences between the two approaches, Kelman's (1997) model provides some useful ideas in terms of how national identity is conceptualised, and on the different ways group members may relate to their group. In the following section Kelman's 'patterns of personal involvement in a national group' are examined more closely. Following this, Kelman's theorising on attachment and patriotism is discussed together with other work in these areas.
3.2.2.2 Patterns of Personal Involvement in a National Group

Attachment

Kelman’s (1997) approach views the content of national identity as collectively constructed but structurally and intra-psychically determined, comprising of distinctive cultural and institutional, characteristics, values, aims and goals. The specific dimensions of a national identity are derived from two ‘sources of attachment’ or content dimensions: sentimental and instrumental (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989d). Sentimental attachment represents the connection group members share to the group’s cultural and symbolic norms. This source of attachment functions to legitimate the group’s existence in the social order and assert its cultural and symbolic distinctiveness. The source of the group’s institutional distinctiveness is represented by instrumental attachment, this includes the group’s operating principles and practices, or institutional norms, such as those associated with the rights and obligations of citizenship. National attachment, as it is conceptualised by Kelman and his colleagues (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989b; Kelman, 1997) represents the descriptive norms of the group in terms of both cultural (sentimental) and instrumental concerns. Although analytically distinct, the two sources of attachment are mutually reinforcing. These researchers argue that “two sources attachment jointly determine the strength of people’s patriotism, [i.e. their] loyalty and commitment to the group” (Kelman, 1997, p.175). However, they also argue that the expression of this group loyalty and commitment (or patriotism) can take different forms and that an individual’s relationship with their

---

3 Although Kelman (1997) argues that national identity is collectively constructed, not all group members are involved in this process. He argues “various leadership elements and particularly active and committed subgroups are far more instrumental in defining the national identity than the rank-and-file members” (p.171). This will be discussed further in latter sections.
national group will be based primarily in a single ‘orientation’. These orientations are discussed in the next section.

Orientations

Three relational orientations are differentiated: rule, value and role. These define three different ‘sets’ of behavioural standards, or prescriptive norms. Born from exposure to different social influences processes, they are characterised by different ways of relating to the group (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c, p.271-272). The orientations strongly reflect an interpersonal basis of social influence (see chapter two, section 2.4.4 for a discussion of interpersonal and group based approaches to social influence).

Rule orientation reflects acceptance of group rules. It is the least powerful of the three orientations and, in terms of commitment to the group, it is characterised by little depth and continuity. The emphasis is on consensus and compliance and appears to be driven by a social influence process similar to normative influence (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). The rule-orientated individual is passive and follows rules in order to avoid punishment and gain approval (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c). The group is seen to have coercive power (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970).

Role orientation, on the other hand, is integration to the group based principally on the enactment of the roles perpetuated by the group. Kelman (1997) argues that this is the most powerful orientation and is characterised by an enthusiastic commitment to the group's cause. 'Powerful' as it is used here does not mean strongly self-defining, rather it implies easy to influence into "actively supporting the government and faithfully obeying its demands" (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c, p.268). The influence process involved in this orientation is called 'identification' and is defined as "an influence strategy that appeals to the person's desire to maintain a self-defining relationship to another person or group" (Kelman & Hamilton,
However, the use of the term 'self-defining' is inaccurate and should be read as *role-defining*. Kelman and Hamilton argue that such individuals pay no heed to whether the values and beliefs circumscribed by these group roles conflict with their other values or beliefs. Rather role-oriented individuals conform to expectations because they want to be rewarded for their faithful obedience to authority, and this forms the basis of their support for the status quo. For the role orientated individual the group is seen to possess reward power (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). What is significant for role-orientated individuals "is possession of the role itself rather than the specific content of that role and its relationship to their broader value system" (Kelman, 1997, p.175).

The third orientation Kelman and Hamilton (1989c) identify is value orientation – which is somewhat different to the other two orientations in that value orientation is less about conformity and more about self-definition. Value orientation is more conditional. It involves integration to the group based principally on the internalisation of the group values and is therefore associated with the private acceptance of these. The social influence process described by the researchers is called internalisation (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c) and is similar to informational influence (Deutsch & Gerard, 1955). This orientation is characterised by conditional loyalty as members evaluate the group's actions in comparison to their own personal values. These individuals are actively involved in formulating and assessing national policies.

**Model Evaluation**

The first issue with the model described above is the apparent lack of self-definition in the *role* and *rule* orientations. As self-definition is fundamental to identification with a social group, and these scholars argue that an individual will display *primarily* one orientation, self-definition should characterise both these two orientation forms as well as the value
orientation. Indeed when discussing ‘sources of attachment’ Kelman (1997) seems to be arguing this very point: “these collective identity elements [i.e. beliefs, values, assumptions and expectations] become important parts of these individuals’ definition of who and what they personally are”. As ‘personal involvement’ in a national group involves both attachment and orientation it is difficult to see how the rule and role orientations – through their interaction with the two ‘sources of attachment’, would not also be self-defining. This apparent inconsistency renders the model problematic: the ‘nominal’ rule orientated national ‘identity’ implies compliance due to pressure from potential sanctions rather than identification, and role orientated national identity implies compliance on the basis of reward expectation. The only orientation that appears to be based in identification and self-definition is value.

A further problem with this model is the assumption that an individual’s relationship with their national group can be based primarily (although not exclusively) on one type of orientation. The model implies that large sections of the population mindlessly follow the rules or perform the roles dictated by those who have ‘values’. The issue with the model is not that it states that there are rules to guide the members’ behaviours and interactions (group norms), or that there are different group roles that need to be ‘performed’, or even that there are group values that are internalised to varying degrees by the members – rather it is in the assumption that all members are not psychologically active in constructing the rules, roles and values of the group (see for example Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c, p.269). Furthermore, the model assumes that there is a single set of ‘correct’ rules, roles and values for the group as a whole from which deviance is sanctioned and adherence is rewarded.

In terms of supporting evidence, Kelman and Hamilton (1989d) conducted a survey in order to develop attachment and orientation scales and attempt to ascertain “which demographic factors are the most potent predictors” (p.292)
of the different attachments and orientations. Although two statistically reliable attachment factors were apparent that corresponded to the sentimental/instrumental division, Kelman and Hamilton's own investigation could not adequately support the validity of their original conceptualisation of the orientations. The main issues were that their items could "not discriminate between integration via rules and roles" and a rather low (0.64) scale reliability for the value orientation scale – even after it had been "pruned" of all "double-loading items" (1989d, p.283). The relationships reported between demographic factors and the scales are also somewhat questionable. For example, although these researchers claim that respondents high in rule orientation were more likely to be black, Democratic and Catholic this assertion is based on weak correlations of 0.16, 0.17 and 0.26 (respectively).

The conceptualisation of social influence processes in Kelman and Hamilton's approach differs from that assumed in this thesis (see chapter two discussion on referent informational influence). However, the intention in this thesis is to use work by these scholars to explore national identity content rather than investigate the specific form of social influence processes. Although the premises of their theory are antinomic with the social identity approach assumed in this thesis, their work does imply that constructions of national identity may include descriptive norms that define the traditional-cultural and civic aspects of the group (sentimental and instrumental attachment respectively), and prescriptive norms that promote the importance, per se, of consensus and compliance (rule and role orientations), or critical and conditional evaluation (value orientation). These proposals, together with the issue of whether different demographic factors will help discriminate between the different orientation forms, will be tested empirically in chapter four.

In the next section, the sociological models of the nation discussed earlier and the sources of attachment discussed above are brought together and
reinterpreted using a social psychological approach that is based in group processes. Following this, research on patriotism is reviewed and also reinterpreted using a social psychological approach that is based in group processes.

3.2.3 Re-conceptualising National Attachment & Patriotism

3.2.3.1 National Attachment as Descriptive Identity Content

Literature Review

Early national attachment research has identified three main forms of attachment relationship (Davis, 1999). Terhune (1964) and DeLamater, Katz and Kelman (1969) each identify similar forms of attachment. The first – symbolic/affective involvement, is characterised by an emotional, sentimental attachment to the nation and its values and symbols. The second form, functional/goal involvement, is more instrumental in nature and is characterised by the role of the citizen in upholding institutional responsibilities; individual efforts are directed towards advancing national objectives. The final form – normative/ego involvement is characterised by a perceived link between the achievements of the nation and the self. Costs and benefits to the nation are experienced as costs and benefits to the self and evaluations of the group are proposed as having a direct effect on personal self-esteem. This final form differs somewhat from the first two forms in that it less about the form one’s attachment takes and more about the repercussions to the self from adopting a given form.

As reviewed in the previous section Kelman and colleagues have since proposed two main sources of attachment: sentimental and instrumental (Kelman, 1969, 1997; Kelman & Hamilton, 1989a). Sentimental attachment is characterised by a perception that the group reflects individual identity and involves an emotional connection to the culture and symbols of the
nation. Instrumental attachment, on the other hand, reflects a pattern of identification that is based on a costs/benefits analysis associated with the rights and obligations of citizenship, such as “satisfaction with political organisations and public services” (Cinnirella, 1993, p.346). The distinction between these two forms of attachment has also received empirical support from a questionnaire study conducted in the UK (Routh & Burgoyne, 1998). These researchers report two distinct and positively correlated forms of attachment: cultural –based in cultural traditions and symbols (e.g. cultural customs, the Pound and the Queen), and instrumental –based in social goods and mechanisms (e.g. the legal, health care and education systems).

Smith's work on ethnic-genealogical and civic-territorial models of the nation, and Kelman's on sentimental and instrumental attachments (Kelman, 1997; A. D. Smith, 1991), each indicate two broad dimensions upon which conceptualisations of modern nation-states may be built. There are some parallels between the ethnic-genealogical model and sentimental attachment – both share a focus on traditional culture and symbols, and between the civic-territorial model and instrumental attachment – both share a focus on the civic elements of nationhood. Kelman (1997) argues that the two sources of attachment are distinct, orthogonal constructs, but not mutually exclusive. Rather, he argues that they are mutually reinforcing: together they define different aspects of national identity (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989d). Although Kelman (1997) does not refer to these components of national identity as group norms, he does argue that assigning national identity to oneself involves the adoption of “normatively prescribed beliefs, values, assumptions and expectations” (p. 172).

Descriptive Norms

From a social identity approach it can be argued that the sources of attachment identified by Kelman (1997) reflect the descriptive group norms of the national models described by Smith (1991). While it is possible that
national groups could define themselves solely in terms of traditional-cultural or civic concerns, it is unlikely that this would occur on a large scale in modern nation-states; rather, as Kelman argues, national identity constructions are likely to involve both aspects of nationhood to varying degrees.

However, as was argued in chapter two, in the context of social identity threat there is an attempt to solidify the group's definition: it becomes more tightly focused and thus the frame of reference of acceptable normative behaviour and defining characteristics is narrowed. As Sani & Reicher's (2000) qualitative research findings indicate, ingroup members argue over the boundaries of their group and the content and prototypes of their social identity. Such disputes occur when a group encounters a new situation that threatens its entitativity or demands a change to the group norms and values that some members believe is incommensurable with their group image (Sani & Todman, 2002). As was apparent from the research reviewed in chapter two, such 'incommensurable' potential changes may explain the comparatively low levels of European identification in the British. Tightly the group’s definition in times of threat may result in a focus on (or polarisation to) different norms by different subgroups with the consequence that each protects and upholds their image of the ingroup. Such an occurrence would result in each subgroup using different categorisation criteria or descriptive norms to define the boundaries of the group and therefore the group prototypes. In the case of the nation this may result in a differential focus and emphasis on one of the two broad dimensions of nationhood: traditional-cultural or civic.

While research by Sani and colleagues (e.g. Sani & Reicher, 2000; Sani & Todman, 2002) focuses on how intense, widespread ingroup disagreements ultimately result in schisms, they also acknowledge that ingroup disagreements can be resolved. This implies that ingroup disagreements vary in intensity. Sani and Todman (2002) argue that schism and
uniformity are intertwined processes. It is possible that uniformity and schism may be opposing poles along a continuum in the 'lifecycle' of a social group. When intragroup differences remain at an acceptable level or are resolved, the single group continues to exist, when they are not, fractures occur and the group divides. In either case there is potential for social change: either through the redefinition of the existing single group or the redefinition of the multiple factional groups that emerge.

The key to schisms occurring lies in the level and latitude of acceptability expressed by each subgroup towards the other subgroup's definition. In self-categorisation theory terms, if the perceived intragroup differences are too great for the context, a lower level of self-categorisation is used to increase contextual fit and groups with differing prototypical definitions become distinct groups in their own right. The original single group now becomes a superordinate level of categorisation. Of central importance is the contextual specificity of self-perception. Lower-level categorisations that divide the single group into two more inclusive subgroups may not reflect mutual antipathy and intolerance of each subgroup's definition – which would be required for schism to occur; but rather a redirection of focus onto specific elements which are given more centrality in a given context. These subgroups can be thought of as 'fuzzy' subgroups; they are not disassociated or split from the original single group, rather they reflect dimensions of social identity that group members believe benefits the group in a given context. Members of each of these fuzzy subgroups may accept each others' definition but may assign it peripheral value in a particular context (c.f. van Knippenberg, 1984).

Such subgroups could be said to be very highly harmoniously nested: the similarity overlap between the fuzzy subgroups is high; the centrality or value assigned to different elements of a social identity may be contested rather than the actual content. Thus one fuzzy subgroup may stress the cultural dimensions of a national identity while another may stress the civic
dimension. In addition, these fuzzy subgroups may cohere temporarily in order to achieve a group goal; such a situation may arise when specific aspects of the group are threatened and members mobilise to counter the threat.

For example, in the case of Britain’s membership in the European Union group members may agree that national identity consists of both traditional-cultural and civic dimensions. However, two national fuzzy subgroups may be apparent that disagree about which descriptive norms occupy central positions in this context – which dimensions are under attack and therefore need protecting: traditional-cultural or civic (e.g. the British pound or the Monarchy for the traditional-cultural dimension, or the British legal or political system for the civic dimension). These dimensions would not only reflect the centrality afforded to certain attributes of national identity in this specific context and their importance as sources of difference between the national ingroup and other EU nation-states, but also which dimensions are perceived as threatened. Each fuzzy subgroup, fearing homogenisation, may act to defend their central and criterial attributes, and thus their national group, from the effects of the European superordinate categorisation. Each fuzzy subgroup may focus mainly on the dimensions of national identity that they believe are being attacked. In this way, threat that has a common origin – the European Union, also has a different interpretation; while these fuzzy subgroups may emerge with the same goal, i.e. to protect their national group from homogenisation, different strategies may be employed to accomplish their goal. The mobilisation of such fuzzy subgroups with specific aims (or dimensions to protect) benefit the whole group against a threat that although perceived differently has a common origin.
Extending Smith's (1991) and Kelman's (1997) theorising that modern nation-states, such as Britain, may be defined in both traditional-cultural and civic terms by its citizens, intragroup variation should be evident in the centrality given to each of these two broad dimensions and thus in the extent to which their concomitant descriptive norms, which define the boundaries, features and values of the group, are endorsed. The proposal here is that there are two broad but theoretically distinct dimensions of national identity content. Psychological boundary demarcation based on shared historical traditions and culture involves an attachment to the nation's symbols and historical values (traditional-cultural dimension); while psychological boundary demarcation based on a shared polity involves an attachment to the nation's civic practices (civic dimension). Of central importance is the proposal that these dimensions are not mutually exclusive but instead they are complimentary.

However, exposure to social identity threat should focus group members' efforts on the norms they believe are under attack in that context. In the case of Britain's membership in the European Union, the superordinate categorisation must be seen to dilute the group's distinctive norms, making them more similar to and interchangeable with other European nation-state subgroups. British citizens should only experience a threat to the particular dimension of British national identity that they believe the superordinate categorisation affects negatively, and the level of threat experienced should be directly proportional to the value they assign to that particular national identity dimension. These proposals are investigated empirically in chapter six.

---

4 The use of traditional-cultural rather than ethno-genealogical denotes the desire to concentrate our theorising on elements that are perceived as historically traditional to British culture as an ethnically heterogeneous nation as opposed to an ethnically homogeneous group.
Thus far, I have concentrated on discussing how existing research and theorising on national models and attachment can be interpreted using a social identity framework. Furthermore, I have argued that by re-conceptualising this work as reflecting descriptive group norms it can be used to explore different national identity content and how these may be affected by a perceived threat that has a common origin. However, within political psychology, theorising about national attachment often also involves the concept of patriotism and in this guise attachment is mainly defined as a behavioural characteristic.

Patriotic feelings appear to be commonplace; they have been observed in large percentages of populations in many countries. For example Rose (1985) who conducted a survey comparing patriotism levels in fifteen countries reports that 86% of the surveyed population in the UK expressed a sense of patriotism (91% in Ireland, 96% in the USA, the lowest he reports is in the Federal Republic of Germany with 59%). The patriotism concept is mainly comprised of guides to personal behaviours that support the national group's decisions and actions. However, much of the patriotism research does not offer social psychological explanations that are based in group processes, instead, as with the attachment literature, there is focus on attitudinal, personality or behavioural correlates.

Here I argue for patriotism to be conceived as a set of behavioural standards that define how group members should relate to their group and how they coordinate and regulate members' interactions by providing acceptable behavioural standards – thereby reinforcing group identification. In short

---

5 Some researchers have defined patriotism as both identity content and a behavioural characteristic (see for example: Sullivan, Fried, & Dietz, 1992).
the proposition here is that these behavioural standards reflect the prescriptive norms of the social group.

3.2.3.2 Patriotism as Prescriptive Identity Content

Literature Review

Most research on patriotism has been largely conducted within the domain of political science and political psychology. Patriotism has been variably defined as a predisposition to behave altruistically on behalf of one's national group (Johnson, 1997), a powerful human impulse (Feshbach, 1987), an attachment style borne out of parental-child attachments (Feshbach & Sakano, 1997), and selfless acts benefiting the group "without regard to self-identity and self-benefit" (Worchel & Coutant, 1997: p.193). Still other researchers view patriotism as a form of intergroup discrimination (e.g. Mummendey, Klink, & Brown, 2001) that may also include perceptions of national superiority and dominance (e.g. Reykowski, 1997; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). Patriotism is often defined in opposition to nationalism, which is constructed as a negative and unhealthy form of attachment to country: "the evil twin because it motivates people to conquer, destroy, or denigrate other nations" (Worchel & Coutant, 1997: p. 192; see also: Bar Tal, 1993; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). Moreover, as Condor (2001) argues "within this literature" nationalism has been portrayed as a consequence of ethnic constructions of nationhood while "benign patriotism is regarded as a possibility specifically within civic forms of nation" (Condor, 2001: p. 180; see also: Viroli, 1995). Alternatively, two forms of patriotism are defined in opposition to each other: one positive, altruistic, peaceful, beneficial, healthy and moral; the other negative, ethnocentric, hostile, authoritarian and chauvinistic (see for example: Andrews, 1997; Bar Tal, 1997; Gozman, 1997; Johnson, 1997; Schatz & Staub, 1997; Staub, 1997).
The idea of patriotism can also be differentiated in terms of the manner with which loyalty is extended to the group: one is based in uncritical conformity, the other in critical loyalty — as is the case with Kelman’s (1997) rule/role and value orientations respectively. The former (uncritical conformity) is often labelled blind patriotism and is generally seen as the negative form of patriotism, the later (critical loyalty), is labelled constructive patriotism is seen as more benign.

Such distinctions between good and bad forms of ‘patriotism’, and their association with certain ideologies are however highly questionable (see also: Billig, 1995; Condor, 2001; Hopkins, 2001, for a critical discussion on the futility of this good/bad division of patriotism). Other scholars (e.g. Nathanson, 1997) take the view that citizens can posses a diversity of beliefs alongside their critical or uncritical affection for their country. For Nathanson (1997) patriotism can be moderate and extreme, or hostile and peaceful, and can include varying degrees of ethnocentrism. By allowing this diversity and variation Nathanson’s approach allows for relationships to exist between different ideologies and different expressions of national loyalty. Indeed empirical evidence against equating patriotism with ethnocentric nationalism has been demonstrated (Schatz et al., 1999). Schatz et al (1999) report reliable correlations between one form of patriotism (blind) and perceptions of ‘nationalism’ — which they defined as: “perceptions of national superiority and support for national dominance” (p.157). However, they also conducted a direct test to examine whether nationalism (as they define it) and blind patriotism form a single construct (although these results are reported in a footnote). Confirmatory factor analyses using LISREL indicated that the two factor model fit the data better than the single factor model. Moreover, other observed significant relationships (discussed below) between blind patriotism and other constructs remained significant after controlling for nationalism, providing further evidence that blind patriotism and ethnocentric nationalism are separate constructs.
The manner with which blind patriotism is operationalised is often based on Staub’s (1989; 1997) definition – which considers the critical/uncritical relational aspects of patriotism together with national superiority, ethnocentrism and evaluative individual characteristics as elements of a single conceptually distinct construct. This is particularly evident in research that equates blind patriotism with ethnocentric nationalism (e.g. Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Reykowski, 1997). This is evident even in research that attempts to focus on the critical/uncritical relational aspects of the patriotism constructs.

For example, Schatz et al’s (1999) operationalisation of blind and constructive patriotism was guided by Staub’s (e.g. 1997; 1989) definitions but appears to focus on the critical/uncritical relational aspects of patriotism alone. Indeed these researchers characterise blind patriotism as an inflexible attachment to the nation, unquestioning positive evaluation, staunch allegiance and intolerance of criticism. Constructive patriotism, on the other hand, is characterised by critical loyalty, where questioning and criticism of current group practices are driven by a desire for positive change (Schatz et al., 1999). This research has shown that these two forms of patriotism are orthogonal dimensions. However, a few of the items Schatz et al (1999) use to measure blind patriotism include evaluations of individual characteristics (e.g. the reversed item: “for the most part, people who protest and demonstrate against US policies are good, upstanding, intelligent people”; p.159), or moral superiority (e.g. “I believe that US policies are almost always the morally correct ones”, p.159). While it is impossible to assess the influence of such statements, it is clear that they depart somewhat from the definitions included by Schatz et al (1999) in their paper and upon which these constructs were based.

Notwithstanding these issues, Schatz et al’s (1999) results do indicate reliable relationships between blind patriotism and protecting the national group from ‘cultural contamination’ –which they define as the “concern
about perceived threats to the homogeneity and distinctiveness of national culture" (p.157). They also report a reliable positive relationship between blind patriotism and both the belief that symbolic behaviours were more important than instrumental ones and, selective exposure to pro-US information (over anti-US information). Conversely, constructive patriotism was reliably associated with political efficacy, political information gathering, political knowledge and the frequency of politically relevant behaviour. These results do appear to indicate relationships between blind patriotism and traditional-cultural concerns, and between constructive patriotism and civic concerns.

Prescriptive Norms

Schatz et al (1999) explain their results in terms of the relationships that they observed between the two patriotism dimensions and, behavioural, attitudinal or personality characteristics, such as: political conservatism, right-wing authoritarianism, nationalism and political activity. In other words, they provide an explanation located at an intrapsychic or interpersonal level of explanation. However, an alternative social psychological explanation is possible: one that is based in group processes.

Conceiving patriotism as a set of regulatory behavioural standards that reflect the prescriptive norms of the national group allows 'patriotism' to be analysed as a group, rather than an individual or interpersonal, phenomenon. The constituent elements of patriotism, i.e. the manner with which loyalty is extended to the group, reactions to ingroup criticism and the appraisal of the group's decisions and actions, all serve regulating group functions, prescribing the appropriate normative behavioural standards to which group members are expected to adhere. The prescriptive norms sustain the members' distinctive image of their group and guide individual behaviours in a manner that supports the subjective validity of that image. As Marques et al (2001) argue: "once intergroup distinctiveness is
established by a denotative [descriptive] norm, ingroup members can devote attention to prescriptive norms that ensure consensus on criteria for positive ingroup evaluation” (p.411; see also discussion in chapter two).

The definitions of the patriotism dimensions provided by Schatz et al (1999) characterise blind patriotism as entrenched, uncritical and intolerant of difference, emphasising consensus and compliance. It is a definition that implies an anti-social change stance. It should come as no surprise then that this construct should be positively related with a “concern about perceived threats to the homogeneity and distinctiveness of national culture” (p. 157), and with a focus on the more traditional and symbolic behaviours of the nation. Both constructs are ways of maintaining the status quo. The preference for selective exposure to pro-US information is also unsurprising as this serves to justify the group's entrenched position and does not expose them to alternative interpretations of the group's actions. Constructive patriotism, on the other hand, is characterised as questioning and tolerant of difference, emphasising the importance of deviance and critical thought: a definition that implies a pro-social change stance. The correlates such as political participation and information gathering are behaviours that are conducive to effecting change. The correlates of blind and constructive patriotism appear to be specific behavioural and attitudinal manifestations prescribed by the two forms of patriotism.

The notion that some groups have regulatory or prescriptive norms that promote the importance of consensus and conformity per se while others promote the importance of criticism and dissent, has been proposed by researchers using a social identity approach (Postmes, Spears, & Cihangir, 2001). Postmes et al examine the quality of decision-making in groups and demonstrate empirically that when considering new information that challenges the value of current group understandings, groups with consensual regulatory norms were comparatively more conservative than groups with critical regulatory norms.
The ideas proposed here are consistent with the social identity approach. Groups have a number of collective strategies at their disposal in the quest for a positive social identity. Resisting 'cultural contamination' and concentrating the group's efforts on traditional symbolic elements of national identification may be an example of social creativity strategies aimed at enhancing the group's distinctiveness on attributes that are seen as central or criterial to the group — when the focus of the group's image is in terms of their traditional-cultural concerns. Alternatively, information gathering and political participation may indicate a willingness to engage in social competition in pursuit of the same distinctiveness goal — when the focus of the group's image is in terms of their civic concerns.

Social identity theory proposes that people possess a social change belief system which can be utilised when a group attempts to avoid the negative implications of group membership that exists in an intergroup structure that is impermeable (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In the case of national citizenship the boundaries between national groups are indeed relatively impermeable. The theory proposes that two types of collective strategies are available to people faced with a negative evaluation or threat to valued distinctive group attributes: social creativity or social competition. Social creativity is a cognitive strategy involving either: (i) selecting different comparison groups, (ii) selecting new dimensions for comparison, or (iii) re-evaluating the existing comparison dimensions, whereas social competition is a behavioural strategy where group members are willing to engage in such things as political lobbying in order to protect or enhance their group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Hogg & Abrams, 1988b).

In the context of European Integration, protecting or enhancing British group attributes is likely to involve either the redefinition of value or social competition. The utility of selecting different comparison groups is somewhat questionable in this context. The review of public opinion polls and social psychological research in chapter two indicated that British fears
relate to the dissolution and devaluation of distinctive British group attributes from European integration. More specifically the fears appear to relate to the homogenisation of national attributes across the fifteen EU member-states. Thus if social comparison with other EU nation-states is involved in the perception of threat to national attributes, the new comparison groups would have to be non-EU nations. However, as such comparison groups are irrelevant in the EU context it is unlikely that positive distinctiveness for the national group as an *EU nation-state* can be achieved in this way. This possibility however, is discussed further and explored empirically in chapter eight.

Research in the context of the European Union has already shown that when *criterial* attributes of the national group are negatively evaluated group members are unwilling to abandon these attributes in favour of more positive comparison dimensions that are not criterial (see Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996, and the discussion in chapter two, section 2.4.3.4). Instead, as social identity theory proposes, the most effective social creativity strategy when criterial attributes are involved is the redefinition of attribute value (see for example: Hogg & Abrams, 1988b, p.57).

The approach developed here does not negate previous research observations such as the relationships observed between blind patriotism and traditional-cultural concerns, and between constructive patriotism and civic concerns; these potential relationships will be explored empirically in chapter five. However, it deflects individual/interpersonal level explanations in favour of explanations that are social psychological and based in group processes. In so doing, it also provides a motivational explanation in terms of maintaining social identity distinctiveness. Furthermore, it separates the behavioural standards that may be applied in support of a variety of national identity conceptualisations from negative ideological connotations: such as morality, and national superiority (see also: Hopkins, 2001).
3.3 **CHAPTER SUMMARY**

The main aim of this chapter was to identify factors that may influence peoples' constructions of national identity, to discuss alternative interpretations of nation-relevant research from sociology, political psychology and social psychology, and to discuss how these may relate to the study of European identification. A number of important theoretical and empirical observations have been identified and these are summarised below.

The first point relates to Kelman's (1997) social influence model of national identity. It was argued that the concepts of attachment (sentimental and instrumental) and orientation (rule, role and value) may have utility in the study of national identity. However, a number of issues were identified as antinomic with the approach assumed in this thesis. I do not take issue with the notion that national groups have norms or 'rules' to guide member's actions, roles that members perform, or values that are internalised to varying degrees. Instead, what is disputed is the notion that individuals will display primarily one form of these 'orientations' in that this renders large sections of the population as 'followers' of rules and 'performers' of roles who have no real active or self-investment in their national group. The model implies that these individuals conform solely on the bases of fear of punishment or reward anticipation. In addition, the futility of these orientation distinctions is supported by Kelman and Hamilton's (1989d) own research which fails to provide convincing evidence on the existence of separate orientations or on their proposed relationships between different orientation forms and various demographic factors.

The second point refers to the re-interpretation of existing work from various perspectives and the integration of these with notions from a social identity approach. The approach taken in this thesis to the concepts of national attachment and patriotism is based in group norms and group
processes. On the basis of attachment and patriotism research I have proposed two broad dimensions of national identity content that may be used multifariously by citizens to conceptualise their national group and therefore their version of national identity. Moreover, I have argued that these two theoretically distinct dimensions – traditional-cultural and civic – may be identified by the descriptive and prescriptive norms group members endorse. It was argued that the concepts Kelman refers to as sentimental and instrumental attachment may reflect traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms respectively. Furthermore, it is proposed that the concepts Schatz refers to as blind and constructive patriotism can be reconceptualised as sets of prescriptive norms that promote the importance of consensus and conformity or critical evaluation respectively, and that these can be used to support the cultural status quo of the nation or to promote social competition and effect change.

Finally, I have argued that when faced with the potentially homogenising effects of a superordinate categorisation – such as the European Union, fuzzy subgroups may mobilise to defend those dimensions of social identity they believe are criterial in terms of the group’s definition in a given context. In this way different national subgroups protect both their interpretation of a distinctive social identity and benefit the group as a whole against a threat that has a common origin. In other words, threat will be experienced only on the dimension that is believed to be under attack, and that the magnitude of this experience will be proportional to the definitional value they assign to that dimension.

3.4 Potential Barriers to European Identification

Through the discussions presented in chapters two and three I have proposed a number of potential concepts and processes that may be involved in facilitating or blocking superordinate identification, or more specifically European identification in British citizens. Throughout these discussions I
have indicated the issues that will be investigated empirically. In this final chapter section I highlight the most relevant arguments and set out the main aims and objectives of the thesis.

3.4.1 Main Aims and Objectives

The first aim of this thesis is to explore the extent to which the 'patterns of personal involvement in a national group' proposed by Kelman (1997) are evident in a British sample. In addition, to investigate whether, as Kelman and Hamilton (1989d) argue, different demographic factors help discriminate between the three different orientation forms.

The second aim is to explore the multidimensional nature of national identity in terms of different descriptive norms (traditional-cultural and civic) and prescriptive norms (conformity and consensus or critical evaluation) as developed from the reinterpretation of attachment and patriotism research.

The third aim of this thesis is to test proposals, developed in chapters two and three regarding the relevance and specificity of threats to social identities. The contention is that threat will be experienced only on a specific social identity dimension that is potentially 'at risk' from the superordinate categorisation. Moreover, I argue that the magnitude of this experience will be proportional to the definitional value assigned to that identity dimension. In addition, when a superordinate threat is perceived as affecting lower-order group distinctiveness this may negatively affect both the perceived compatibility between the superordinate and lower-order identity, and the levels of superordinate identification expressed by group members.

Fourthly, I aim to further clarify how perceptions of similarity and distinctiveness between subgroups affect self-categorisation at the
superordinate level. This aim was developed from the observation presented in chapter two, where it was argued that there is a fundamental paradox in the social identity approach, that is, superordinate categorisation can bring members of subgroups together, but it can also be a source of subgroup distinctiveness threat.

The final aim is to explore the relationship between maintaining group distinctiveness through intersubgroup comparisons and identification with the relevant superordinate group. To this end the effect on European identification from such comparisons is compared to using other comparison groups.

3.4.2 Overview of Empirical Work

In general the empirical work of this thesis was conducted to examine potential barriers to European identification in British citizens. To this end the first two empirical chapters (chapters four and five) are mainly concerned with developing, exploring and investigating different national identity content. In the third empirical chapter (chapter six) national identity content is used to predict levels of national group distinctiveness threat from European integration. In addition, the relationships between this perceived threat and both identity compatibility (between national and European identities) and levels of European identification are explored. In chapter seven, the fourth empirical chapter, perceptions of intersubgroup similarity are investigated to see if these function either as a source of threat to national identity distinctiveness or in interaction with perceptions of attribute threat to facilitate or block European identification. The final empirical chapter, chapter eight, investigates the superordinate identity facilitating or blocking effect of using different comparison groups to maintain distinctiveness for one's national group. As in chapter seven the possible interactive effect of national group distinctiveness threat is also investigated.
Together then the next five chapters, i.e. chapters four through eight, report and discuss the empirical work of this thesis. The following chapter presents the first study conducted in this thesis.
Chapter Four: Patterns of Personal Involvement in the National Group

"National identity is the group's definition of itself as a group – its conception of its enduring characteristics and basic values; [...] its institutions and traditions; and its past history, current purposes, and future prospects"

(Kelman, 1997, p.171)
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4.1 Introduction

This chapter draws upon the discussion presented in chapter three and presents the findings of a study which addresses the first aim of the thesis. The study explores to what extent the 'patterns of personal involvement in a national group' identified by Kelman (1997) are evident in a British sample of young adults, and whether different demographic factors help discriminate between the three orientations. In addition, the study presented here explores the relationship between levels of national and European identification.

Before presenting and discussing the study itself, I begin with a brief overview of Kelman's model and a summary of previous research findings relating to levels of national and European identification in the British. This is followed by a statement of the study aims and research questions.

4.1.1 Patterns of Personal Involvement with the National Group

The two sources of attachment – sentimental and instrumental, and the three orientations – role, rule and value, identified by Kelman and colleagues (Kelman, 1997; Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c, 1989d) form six 'patterns of personal involvement in a national group' and these are summarised in table 1 below.
Table 1: Patterns of personal involvement in a large-scale group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of attachment to the group</th>
<th>Types of orientation to the group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental</td>
<td>Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance of the group's authority to define membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional involvement in role of group member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to the group's traditions and defining values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entanglement in social roles mediated by the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to the group's institutional arrangements and operating values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Kelman (1997)

Kelman (1997) contends that the two sources of attachment “generate and reinforce one another” (p.173), but that individuals will primarily display one of three orientations to group. In other words, he proposes that national identity content is comprised of two types of descriptive norms that represent the cultural and instrumental attributes of the group. The extent to which these norms are endorsed by the group members is expressed through their sentimental and instrumental attachments respectively. He also claims that group members can differ in the manner they express their patriotism, i.e. their group loyalty and commitment, and that there are three different ways individuals relate to their nation, through rule, role and value orientations. That is he proposes that there are three different sets of behavioural guides, or prescriptive norms, which serve to regulate members' behaviour.

This approach, he proposes, allows us to explore individuals' relationships with national groups while simultaneously taking into account both qualitative differences – through the different 'patterns of involvement' people express, and quantitative differences – through the varying strength in levels of involvement with the group. In other words, individuals should express stronger sentimental and instrumental attachment on one of the
three orientation forms (their primary orientation), when compared to sentimental and instrumental attachment on the two remaining orientation forms. For example, someone who is primarily rule orientated should express stronger sentimental rule and instrumental rule when compared to sentimental role, instrumental role, sentimental value and instrumental value.

In addition, Kelman and Hamilton (1989d) suggest that different demographic factors help discriminate between the three orientations. However, they do not elaborate on exactly why we should expect different primary orientations in, for example, different racial, religious or political groups. Instead, they “account for these differences in terms of the situations [e.g. societal positions, social class & education level] in which different population groups find themselves” (1989c, p.263).

As discussed in chapter three, the empirical evidence forwarded by Kelman and Hamilton (1989d) in support of the different orientations and the differences based on demographic factors (e.g. race, religion and political orientation) is fairly weak and unconvincing. However, based on this evidence (see for example p.292-300), rule orientated individuals are more likely to be black, democratic and Catholic, role orientated individuals white republican and Catholic, while value orientated individuals are more likely to be non-Catholic and white.

Although this thesis is not concerned with the influence of demographic factors, Kelman and Hamilton's proposals in this regard will be tested in the current study in order to examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the orientation forms. However, as Kelman and Hamilton's scales were developed for use in an American population and were therefore culturally specific, and there were reliability problems associated with their scales new measures were developed for use in the current study.
4.1.2 Levels of National and European Identification
The social psychological research discussed in chapter two indicated that British national identity is always significantly higher than European identity (Cinnirella, 1997; Huici et al., 1997). In addition, the relationship between these identities has been observed to be either weak and significantly negative (r=-0.26, Cinnirella, 1996b, 1997), or not apparent (r=0.01, Huici et al., 1997). In this study, this relationship is re-examined in order to assess to what extent, as in Cinnirella's study, the two identities are still constructed in opposition.

4.1.3 Research Aims, Questions & Hypotheses
The main aims of the study reported here are to explore: (a) patterns of involvement in the British national group, and (b) levels of British national and European identity.

Research Questions
1a. To what extent are the six 'patterns of personal involvement' in the national group evident in a British population?
1b. Do the three orientations form distinct orthogonal constructs as predicted by Kelman?
1c. Are there any significant statistical differences in the endorsement of the orientations based on different demographic factors?
2a. Are levels of national identity higher than levels of European identity?
2b. What is the relationship between levels of national and European identity?

Hypotheses
1a. Given the exploratory nature of the 'patterns of personal involvement' section of the study, no hypotheses are forwarded in this regard.
1b. If, as Kelman suggests, the three orientations form distinct constructs, then contrary to Kelman's suggestions endorsement levels of the three
forms are expected to be positively correlated.

1c. If Kelman and Hamilton's proposals are correct, then significant differences by race, religion and political orientation should be apparent in the endorsement levels of the different orientations⁶.

2a. Levels of national identity will be significantly higher than levels of European identity.

2b. The relationship between levels of national and European identity will be weak and negative.

⁶ Given the nature and cultural specificity of the demographic factors used by Kelman and Hamilton specific hypotheses are difficult to formulate. These would require a number of assumptions to be made regarding the similarity between certain demographic factors across Kelman and Hamilton's study and the current one (e.g. democratic/republican and conservative/liberal/labour).
4.2 Methodology

4.2.1 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire (see appendix 1A) was designed for self-completion following relevant advice from the social science literature regarding item wording, questionnaire layout, use of space, response formats, and participant instructions (de Vaus, 1996; Oppenheim, 1992). For example, long (more than twenty words) and double-barreled questions, double negatives, jargon and technical terms were avoided. After piloting the questionnaire, back to back printing and section headings were used to reduce the perceptible length of the questionnaire. An introductory page was included that obtained participants' consent and informed them of their rights to confidentiality, anonymity and withdrawal without penalty. Throughout the questionnaire each section was introduced with a brief description and clear instructions were given with examples where appropriate.

4.2.1.1 Patterns of Personal Involvement in the Group

The development of the items for the six patterns of involvement with the national group was guided by Kelman's (1997) definitions (see table 1 above). For example, 'sentimental value' is defined as a 'commitment to the group's traditions and defining values', an example item used to measure this construct was "as British citizens we should be committed to celebrating important British historical events" (see table two for a complete list of the constructs and their items).
# Table 2: Patterns of Personal Involvement Items

## Sentimental Role

**As a British citizen ...**

1. ... I feel it is important for the country when a fellow Briton is recognised for an achievement.
2. ... I care enough about my country to be involved in British community affairs.
   
   I would support ...
3. ... the way men and women are treated in British society.

## Sentimental Rule

**Who can call themselves British?**

1. Only people who most other British people accept as British.
2. Only someone thought of as British by the majority of the British population.
3. Only people who are accepted as part of the British community by most other British people.
4. Only those people who the British, as a group, decide can call themselves British.

## Sentimental Value

**As British citizens we should be committed to ...**

1. ... the monarchy.
2. ... celebrating important British historical events.
3. ... ‘putting on a brave face’ in times of crisis.
4. ... the British tradition of ‘fair play’.
5. ... teaching our children traditional British family values.

## Instrumental Role

**I would support ...**

1. ... the active involvement of British citizens in the maintenance of a lawful British community.
2. ... the buying of British goods in order to support the national economy.

**As a British citizen ...**

3. ... I care enough about my country to vote in British elections.
4. ... I care enough about my country to ensure I stay informed about new developments in British policies.

## Instrumental Rule

**As British citizens we should ...**

1. ... pay tax at the levels set by the British government.
2. ... accept Britain’s immigration policies whatever they are.
3. ... follow all laws established by the British courts whether we agree with them or not.
4. ... accept the British legislation regarding lifestyle choices.
5. ... vote whether we like Britain’s election process or not.

## Instrumental Value

**I feel committed to maintaining ...**

1. ... British democracy.
2. ... the British police force.
3. ... the British tax system.
4. ... the British legal system.
5. ... British Employee and worker rights.
6. ... the British national health system.
7. ... the British education system.
Five expert judges were used for the validation of content. Scale items were then revised based on comments and suggestions made (such as item rewording), and items were retained only if all five judges agreed that the item was measuring the same pattern. Overall, two items were removed: one sentimental role item, 'As a British citizen I'm proud of the way animals are cared for in the UK', and one instrumental role item, 'I would support the conscription of British men in the armed forces'. These were removed because three judges suggested that the first item did not relate to member interaction and the second item may bring out gender effects. The final measure contained twenty-eight items across the six 'patterns of involvement with the national group'.

4.2.1.2 Levels of Identity

Guided by Kelman's (1997) theorising on factors that affect identity strength, the identity scale was designed to address the following six domains:
1. the centrality of the identity;
2. the extent the identity contributes to self-definition;
3. the intensity of a person's involvement with the group;
4. their commitment;
5. their loyalty; and
6. their sense of belongingness.

Six items were generated to measure these six elements (see table three where each of the items 1-6 correspond to points 1-6 above). Through alterations in item wording the same items were used to measure levels of both national and European identity.

---

7 A draft version of the scale items together with a list of Kelman's (1997) construct definitions was given to five judges who were also social psychologists.
Operationalising the ‘levels of identity’ measure in this manner has the added advantage of conforming to research in the social identity tradition. Point one above reflects the positional importance or salience of a social identity within an individual’s identity structure; it may be regarded as reflecting the current accessibility and salience of a given group identity (Oakes, 1987). Points two and three refer to the self-defining and self-categorising nature of social identifications (Tajfel, 1981a), while points four and five deal with feelings of attachment with the group and its members that are based in commitment and loyalty. Finally, point six captures the feelings of belongingness and inclusiveness that characterise membership in a social group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Table 3: Levels of Identity Items

1. Being British is a central part of my identity.
2. I get a strong sense of who I am from being British.
3. I rarely think of myself as a British person.
4. I do not feel very committed to other Britons.
5. I feel a sense of loyalty to other Britons.
6. I do not feel like I belong to the British group of people.

NB: For the European scale the terms British and Britons were replaced with European & Europeans

4.2.1.3 Pilot Work: Participant Feedback

Thirty participants were recruited for the pilot phase of the study from one university and one college, both in London. The data were collected in two group sessions (N=14 and N=16). After completing the questionnaire participants were engaged in a thirty-minute discussion regarding the ease

8 Such feelings are implicated in many identity theories (see for example: Moreland et al., 1993) and may contribute to group cohesiveness.
of questionnaire completion and understanding of terminology along with impressions regarding the constructs being measured.

Amongst the main issues of concern identified by these participants were: (i) the length of the questionnaire (approximately fifteen minutes to complete); (ii) feeling non-European; (iii) feelings of political apathy; and (iv) disillusionment with the government over the issues of health and education. However, these participants did not identify any problems relating to question format and content or questionnaire instructions. Overall, the questionnaire was perceived as easy to understand and complete. For the main study the perceptible length of the questionnaire was reduced using back-to-back printing and section headings.

4.2.2 Procedure

All participants completed the questionnaire in a controlled environment in the presence of the researcher. This ensured that the questionnaire was completed in a quiet environment, in one sitting and in the order presented.

Participants were informed that the study concerned thoughts and feelings about 'some of the groups they belong to'. In compliance with the BPS ethical code of conduct and in order to reduce social desirability bias, participants were informed that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions in the questionnaire, of the voluntary basis of their participation, their right to withdraw from the study at any point, and the anonymity of their responses. Each questionnaire contained a cover sheet that explained participant rights to withdrawal, anonymity, confidentiality and consent (see appendix I).

Upon completion participants were debriefed and thanked, and given the opportunity to ask the researcher questions. They were encouraged to discuss their reflections on the questionnaire items as this debriefing
session was also used as an opportunity to receive further feedback on the questionnaire.

4.2.3 Reflexivity

One of the main objectives of this study was to investigate whether evidence for the 'patterns of personal involvement' defined by Kelman (1997) were apparent in a British sample. The definitions provided by Kelman (1997) were used to build scales with the intention that these would be used in subsequent investigations.

The main research interests were directed towards finding evidence for dimensions of national identification that had been generated by theorists rather than the participants themselves. These dimensions are by no means meant to be exhaustive, and I accept that the construction of any social identity is very diverse. Given the approach assumed, I believe that engaging participants in post participation discussions allowed me to gauge the subjective validity of the scales in addition to their statistical construct validity and reliability.

In a process based on the concept of cogenerative learning (Greenwood & Levin, 1998) – a process used in action research – participants' comments on their understandings of the research instruments were sought. Proponents of cogenerative learning argue that through such collaborative processes, between researcher and participants, "the quality of research can be enhanced because the insiders are able to contribute crucial local knowledge and analysis to the research" (Greenwood & Levin, 1998: p.110).

Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor and Tindall (1994) argue that all research can benefit from an approach that takes into account issues that come to light through the participants' experience of completing the study – including any reports from the participants themselves. The advantage of
such an approach is in the combination of scientific knowledge, practical reasoning and the socially constructed meaning held by participants (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). While I accept that this is not standard practice in quantitative research, this approach offers an opportunity to bridge the gap between scientifically generated knowledge and local knowledge, and, in this particular context, to inform the creation of new research instruments that are not only statistically reliable but also subjectively valid to the participants. The discussion section therefore incorporates participants' comments in the evaluation of the study's outcomes.

4.2.4 Participants

The data were gathered at four British colleges and Universities. Access to the students was granted in exchange for teaching exercises and informational presentations. The sample consisted of students who were studying a range of subjects.

Data from British participants that were born and raised in England, or at least lived in England since age five (not Northern Ireland, Wales or Scotland) were retained for analyses. The decision to exclude participants from these three provenances was taken because other scholars have argued that British citizens from different British nations construct and understand Britishness in different ways (Condor, 2001) and that the term 'British' may be often (mis)understood to mean 'English' (McCrone, 1992). The choice of age five as the 'cut off' point for inclusion was based on research that has indicated that before this age children's knowledge of their own nationality or country is limited (Jahoda, 1963; Middleton, Tajfel, & Johnson, 1970; Barrett, 1996). This reduces the likelihood that a country other than Britain would contribute to participants' national identity. Although this means that I cannot completely discount the possibility of other influences, I did not want to exclude participants who are British except by virtue of a birthplace of which they are unlikely to have extensive
memory. In addition, the instructions in the questionnaire that preceded questions regarding 'being British' explicitly explained that 'Being British refers to the fact that you are a citizen of the United Kingdom whatever your ethnic country of origin' (see appendix 1A).

Overall, three hundred and seventy two participants took part in this study and seventeen of these were discarded because they had not been in England since age five. Therefore the data from three hundred fifty five participants were included in the analyses. The mean age of the sample was twenty-two years (see also table 4) and consisted of one hundred and fifteen males and two hundred and thirty five females, five participants did not state their gender.

Demographic data relating to participants' religion, race, and political orientation were also collected in order to allow the endorsement of the orientations to be explored for group differences. These demographic frequencies can be found in tables 5 - 7. Racial and religious groups with at least forty members were included in separate groupings. Although I accept that this is a crude classification, it is nevertheless in line with the racial and religious factors used by Kelman and Hamilton (1989d).

The political orientation data were based on responses to the statement: 'I would say my views are best represented by the [name] party', and assessed on a five point scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). This statement was presented three times with the party names Conservative, Labour and Liberal inserted. Participants were assigned to a political orientation if they scored four or more on only one of the three statements, else they were left unclassified.
### Table 4: Age frequency data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 and Over</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: Religious orientation frequency data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6: Race frequency data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Political orientation frequency data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.5 Data Analyses

All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, and item distributions were examined both visually and statistically for normality; unless indicated items can be assumed to fall within normal parameters for skewness and kurtosis.

Each scale's factor structure was examined using Principal Components Analysis (PCA) and confirmed through factor analyses using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF). Factor extraction was guided by a combination of techniques including: a priori theoretical considerations; Kaiser's criterion; scree plots; and factor interpretability (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Both oblique and orthogonal rotations were attempted in the multi-factor solution and oblique rotation results will be reported because correlations between scale factors were greater than ±0.3. Structural coefficients were taken to be significant if they were greater or equal to 0.4.

4.3 Results and Discussions

4.3.1 Patterns of Personal Involvement

4.3.1.1 Principal Components and Reliability Analyses

The PCA produced seven correlated factors with eigenvalues over 1.00 (see table 8 for factor eigenvalues and appendix I.B figure A for scree plot). All seven factors were extracted and an oblique rotation was favoured as five pairs of factors displayed correlations greater than ±0.3 (see table 9). The solution achieved simple structure and the structural coefficients were above 0.4 (see table 10), with approximately sixty-eight percent of the total variance explained. The factor structure was confirmed by factor analysis using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) and the factor structure using this method was very similar to the PCA analysis therefore only PCA results are reported here (see appendix I.B tables A & B for PAF results).
Table 8: Factor Eigenvalues and Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Value</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Rule</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Value</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Role</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Rule</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Value</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Role</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Factor Correlation Matrix for Patterns of Involvement (PCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Rule</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian Value</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Role</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Rule</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Value</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Role</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items constituting each factor were examined and five of the factors were interpreted as corresponding broadly to five of the six patterns of involvement identified by Kelman: sentimental role (factor IV), sentimental rule (factor II), sentimental value (factor I), instrumental role (factor VII) and instrumental rule (factor V). However, two of the items designed to measure instrumental role (as a British citizen ... I care enough about my country to ensure I stay informed about new developments in British
policies' and 'I care enough about my country to vote in British elections'), loaded significantly on the sentimental role factor instead. In addition, the sentimental role item, 'I would support the way men and women are treated in British society', loaded significantly on the instrumental role factor.

The final two factors (III & VI) consisted of the seven items designed to measure instrumental value. Factor III was characterised by items relating to social rights (education, healthcare and employment) and was therefore labelled 'egalitarian instrumental value'. Factor VI, on the other hand, was characterised by items relating to civic systems (tax, legal, democracy and the police force) and was labelled 'civic instrumental value'.

In general the principal components analysis (PCA) supported the multidimensionality of national identity as proposed by Kelman (1997). However, the swapping of items between the instrumental and sentimental role factors is somewhat problematic and will be discussed shortly. The items constituting each factor were tested for internal consistency and each factor-scale was found to have good reliabilities (between 0.71 – 0.92, see table 10). The internal consistency of each factor-scale was further supported by significant, positive inter-correlations between the items for each factor-scale (see appendix I.C tables C–I).

In order to test Kelman's proposals that the two attachments generate and reinforce one another but that individuals will primarily display one of the three orientations to the group, a second order factor analysis was conducted. Support for these proposals would be obtained if three second-order factors emerged relating to each of the three orientations and consisting of both sentimental and instrumental factors. The results obtained indicated two unrelated second-order factors explaining approximately 57% of the variance. The results are displayed in table eleven.
Table 10: Structural Coefficients and Cronbach's Alpha for 'Patterns of Involvement' Factors (PCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should be committed to ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... 'putting on a brave face' in times of crisis.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British tradition of 'fair play'.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... celebrating important British historical events.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the monarchy.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... teaching our children traditional British family values.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can call themselves British?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only people who are accepted as part of the British community by ...</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everyone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only someone thought of as British by the majority of the British</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only those people who the British, as a group, decide can call ...</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves British.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only people who must other British people accept as British.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to maintaining ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British education system.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British national health system.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... British Employee and worker rights.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a British citizen ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I care enough about my country to ensure I stay informed about ...</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new developments in British policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I care enough about my country to vote in British elections.</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I care enough about my country to be involved in British community affairs.</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel it is important for the country when a fellow Briton is recognised for an achievement.</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... accept Britain's immigration policies whatever they are.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... follow all laws established by the British courts whether we agree with them or not.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... accept the British legislation regarding lifestyle choices.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... vote whether we like Britain's election process or not.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... pay tax at the levels set by the British government.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to maintaining ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British tax system.</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British legal system.</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... British democracy.</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British police force.</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would support ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the way men and women are treated in British society.</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the buying of British goods in order to support the national economy.</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the active involvement of British citizens in the maintenance of a lawful British community.</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblique. Only structural coefficients above ±0.4 are shown.
Results obtained from this analysis do not support Kelman's proposals. Rather they indicate two orthogonal second-order factors the first of which consists of first-order factors relating to both sources of attachment and all three ways of relating to the group. The second factor is composed solely of the sentimental rule factor which relates to 'acceptance of the group's authority to define membership' (as defined in table 1).

Table 11: Second-order factor Analysis Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-order Factors</th>
<th>Second-order Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Value Civic</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Value</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Role</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Role</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Rule</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Value Egalitarian</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentimental Rule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Orthogonal. Only structural coefficients above ±0.4 are shown.

4.3.1.2 Discussion

Evidence was found for all six patterns of personal involvement in the group proposed by Kelman (1997). However, an examination of the structure of the items in table 10 reveals that all the items within each factor correspond to the items with the same leading phrase which also explains the swapping of the instrumental and sentimental role items. In other words, semantic similarity may explain the pattern of loadings observed. Given this observation it is difficult to discount the possible influencing effect of response set.
In addition, the items designed to measure the pattern 'instrumental value' were found to compose two separate factors; these were both interpreted as measuring instrumental values as defined by Kelman; however, there was a distinction between items associated with the social rights and benefits of citizenship (factor III) and the items associated with the institutions which guide the duties of citizens (to pay tax, abide the law, etc.; factor VI).

The division of the instrumental value factor into two factors may be an indication of a conceptual distinction between instrumental values that are associated with social rights and civic duties as assumed in the interpretation of the factors. This interpretation would suggest that further distinctions would be required in Kelman's model.

Alternatively, factor III -- egalitarian instrumental value, contained items measuring issues that have traditionally been sources of pride for British citizens, e.g. free national health provision, free access to education and the protection of employee/worker rights (e.g. through trade union membership). These areas have undergone many changes in recent years: there is a funding crisis in the national health system; university tuition fees were recently introduced for the first time in British history; and law relating to trade unions has changed in favour of business and market interests (e.g. in the coal mining and steel industries). Two of the three items that loaded on this factor (health and education), had been identified during the piloting stage as areas of disillusionment with government policy and these views were supported during debriefing discussions with participants in the main study. I cannot therefore discount the possibility that responses to these items may have been influenced by participants' dissatisfaction with the current institutional arrangements and operating values in these areas. This interpretation would indicate that individuals are not simply characterised by an instrumental value orientation as suggested by Kelman (1997) but express further nuances relating to the current state of institutions in their nation.
The inter-factor correlations are also problematic for Kelman's model. The three orientations are supposed to be orthogonal, however, significant correlations between the different orientation factors indicate otherwise. For example, sentimental value and instrumental role are positively\(^9\) correlated at 0.36, indicating that people would score similarly on both these factors making it unlikely that one could relate primarily to their group in one manner. This is further supported by the second-order factor analysis where all the 'pattern' factors except sentimental rule loaded significantly on a single component.

A number of novel issues were raised by participants during the debriefing sessions of the main study which had not been raised during the pilot phase that related to the content of some of the questionnaire items. Some items were perceived either as too outdated or ambiguous, or as inadequate in their provision for a diversity of responses. For example, two of the sentimental value items, those referring to 'putting on a brave face' and 'fair play', were perceived as measuring outdated views of Britishness; 'traditional British family values' (sentimental value item) and 'British lifestyle choices' (instrumental rule item) were perceived as too ambiguous: participants had difficulty understanding to what these items were referring. Participants also complained that they had difficulty responding to items that constituted both the instrumental value factors. They argued that the format did not allow them to specify that while they felt committed to maintaining the various British systems and institutions – they did not endorse these systems in their current forms. This led to participant uncertainty regarding whether to agree or disagree with an item and may have contributed to these items forming two distinct factors. A further point

---

\(^9\) The inter-factor correlation is positive because items loaded negatively on the instrumental role factor and this shared a negative correlation with the sentimental value factor whose items loaded positively.
raised by participants related to the phrase: ‘I care enough about my country’, which appeared in three of the role items. Participants suggested that their participation in the behaviours mentioned in these items was not necessarily related to how much they ‘cared’ about their country – rather participation was driven by a sense of duty or collective responsibility.

Overall, the principal components and factor analyses of the ‘personal involvement’ items were found to have a relatively good underlying simple structure as well as good internal reliabilities. Nevertheless, this did not necessarily lead to subjectively valid tests of the target constructs. From the possibility of response set and through the issues raised by participants during the debriefing sessions, it was apparent that the validity of the test items may be questionable in that they may not have been perceived in the manner intended by the researcher. This highlights the importance of examining both the reliability and the validity of measures – as well as the importance of participant feedback. Although steps were taken to refine the questionnaire and explore any issues relating to the question format and content through pilot work, and to validate the content of our tests through the use of expert judges, we were unable to identify the issues later raised by participants in the main study. A possible explanation for this may be that the expert judges focused on assessing the items in terms of the theoretical definitions of the constructs while participants focused on the relevance of the items in terms of national identity content.

Even though Kelman and Hamilton (1989d) had problems relating to the reliability and validity of their scales, they were still able to identify differences in the endorsement of the three orientations – rule, role and value, based on demographic factors. Notwithstanding, the problems highlighted in this discussion, the factors in the current study were broadly interpretable and the scales statistically reliable. Therefore it was decided to progress with testing for differences between demographic groups in the endorsement of the orientations as Kelman and Hamilton had done. Only
differences in orientations will be examined as Kelman (1997) argues that the two sources of attachment generate and reinforce one another but that individuals will primarily display one of the three orientations to the group.

### 4.3.2 Differences in Patterns of Endorsement Amongst Demographic Groups

#### 4.3.2.1 Computing Scale Scores

In order to compare the three orientations across groups, scale scores relating to the three orientations were computed. The simple summation method \( \sum \frac{x_{item}}{N_{items}} \) was used to create scale scores as all items loaded well on their respective factors, and the standard deviations for the items within each orientation scale were within a similar order of magnitude (between 0.89 & 1.13 across all items, Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.678). As both the sentimental and instrumental factors were included within each orientation the reliability of these collapsed scales was examined. The results indicated acceptable reliability for all three scales (Rule Cronbach’s \( \alpha = 0.72 \); Role Cronbach’s \( \alpha = 0.84 \); Value Cronbach’s \( \alpha = 0.85 \)).

#### 4.3.2.2 Analysis of Covariance

The intention was to examine group differences using MANOVA therefore the inter-factor correlations were examined. Given inter-factor correlations observed in the first-order factor analysis, significant correlations between the three collapsed orientation scales were expected. The analysis revealed that the three orientations were indeed significantly correlated (role & value \( r=0.62, p<0.001 \); rule & role \( r=0.36, p<0.001 \); rule & value \( r=0.34, p<0.001 \)).

Given these results it was decided that it was inappropriate to continue with MANOVA analysis. The correlation between the dependent variables (i.e. the orientations) would render any univariate results uninterpretable;
the overlapping variance in the DVs would in essence be assessed twice. In addition the already inflated possibility of type one errors (from multiple tests) is further inflated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.402). Given these issues only two possible options remained if group differences were to be examined: Roy-Bergmann Stepdown analysis or ANCOVA. The Roy-Bergmann Stepdown analysis requires the researcher to prioritise one DV over the others, and as there were no convincing theoretical reasons to do this it was decided to conduct a series of ANCOVAs instead. In this way the effects of two of the orientations can be partialed out from the third leaving relatively 'pure' constructs to test. This process will be repeated for each of the three orientations and the corrected DVs tested for significant group differences in terms of race, religion and political orientation. This effectively means that three ANCOVAs will be conducted for each demographic group test (i.e. three for each of the between groups independent variables: race, religion & political orientation) therefore a Bonferroni correction will be applied and the significance level lowered to 0.0167 (0.05/3). Type III sums of squares were used throughout to estimate the f-values as this corrects for unbalanced cell sizes.

The results of all the ANCOVA tests indicated no significant group difference due to race (Asian vs. black vs. white), religion (Christian vs. Muslim vs. Atheist) or political orientation (Conservative vs. Labour vs. Liberal; see table 12 below for the means, and appendix I.E, tables N to P for the non-significant ANCOVA results). In other words, all the demographic groups endorsed the three orientations similarly.
Table 12: Estimated Orientation Marginal Means, Standard Errors & Cell Sizes by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.3 Discussion

As expected (hypothesis 1b) scores on the three orientations were positively related. This suggests that, as with Kelman's proposal for attachment forms, the orientations too generate and reinforce one another. This provides empirical support that for each group member, membership in the national group involves all three relational orientations not primarily one as Kelman's model implies. In addition and in line with the case set out in chapter three, these observations also suggest that adherence to rules that guide the members' behaviours and interactions (group norms), the 'performance' of different group roles, and the internalisation of group values are inherently related and that all group members will relate to their national group, to varying degrees, along all three forms of 'orientation'. 
The proposal that demographic factors influence the way individuals and
groups relate to their nation was tested using a series of Bonferroni
corrected ANCOVAs. The results obtained were contrary to hypothesis 1c in
that no support was found for Kelman and Hamilton’s predictions regarding
group differences. Demographic factors did not significantly influence the
endorsement of the various orientations. Instead all participants,
irrespective of race, religion or political orientation, scored similarly on all
three orientations. This implies that qualitatively different involvement
with ones national group may not be a function of such demographic
characteristics.

4.3.3 Levels of British and European Identity

This next section addresses the relationship between national and European
identification by reporting the findings from the study that relate to levels of
identification with these two groups.

4.3.3.1 Principal Components and Reliability Analyses

Two unconstrained PCAs were conducted on the data from the two ‘levels of
identity’ scales: national and European. The results of these analyses
appear in tables 13 and 14. Examination of the PCA results indicated that
for both scales a single factor solution was evident. All factor loadings were
above 0.5 and the solutions achieved simple structure. The variance
explained by these solutions was 56% for British identity and 47% for
European identity. These single-factor solutions were further supported by
employing factor analyses using PAF (see appendix I.D tables J & K). The
factors were interpreted as measuring levels of British and European
identity respectively. The internal consistency (assessed using Cronbach’s
alpha) indicated that both scales were indeed reliable (British $\alpha=0.84$;
European $\alpha=0.77$). The scale consistencies were further supported by
significant, positive inter-item correlations within each scale (see appendix I.D tables L & M).

Table 13: Strength of British National Identity – Factor Loadings and Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being British.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being British is a central part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Britons.</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a British person.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the British group of people.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Britons.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.84

*Indicates reversed scored items

Table 14: Strength of European Identity – Factor Loadings and Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being European.</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a European person.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being European is a central part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6*</td>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people.</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Europeans.</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha: 0.77

*Indicates reversed scored items
4.3.3.2 Relationships Between British and European Identities

Using the summation method (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.678), factor scores were computed for each group identity and compared using a paired samples t-test and bivariate correlation. Using the paired samples t-test to examine the levels of national and European identities across all participants revealed that levels of national identity were significantly higher than European identity ($t(350)=7.39$, $p<0.001$; $\bar{x}_{\text{national}}=3.05$ versus $\bar{x}_{\text{European}}=2.69$). The correlation between scores on the two scales was $r(351)=0.20$, $p<0.001$, indicating that the two forms of identification are weakly related to one another.

4.3.3.3 Discussion

Analyses of the 'levels of identity' scales produced internally consistent unidimensional factors. Moreover, no problem issues were identified by participants during debriefing regarding item wording or comprehension.

Other research has cautioned against reducing a complex construct such as identity to a unidimensional scale (e.g. Hinkle et al., 1989). However, the scale developed in the present context is intended as a measure of the strength level of a given identity while incorporating the various elements that are thought to characterise identification with a social group (as discussed earlier). In this regard, a unidimensional scale is appropriate. The advantage is that it incorporates the general characteristics of social identification and allows more robust generalisations to be made.

The generalisability of the current identity strength scale was supported in this study by the similar structure observed when the scale was used as a measure of both levels of British and European identity. The scale was found to be a reliable and valid measure of identity strength for identities attached to both a group with a long existence (national group) and a group
which is relatively new and probably, psychologically, still in the formation stage (European group). As expected (hypothesis 2a) Britons reported higher levels of national identification when compared to European identification.

Somewhat unexpectedly (hypothesis 2b) the relationship between the two identities was significantly positive. However, this relationship was very mild ($r=0.20$): the two identities shared 4% of their variance. These observations are broadly consistent with previous findings (e.g. Cinnirella, 1996b; Huici et al., 1997). Although Cinnirella's research indicated a negative correlation between the two identities ($r=-0.26$) and Huici et al's no significant relationship ($r=0.01$), the amount of variance shared between the two identities in all three studies is not substantially different. However, the use of different scales and the difference in time frames between the three studies may have contributed to the differing results.

4.4 Chapter Summary

In summary, some support was obtained for the different ‘patterns’ of personal involvement in the nation in that seven factors were evident from the data that more or less corresponded to the six patterns identified by Kelman. However, although the PCA and PAF analyses resulted in reliable scales, in light of potential response set and the issues regarding the relevance of the items to current constructions of national identity, the validity of the scales was questionable.

The issues raised by the participants highlight the difficulties in generating specific self-definitional characteristics of a social identity that are relevant or applicable to all group members, both in terms of content and historical relevance. Evidence for this could be seen in the perception of some items as outdated. In addition, when using real social groups and categories, uncontrollable events occurring externally to the research context may
affect the manner with which certain aspects of the study are perceived. This may have been an issue when participants responded to items involving areas such as health and education.

The problems encountered in this study may have been exacerbated by the research instruments themselves. Participant feedback indicated that the scale format was inadequate in that some items did not allow participants to express their conditional support and loyalty to the group's actions, policies and decision-making. From the participants' perspective a further constraint was inherent in the presentation of a fixed motivation to engage in certain group behaviours. For example, participants argued that participation in some behaviours was related to a sense of national duty and responsibility rather than an emotional group attachment implied by including the item prefix 'I care enough about my country'.

No evidence was found to support the primacy of one form of orientation over any of the others within different demographic groups. Instead the orientations were positively correlated. It is likely that the three orientations, as with the two attachments, generate and reinforce one another, making national identification a complex construct involving both sentimental and instrumental dimensions as well as rules, roles and values.

The new 'levels of identity' scale had acceptable psychometric properties. Using this scale to examine levels of national and European identification revealed that British national identification is significantly stronger than European identification, and that these two identities are not correlated to a great extent. Although contrary to previous research, a small positive correlation was observed. This may indicate a shift in the relationship between the two identities in the British, however, such claims require further empirical support.
4.5 **PROGRESSION TO THE NEXT STUDY**

The issues encountered in the course of this initial study were used to inform a different approach in the exploration of British national identity content. It was concluded that attempting to develop measures of the intersection between the different forms of attachment and orientation was an ineffective way of exploring the descriptive and prescriptive norms of the group. In order to provide participants with more flexibility, descriptive and prescriptive elements of national identification will be measured separately. In addition, given the potential complexity and diversity of national identity content it was decided to avoid highly content specific items, particularly if they had proved to be problematic in the current study.

The next chapter therefore draws on both the current study, and the attachment and patriotism literature reviewed and reinterpreted in chapter three to create measures of the two descriptive dimensions – traditional-cultural and civic, and the two prescriptive dimensions – group conformity and critical evaluation. The next chapter describes and discusses a study conducted in fulfilment of these aims.
CHAPTER FIVE: DESCRIPTIVE & PRESCRIPTIVE NATIONAL GROUP NORMS

“Once intergroup distinctiveness is established by a denotative norm, ingroup members can devote attention to prescriptive norms that ensure consensus on criteria for positive ingroup evaluation”

(Marques, Abrams, Pàez, & Hogg, 2001, p.411)
5.1 Introduction

The initial attempt, in the previous study, to generate measures of different dimensions of British national identity content was of limited success and utility. However, the issues encountered during the course of that initial study are used to inform a second attempt to generate such measures. The study conducted to this end is reported in the current chapter.

This chapter then, tackles the second aim of the thesis, i.e. to explore the descriptive and prescriptive norms associated with British national identity. The operationalisation of the norm constructs was guided both by the previous study, and attachment and patriotism research discussed in chapter three.

I begin by summarising the main points of the approach and the research aims and questions relevant to the study, before progressing to the study itself.

5.1.1 Constructing the National Group

The nation has been identified as an important element of identity and self-definition; it has also been conceptualised as an imagined community (B. Anderson, 1983; Billig, 1996) and as such may give rise to different interpretations. However, little has been done to explore the particular ways that identification with the nation occurs. To do this one may wish to explore how ingroup members conceptualise their national group. One can ask: what characteristics simultaneously define the group and differentiate it from other social groups? One may also wish to explore how ingroup definitions are supported, in other words we can also ask how consensus on a particular definition is encouraged. How is behaviour within the group regulated to sustain the group's definition of itself and reinforce identification?
As argued in chapters two and three the approach assumed in this thesis is based on the social identity approach. Group norms are given a central position in our theorising. In their descriptive form, they are seen as crucial variables in the formation, definition and differentiation of social groups. In their prescriptive form they regulate members' behaviours by prescribing appropriate behavioural standards – thus sustaining the group image while at the same time reinforcing group identification (Marques et al., 2001).

The novel aspect of the research presented here is in the use of sociological models of the nation, and national attachment and patriotism research to operationalise the national group norms. Using a social identity approach it was argued, in chapter three, that the sources of attachment identified by Kelman (1997) reflect the descriptive group norms of the national models described by Smith (1991), and the patriotism concepts, blind and constructive (Staub, 1997; Schatz et al., 1999), reflect the prescriptive norms that are used to sustain the group's definition of itself and reinforce identification.

5.1.2 Descriptive Norms

Smith's work on ethnic-genealogical and civic-territorial models of the nation, and Kelman's on sentimental and instrumental attachments (Kelman, 1997; A. D. Smith, 1991), each indicate two broad dimensions upon which conceptualisations of modern nation-states may be built. The ethnic-genealogical model and sentimental attachment both share a focus on traditional culture and symbols, while the civic-territorial model and instrumental attachment both share a focus on the civic elements of nationhood. In chapter three it was speculated these reflect two broad but theoretically distinct dimensions of national identity content. More specifically, it was argued that psychological boundary demarcation based on shared historical traditions and culture involves an attachment to the nation's symbols and historical values (traditional-cultural dimension);
while psychological boundary demarcation based on a shared polity involves an attachment to the nation’s civic practices (civic dimension).

As may be apparent the distinctions based on Kelman’s (1997) sentimental/instrumental attachments assumed in the previous chapter have not been abandoned. Rather these, together with the observations from the previous study and the sociological definitions discussed above are used together to refine the operationalisation of the descriptive aspects of national identity content.

Following Kelman (1997) it was proposed that the two dimensions of national identification are distinct, orthogonal constructs, but not mutually exclusive. Together the two dimensions define different aspects of national identity. It is expected that the two descriptive constructs described here will be orthogonal because while an individual may endorse both dimensions to varying degrees, it is not expected that these will be related in a systematic manner. In addition, it is not proposed here that these two dimensions are exhaustive – rather it is accepted that other definitions and group attributes may exist that are not explored here. However, the aim of this research is to explore whether these two dimensions are apparent in British national identity.

5.1.3 Prescriptive Norms

In addition to re-conceptualising national attachment as reflecting the descriptive norms of the national group, it was argued in chapter three that the concept of patriotism can be conceived as a set of behavioural standards that reflect the prescriptive norms of the social group. The constituent elements of patriotism, the manner with which loyalty is extended to the group, reactions to ingroup criticism (or deviance) and the appraisal of the group’s decisions and actions, all serve regulating group functions, prescribing the appropriate normative behavioural standards to which
group members are expected to adhere. The two dimensions of patriotism, conventionally known as blind and constructive, can be re-conceptualised as prescriptive norms that promote the importance, per se, of group conformity and critical evaluation respectively\textsuperscript{10}.

Finally, the discussion in chapter three indicated that there is a relationship between: (i) traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms, and (ii) civic descriptive norms and critical evaluation prescriptive norms. These propositions were based in political psychological research that indicates that national groups resist changes to the group attributes that are seen as traditional and symbolic, while a more critical approach is taken to the civic aspects of nationhood. These propositions are examined in the current study.

Given that I expect the two forms of prescriptive norms to be used in conjunction with different dimensions of group definition, the two prescriptive norm constructs are also expected to be orthogonal.

5.1.4 Research Aims, Questions and Hypotheses

The main aims of the study reported here are to: (a) develop measures of traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms, and group conformity and critical evaluation prescriptive norms; (b) explore whether these norms are apparent in a British/English population; and (c) explore the relationships among the proposed descriptive and prescriptive norms.

\textsuperscript{10} The proposition that patriotism can be differentiated in terms of the manner with which loyalty is extended to the group: one is based in uncritical conformity, the other in critical loyalty, is also consistent with Kelman's (1957) rule/role and value orientations respectively (see also chapter three).
Research Questions

1a. Do traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms form two distinct factors?
1b. What is the relationship between these descriptive factors, if any?
2a. Do group conformity and critical evaluation prescriptive norms form two distinct factors?
2b. What is the relationship between these prescriptive factors, if any?
3. What is the relationship between the two forms of descriptive and prescriptive norms?

Hypotheses

1. Traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms will form two distinct orthogonal factors.
2. Group conformity and critical evaluation prescriptive norms will form two distinct orthogonal factors.
3. Positive relationships will be apparent between traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms, and between civic descriptive and critical evaluation prescriptive norms.

5.2 Methodology

5.2.1 Questionnaire Design

As with study one the questionnaire for this study (see appendix IIA) was designed for self-completion following the same guidelines regarding item wording, questionnaire layout, use of space, response formats, and participant instructions (see also chapter four). All measures were scored on a 5-point Likert scale and basic demographic information was also collected. Both the descriptive and prescriptive norms scale ranged from 1 — strongly disagree (through 2, 3, 4: somewhat disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree somewhat) to 5 — strongly agree.
5.2.1.1 Descriptive Norms

The operationalisation of traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms was based on theorising by Kelman (Kelman, 1969; Kelman & Hamilton, 1989a; Kelman, 1997) and Smith (A. D. Smith, 1991) and was also guided by the observations from the previous study. For example, content areas that were found to be problematic in the previous study were avoided (e.g. traditional components such as 'fair play' and 'family values', and institutional components such as health and educational provision), but areas that were well received were retained (e.g. traditional components such as British historical events and the Monarchy, and institutional components such as the legal system and democracy). In addition, the design of the items measuring traditional-cultural content was also guided by Routh & Burgoyne's (1998) operationalisation of cultural attachment.

All the items were developed specifically for this study. Traditional-cultural content was measured using ten items: five assessed psychological boundary demarcation based on shared historical traditions and culture, and five assessed shared traditional and symbolic behaviours and values (see table 15). Civic content was also measured using ten items: five items assessed psychological boundary demarcation based on shared national citizenship, and five assessed shared civic behaviours and values (see table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15: Traditional-Cultural Descriptive Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary Demarcation: Shared Historical Traditions &amp; Culture (5 Items)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have family that has lived in Britain for many generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have not been influenced by non-British cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... share traditional British religious beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value important British historical events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... can trace their British ancestry for many generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Esteemed Behaviours &amp; Values: Shared Traditional &amp; Symbolic Behaviours &amp; Values (5 Items)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... adhere to a traditional British way of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in maintaining traditional British culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value having the Queen’s head on British currency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... swear allegiance to the Queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... are loyal to the Monarchy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Civic Descriptive Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary Demarcation: Shared National Citizenship (5 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... are committed to British society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... think of Britain as their democratic 'home'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have not been influenced by non-British civic systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... feel a sense of joint national responsibility with other Britons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... share a common sense of allegiance to Britain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Esteemed Behaviours &amp; Values: Shared Civic Duties &amp; Responsibilities (5 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... adhere to their citizenship obligations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in maintaining British democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value their right to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in the British legal system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe they have a role in British society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1.2 Prescriptive Norms

The operationalisation of group conformity and critical evaluation norms was mainly guided by Staub's (1997) and Schatz et al's, (1999) work on patriotism; however they were also influenced by the arguments forwarded in chapter three. In other words, I avoided including items that assessed such things as moral superiority and personality characteristics. All the items (except three which were taken directly from Schatz et al, (1999)) were developed specifically for this study.

Group conformity and critical evaluation norms, which share the function of prescribing guides to behaviour and cognition, each consist of three elements: group loyalty, reactions to ingroup criticism and appraisal of the group’s decisions and actions.

In the group conformity scale there were eleven items (see table 17): four items assessed staunch loyalty, four intolerance towards ingroup criticism, and three an unquestioning positive evaluation of the group’s decisions and actions. The critical evaluation scale contained ten items (see table 18): three items measured critical loyalty, four tolerance towards ingroup criticism, and three a questioning and critical evaluation of the group's decisions and actions.
Table 17: Group Conformity Prescriptive Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Loyalty: Staunch Loyalty (4 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If another country disagreed with an important British policy that I knew little about, I would still support my country's position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would support my country right or wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to international affairs Britain is nearly always right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain can only remain a strong nation if we as citizens unite unquestioningly behind her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions to Ingroup Criticism: Intolerance (4 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even if you personally disagree with your country's actions you should still support your country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should not tolerate citizens who challenge national decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should set aside any personal beliefs and never protest against national policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be a powerful nation we as citizens must accept the guidance of our national leaders without doubting them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal of the Group's Decisions &amp; Actions: Unquestioningly Positive (3 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being good British citizens involves accepting all the decisions made on our behalf by our government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning national decisions will lead to the downfall of Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support British policies for the very reason that they are the policies of my country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Italics denotes items taken from Schatz et al, 1999)

Table 18: Critical Evaluation Prescriptive Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Loyalty: Critical Loyalty (3 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you love your country you should say when you think its actions are wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being positively critical of one's nation is the best thing I can do for my nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My willingness to challenge the 'wrongs' Britain commits allows the building of a better nation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions to Ingroup Criticism: Tolerance (4 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to recognise the faults in British policies rather than to blindly accept them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning policy decisions is one's obligation as a citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All citizens should voice their opinions even if these opinions oppose the national status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the duty of a good citizen to express their discontentment with the national decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal of the Group's Decisions &amp; Actions: Questioning &amp; Critical (3 Items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to maintain a strong nation citizens should demand changes in government policies when they feel it is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking action against bad national policy is good for the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply accepting the actions of Britain when I disagree with them, is bad for the nation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2 Procedure

The procedure followed in this study was the same as that of study one. All participants completed the questionnaire in the presence of the researcher. This ensured that the questionnaire was completed in a quiet environment, in one sitting and in the order presented.
Participants were informed that the study they were taking part in was about 'their views on being British'. In compliance with BPS standards and in order to reduce social desirability bias, participants were orally informed that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions in the questionnaire, of the voluntary basis of their participation, their right to withdraw from the study at any point, and the anonymity of their responses. Furthermore, all questionnaires contained a cover sheet that explained these rights (see appendix II.A).

As with the previous study upon completion of the questionnaire participants were debriefed and thanked, and given the opportunity to ask the researcher questions. They were encouraged to discuss their reflections on the questionnaire items as the debriefing session was again also used as an opportunity to receive further feedback on the questionnaire which could potentially inform the refinement of the new measures as required.

The presentation order of the items were, demographics followed by prescriptive norms (randomised group conformity and critical evaluation items) and finally descriptive norms (randomised traditional-cultural and civic items).

5.2.3 Participants

One hundred and two participants from an ethnically diverse university in London took part in the study as part of a research methods class; participation was voluntary.

The ethnicity, race or religion of the participants were not controlled. Given that Britain is a multicultural nation the sample used reflects this. However, as with the first study only data from participants who were British and had lived in England since age five were included in the analyses. This resulted in the exclusion of six participants. Forty-five
participants classified their race as white, twenty-three as black, twenty-five as Asian and nine as other. The mean age of the sample was 22.91 years.

5.2.4 Data Analyses

The factor structure of the scales was assessed through principal components analyses and the scales were examined for reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The inferential analyses adopted a correlational design; the data were analysed using regression analyses.

5.3 Results & Discussions

5.3.1 The Multi-dimensionality of National Identity Content

5.3.1.1 Results

Two unconstrained principal components analyses (PCAs) were conducted: one for descriptive and one for prescriptive norms. The prescriptive PCA revealed five factors with eigenvalues over 1.00, and the descriptive four. The accompanying scree plots however, suggested two or three factor solutions for both constructs (see appendix IIB, figures B & C).

Given the theoretical propositions that each of these constructs consists of two factors the PCAs were repeated constraining them both to two-factor solutions with orthogonal rotations\(^\text{11}\). This produced a simple solution where all structural coefficients were above 0.5 and all the relevant items loaded on the appropriate factor (see tables 19 & 20). The results of both

\(^{11}\text{Oblique rotations were conducted and discarded as the factor inter-correlations were <0.3 (absolute value) indicating an orthogonal rotation was appropriate.}\)
the prescriptive and descriptive PCAs supported the hypothesised structure. The two descriptive factors were indeed distinct orthogonal constructs as were the two prescriptive factors.

The two-factor structure of each solution was confirmed via parallel analysis comparisons. This technique guides factor extraction by comparing the factor eigenvalues from the real data set with factor eigenvalues from random number data sets of the same "rank"; "a factor is extracted for the real data for any real eigenvalue that exceeds the associated eigenvalues from the random data" (Thompson, 1996, p200). Two parallel analyses were conducted for each solution, all of which yielded random data set eigenvalues for factors III and above which were larger than those from the sample data (see appendix II.B, tables Q & R). This confirmed that two-factor extractions were justified12.

---

12 The assumption in this thesis that descriptive and prescriptive norms are theoretically distinct constructs was tested by conducting a single PCA containing all the descriptive and prescriptive items. The factor extraction was guided by the scree plot and parallel analyses as detailed above. The results indicated a four factor oblique solution that explained 49% of the variance. The four factors corresponded to two descriptive and two prescriptive dimensions; moreover, all items loaded significantly (between 0.43 & 0.81) on the construct they were designed to measure. Only one pair of factors had a correlation above ±0.3: traditional-cultural descriptive & group conformity prescriptive r=0.34. These results support the underlying assumption of distinct descriptive & prescriptive constructs (See appendix II.C for results).
Table 19: Descriptive Norms – Structural Coefficients, Cronbach’s Alpha and Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FI Traditional cultural</th>
<th>FII Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion a person is truly British if they ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in maintaining traditional British culture.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... adhere to a traditional British way of life.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... can trace their British ancestry for many generations.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value important British historical events.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... swear allegiance to the Queen.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have family that has lived in Britain for many generations.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... share traditional British religious beliefs.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value having the Queen’s head on British currency.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have not been influenced by non-British cultures.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... are loyal to the Monarchy.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... feel a sense of joint national responsibility with other Britons.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... are committed to British society.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe they have a role in British society.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... think of Britain as their democratic ‘home’.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... share a common sense of allegiance to Britain.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in maintaining British democracy.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have not been influenced by non-British civic systems.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... adhere to their citizenship obligations.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value their right to vote.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in the British legal system.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Explained (%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural coefficients below ±0.3. not shown
Table 20: Prescriptive Norms – Structural Coefficients, Cronbach’s Alpha and Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FI Critical Evaluation</th>
<th>FII Group Conformity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would support my country right or wrong.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being good British citizens involves accepting all the decisions made on our behalf by our government.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should set aside any personal beliefs and never protest against national policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if you personally disagree with your country’s actions you should still support your country.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If another country disagreed with an important British policy that I knew little about, I would still support my country’s position.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support British policies for the very reason that they are the policies of my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should not tolerate citizens who challenge national decisions.</td>
<td>(-.30)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning national decisions will lead to the downfall of Britain.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain can only remain a strong nation if we as citizens unite unquestioningly behind her.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to international affairs Britain is nearly always right.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be a powerful nation we as citizens must accept the guidance of our national leaders without doubting them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My willingness to challenge the 'wrongs' Britain commits allows the building of a better nation.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to recognise the faults in British policies rather than to blindly accept them.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to maintain a strong nation citizens should demand changes in government policies when they feel it is necessary.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning policy decisions is one’s obligation as a citizen.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking action against bad national policy is good for the country.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you love your country you should say when you think its actions are wrong.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being positively critical of one’s nation is the best thing I can do for my nation.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply accepting the actions of Britain when I disagree with them is bad for the nation.</td>
<td>.59 (-.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the duty of a good citizen to express their discontentment with the national decisions.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All citizens should voice their opinions even if these opinions oppose the national status quo.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability

| Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability | .85 | .84 |
| Variance Explained (%)       | 29  | 15  |

Structural coefficients below ±0.3. not shown; Parentheses indicate non-significant loadings above ±0.3.
Factor I of the descriptive norms scale was comprised of all the items assessing shared historical traditions and culture, and shared traditional and symbolic behaviours; it was interpreted as a measure of traditional-cultural descriptive norms. Factor II, on the other hand, comprised all the items assessing shared national citizenship, and shared civic duties and responsibilities: this was interpreted as assessing civic descriptive norms.

All the items that loaded significantly on factor I of the prescriptive norms scale related to critical group loyalty, tolerant reactions to ingroup criticism and a questioning/critical appraisal of the group's decisions and actions; it was therefore interpreted as a measure of critical evaluation norms. Factor II consisted of items assessing staunch group loyalty, intolerant reactions to ingroup criticism and an unquestioning appraisal of the group's decisions and actions; this was defined as the group conformity factor.

The internal consistencies of the four sub-scales were assessed using Cronbach's alpha; all sub-scale reliabilities were good: group conformity $\alpha=0.84$, critical evaluation $\alpha=0.85$, traditional-cultural $\alpha=0.91$, and civic $\alpha=0.84$.

5.3.1.2 Discussion

Reflexivity Through Participant Feedback

Participant feedback on the current questionnaire was generally positive. Participants' discussions included debates regarding the role of the Monarchy and religion in contemporary British society, multicultural Britain, citizenship obligations and also on political apathy in terms of motivation to vote in political elections. Opinions on these issues were varied but no significant issues of concern were identified. In general, participants' comments indicated that the questionnaire was well received, and easy to understand and complete.
Descriptive Norms as Identity Content

The results confirmed the multidimensional nature of descriptive national group norms. As hypothesised (hypothesis 1) two qualitatively different and largely orthogonal dimensions were apparent, sharing less than 3% of their variance. The emergent factor structure was clearly interpretable and supported the operationalisation of the two descriptive norm dimensions: traditional-cultural and civic. The two scales created from their constituent items demonstrated good internal consistency.

Overall, the pattern of responses indicate that the definition of the national group emerges along the two distinct dimensions that had been operationalised, each anchored in different constructions of nationhood that correspond to the sociological definitions of the nation identified by Smith (1991). The patterns of endorsement applied by British citizens to scale items would seem to support two distinct dimensions of national identification. Each dimension consisted of items relating to the characteristics of ingroup members and the values and beliefs they share. The traditional-cultural dimension comprised items relating to psychological boundary demarcation based on shared historical traditions and culture, and national attachment based on shared traditional and symbolic behaviours and values. The civic dimension comprised items relating to psychological boundary demarcation based on shared national citizenship, and national attachment based on shared civic behaviours and values.

The utility of these observations is twofold. Firstly, it supports the two distinct sociological definitions proposed by Smith (1991). Secondly, it connects these with behaviours and values operationalised on the basis of Kelman's (1997) sentimental and instrumental attachments to the nation.

These observations inform our understanding of the connections between the normative characteristics used to demarcate group boundaries (what members should be) and the associated esteemed behaviours and values.
(what members should value). For example, a British citizen who endorses the idea that a person is truly British if they ‘value important British historical events’ (traditional-cultural boundary demarcation item) is also likely to ‘value having the Queen’s head on British currency’ (traditional-cultural esteemed behaviours and values item). On the other hand a British citizen who endorses the idea that a person is truly British if they ‘share a common sense of allegiance to Britain’ (civic boundary demarcation item) is likely to ‘value their right to vote’ (civic esteemed behaviours and values item).

Connections such as these may allow us to build a better understanding of the differential manner with which the British nation is imagined. In addition, these results indicate that traditional-cultural or civic definitions are not constructed in opposition to each other. The independence of the two dimensions indicates that there is no systematic relationship between the two dimensions in an English population. Endorsement of one definition is not dependent on positive or negative endorsement of the other definition: rather, both are differentially used to define the national group. Together these definitions influence the content of national identification, an observation that may be generalisable to other national groups. Individuals define their national group, to varying degrees, in terms of both traditional-symbolic and civic culture.

**Prescriptive Norms as Identity Content**

As hypothesised (hypothesis 2) the principal components analysis of the prescriptive norms items resulted in a solution consisting of two distinct orthogonal factors. As with the descriptive norms the emergent factors were clearly interpretable and supported the operationalisation of two proposed prescriptive norm dimensions: group conformity and critical evaluation. Both prescriptive sub-scales were found to be reliable.
The endorsement pattern of the items indicates two forms of behavioural standards that promote the importance of critical evaluation or group conformity per se. The first dimension, critical evaluation, consisted of items assessing critical group loyalty, tolerant reactions to ingroup criticism, and a questioning and critical appraisal of group decisions and actions. The second dimension, group conformity, comprised items assessing staunch group loyalty, intolerant reactions to ingroup criticism and an unquestioning appraisal of the group’s decisions and actions.

These observations show that operationalisations based on the definitions of blind and constructive patriotism, form two distinct dimensions – even when the operationalisations are not confounded with elements of national superiority or ethnocentrism. This approach allows the development of ‘cleaner’ scales that measure single constructs. Any relationships with other constructs, such as ethnocentrism and national superiority, can then be assessed empirically.

The orthogonality of the two prescriptive norm dimensions indicates that a systematic relationship was not apparent between them. One possible explanation for this may be that different situations may warrant a different approach. Individuals may identify situations where behaviour is incongruent with one form and more congruent with the other form. Given the relationships identified between traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms on the one hand, and between civic descriptive norms and critical evaluation prescriptive norms on the other hand, the behavioural standards used to guide one’s actions may be dependent on the specific descriptive dimension involved. The next section explores the data for these relationships.
5.3.2 Relationships Between Different Descriptive & Prescriptive Norms

5.3.2.1 Results

Data Preparation
Factor scores for both group conformity and critical evaluation prescriptive norms, and traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms were calculated. The simple summation method \( \frac{\sum x_{\text{items}}}{N_{\text{items}}} \) was used as all items loaded well on their respective factors; furthermore the standard deviations for the items within each scale were roughly equal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.678). Item scores for each factor were summed and the total divided by the number of items in the scale thus retaining the same possible range within each factor-scale. Pearson correlation coefficients were then calculated between the two prescriptive factors \( (r=-0.009, \text{ns}) \) and the two descriptive factors \( (r=0.173, \text{ns}) \) confirming that the pairs of factors were not reliably correlated, rather they were orthogonal.

The next stage in the analyses involved exploring the relationships between the two forms of descriptive and prescriptive norms. The aim was to examine the data for evidence in support of the propositions made in chapter three and in hypothesis 3. To this end the relationship between each form of prescriptive norms and the two forms of descriptive norms were examined using hierarchical multiple regression. Multiple regression was favoured over ANOVA techniques in order to avoid dichotomising a continuous variable, which would ultimately result in a lowering of statistical power (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Two separate analyses were conducted, one for each form of prescriptive norms (group conformity and critical evaluation).

As these analyses were exploratory, both forms of descriptive norms were entered as predictors for each form of prescriptive norms. In addition the
possible joint effect of the two forms of descriptive norms was also examined by creating an interaction term (traditional-cultural*civic). The interaction effects were examined using Cohen and Cohen's (1983) recommendation which states that forming a multiplicative term, i.e. $X_1X_2$, encompasses the interaction effect. Two $R^2$ values are obtained, one for the main-effects model (including both traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms as predictors) and one for the full model which included the multiplicative term; if an interaction is present, the $R^2$ change between these two models should be statistically significant.

Cronbach's (1987) suggestion to centre the variables prior to forming the multiplicative term was followed. This is a way of minimising correlations between the product term and the component parts of the term; thus, minimising the adverse effects of multicollinearity associated with multiple regression, which tend to be inflated when multiplicative terms are used (Jaccard, Turrisi, & Wan, 1990). The mean of each descriptive norm variable (traditional-cultural & civic) was obtained and subtracted from all the scores on that variable, thereby effectively placing the mean of the new measures at zero. A product term was then calculated between the two centred descriptive norm scores (traditional-cultural*civic). These new measures were used throughout the analyses.

Model testing commenced by comparing the main-effects model with the full-model (which included the interaction term) through hierarchical regression. Results will be reported for group conformity followed by critical evaluation.

**Group Conformity Prescriptive Norms**

The analyses revealed that the main-effects model predicted 28% of the variance in group conformity (26% adjusted). However, of the two descriptive norm variables only traditional-cultural was found to be a
significant predictor of group conformity prescriptive norms (traditional-cultural: \( t_{(102)}=5.08, p<0.001 \); civic: \( t_{(102)}=-1.84, \text{ns} \); see also table 21). The full model did not significantly increase the explained variance (\( R^2_{\text{change}} = 0 \)); rather the interaction term was found to be non-significant \( t_{(102)}=-0.32, \text{ns} \).

Table 21: Group Conformity Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Zero-order correlations</th>
<th>( sr^2 ) (unique variance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Unique Variability 0.29

\( R \) 0.53*

\( R^2 \) 0.28

Adjusted \( R^2 \) 0.26

Shared Variance 0.01

Intercept 2.35

\(*=p<0.001\)

These results indicate a reliable positive relationship between group conformity prescriptive norms and traditional-cultural descriptive norms and no significant relationship with civic descriptive norms. In other words, this analysis implies that group conformity pressures are only used in support of the traditional-cultural dimension of national identity. Given the absence of any other significant effects, it can be concluded that no systematic linear relationship exists between group conformity and civic aspects of national identity. Thus, group conformity norms and civic definitions exist independently of each other.
Critical Evaluation Prescriptive Norms

When critical evaluation prescriptive norms served as the dependent variable, the main-effects model was found to predict 31% of the variance in this variable (30% adjusted). Both the descriptive norm variables were found to be significant predictors (traditional-cultural: \( t_{(102)} = -4.44, p<0.001 \); civic: \( t_{(102)} = 5.52, p<0.001 \); see also table 22). The full model significantly increased the variance by 4% (3% adjusted) to 35% (33% adjusted; \( R^2_{\text{change}} = 0.04, F(1,98)=5.03, p<0.03 \); the interaction term was also found to be significant \( t_{(102)} = 2.24, p<0.03 \); see also table 23).

Table 22: Critical Evaluation Regression Analysis – Main Effects Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>Zero-order correlation</th>
<th>( sr^2 ) (unique variance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Unique Variability**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R )</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Variance</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p<0.001
Table 23: Critical Evaluation Regression Analysis – Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Zero-order correlation sr² (unique variance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Unique Variability**

- R: 0.59*
- R²: 0.35
- Adjusted R²: 0.33
- Shared Variance: 0.10
- Intercept: 3.70

*p<0.001; **p<0.03

These results indicate that critical evaluation prescriptive norms have a reliable positive relationship with civic descriptive norms. However there is also a reliable negative relationship with traditional-cultural descriptive norms. Moreover, these relationships were qualified by a small but significant interaction (traditional-cultural*civic). The main effects results imply that critical evaluation is only directed at civic aspects of national identity, and is antinomic with the traditional-cultural dimension.

In order to investigate the interaction effect, the regression equation:

\[ Y'_{\text{critical evaluation}} = 3.70 + 0.40_{\text{civic}} - 0.29_{\text{traditional-cultural}} + 0.19_{\text{interaction}} \]

was used to calculate predicted critical evaluation scores for low, medium and high levels of traditional-cultural descriptive norms for each level (low, medium and high) of civic descriptive norms. In order to plot the full range of scores 'Low' scores were defined as two standard deviations below the mean, 'medium' as the mean, and 'high' as two standard deviations above
the mean\textsuperscript{13}; these are shown in table 24. These were then represented graphically (see figures III).

Table 24: Critical Evaluation Scores at Mean & ±2SD Levels of Traditional-cultural & Civic Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional-cultural Norms</th>
<th>Civic Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure III: Critical Evaluation Prescriptive Norms as a Function of Traditional-cultural & Civic Descriptive Norms (at mean & ±2SDs)

\textsuperscript{13} Calculations where 'low' scores were defined as one standard deviation below the mean, 'medium' as the mean, and 'high' as one standard deviation above the mean, together with the plot of these scores can be found in appendix II, table V and figure D.
Investigation of the interaction effect specified the main effects relationships further. The positive relationship between critical evaluation and civic norms was apparent at all levels of traditional-cultural norms. However, the negative relationship between critical evaluation and traditional-cultural norms was most strongly apparent at lower levels of civic endorsement. At high levels of civic descriptive norms, scores on the critical evaluation prescriptive norms are similar at all levels of traditional-cultural norms. Thus, critical evaluation is only mildly influenced by traditional-cultural descriptive norms unless civic descriptive norms are low.

These results indicate that endorsement of critical evaluation prescriptive norms is positively associated with endorsement of civic descriptive norms and only strongly negatively associated with endorsement of traditional-cultural norms in the absence of strong civic norm endorsement. This simply serves to confirm the main effects relationships in that a critical approach is most strongly associated at civic aspects of national identity ($\beta=0.48$) and is antinomic with traditional-cultural aspects ($\beta=-0.39$).

5.3.2.2 Discussion

Group Conformity

Group conformity prescriptive norms were found to be reliably associated with traditional-cultural descriptive norms, sharing 28% of their variance. As was hypothesised (hypothesis 3) endorsement levels of group conformity prescriptive norms increased with increasing levels of traditional-cultural descriptive norms. Moreover, no reliable relationships were observed between group conformity prescriptive norms and either civic descriptive norms or the interaction of civic and traditional-cultural norms.
The relationship between traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms indicates a connection between particular elements of national group definition and uncritical, conformist regulatory behaviours. Identity content relating to the historical traditions, symbols and culture of the group are likely to be supported and maintained through a conformity generating strategy. These current observations are consistent with Schatz et al's (1999) findings regarding the positive relationship between blind patriotism – which is the inflexible, unquestioning form of patriotism, and both “protecting the group from perceived threats to the homogeneity and distinctiveness of national culture” (p.157), and a preference for symbolic behaviours over civic ones. The current research mirrors these findings to the extent that maintaining traditional and symbolic aspects of national culture are associated with conformity driven behavioural expectations.

The constituent elements of group conformity prescriptive norms guide group members to extend staunch loyalty to the group, be intolerant of ingroup criticism (or deviance), and appraise the ingroup's decisions and actions positively and unquestioningly. All of these support an anti-social change stance and are ways of maintaining the status quo. These types of regulatory prescriptions are not significantly related with civic descriptive norms possibly because the civic system is based in the idea of democracy and citizenship. That is, it is constructed in a manner that is based in citizens' rights and obligations to effect change as and when the group members deem fit. The traditional-cultural dimension is based in no such constraints.

One possible explanation for the relationship between tradition-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms may be that national groups, and perhaps social groups more generally, resist changes to group attributes that are seen as traditional and symbolic, not for tradition or symbolisms sake per se, but because those aspects of identification
provide a historical image of the group and a sense of continuity. For example, Billig (1992, p.33-35) shows how images of the British monarchy are used by British citizens to define and differentiate the national group in an historical manner – achieving simultaneously a sense of distinctiveness and continuity from national identity. The image of the monarchy is mobilised in this way to the extent that some of Billig’s participants claimed that should the monarchy be abolished the national group would cease to exist as an independent and distinctive nation. It could be argued that the traditional-cultural dimension of national identity provides the group with historical distinctiveness which is valued because it is constructed as relatively constant and unchanging. Group conformity on the attributes of this dimension would ensure that this dimension continues to be constructed in such a manner.

The interpretation discussed here is further supported by observations with respect to Britain’s membership in the European Union. Threatening the attributes that provide historical distinctiveness, i.e. threatening the traditional-cultural dimension of national identity instigates fears regarding the group’s demise. As was apparent from the review of public opinion surveys in chapter two, such fears are evident in Britain in relation to European integration (Eurobarometer, 1999a, 2000, 2002a; Mortimore, 2000). Moreover, such expressions can also be readily found in the British media: “Europhobes fear a multicultural pot melting down everything of value – Shakespeare, the bible, PG Woodhouse – in exchange for globalised pap, pan-European homogeneity stamping out our individuality. To them a European future does threaten the end of history as they always dreamt it” (Polly Toynbee, The Guardian, April 20, 2001).

Critical Evaluation

Critical evaluation prescriptive norms on the other hand were not only positively related to civic descriptive norms as hypothesised, but also
negatively related to traditional-cultural descriptive norms. The main-effects relationships were qualified by a significant interaction between the two forms of descriptive norms. The model explained 35% of the variance in critical evaluation scores. The positive relationship between critical evaluation and civic norms was apparent at all levels of traditional-cultural norms. However, the negative relationship between critical evaluation and traditional-cultural norms was most strongly apparent at lower levels of civic endorsement. At high levels of civic descriptive norms, scores on the critical evaluation prescriptive norms were similar at all levels of traditional-cultural norms.

The positive relationship between critical evaluation and the civic dimension was expected. It indicates a questioning and evaluative approach to the civic elements of national identity content. At lower levels of civic norm endorsement, the negative relationship between traditional-cultural norms and critical evaluation becomes more apparent. This serves to strengthen the contention that the group's definition in terms of their traditional-cultural image is not supported by evaluative critical action. Rather, as discussed in the preceding section, group members are expected to conform to the current understanding.

Again the current results are consistent with those obtained by Schatz et al (1999). As was argued in chapter three, the correlating behaviours (political efficacy, political information gathering, political knowledge and the frequency of politically relevant behaviour) associated with constructive patriotism - upon which the critical evaluation prescriptive norms construct was based, are conducive both to an evaluative approach based in the premises of social change, and a civic understanding of nationhood. The current empirical evidence strengthens this proposed relationship.

The constituent elements of critical evaluation prescriptive norms guide group members to be critically loyal, tolerate ingroup criticism or dissent,
and question the ingroup's decisions and actions when required. Such regulatory prescriptions support a construction of national identity in terms of the institutional arrangements of the group and, as was argued above, a construction that is grounded in citizen's rights and obligations to effect social change, as and when the ingroup members decide such action is appropriate.

Importantly, it is the group members who decide upon and take action. Change to the group's distinctive institutional systems and "unique, special and valuable [...] way of doing things" (p.170, Kelman, 1997) from an external body is likely to be perceived as illegitimate. Again Britain's membership in the European Union and opinion polls provide evidence in support of this proposition. As was discussed in chapter two, Britons are unwilling to cede authority on national decision-making to EU institutions, which are distrusted, preferring instead to retain authority and their own distinctive 'ways of doing things' (Eurobarometer 57 Executive Summary, 2002: p.5). In addition, social psychological research has also indicated that British sovereignty is threatened by European integration (Cinnirella, 1993; Sotirakopoulou, 1991).

5.4 **Chapter Summary**

The main aim of the study presented in this chapter was to explore British national identity content in terms of traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms, and group conformity and critical evaluation prescriptive norms. In addition, the relationships between the two forms of descriptive and prescriptive norms were investigated.

The results obtained corroborated the operationalisation of both forms of descriptive and prescriptive norms as orthogonal constructs. The relationships between these norm forms verified both the current hypotheses and previous research findings. Traditional-cultural group
definitions were supported by conformity driven behavioural expectations, while civic definitions were supported by a more evaluative and critical approach. Moreover, the results indicated that a critical approach was antinomic with traditional-cultural group definitions.

5.5 PROGRESSION TO THE NEXT STUDY

Having devised reliable scales of the two descriptive dimensions of British national identity content and their concomitant prescriptive norms, the next study was conducted in order to fulfil the third aim of this thesis. That is, to test the proposal that threat to lower-order identity distinctiveness from superordinate categorisation arises when the superordinate categorisation negatively affects the lower-order criterial group attributes. The consequences of this perceived threat are then explored in terms of its relationships with both identity compatibility perceptions, between the lower- and higher-order identities, and identification levels with the superordinate group.

The following chapter reports the results of the study conducted to investigate the consequences of content specific threats to national identity, threats that have their origin in the superordinate categorisation European.
CHAPTER SIX: SUBGROUP THREAT & SUPERORDINATE IDENTIFICATION

"The idea is not for the Member States to be ‘dissolved’ into the EU, but rather for them to contribute their own particular qualities. It is precisely this variety of national characteristics and identities that lends the EU its moral authority, which is in turn used for the benefit of the Community as a whole”

(Euro-Lex, 2003)
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6.1 INTRODUCTION

It was previously argued (in chapter two) that there is a fundamental paradox in the social identity approach. While superordinate categorisation can bring members of subgroups together, it can also be a source of threat to the distinctiveness of the subgroup. The current study explores how such a threat may arise by examining whether a perceived threat to the attributes that define one's national identity is related to the levels of national distinctiveness threat they express. The relationship between this distinctiveness threat and both, (a) the compatibility between national and European identities, and (b) the European identity levels, is then explored.

I begin with an overview of the relevant arguments in relation to British national and European identities (these were discussed more fully in chapters two and three) before presenting and discussing the results of the study.

6.1.1 Superordinate Categorisation & Subgroup Distinctiveness Threat

Research by Gaertner, Hewstone and their colleagues (e.g. Gaertner et al., 1993; Gaertner et al., 1999; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hewstone, 2000) in the form of the common ingroup identity model and mutual intergroup differentiation model, argue that subgroup relations are aided by emphasising the superordinate categorisation. The latter model also emphasises the preservation of subgroup boundaries and the minimisation of subgroup distinctiveness threat as a further strategy to aid this process.

Although not dealing directly with identification with cross-level categories (the research focuses on intergroup cooperation and intergroup bias), proponents of the mutual intergroup differentiation model argue that this model allows group members to maintain both their subgroup identities and positive subgroup distinctiveness in the context of a superordinate
categorisation, thereby facilitating subgroup relations (Brown & Wade, 1987; Dovidio et al., 1998). Other research has identified a link between positive subgroup relations and superordinate identification (Huo et al., 1996; H. J. Smith & Tyler, 1996). Together these findings suggest that protecting subgroup boundaries and distinctiveness aids superordinate identification.

Brewer’s (1991) optimal distinctiveness theory provides a possible explanation for these observations. In proposing that social identity is motivated by two competing needs - for similarity and distinctiveness (or inclusion and differentiation), Brewer & Gaertner (2001, p.460) argue: “in order to satisfy both these motives simultaneously individuals seek inclusion in distinctive social groups where the boundaries between those who are members of the ingroup category and those who are excluded can be clearly drawn”. Such groups are thought to provide a comfortable equilibrium between the two needs. Over-inclusive superordinate groups do not fulfil distinctiveness needs but may fulfil inclusiveness needs, and over-exclusive lower-order groups do not fulfil inclusiveness needs but may fulfil distinctiveness needs.

Together the theories discussed above suggest that the strategy proposed by the mutual intergroup differentiation model may induce a perceived compatibility between subordinate and superordinate levels of self-categorisation, where both inclusiveness and distinctiveness needs may both be satisfied. It may be then, that perceived threat to subgroup distinctiveness interferes with the use of these categories in this manner. Such threat may have a crucial role in determining identification with superordinate categories: an observation forwarded and supported by both Medrano and Gutierrez (2001) and Cinnirella (1997) in the context of European identification.
6.1.2 The Role of Identity Content Specific Threat

It has been argued in this thesis (chapter two) that when investigating the effects of multiple level categorisations it is important to consider the structural relations between them, not just in terms of salience but also in terms of the identity content associated with the groups.

Very little research has examined the effects of different cross level category structures (e.g. cross-cutting or nested) on group identification levels, and superordinate identification levels in particular are not usually the primary focus of these investigations, rather interest is on subgroup identification levels.

One study that has measured superordinate identification levels (i.e. Hornsey & Hogg, 2000c) in conjunction with different cross level category structures reports no significant effects on levels of superordinate identification from the different structural relations tested (see more in-depth discussion in chapter two). However, this type of research does not consider identity content in its theorising. Predictions are based on the assumption that denying the subgroup identity in favour of a superordinate one, would lead to perceptions of subgroup threat (as they are denying the subgroup's distinctive existence) – which would result in elevated subgroup identity levels as the group attempts to assert itself. No predictions are made regarding the effects to superordinate identification levels. However, some research (e.g. Medrano & Gutierrez, 2001; Cinnirella, 1997) implies that subgroup distinctiveness threat attenuates superordinate identification.

What is generally not considered is whether the cross-level categories conflict in terms of content. That is, whether valued subgroup attributes are negatively affected by the superordinate categorisation. The current study investigates these possibilities.
6.1.3 British National & European Identities

In the case of Britain's membership in the European Union, the superordinate categorisation must be seen to dilute the group's distinctive norms, making them more similar to and interchangeable with other European nation-state subgroups. British citizens should only experience a threat to the particular attribute of British national identity that they believe the superordinate categorisation affects negatively, and the level of threat experienced should be directly proportional to the value they assign to that particular national identity attribute. In addition, when a superordinate categorisation is believed to reduce national group distinctiveness by threatening criterial attributes (attribute threat) this will negatively affect both the perceived compatibility between national and European identities (i.e. whether an individual believes he/she can be a member of both groups), as well as levels of European identification.

In the current study British national identity content is defined along the two dimensions proposed in chapter three, i.e. traditional-cultural and civic. The scales developed and tested in chapter four are therefore used to measure participants' endorsement of these two dimensions. It is expected that exposure to potential homogenisation on these dimensions will lead to subgroup distinctiveness threat that is directly proportional to levels of endorsement of the two descriptive norms. Given the positive relationships observed in the previous study between traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms, and between civic descriptive norms and critical evaluation prescriptive norms, I expect that any threat experienced in relation to a descriptive content dimension will also be related to the concomitant prescriptive content dimension.

6.1.4 Research Aims, Questions and Hypotheses

The general aim of the research reported in this chapter is to explore potential barriers to European identification. To this end a model is
developed that explores: (a) how content-specific attribute threats are related to perceptions of national distinctiveness threat, and (b) the impact of this national distinctiveness threat on both the perceived compatibility between national and European identities and levels of European identification.

This will be achieved by exposing participants to different types of attribute threat manipulations, manipulations that threaten the very existence of group defining qualities. Two forms of these manipulations are used, one is aimed at traditional-cultural attributes and one civic attributes. To this end two studies will be presented. The first reports a development study where three new scales were piloted and the attribute threat manipulations were tested. The second describes the larger study where the relationships proposed above were tested.

6.1.4.1 Development Study

The first study was conducted in order to develop and test:
1. Two attribute threat manipulations that correspond to the two national identity dimensions;
2. A measure of group distinctiveness in a global comparative context;
3. A measure of EU related national group distinctiveness threat; and
4. A measure of identity compatibility between national and European identities (individual level).

6.1.4.2 Main study

Research Questions

1. Are perceptions of subgroup distinctiveness threat:
   1a. Experienced only in relation to the content dimension under attack?
   1b. Proportionally related to the dimension's centrality value?
2. In the context of a superordinate categorisation is:
2a. Perceived national group distinctiveness threat related to perceptions of compatibility between the two identities?

2b. Are these threat levels related to European identity levels? And,

2c. Are perceptions of identity compatibility related to European identity levels? Or,

2d. Is the relationship between threat and European identity mediated by identity compatibility?

3. Is mere exposure to the attribute threat sufficient to directly affect levels of European identification, or is this mediated through distinctiveness threat?

Hypotheses

1. In the context of European integration levels of national group distinctiveness threat will be moderated by the relevance of the potential attribute threat to an individual’s national identity. More specifically:
   1a. Distinctiveness threat will be positively associated with levels of both civic descriptive norm endorsement and critical evaluation prescriptive norm endorsement only in the presence of an institutional attribute threat;
   1b. Distinctiveness threat will be positively associated with levels of both traditional-cultural descriptive norm endorsement and group conformity prescriptive norm endorsement only in the presence of cultural attribute threat;

2. In the context of the European integration:
   2a. Distinctiveness threat will be negatively related to identity compatibility;
   2b. Distinctiveness threat will be negatively related to European identity; and
   2c. Identity compatibility will be positively related to European identity;
   2d. Furthermore, the relationship between threat and European
identity may be mediated by identity compatibility.

3. Mere exposure to content-relevant attribute threat will not directly affect European identity levels; rather this relationship is mediated through distinctiveness threat.

6.2 **Development Study**

6.2.1 **Methodology**

6.2.1.1 **Questionnaire Design and Procedure**

The questionnaire (see appendix III) consisted of a cover page and four sections as follows.

The cover page served to obtain participants' consent and inform them of the nature of the study, general instructions, and their rights as participants.

*Section one* contained all the demographic items and items assessing the perceived distinctiveness of the national group (pre-manipulation). A new *group distinctiveness* scale was created (four items) with a global comparative context; group distinctiveness was operationalised as the extent to which Britons believed that their national group was distinctive in comparison to any other nation. For example: 'of all the countries in the world the British stand out'. The scale was measured on a 5-point Likert scale from 1: 'not at all' to 5: 'very much'.

The global nature of the intergroup comparative context was used in order to avoid specifying a comparison group and avoid framing participants' responses within a specific superordinate context at the pre-manipulation stage. The objective of this scale was to check the effectiveness of the
attribute manipulation and thus the items were presented again in section three.

Section two presented one of two attribute threat manipulations (depending on the condition), followed by a measure of national group distinctiveness threat.

The two attribute threat manipulations were designed to manipulate the salience of national attribute threat in terms of: (i) British culture, traditions and heritage, and (ii) British institutional practices. This was achieved through the reporting of a mock survey (see also appendices III.A and III.B). The manipulation texts were written in a manner that would make salient the possibility of national distinctiveness threat without confounding the participants' responses by stating the direction of effect supposedly obtained in the mock survey.

The manipulation texts encouraged participants to consider three points: (i) the distinctiveness and uniqueness of either British culture, traditions and heritage (cultural manipulation condition) or British institutional practices (institutional manipulation condition); (ii) the fact that Britain and fourteen other countries have joined to become one group – the European Union; and (iii) that citizens from all fifteen countries are now European citizens. Participants were then asked to consider whether they believed the distinctiveness of their nation would be lost or diluted due to influence from the European Union and the other countries within the European Union (i.e. level of national group distinctiveness threat); these perceptions were then measured using a pictogram scale.

The measure of national group distinctiveness threat consisted of five circular pictograms as depicted below.
Figure IV: Distinctiveness Pictograms

(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

The circles in the pictograms represent all British 'culture, traditions and heritage' (cultural manipulation condition) or 'institutional practices' (institutional manipulation condition); while the shaded portions represent the proportional 'lost or diluted amount'. The shaded areas were designed to visually approximate five different proportions: 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%.

Section three consisted of the time two presentation of the national group distinctiveness scale described in section one; the constituent items were presented in a different order from that used in section one.

Section four consisted of the identity compatibility scale and seven manipulation check items. Identity compatibility (four items) was operationalised as the extent to which Britons believed they could simultaneously be both British and European. For example: 'do you think you can be a British citizen and a European citizen at the same time'. The scale also assessed simultaneous loyalty, obligation fulfilment and allegiance. The response possibilities were scaled from 1: 'definitely not' to 5: 'definitely yes'.

Five of the seven manipulation check items assess participants' perceptions of threat to British distinctiveness in general (one item) and to four elements of Britishness: traditions, heritage, the legal system and institutional practices. Two further items asked participants to rate the credibility and believability of the mock survey text that served as the
attribute manipulation. Response possibilities for all seven items were scaled from 1: 'not at all' to 5: 'very much'.

Finally, an open-ended comments section was included and participants were encouraged to comment on the questionnaire. As with the previous studies upon completion of the questionnaire participants were debriefed and thanked, and given the opportunity to ask the researcher questions. They were encouraged to discuss their reflections on the questionnaire items as this debriefing session was also used as an opportunity to receive further feedback on the questionnaire.

6.2.1.2 Variables, Design and Analytical Procedures

The study was a mixed quasi-experimental design. The between groups element consisted of the two types of attribute manipulation, cultural and institutional. All four measured variables, national group distinctiveness (time one), national distinctiveness threat, national group distinctiveness (time two), and identity compatibility, and the manipulation checks formed the repeated measures element of the design.

The factor structure of the scales was assessed through principal components analyses and the scales were examined for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha. Manipulation checks were assessed using t-tests.

6.2.1.3 Participants

Eighty two participants were recruited voluntarily and at random from a university in London. Participants were studying a variety of subjects. There were 24 males and 58 females and the mean age of the sample was 19.17 years. Fifteen participants stated their race as black, 42 white, 21 Asian and 4 as other; 30 participants stated their religion as Christian, 24 as Muslim, 12 as atheist and 9 as other; a further 7 did not provide this information.
6.2.2 Results and Discussions

6.2.2.1 Group Distinctiveness and Identity Compatibility

The unidimensionality of the two new scales: national group distinctiveness and identity compatibility, was assessed using principal components analyses (PCA) and their internal consistency using Cronbach’s reliability analyses. Given the sample size (N=82) structural coefficients were deemed significant if their absolute value was above 0.6 (Hair et al., 1998, p.112).

The underlying structure of the national group distinctiveness items was assessed using time one responses and the reliability of the scale was assessed at both time one and two. The PCA indicated a single factor solution (eigenvalue: 2.30) explaining 55% of the variance in the construct (see also table 25). All the items loaded well on the factor and the scale was found to be reliable (time one: α = 0.72; time two: α = 0.75).

Table 25: National Group Distinctiveness – Structural Coefficients, Cronbach’s Alpha and Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of all the countries in the world the British stand out.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to other nationalities the British are very different.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British are similar to people from other nations.</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I think about people from other countries I believe there is nothing unique about being British.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha: Time One</th>
<th>0.72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha: Time Two</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Explained</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Italics denote reversed items

Repeated measures t-test comparisons indicated that there were no significant differences between the time one and time two levels of national group distinctiveness. This was apparent in both the cultural manipulation condition ($\bar{x}_{time\ one}=3.07$, $SD_{time\ one}=0.73$; $\bar{x}_{time\ two}=3.09$, $SD_{time\ two}=0.61$;
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\[ t(39)=0.34, \ p=NS \), and the institutional manipulation condition \( (x_{\text{time one}}=3.17, \ SD_{\text{time one}}=0.63; \ x_{\text{time two}}=3.08, \ SD_{\text{time two}}=0.58; \ t(41)=1.13, \ p=NS) \).

The four identity compatibility items also loaded on a single factor (eigenvalue = 2.76; see also table 26); confirming the unidimensionality of the scale. The solution explained 69% of the construct variance and the reliability of the scale was good (\( \alpha = 0.85 \)).

Table 26: Identity Compatibility - Structural Coefficients, Cronbach's Alpha and Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you can ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... fulfil your citizenship obligations to both Britain and the European Union?</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... be a British citizen and a European citizen at the same time?</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... be loyal to both Britain and the European Union at the same time?</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... feel a sense of allegiance to both Britain and the European Union?</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the results of both the PCAs and the reliability analyses, the two scales, national group distinctiveness and identity compatibility, were interpreted as measuring these constructs respectively.

6.2.2.2 Manipulation Texts

Content Validation

The content validity of the manipulation texts was assessed using four expert judges. Both texts were assessed for face validity, complexity, grammar and relevance. Minor suggested changes were incorporated and the texts reassessed; all four judges subsequently agreed on the validity of the texts.
Manipulation Checks

Direct measures were used to assess perceived threat, from European integration, to various components of Britishness, i.e. to: institutional practices, the legal system, heritage, traditions and general national group distinctiveness. Participants were also asked to rate the credibility and believability of the manipulation texts.

The manipulation checks indicated that the texts worked well. Participants who had read the institutional manipulation reported significantly more threat to British institutional practices (t(79)=5.43, p<0.001) and the legal system (t(80)=2.11, p<0.04) than participants who received the cultural manipulation (see table 27). Conversely, participants who received the cultural manipulation reported significantly more threat to British heritage (t(80)=4.39, p<0.001) and traditions (t(79)=3.00, p<0.004). There were no significant differences between the two conditions in the levels of perceived threat to national group distinctiveness (t(80)=1.16, NS), or the credibility (t(80)=0.77, NS) and believability (t(80)=0.32, NS) of the two texts. Furthermore all 95% confidence intervals for the means were within acceptable ranges.

Table 27: Manipulation Check Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cultural Threat Condition</th>
<th>Institutional Threat Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD  95% CI</td>
<td>Mean  SD  95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Institutional Practices</td>
<td>^2.00  0.95  1.70 – 2.30</td>
<td>^3.10  0.87  2.82 – 3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Legal System</td>
<td>*1.95  1.02  1.63 – 2.27</td>
<td>*2.50  1.09  2.15 – 2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Heritage</td>
<td>^3.17  1.18  2.80 – 3.54</td>
<td>^2.00  1.24  1.60 – 2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Traditions</td>
<td>#2.90  1.00  2.59 – 3.22</td>
<td>#2.10  1.26  1.70 – 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Distinctiveness</td>
<td>3.10  1.08  2.75 – 3.45</td>
<td>2.84  1.00  2.51 – 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>2.95  0.85  2.68 – 3.22</td>
<td>2.79  0.99  2.46 – 3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believability</td>
<td>3.13  0.79  2.87 – 3.38</td>
<td>3.18  0.83  2.91 – 3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.04; *p<0.004; ^p<0.001
These observations indicate that participants' perceptions of national group distinctiveness threat were influenced by the manipulations in the intended direction and on the intended identity dimension.

6.2.2.3 Distinctiveness Threat Pictograms

The pictogram scale used to examine perceptions of national group distinctiveness threat due to European integration appeared to work well. Descriptive statistics indicated that the scale was normally distributed and confidence intervals were acceptable ($\bar{x}=2.40$, $SD=0.90$, 95% CI=2.20–2.59).

An independent samples t-test indicated that perceptions of distinctiveness threat did not differ significantly between the two conditions ($t(79)=1.54$, $p=NS$; institutional: $\bar{x}=2.24$, $SD=0.99$; cultural: $\bar{x}=2.55$, $SD=0.78$). The results obtained here indicate that in terms of magnitude the two manipulations had a similar effect.

6.2.2.4 Reflexivity Through Participant Feedback

In general, participants' oral and written feedback on the questionnaire was positive. The questionnaire was perceived as easy to understand and complete. The only significant issue raised by participants referred to the repetition of the national group distinctiveness scale in section one and again in section three. Written comments indicated that participants recognised that the scale was presented twice. Discussing participant perceptions during debriefing indicated that, at time two, participants may have simply remembered and repeated their responses to these items from time one. Initially, this raised concern regarding the effectiveness of the manipulations. However, given the results obtained to the direct manipulation check items fears in this regard were alleviated. It was decided that the non-significant difference between time one and two distinctiveness may be an artefact of scale repetition rather than an indication of ineffective manipulations.
As the national group distinctiveness scale will be used in the subsequent main study where this construct will again be measured twice in quick succession, it was decided to split the scale and use half at time one and half at time two. The scale was split by randomly selecting one positive and one negative item for each scale half; this method was chosen in order to ensure that both halves contained both negative and positive items.

The split-half reliability was calculated from the formulas suggested by Spearman (1907, cited in Hammond, 1995, p.204-205) and is displayed below:

\[ r_{ht} = \frac{2r}{1+r} \]

The correlation between the two halves of the scale was 0.66, resulting in an acceptable split-half reliability (\( r_{ht} = 0.80 \)).

6.2.3 Progression to the Main study

The results obtained from the development study indicated that, in general, the measures and manipulations used were suitable for the research intentions and therefore use in the main study. The two new scales: national group distinctiveness and identity compatibility, and the national group distinctiveness threat pictograms performed well. The attribute threat manipulation texts appeared to effectively threaten the identity dimensions intended and, in terms of effect magnitude, appeared to work in a similar fashion.
6.3 MAIN STUDY

6.3.1 Methodology

6.3.1.1 Questionnaire Design and Procedure

The questionnaire design and procedure implemented in this study was very similar to that of the development study. There were deviations in sections one, three and four of the questionnaire (see also appendix IV.A) and these will be discussed here.

In section one of the questionnaire the descriptive and prescriptive norm scales presented in chapter five were included. These were placed after the demographic items but before the group distinctiveness items (of which only two items were included\(^{14}\)). Section three contained the remaining two group distinctiveness items and the six item (levels of) European identity scale developed in study one and discussed in chapter four. Finally, section four was essentially the same as that of the development study except that the seven direct measures used previously for development purposes were omitted.

6.3.1.2 Variables, Design and Analytical Procedures

The main study was also a mixed quasi-experimental design. The between groups element again consisted of the two types of attribute manipulation, cultural and institutional. All seven measured variables, prescriptive norms, descriptive norms, national group distinctiveness (time one), national distinctiveness threat, national group distinctiveness (time two),

\(^{14}\) The four item group distinctiveness scale was split as discussed earlier.
levels of European identity, and identity compatibility formed the repeated measures element of the design.

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and the main statistical techniques employed were multiple regression and path analyses.

6.3.1.3 Participants

Two hundred and forty four participants were recruited voluntarily from a university and three further education colleges in London. Participants were studying a variety of subjects. There were 86 males and 155 females; 3 participants did not state their gender. The mean age of the sample was 19.35 years. Forty seven participants stated their race as black, 128 as white, 55 as Asian and 14 as other; 103 participants stated their religion as Christian, 49 as Muslim, 29 as atheist and 38 as other; a further 25 did not provide this information.

6.3.2 Results and Discussions

6.3.2.1 Internal Consistency

Before progressing with the analyses, the six scales used in this study were examined for internal consistency. All the scales were found to be reliable (see table 28).
Table 28: Internal Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European identity</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity compatibility</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group conformity prescriptive norms</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical evaluation prescriptive norms</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural descriptive norms</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic descriptive norms</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2.2 Manipulation Checks

The national group distinctiveness items invited participants to make comparisons between Britain and any other nations, giving these measures a global comparative context. This allowed participants to choose their comparison countries. Both pre- and post manipulation presentations of these items used this format.

At time one presentation (pre-manipulation) participants would have been unaware that the study was about the European Union, participants' responses therefore should reflect general perceptions of national group distinctiveness. At time two presentation (post-manipulation) however, the salience of the possible homogenising effect of the superordinate European grouping should have increased and this should be reflected in participants' responses. Any change in distinctiveness perceptions from time one to time two would therefore reflect the influence of the manipulation.

The effectiveness of the manipulation texts was examined using the pre- and post-manipulation measures of perceived national group distinctiveness. Repeated measures t-tests indicated that both manipulations had been effective. Perceptions of national group distinctiveness significantly decreased post-manipulation in both conditions.
(cultural: $t(128)=8.21$, $p<0.001$; institutional: $t(112)=5.19$, $p<0.001$; see also table 29).

### Table 29: Pre and Post Manipulation Means & Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Condition</th>
<th>Pre-Manipulation Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Manipulation Sd</th>
<th>Pre-Manipulation N</th>
<th>Post-Manipulation Mean</th>
<th>Post-Manipulation Sd</th>
<th>Post-Manipulation N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the distinctiveness measures were framed in a global comparative context the lowering effect of the manipulations was apparent. Participants' general perceptions of group distinctiveness were obviously influenced by the manipulations.

However, although the homogenising effects of the manipulation decreased general perceptions of national group distinctiveness, it is not expected that this change in perceptions would be systematically related to perceptions of national distinctiveness threat that are contextualised by the European Union. Participants still have the opportunity to achieve some group distinctiveness through comparisons with non-EU nation-states. Given the salience of the European Union following the manipulation it is accepted that participants may be more likely to include other European nations in their intergroup comparisons. However, the global nature of the distinctiveness measure should still allow participants to compare the national group to any other national groups and not just EU nation-states.

The change in distinctiveness perceptions from time one to time two should be unrelated to measures of distinctiveness threat arising from the European categorisation. A non-significant relationship between distinctiveness change and threat would highlight the importance of the comparative dimension.
A new variable, 'group distinctiveness change', was calculated by subtracting participants' scores on the distinctiveness measure pre-manipulation from their scores post-manipulation. Negative scores on the variable 'group distinctiveness change' indicated a post-manipulation decrease in distinctiveness and positive scores an increase.

Bivariate correlations indicated that the level of group distinctiveness change was not significantly related to either scores on the EU related national group distinctiveness threat measure (i.e. the pictogram measure; r(240)=0.06, p=NS) or levels of European identity (r(240)=-0.10, p=NS).

Together the above analyses indicate that although perceptions of national group distinctiveness decreased post manipulation there was no systematic relationship with either of the EU related measures. In other words, when the comparative dimension was not specifically related to the EU and other EU nations, no significant relationships were observed. These observations highlight the importance of the comparative dimension and indicate that such generalised measures of distinctiveness have no predictive utility in this domain.

6.3.2.3 Model Testing

Figure V depicts the model that will be tested in this study. The model illustrates the paths as laid out in the hypotheses. The eight variables in the first section of the path diagram reflect contingent scores on the four norm scales (group conformity, critical evaluation, traditional-cultural and civic), in the presence of either the cultural or institutional manipulation. For example, scores on the group conformity scale are represented by 'group conformity* cultural manipulation' and 'group conformity* institutional manipulation' for participants in the cultural and institutional manipulation conditions respectively. It is important to note that the inclusion of '*cultural manipulation' and '*institutional manipulation'
simply denotes which manipulation participants had been exposed to and
does not change the scores obtained from participants in any way (this will
be discussed in more detail in a latter section).

Figure V: Predicted Path Model

Paths marked with a 0 indicate expected non-significant paths while those
marked with either a plus or minus sign indicate expected significant
positive and negative effects respectively. The model will be discussed in
three parts: (i) predictors of perceived national group distinctiveness threat;
(ii) the effect of national group distinctiveness threat on identity
compatibility; and (iii) predictors of European identity strength. In order to
aid the reader, the segment of the path model discussed in each of the
following sections will be depicted within each section.
Predicting National Group Distinctiveness Threat: Results By Condition

Initially, in order to ensure that the model is equally applicable in both conditions and to ensure that the two manipulations used were equally sensitive, the first part of the model was tested on each condition subgroup separately. In other words, results will be presented separately for participants who were exposed to the two different manipulations.

To determine whether the norm variables were useful predictors of perceived distinctiveness threat, standard multiple regressions were used to regress levels of perceived national distinctiveness threat on the four norm variables.

The results indicated that the model worked well in both conditions. The results are presented in table 30 and figure VI for the institutional manipulation condition and in table 31 and figure VII for the cultural manipulation condition. The models predicted 42% (40% adjusted) and 45% (43% adjusted) of the variance in perceived threat respectively.
Table 30: Multiple Regression Results for Distinctiveness Threat – Institutional Manipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.65
R² = 0.42
Adjusted R² = 0.40
Intercept = -2.22

Note: Italicics denotes non-significant paths

Figure VI: Path Model Section One – Institutional Manipulation

Group Conformity

Critical Evaluation

Traditional-cultural

Civic

→ National Group Distinctiveness Threat
Table 31: Multiple Regression Results for Distinctiveness Threat – Cultural Manipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R 0.67
R² 0.45
Adjusted R² 0.43
Intercept -0.01

Note: Italics denotes non-significant paths

Figure VII: Path Model Section One – Cultural Manipulation

As was expected (hypotheses 1a & 1b) perceived threat was significantly predicted by civic descriptive norms and critical evaluation prescriptive norms when participants had been exposed to the institutional manipulation and by traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms when participants had been exposed to the cultural manipulation.
These results indicate that perceived threat to national group distinctiveness is positively associated with the content specific dimensions of national identity. National distinctiveness threat then was experienced only in relation to the dimension that had been presented during the manipulation as potentially 'at risk' from European integration. This observation is unsurprising.

However, the proportionality of the relationships between the endorsement levels of the different norms and levels of distinctiveness threat indicates that the experience of threat is proportionally related to the criterial value placed upon those norms (in terms of how one defines their national group). Given that the endorsement of the four types of norms were measured prior to the presentation of the manipulation. How much a given dimension was endorsed could not have been influenced by the manipulation. As both types of descriptive norms and both types of prescriptive norms were randomly presented together participants could not have been primed on one dimension alone. Therefore how much threat was reported could not have been influenced by measuring the norms.

The amount of variance explained by each of the two models was similar, indicating that norm endorsement had a similar effect on perceived threat irrespective of the identity dimension under consideration.

However, one disadvantage of testing the effects of the independent variables from the two conditions separately is that it does not take into account the full sample. “By estimating separate regressions within the subgroups, we automatically estimate group specific effects” (Hardy, 1993: p.49). In essence, the variances of the “separate subgroup coefficients are based, in part, on separate estimates of the population variance” (Hardy, 1993: p.51). This means that the beta coefficients for the significant predictors in each model cannot be directly compared. This can however, be overcome by allowing the effects of all independent variables to differ by
subgroup and including them in a single regression analyses. To this end the procedure discussed in Hardy (1993; alternatively see: Aiken & Stephen, 1991) was used: this will be more fully discussed in the following section.

**Predicting National Group Distinctiveness Threat: Results In The Full Sample**

The first section of the path diagram (see figure five) contains the contingent scores of the four IVs (group conformity and critical evaluation prescriptive norms, and traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms) in the presence of each of the two forms of attribute manipulations (cultural and institutional).

The contingent terms were created in the following way. Two new binary dummy variables were created: one for each type of attribute manipulation (institutional and cultural). The presence or absence of a particular attribute manipulation was dummy coded in binary form within each of the new variables: 1 indicating the presence of a particular attribute manipulation and 0 indicating its absence. For example, if a participant had been exposed to the institutional manipulation then they were coded with 1 on the ‘institutional manipulation’ variable and 0 on the ‘cultural manipulation’ variable.

Next the four IVs were centred by subtracting the relevant mean from all the scores on each variable; these new centred variables were then used to create the contingent terms. This was achieved by calculating the products between each of the four IVs and each of the two dummy manipulation variables resulting in eight new norm*manipulation contingent terms. Creating contingent terms in this manner means that any participant who was not exposed to a particular attribute manipulation would in essence score 0 on the contingent variable, however if they had been exposed their score on the IV would be multiplied by 1 leaving their score unchanged.
Including these contingent terms in multiple regression analyses effectively means that the beta coefficients reflect scores on a particular variable but only in conjunction with the presence of a particular attribute manipulation. Furthermore, as the beta coefficients are based on estimates of the same population variance this allows them to be directly compared.

The eight contingent variables therefore consisted of four content-relevant norm*manipulation variables:

• Group Conformity * Cultural Manipulation;
• Critical Evaluation * Institutional Manipulation;
• Traditional-cultural* Cultural Manipulation; and
• Civic * Institutional Manipulation...

...and four content-irrelevant norm*manipulation variables:

• Group Conformity * Institutional Manipulation;
• Critical Evaluation * Cultural Manipulation;
• Traditional-cultural* Institutional Manipulation; and
• Civic * Cultural Manipulation.

When a regression model contains contingent variables such as the ones in the current model, Baron and Kenny (1986) advise the researcher to guard against two possible factors. Firstly, the measurement error in the dependent variable should not vary as a function of the moderator variable\(^\text{15}\), and secondly that the independent variables should have equal variances at each level of the moderator variable.

In order to ensure homogeneity of variance across the two levels of the moderator variable (institutional and cultural), all the standard deviations

\(^{15}\) In order to minimise this possibility, the measure of distinctiveness threat (the pictogram scale) used in both conditions was exactly the same, thus there is no reason to suspect any differences in measurement error by condition.
of the independent variables were examined by condition. This indicated that this assumption had not been violated. As can be seen from table 32 the standard deviations for each independent variable were very similar across the two conditions.

Table 32: Means and Standard Deviations of the Independent Variables by Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Moderator Variable</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Cultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity</td>
<td>2.29 0.60</td>
<td>2.28 0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation</td>
<td>3.70 0.43</td>
<td>3.70 0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural</td>
<td>2.58 0.77</td>
<td>2.50 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>3.21 0.62</td>
<td>3.20 0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard multiple regression analysis was used to test the moderating effect of the two attribute manipulations. Levels of perceived national distinctiveness threat were regressed on the eight contingent variables: only content-relevant contingent terms were expected to reach significance.

As was expected (hypotheses 1a & 1b) the four content-relevant contingent variables displayed significant paths while the four content-irrelevant variables were non-significant (see also table 33). The model explained 43% (41% adjusted, R=0.65) of the variance in national distinctiveness threat.

When the cultural manipulation was present group conformity prescriptive norms and traditional-cultural descriptive norms were significant predictors. On the other hand, when the institutional manipulation was present critical evaluation prescriptive norms and civic descriptive norms were significant predictors (see also figure VIII). The similarity in the results obtained here and in the separate analyses presented earlier eliminates the possibility that the effects observed in the separate analyses
were group specific. In addition, direct comparison of the beta coefficients of the significant predictors indicates that all content-relevant norms affected perceptions of national distinctiveness threat to a similar order of magnitude.

**Table 33: Multiple Regression Results for Distinctiveness Threat**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R 0.65  
R² 0.43  
Adjusted R² 0.41  
Intercept 2.79

Note: Italics denotes non-significant paths

**Figure VIII: Path Model Section One**

- Group Conformity * Cultural Manipulation
- Critical Evaluation * Institutional Manipulation
- Group Conformity * Institutional Manipulation
- Critical Evaluation * Cultural Manipulation
- Traditional-cultural * Institutional Manipulation
- Civic * Cultural Manipulation
- Traditional-cultural * Cultural Manipulation
- Civic * Institutional Manipulation

→ National Group Distinctiveness Threat
These results indicate that perceptions of threat from European integration were indeed moderated by the content area of the attribute manipulation. Levels of perceived threat were significantly related to the specific identity dimension portrayed by the manipulations as potentially at risk from European homogenisation. When the national attribute manipulation was framed in terms of its potential effect to British culture, traditions and heritage, the level of perceived national group distinctiveness threat was positively related to levels of group conformity prescriptive and traditional-cultural descriptive norm endorsement. On the other hand, when the manipulation was framed in terms of potential effects to British institutional practices, the positive relationship was with endorsement levels of critical evaluation prescriptive and civic descriptive norms.

**Interim Discussion**

The first section of the path model consists of the relationships proposed in hypotheses 1a and 1b. The analyses conducted this far were focused on testing the moderating effect of content specificity in perceptions of group distinctiveness threat. In other words, I proposed that threat would be experienced only on the dimension that is believed to be negatively affected by the superordinate categorisation, and that the magnitude of this experience will be proportional to the importance afforded to that dimension. Support for these predictions was obtained in the analyses presented above.

The implication from the analyses is that threat to lower-order group distinctiveness is restricted to the identity dimension under attack from the superordinate categorisation. Moreover, the extent to which an individual endorses a given definition or dimension of group identity was positively related to levels of perceived threat.
While this information can be used to inform our understanding of the factors involved in social identity threat and aid the development of strategies to counteract these, the utility of this information in terms of superordinate identification lies in the role perceived lower-order group distinctiveness threat may have in facilitating or blocking superordinate identification. From a self-categorisation theory perspective the superordinate category provides a degree of background similarity that contextualises lower-order intersubgroup relations, threats to criterial subgroup attributes may be interpreted by subgroup members as an attempt at intersubgroup homogenisation. The potentially homogenising effects of the superordinate categorisation may lead group members to perceive the two identities, national and European, as incompatible.

In an attempt to protect their definition of the (sub)group and an important source of distinctiveness against the diluting and homogenising effects of the superordinate categorisation, this perceived identity incompatibility may result in the rejection of the superordinate categorisation. In so doing, not only do group members protect their interpretation of a distinctive social identity, and therefore a factor that contributes to a distinctive self-concept, but they also benefit the group as a whole against a threat that has a common origin.

An interim conclusion that may be drawn from this discussion is that the positive relationship between differential norm endorsement and lower-order distinctiveness threat is supportive of the argument that threat is only experienced in relation to perceived attacks on criterial aspects of the group's identity: the more a set of norms were endorsed as defining an individual's definition of the group identity the higher the perceived threat.

The arguments made here however, rely on the assumption that perceived threat at the national (lower-order) level significantly affects European identification, either directly or indirectly through identity compatibility.
perceptions. These assumptions will be tested in the subsequent analyses presented in this chapter.

**Predicting Identity Compatibility**

The middle section of the path model involves a single negative path from national group distinctiveness threat and identity compatibility, i.e. the relationship proposed in hypothesis 2a. This was assessed using bivariate correlation.

The identity compatibility scale was designed to assess whether participants believed they could be members of both their national group and the European group simultaneously. Results indicated that identity compatibility was reliably associated with national group distinctiveness threat \( r(239) = -0.31, r^2 = 0.10 \), indicating that the more participants' believed national distinctiveness would be affected (decreased) through European integration the less likely they were to perceive national and European identities as consonant (see also figure IX).

**Figure IX: Path Model Section Two**

Support for hypothesis 2a was obtained from this analysis. The relationship between perceived threat and identity compatibility was mild; the variables shared 10% of their variance: nonetheless it was both negative and significant. Further discussion of this relationship will be presented following the analysis of section three of the path model.
Predicting levels of European Identification

The final section of the path model involves the proposed predictors of European identity. It was hypothesised (hypothesis 2b & 2c) that both distinctiveness threat and identity compatibility would be significantly related to levels of European identity (negatively and positively respectively). In addition, it was proposed (hypothesis 2d) that the relationship between national group distinctiveness threat and European identity may be mediated by identity compatibility.

Moreover, the third hypothesis in this study proposes that mere exposure to content-relevant attribute threat is insufficient to significantly directly affect European identification. Rather this relationship is mediated through national distinctiveness threat.

In order to test these hypotheses, three regression models were tested in a hierarchical multiple regression. The first model regressed European identity on the four content-relevant contingent variables. To take into account distinctiveness threat, this variable was added to the second model. The third model also allowed the influence of identity compatibility to be assessed. If distinctiveness threat does indeed mediate the relationships as hypothesised above we would expect any significant direct paths between the content-relevant variables and European identity to be significantly reduced by the inclusion of national group distinctiveness threat. Furthermore if the relationship between national group distinctiveness threat and European identification is mediated by identity compatibility then we would expect this direct relationship to be significantly reduced by the inclusion of identity compatibility as a predictor.

Model one significantly accounted for 8% of the variance in European identity (R=0.29, F(4, 232)=5.33, p<0.001). Two of the four independent variables were found to be significant predictors: traditional-cultural*cultural manipulation (β=-0.18, t(238)=-2.73, p<0.007) and
civic*institutional manipulation ($\beta=-0.16, t_{(236)}=-2.50, p<0.013$; see also table 34 & figure X). This indicated that in the presence of potential content-relevant attribute threat, descriptive norm endorsement, but not prescriptive norm endorsement, significantly predicted levels of European identity. However, these paths although significant were very weak.

**Table 34: Contingent Variables as Predictors of European Identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural* Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R     | 0.29 |
| R²    | 0.08 |
| Adjusted R² | 0.07 |
| Intercept | 2.63 |

**Figure X: Path Model Section Three, Regression Model One**

- Group Conformity* Cultural Manipulation
- Critical Evaluation* Institutional Manipulation
- Traditional-cultural* Cultural Manipulation
- Civic * Institutional Manipulation

The second regression model, which included distinctiveness threat, not only explained significantly more variance (28%) compared to model one ($R^2_{\text{change}}=0.20, F(1, 231)=64.66, p<0.001$), it also rendered non-significant the
two significant predictors from model one (see table 35 & figure XI). This indicates that any direct effects on European identity from the contingent variables tested are fully mediated by distinctiveness threat (hypothesis 3). Furthermore, the negative distinctiveness threat beta coefficient indicates that perceived threat is negatively associated with levels of European identity (hypothesis 2b).

Table 35: Contingent Variables & National Group Distinctiveness Threat as Predictors of European Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural* Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Group Distinctiveness Threat</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-8.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.53  
R² = 0.28  
Adjusted R² = 0.27  
Intercept = 3.62

Figure XI: Path Model Section Three, Regression Model Two
These results indicate that while both the content-relevant descriptive norm contingent variables significantly predicted levels of European identity, these paths became non-significant when distinctiveness threat was taken into account. These results confirm that any significant effects on European identity from the content-relevant contingent variables are fully mediated through national group distinctiveness threat.

The inclusion of identity compatibility as a predictor in model three significantly increased the explained variance by a further 9% to 37% (36% adjusted; $R^2_{\text{change}}=0.09$, $F(1,230)=32.48$, $p<0.001$; see also table 36 & figure XII).

Table 36: Contingent Variables, National Group Distinctiveness Threat & Identity Compatibility as Predictors of European Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Conformity * Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Evaluation * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional-cultural* Cultural Manipulation</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic * Institutional Manipulation</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Group Distinctiveness Threat</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-7.32</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Compatibility</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive identity compatibility beta coefficient indicated that the greater the perceived compatibility between the two identities, national and European, the higher the levels of European identification (hypothesis 2c). However, the mediating effect of identity compatibility was rather weak; the direct path from national group distinctiveness threat to European identity decreased from -0.59 to -0.51 (beta coefficients) when identity compatibility was added to the analysis (hypothesis 2d). A strong mediating effect would
have eliminated the significant effect of the direct path, or at least reduced it more substantially (Baron & Kenny, 1986).

**Figure XII: Path Model Section Three, Regression Model Three**

![Path Model](image)

The Full Model

The path analyses reported in this chapter (see the full model in figure XIII) indicate that in the context of European categorisation, levels of national group distinctiveness threat are moderated by the content-relevant national identity attribute threats. Furthermore, the extent to which national distinctiveness is threatened is proportionally related to the value an attribute has in defining one's national identity.

In other words, forms of attribute threat that have their origins in European integration lead to perceptions of national group distinctiveness threat. However, these relationships are both moderated by and proportional to the content-relevance of the perceived threat.
Endorsement levels of group conformity prescriptive norms and traditional-cultural descriptive norms were only significantly related to the level of national group distinctiveness threat in the presence of cultural threat, conversely critical evaluation prescriptive norms and civic descriptive norms required the presence of institutional threat.

The level of perceived national distinctiveness threat resulting from Britain’s membership in the EU was significantly related negatively to both Briton’s levels of European identity and their beliefs regarding whether they could be members of both their national and European groups (identity compatibility).

The effect of national distinctiveness threat was not only directly related to levels of European identity but was also weakly mediated through identity compatibility. Evidence for the weak mediating effect was provided by the
decrease in the beta coefficient for the direct path (from $\beta=-0.59$ to $\beta=-0.51$) when the variable identity compatibility was included in the analysis. In terms of predicting levels of European identity, the model contained one significant direct path – from levels of perceived national distinctiveness threat (direct effect=-0.51), and one significant indirect path from this variable through identity compatibility (indirect effect=-0.10). The total effect of national group distinctiveness threat on European identity was therefore -0.61.

Overall the model predicted 43% of the variation in perceptions of national group distinctiveness threat and 37% of the variation in reported levels of European identity.

6.3.2.4 General Discussion

The Moderating Effect of Content Specific Identity Threats

The analyses presented in this chapter indicate that in the context of European integration, subgroup attribute threats lead to national identity distinctiveness threat, but only when the identity dimensions under attack are relevant to the definition an individual has of national identity. The level of threat perceived was both related to the level of descriptive and prescriptive norm endorsement, and the relevance of the perceived threat to specific identity components. Potential threats that target specific national identity dimensions do not extend to other dimensions of the same social identity; rather threat perception is restricted to the dimension under attack.

Such findings strengthen the case for incorporating content in social identity research. Generic national identity measures may have masked the positive relationship between national identity and the perception of distinctiveness threat from European categorisation.
Exposure to an unspecified distinctiveness threat, such as that used in the studies by Hornsey and Hogg (2000c, discussed in chapter two), rely solely on superordinate categorisation to instigate threatening levels of subgroup homogenisation. As was apparent by the inconsistent results obtained by these researchers this is not always the case. This assumption is also somewhat antinomic with self-categorisation theory. Superordinate categorisation alone should not have this effect. If it did then categories could never exist in a harmoniously nested structure. The functional antagonism espoused by the theory allows changes in self-perception to facilitate identification at various levels of abstraction.

Here, it is argued that a crucial factor in determining harmoniously or disharmoniously nested structures is criterial attribute threat. The superordinate categorisation should not threaten attributes that are important to lower-order group definition as this has the capacity to threaten the lower-order group's distinctive and independent existence – a position that is in line with the proposals of the mutual intergroup differentiation model (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hewstone, 2000). This study provides some evidence in support of these propositions.

**Subgroup Distinctiveness Threat and Identity Compatibility**

Although the common ingroup identity model shows how superordinate categorisation can aid superordinate identification, it does not however, explain why identities are not always harmoniously nested. The mutual intergroup differentiation model (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hewstone, 2000) provides a possible explanation. It subsumes the propositions made by the common ingroup model but also emphasises the preservation of subgroup boundaries and the minimisation of subgroup distinctiveness threat as a strategy to induce compatibility between levels of self-categorisation: thereby facilitating identification with both higher- and lower-order groups simultaneously.
In the present study the significant negative relationship observed between perceived subgroup distinctiveness threat and the level of perceived compatibility between the higher and lower order identities supports these propositions. The more an individual believed their subgroup's distinctiveness was threatened by the superordinate categorisation the greater the perceived incompatibility between the two identities.

Subgroup Distinctiveness Threat, Identity Compatibility and Superordinate Identification

Further evidence for the facilitating effect of the 'subgroup boundary preservation' strategy forwarded by the mutual intergroup differentiation model, is provided by the significant positive relationship between levels of identity compatibility and levels of superordinate European identity, and the significant negative relationship between levels of subgroup distinctiveness threat and levels of superordinate European identity. It appears that perceptions of compatibility between identities across levels of abstraction and the minimisation of national distinctiveness threat both have the capacity to facilitate superordinate European identification. However, identity compatibility was expected to mediate the relationship between distinctiveness threat and levels of European identity. Instead this mediating effect was fairly weak. This indicated that although significant relationships were apparent between all three variables, the hypothesis relating to mediation could not be supported.

Mere Exposure to Attribute Threat & the Mediating Effect of Distinctiveness Threat

Finally, further evidence was sought in support of the proposition that exposure to national attribute threat does not directly impact European identification. Rather it is perceived distinctiveness threat that is the crucial variable.
In the presence of content-relevant attribute threats, direct negative relationships between subgroup descriptive norm endorsement and superordinate European identification were very weak (beta weights: -0.18 and -0.16). Due to the size of the sample (244) these small beta weights were significant but they were reduced to non-significant levels when perceptions of actual distinctiveness threat were accounted for. The effect on superordinate identification from exposure to attribute threat was fully mediated through distinctiveness threat.

6.4 Chapter Summary

By exposing subgroup members to the attribute threats along two different dimensions of national identity, this study was able to demonstrate that: (a) the mere presence of potentially threatening information (to the national attributes) was insufficient to directly affect superordinate identification; rather the effect was fully mediated through national distinctiveness threat, and (b) that exposure to attribute threat resulted in distinctiveness threat only on the identity dimension under attack. Rather than threatening all aspects of a social identity, this study indicates that the relationship between group definitions and perceived threat is moderated by the content-relevance of the perceived threat.

In the context of European integration the level of national distinctiveness threat was negatively related to both: (a) the extent to which the two identities, national and European, were seen as compatible, and (b) levels of identification with the superordinate category. These observations indicate that national distinctiveness threat directly affects whether one believes one can simultaneously be a member of their nation and the European Union, as well as the extent to which one identifies with the European category.
6.5 *Progression to the Next Study*

The observations in this study indicated that the perceived homogenisation of criterial attributes leads to subgroup distinctiveness threat, and that this threat plays an important role in moderating superordinate identification.

This study has contributed to our knowledge regarding the role of content specificity in threats to subgroup distinctiveness. In this way it has also informed our knowledge of how the processes involved in superordinate categorisation and the relationships between different levels of self-categorisation impact identification at the superordinate level.

However, from the current study it is impossible to discern whether European identification is attenuated because national group members fear: (a) the loss of distinctive criterial national attributes per se, (b) the loss of the national group as a distinctive social category in its own right and therefore fear intersubgroup similarity, or (c) a combination of both (a) and (b). In the next chapter I explore the paradox mentioned above through these issues.
CHAPTER SEVEN: PERCEPTIONS OF SUBGROUP SIMILARITY & SUPERORDINATE IDENTIFICATION

“People might become more relaxed about being citizens of the European Union if they could be brought to accept that such citizenship does not necessarily involve purchasing into a homogenised European identity, and discarding older, valued points of reference.”

(Linda Colley, The Observer, December 12, 1999)
Chapter 7: Perceptions of Subgroup Similarity and Superordinate Identification
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7.1 Introduction

The general aim of this chapter, as with the general aim from the previous chapter, was developed in part from the observation presented in chapter two, where it was argued that there is a fundamental paradox in the social identity approach. That is, that superordinate categorisation can bring members of subgroups together, but it can also be a source of subgroup distinctiveness threat.

In tackling the fourth aim of this thesis, to investigate how perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness affect self-categorisation at the superordinate level, I aim to explore how these perceptions also interact with perceptions of subgroup attribute threat in their effect.

The previous study indicated that the perceived loss of national distinctiveness was indeed positively related to levels of European identification. However, as was highlighted at the end of chapter six, the previous study did not allow us to discern whether European identification was attenuated because national group members fear: (a) the loss of distinctive criterial national attributes, (b) the loss of the national group as a distinctive social category in its own right, or (c) as the public opinion surveys indicate, a combination of both (a) and (b).

The review of public opinion surveys and attitude research in chapter two indicated that low levels of European identification in the British do not correlate with a desire to forfeit EU membership. Instead, the core concerns appear to be characterised by fears located at the national level, which include the loss of distinctive national identity and culture, and a fear that Britain as a distinctive independent country will cease to exist. In terms of social psychological theory, it is proposed in this chapter that in the context of a new superordinate categorisation these two fears reflect the impact at the subgroup level in terms of: (a) motivational repercussions in the achievement of a distinctive group-definition, and (b) cognitive
repercussions in terms of the restructuring of current cognitive representations of social groups.

7.1.1 A Distinctive and Positive Group-image?

Social identity theory argues that the fundamental motivating force for group identification is the desire to achieve positive distinctiveness from relevant outgroups, which in turn benefits group evaluation and ultimately self-evaluation (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, satisfactory group memberships should aid in the achievement of a self-image that is both positive and distinctive. Given that criterial group attributes are the means by which groups achieve both distinctiveness and positivity, it is likely that these two needs are intimately linked. Indeed, most research tends to treat these as part of the same process.

However, research in the context of the European Union has already shown that when criterial attributes of the national group are negatively evaluated, group members are unwilling to abandon these attributes in favour of more positive comparison dimensions that are not criterial (see Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996, and the discussion in chapter two, section 2.4.3.4). Mlicki & Ellemers findings may indicate that in the context of a superordinate categorisation distinctiveness needs may supersede positive group image needs.

It is possible that in the context of a superordinate categorisation, intergroup differentiation is primarily motivated by a desire to maintain category boundaries. Cinnirella's (1996b) studies lend support to the propositions outlined above. His findings indicate that in the context of European integration, although Britons strongly endorsed the pursuit of group distinctiveness as one of the top three motivations linked to British identity, the self-esteem motivation was endorsed significantly less frequently. Such observations imply that the processes involved in
achieving distinctiveness and positivity are not necessarily inextricably linked, at least in cross-level categorisation contexts, and that one process, such as achieving intergroup distinctiveness, can indeed be given priority.

### 7.1.2 Structuring the Social Environment

As has been discussed previously in this thesis, a new superordinate categorisation challenges how one structures and simplifies their social environment. Self-categorisation theory proposes that the hierarchical social structure of society is represented cognitively and in a self-referential manner (Turner et al., 1987). The societal restructuring that is inevitable when a new category is added, such as the European Union, challenges existing group boundaries that are reflected in the cognitive system and upsets the manner with which one’s social environment is understood.

This new category then can threaten the existing structural representation of social groups and opens the way for numerous restructuring possibilities that need to be considered. One possibility, as argued by the mutual intergroup differentiation model, is the obfuscation of lower-order category boundaries, resulting in the perceived loss (or devaluation) of a distinct lower-order category with which one is identified. The restructuring then can threaten the independent existence of the group that is important both to the provision of self-image distinctiveness and to one’s current cognitive representation of social groups. Differentiating the lower-order group may be given priority over achieving a positive self-image in order to ensure the group’s continued independent survival. Marques et al (2001) make a similar proposal, they argue: “once intergroup distinctiveness is established by a denotative norm, ingroup members can devote attention to prescriptive norms that ensure consensus on criteria for positive ingroup evaluation” (p.411; see also discussion in chapter two).
Thus, as Britons have been telling us (e.g. Eurobarometer, 1999a, 2000; 2002a, but see also chapter two) resistance to a European superordinate categorisation is based, at least in part, in two fears: the loss of distinctive national identity and culture, and the fear that Britain as a distinctive independent country will cease to exist.

It appears that achieving group distinctiveness in the context of a superordinate categorisation occurs in order to maintain one's current understanding of social structure and the relationships between the various groups therein, and in order to maintain distinctiveness of self-image. Intersubgroup differentiation then can occur in order to maintain the cognitive structural representation of social groups and to fulfil the motivation for a distinctive self-image. As Hornsey and Hogg argue, perceptions that group boundaries are blurred or in some way not “rooted in reality (i.e. that the groups are similar)”, can challenge not only how group members structure and simplify their world but also how they define themselves (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b, p.948).

In summary, superordinate categorisation can impact subgroup members in two inter-related ways. Firstly, there are potential motivational repercussions in the impact to self-definition, and in the use of criterial subgroup attributes to achieve a distinctive group image and therefore self-image. Secondly, there are potential cognitive repercussions in the impact to one's structural representation of social groups and in the use of criterial subgroup attributes to support one's current understanding of societal structure. In the context of the European Union this would involve the use of criterial national group attributes to achieve a distinctive group image, and to support a societal structure composed of separate national groups. The potential loss (or homogenisation) of distinctive national attributes then would impact the achievement of a distinctive national group image, while implying intersubgroup similarity would impact the cognitive representation of separate national groups.
7.1.3 Similarity-attraction and/or Similarity-differentiation?

Predictions based on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) imply that simply being categorised at the superordinate level will introduce a degree of subgroup distinctiveness threat that is exacerbated by perceptions of intersubgroup similarity (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b). Social identity theory's similarity-differentiation hypothesis argues that similar outgroups are threatening because they diminish opportunities where the ingroup can be (positively) distinguished from the outgroup (Tajfel, 1982; White & Langer, 1999), a position consistent with the propositions of the mutual intergroup differentiation model discussed previously. Indeed Tajfel (1982) predicted “groups will tend to work harder at establishing their distinctiveness from the outgroups which are perceived as similar than those that are seen as dissimilar” (p.25).

As was argued earlier perceptions that group boundaries are blurred or that groups are similar, can challenge both how group members structure and simplify their world but also how they define themselves. Hornsey and Hogg argue (2000b) that to alleviate the negative arousal caused by this threat to group distinctiveness, ingroup members may act to distance their group from the outgroup. Such action, which will help maintain and reinforce the perception that the groups are separate entities, i.e. that will increase the entitativity of the subgroups and maintain a cognitive representation of separate subgroups, may be incompatible with superordinate categorisation and identification. Group entitativity perceptions have been positively linked both to intergroup competition (Insko & Schopler, 1987) and ethnocentrism (Brewer, Weber, & Carini, 1995). The deterioration of subgroup relations in this way may make it less likely that members of the subgroups will be categorised together in a single superordinate group. In general, research that has explored perceptions of intersubgroup similarity has found support for such a similarity-differentiation hypothesis. Although, most research tends to focus on how similarity perceptions influence ingroup favouritism and bias it may still
inform the study of superordinate identification. Other research has identified a link between positive subgroup relations and superordinate identification (Huo et al., 1996; H. J. Smith & Tyler, 1996).

However, there are inconsistencies in research findings regarding whether intersubgroup similarity ultimately leads to differentiation. Some research, particularly political science research in the area of assimilation (Fredrickson, 1999; Hutnik, 1991), implies a similarity-attraction hypothesis. That is, the more groups are encouraged to see their similarities the more likely they are to perceive themselves as one group. The common ingroup identity model (Gaertner et al., 1993; Gaertner et al., 1999) makes similar predictions, although Gaertner and colleagues acknowledge “that the development of a common ingroup identity does not necessarily require each group to forsake its original group identity completely” (Gaertner et al., 2000, p.134).

Results from the ingroup favouritism/bias research indicate that a number of moderating variables may help explain the inconsistent effects from intersubgroup similarity perceptions. For example, similarity-differentiation was heightened when there were unstable group status relations (Mummendey & Schreiber, 1984b), when the similarity between the groups was very high (Brown & Abrams, 1986; Roccas & Schwartz, 1993), or as the results from the study presented in chapter six would imply, where intergroup comparison involves criterial subgroup dimensions (Moghaddam & Stringer, 1988). Furthermore, there is evidence that when the ingroup identity is threatened by the outgroup, perceptions of similarity lead to ingroup bias, in the absence of such threat similarity-attraction is apparent (Henderson King, Henderson King, Zherma, Posokhova, & Chiker, 1997).

It appears then, that Tajfel’s (1982) prediction regarding the accentuated need for distinctiveness when outgroups are similar to the ingroup, needs to
be qualified further. The evidence implies that the perceived similarity between groups does not inevitably result in differentiation. Intergroup similarity can also lead to attraction. Rather, it is when the need for group distinctiveness is high that intergroup similarity leads to differentiation (see also: Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b).

These observations are consistent with Brewer’s (1991) optimal distinctiveness theory and the proposition that social identities are required to fulfil both similarity and distinctiveness needs (see also discussions in chapters two and six). The interplay between these two opposing needs is somewhat problematic when dealing with cross-level identifications. That is, when dealing with identification with groups at different levels of abstraction, it is the interplay between the opposing needs for intergroup distinctiveness (between subgroups) and intragroup similarity (at the superordinate level and therefore intersubgroup similarity) that is somewhat problematic. As others have argued (e.g. Chryssochoou, 1996; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a) “distinctiveness cannot be maximised at both subordinate and superordinate group levels” (Licata et al., 2003: p.88). However, in an effort to capture and explain this contradiction Brewer’s work on optimal distinctiveness (Brewer, 1991, 1993, 2001) has shown that maximum distinctiveness, or for that matter maximum similarity, is not what is required; rather a state of equilibrium between the two competing processes is desirable.

7.1.4 Superordinate Identification and Intersubgroup Similarity/ Distinctiveness

Very little work exists on how perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness affect superordinate identification although some evidence has been observed that links perceptions of intersubgroup similarity with increased superordinate identification. Licata et al’s (2003) work, for example has shown that perceptions of intersubgroup similarity facilitated
European identification – but only when similarity between the subgroups had been presented as desirable. This relationship was not apparent when subgroup distinctiveness was presented as desirable, or when no information regarding the desirability of intersubgroup similarity or distinctiveness was presented. Another study (Castano, 1998, cited in: Licata et al., 2003, p.87-88) has shown that identification with the European Union increased when participants were asked to concentrate on the similarity between EU nation-states, and decreased when they were asked to concentrate on the differences.

These studies appear to support both similarity-attraction and similarity-differentiation. Intersubgroup similarity appears to be a prerequisite for superordinate group identification to occur (Castano study), but only when distinctiveness needs are not of concern (Licata et al study).

In the context of the current thesis, the British concern with national distinctiveness (i.e. a perceived threat) may indicate that we should expect social identity theory's predictions to be in operation. That is, we would expect similarity-differentiation, which may hinder European identification. On the other hand, the absence of national identity threat should provide conditions for similarity-attraction, conditions that may facilitate superordinate identification.

Castano's research also indicates that focusing on intersubgroup differences attenuates superordinate identification. Given that focusing on the differences between subgroups also highlights the differences between the individual members of these groups this may make it less likely that one will be willing to categorise oneself in the same group with individuals from other subgroups (c.f. self-categorisation theory).

The Licata et al study, on the other hand, indicated that superordinate identification was unaffected when subgroups were presented as different.
Thus although there was again a focus on intersubgroup differences there was no effect from this on European identification. Contrary to Castano's findings, these findings may indicate that concentrating on maintaining differences at the subgroup level has no effect of superordinate identification levels. However, Licata et al.'s study presented the maintenance of subgroup differences as a desirable feature of the European Union. Therefore, there is no real reason to expect levels of European identification to be attenuated under such conditions. It makes the maintenance of difference compatible with European identification.

In the current study, the effect on European identification from perceptions of intersubgroup differences will be explored without comment on whether this is desirable. Instead it will explore these perceptions in terms of their interactions with perceived national distinctiveness threat.

Given that under threat there is an emphasis on accentuating subgroup differences, it is possible that when the maintenance of intersubgroup differences are made salient it may serve to alleviate some of this emphasis. However, whether this will extend to an elevation in European identification is questionable. The perception that intersubgroup differences are maintained may alleviate intergroup distinctiveness threat, i.e. threats related to the quest to differentiate one's group from other groups, but it may not alleviate threats related to maintaining a distinct group definition (attribute threat). Therefore it is not expected that European identification will be elevated under these conditions. Moreover, given the observations from the previous study, it is expected instead that higher levels of perceived attribute threat will still serve to hinder superordinate identification.

On the other hand, in the absence of attribute threat, there is no need to further accentuate subgroup differences. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that national and European identities will be constructed as
incompatible, on the contrary, as the previous study indicated it is more likely that they will be constructed as compatible. The perception that intersubgroup differences are maintained should not influence European identification in either direction.

These proposals will be tested in the current study by comparing the European identification levels of control participants to those of participants in whom perceptions of intersubgroup similarity or intersubgroup difference have been manipulated.

7.2 Research Aims, Questions and Hypotheses

As with the study in chapter six the general aim of the research reported in this chapter is to explore the fundamental paradox highlighted earlier, i.e. to explore what determines whether a superordinate categorisation either brings members of subgroups together or, functions as a source of threat to the distinctiveness of a subgroup. However, while the previous study concentrated on the role of perceived criterial attribute threat, the current study also focuses on perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness.

To this end the current study explores whether superordinate identification is facilitated or impeded by: (a) the perceived loss of distinctive national attributes, (b) perceived intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness, or (c) a combination of both (a) and (b).

Research Questions
In the context of European integration, is superordinate identification affected by perceptions of:
1. national attribute threat?
2. intersubgroup similarity?
3. intersubgroup distinctiveness?
4. intersubgroup similarity/distinctiveness and subgroup attribute threat jointly?

**Hypotheses**

1. Relative to controls,
   1a. Perceptions of intersubgroup similarity under high attribute threat will decrease superordinate identification;
   1b. Under low attribute threat perceptions of intersubgroup similarity will increase superordinate identification;

2. Relative to controls,
   2a. Perceptions of maintained intersubgroup differences under high attribute threat will decrease superordinate identification;
   2b. Under low attribute threat perceptions of maintained intersubgroup differences will result in equivalent levels of superordinate identification.

**7.3 Methodology**

**7.3.1 Questionnaire Design and Procedure**

In the present study intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness perceptions were manipulated. All participants were made aware of both their subgroup membership (Britain) and their superordinate category membership (the European Union). In the experimental conditions participants were then presented with a text highlighting either intersubgroup similarities or distinctiveness (this was omitted in the control condition). Levels of European identity obtained in the experimental conditions were then compared to those obtained in the control condition.

There were three versions of the questionnaire used in the current study (see appendix VA-VC): one corresponding to each of the two experimental conditions and one to the control condition. Each participant was randomly
assigned to one condition. The questionnaire consisted of two pages and the progression of the questionnaire sections were as follows.

The first page contained an initial section which informed participants of their rights and obtained their consent. In the two experimental conditions this section was followed by the manipulation texts. As in the last study the manipulations took the form of a mock survey. This time however, participants in the experimental conditions were given information regarding the conclusions supposedly drawn by the researchers involved. In both experimental conditions the mock survey conclusions were presented under a section entitled ‘the purpose of this study’.

In both the experimental and control conditions, simultaneous activation of both superordinate and subordinate group membership was achieved by stating at the beginning of ‘the purpose of this study’ section that:

Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. This study is about British citizens’ attitudes on the European Union.

In this way, participants’ attentions were drawn towards their superordinate group membership without obfuscating subgroup boundaries. In the experimental conditions, this was followed by the manipulation texts.

The two manipulation texts were similar in length and in content except with regards to the manipulation of either intersubgroup similarity or distinctiveness (see below). Given that other researchers (e.g. Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b) have argued that simply being told that two groups are similar or different does not necessarily lead to the adoption of these perceptions, efforts were made to strengthen the manipulations by using real examples of how the EU national groups are similar or different. Following, Routh & Burgoyne (1998) examples were used that were salient in the mass media.
Both the experimental conditions presented the following information about the mock survey:

Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people's attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain. Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey. The information gathered led the researchers to conclude the following.

*British people believe that all the countries of the European Union have their own distinctive culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices; they are unique in their own ways. The distinctiveness of each country has always been a source of pride to its citizens.*

In the induced similarity condition a further paragraph stated:

*Britons also believe that the way the European Union has been formed has led all the involved countries to adopt similar ways of doing some things. They believe this is evident in such things as: the European court of law; the single European currency (the Euro); and common European fishing and agricultural policies that are in effect at present."

In the maintaining distinctiveness condition this paragraph was changed to:

*Britons also believe that the way the European Union has been formed has allowed all the involved countries to retain their valued differences. They believe this is evident in such things as: the use of different languages and social past-times; and, amongst many other things, different systems of government, education, health and tax.*

All conditions, including the control condition, ended with the sentence: ‘in this study we would like to know what you think’.
The second page of the questionnaire contained the pictogram measure of national attribute distinctiveness threat (5-point scale: 1=0% to 5=100%) and the levels of European identity scale (7-point scale: 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree) used in the previous study. The instructions that preceded the pictogram scales however differed from those used in the previous study.

In the previous study the instructions directed participants to consider loss of attribute distinctiveness “due to influence from the European Union and the other countries within the European Union”, thus drawing participants' attentions to intersubgroup relations. In the current study these instructions were changed to “due to Britain's membership in the European Union”, in an effort to avoid explicitly drawing control participants' attentions to the intersubgroup context.

Finally, some basic demographic information (age, gender and nationality) was collected.

7.3.2 Pilot Study

In order to test whether the new manipulations induced perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness a small pilot study was conducted. The participants were undergraduate students studying for a nursing degree at a university in London (N=25).

This examined intersubgroup similarity perceptions following the new manipulations by presenting the first page of the questionnaire as described above (experimental and control conditions) followed by a measure of intersubgroup similarity/distinctiveness. The four item group distinctiveness scale from chapter six was used to this end. However, the global comparative context was replaced by the EU (see also appendix V.D). Responses therefore indicated how similar or distinctive participants
believed British citizens were in comparison to other EU citizens (e.g. ‘when I think about people from other EU nations I believe there is nothing unique about being British’). The response format of the scale was from ‘not at all’ to ‘very much’; items were scaled from 1 indicating high intergroup distinctiveness, to 5 indicating high intergroup similarity. Responses to the items were summed to create the dependent variable (scale α=0.83).

The data were analysed using a one-way independent groups ANOVA with planned comparisons between the control condition and each of the two experimental conditions (induced similarity and maintaining distinctiveness). Results indicated that the manipulations were effective: similarity perceptions differed significantly across the three conditions (F(2,22)=13.78, p<0.001, partial η²=0.56). Planned comparisons indicated that compared to the control condition (¯x=2.87; N=8) participants in the induced similarity condition (¯x=3.87; N=8) reported significantly higher levels of intersubgroup similarity (¯x_{diff}=1.00, SE=0.33, p=0.006), and participants in the maintaining distinctiveness (¯x=2.22; N=9) condition reported significantly lower levels (¯x_{diff}=-0.65, SE=0.32, p=0.05).

Given these observations, the manipulations were retained for use in the main study.

7.3.3 Participants

In the main study one hundred and forty eight British/English participants voluntarily took part in the current study. Participants were recruited from two corporations, one further education college and one university, all in London. Seventy eight participants were female and seventy male. The mean age of the sample was 23.36 years. Random allocation of participants to the conditions resulted in 54 receiving questionnaires containing the
induced similarity manipulation, 45 the maintaining distinctiveness manipulation, and 49 the control.

### 7.3.4 Data Analyses and (Quasi) Experimental Design

The dependent variable was measured using the European identity scale from the previous study and the internal consistency of the scale was examined using Cronbach’s reliability analysis.

There were two independent variables: condition and level of attribute threat. The subgroup attribute threat independent variable was constructed by grouping participant responses on the pictogram scale. Responses that corresponded to 0-25% lost distinctiveness were classified as low threat, while responses corresponding to 75-100% were classified as high threat. Participants who responded 50% were excluded from the analyses.

The main inferential analysis employed was a 2 (attribute threat: low vs. high) by 3 (condition: maintaining distinctiveness, induced similarity & control) independent groups ANOVA.

### 7.4 Results

#### 7.4.1 Manipulation Check and Scale Reliability

The pilot study had already indicated that the two manipulations were effective in inducing intersubgroup similarity and distinctiveness. However, in the pilot study the effect of the manipulations on perceptions of subgroup attribute threat had not been explored. The intention in this main study was not to influence these threat perceptions. Rather the focus of the study was on superordinate identification levels and how these may be affected by perceptions of subgroup similarity/distinctiveness and measured levels of
subgroup attribute threat. However, as the subgroup attribute threat measure appeared after the manipulations the possibility of influence could not be discounted. In order to ensure that levels of threat were unaffected by the manipulations a one-way ANOVA was conducted using threat as the dependent variable and conditions (induced similarity vs. maintaining distinctiveness vs. control) as the independent variable.

No significant differences were found in the level of threat reported by participants in the various conditions \( F(2,145)=1.01, p=\text{NS} \); maintaining distinctiveness (MD) \( \bar{x}=2.98 \); control \( \bar{x}=2.90 \); induced similarity (IS) \( \bar{x}=2.89 \). This observation indicates that the similarity/distinctiveness manipulations did not significantly affect subgroup attribute threat perceptions.

The European identity scale displayed good reliability \( (\alpha=0.84) \) and was used as the dependent variable in the following analyses. Factor scores were computed using the same summation method \( \left( \sum \frac{x_{\text{item}}}{N_{\text{item}}} \right) \) as in the previous study.

### 7.4.2 Inferential Analyses

The 2 (threat: low vs. high) by 3 (condition: IS vs. MD vs. control) independent groups ANOVA indicated a significant main effect for level of attribute threat \( F(1,94)=25.37, p<0.001, \text{partial } \eta^2=21\% \); see also table 37), indicating that low threat participants expressed significantly higher levels of European identity compared to high threat participants. There was no significant main effect due to condition \( F(2,94)=0.91, p=\text{NS} \), however the main effects were qualified by a significant disordinal interaction \( F(2,94)=5.18, p<0.02, \text{partial } \eta^2=10\% \); see also figure XV).
Table 37: European identity levels by level of subgroup attribute threat and condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Level of Threat</th>
<th>Low Threat $\bar{x}$ (SD)</th>
<th>High Threat $\bar{x}$ (SD)</th>
<th>Marginal Means For Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Similarities</td>
<td>Low Threat</td>
<td>*4.72 (0.88) $n=18$</td>
<td>#2.54 (0.85) $n=16$</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintained Distinctiveness</td>
<td>Low Threat</td>
<td>3.77 (1.80) $n=17$</td>
<td>2.74 (1.21) $n=16$</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Low Threat</td>
<td>*3.69 (1.14) $n=18$</td>
<td>#3.33 (1.01) $n=15$</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginal Means For Level of Threat

- Low Threat $\bar{x}$ = 4.06
- High Threat $\bar{x}$ = 2.87

Grand Mean = 3.46

$^p=0.03; ^*p=0.02; ^p=0.01; ^*_p=0.001; ^{\gamma}p<0.001$

Figure XIV: Effect of the interaction between level of threat and condition on European identity levels
The significant interaction was explored through simple effects analyses while controlling for type I errors. Effects due to level of threat will be reported followed by effects due to condition.

Effects due to level of threat were investigated within each condition. Given that all possible comparisons were being made, one-way independent groups ANOVAS were used and type I errors were controlled by calculating the f-ratios using the mean squares error from the original two-way ANOVA. These f-ratios were then evaluated using the degrees of freedom for the full model (see appendix V.E for calculations).

The results indicated a significant difference between low and high threat in the IS condition \((F(1,94)=29.19, \ p<0.001, \ \text{partial } \eta^2=24\%; \ \bar{x}_{\text{low}}=4.72; \ \bar{x}_{\text{high}}=2.54)\), and in the MD condition \((F(1,94)=6.28, \ p=0.01, \ \text{partial } \eta^2=6\%; \ \bar{x}_{\text{low}}=3.77; \ \bar{x}_{\text{high}}=2.74)\), but not the control condition \((F(1,94)=0.73, \ p=\text{NS}, \ \text{partial } \eta^2=1\%; \ \bar{x}_{\text{low}}=3.69; \ \bar{x}_{\text{high}}=3.33)\). Irrespective of whether participants concentrated on the similarities or differences between subgroups, low threat participants expressed significantly higher levels of European identity when compared with high threat participants. Thus, European identification was moderated by level of subgroup attribute threat, however, this effect was not apparent in the control condition.

For effects due to condition, each experimental condition was compared to the control condition within each level of threat. Dunnett’s independent samples t-tests were favoured over other methods as they provide a more powerful test in experimental designs that incorporate a control condition (following advice from Howell, 2002, p.401-402). As the hypotheses were directional these tests were also one-tailed. Effect size was calculated using Cohen’s d (Cohen, 1988) and converted to an effect-size \(r^2\) using Cohen’s (1988) conversion tables in order to gauge the variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variable.
Results indicated that, in the presence of high threat, significant differences were apparent in comparison to the control for the IS condition ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=-0.79$, SE=0.35, $p=0.03$, Cohen’s $d=0.93$, effect-size $r^2=17\%$), but not the MD condition ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=-0.59$, SE=0.35, $p=0.09$, Cohen’s $d=0.53$, effect-size $r^2=6\%$). As expected (hypotheses 1a & 2a) high threat participants expressed lower levels of European identity compared to controls (see table 37 for means). However, contrary to expectations, this difference was only significant in the IS condition. In the MD condition the means were in the expected direction, however, the mean difference did not reach conventional significance ($p=0.09$). Thus, when the threat to subgroup attribute distinctiveness was high, focusing on the similarities, but not the differences, between the EU nation-states had the effect of significantly reducing European identity levels.

In the presence of low attribute threat significant differences were again apparent between the IS and control conditions ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=1.04$, SE=0.44, $p=0.02$, Cohen’s $d=1.02$, effect-size $r^2=20\%$), but not between the MD and control conditions ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=0.08$, SE=0.45, $p=\text{NS}$, Cohen’s $d=0.05$, effect-size $r^2=1\%$). As expected (hypothesis 1b) low threat IS participants expressed significantly higher levels of European identity ($\bar{x}=4.72$) when compared to the controls ($\bar{x}=3.69$), and (hypothesis 2b) the means in the MD and control conditions were very similar. Thus, when the threat to subgroup attribute distinctiveness was low, focusing on the similarities, but not the differences, between the EU nation-states had the effect of elevating European identity levels.
7.5 DISCUSSION

The results of the study presented in this chapter indicated that perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and subgroup attribute threat both significantly affect identification with a relevant superordinate category. In this section the implications of these findings are discussed.

In both experimental conditions, levels of European identification were moderated by perceptions of national attribute threat. As in the last study this indicated a significant negative relationship between levels of perceived attribute threat and levels of European identification. It appears that the response to the negative arousal caused by threats to subgroup distinctiveness is to reject superordinate identification.

The effect of threat levels on superordinate identification was in the same direction in both experimental conditions, however the magnitude of this observed effect was much greater in the induced similarities condition (24% explained variance) than in the maintained distinctiveness condition (6% explained variance). This suggests that the effect from attribute threat on levels of European identification was itself moderated by intersubgroup similarity/distinctiveness perceptions. In other words, the effect from attribute threat on European identification was much weaker when Britons believed they could maintain intersubgroup differences in the context of European integration. These results cannot be explained by differences in the levels of attribute threat reported as the results had also shown that these had not differed by condition.
It appears that for Britons with lower levels of attribute threat European identification can be facilitated by encouraging perceptions of intersubgroup similarity. However, this has a detrimental effect on the European identification levels of those with higher levels of attribute threat. For higher threat Britons neither inducing perceptions of intersubgroup similarity nor intersubgroup distinctiveness was found to elevate European identification.

In the control condition, European identification was not moderated by subgroup attribute threat. This may be explained by a lack of focus on intersubgroup relations. In the experimental conditions participants' attentions were drawn both to their superordinate categorisation and intersubgroup relations, while in the control condition intersubgroup relations were not explicitly made salient.

One interpretation of this observation may be that in the control condition the loss of national attributes may not have been considered in terms of its potential impact on intersubgroup distinctiveness, but only in terms of group distinctiveness. The negative effects to the group's distinctive image may be buffered using social creativity type strategies. If this proposition is correct then the implications of decreased group distinctiveness may not impact the structural representation of the groups by presenting them as similar and potentially a single group.
7.6 **PROGRESSION TO THE NEXT STUDY**

The study presented in this chapter implies that the process of engaging in intersubgroup comparisons *per se* does not impede (or facilitate) identification with Europe. Rather the effect of this process was moderated by the extent to which individuals believed the distinctiveness of their British identity was threatened. The effect on European identification levels from making these comparisons was accentuated when the groups were perceived as similar, both accentuating European identification in the absence of threat and attenuating it in the presence of threat. In other words, this study indicated that making intersubgroup comparisons within a European context *per se* does not necessarily act as a barrier to European identification.

The study presented in the next chapter addresses this issue; that is it asks: is engaging in intersubgroup comparisons in the pursuit of national group distinctiveness incompatible with superordinate identification?
CHAPTER EIGHT: SOCIAL COMPARISONS AND SUPERORDINATE IDENTIFICATION

“In what respects is Britain more different from continental European countries than they are from each other? In what respects is Britain more like other countries – the US, Canada or Australia – than it is like those European ones? [...] Britain is a European country, full stop. Or as we say in our Americanised way, period.”

Chapter 8: Social Comparisons and Superordinate Identification
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8.1 **Introduction**

The final aim of this thesis is to explore the relationship between intergroup comparisons and identification with a superordinate group. The study presented in this chapter addresses the general question: is focusing on intersubgroup comparisons in the pursuit of national group distinctiveness incompatible with superordinate identification?

The current study also draws on strategies suggested by other researchers and the recurrent negative association between threats to British (attribute) distinctiveness and European identification, to explore further strategies that may allow Britons to differentiate their national group and achieve a sense of group distinctiveness while at the same time facilitating European identification. To this end the current chapter reports the results of a study in which different social comparison strategies are used in the pursuit of national group distinctiveness.

**8.1.1 Intergroup Comparisons at the European Level**

The problem of relatively low levels of European identification has led some researchers to suggest strategies to 'help' groups such as the British achieve higher levels of European identification. Cinnirella (1996a; 1996b), for example, has suggested that encouraging perceptions of an outgroup, such as the U.S.A. or Japan, with which to compare Europe may help people to focus on making intergroup comparisons between Europe and non-EU national groups, and may facilitate superordinate identification. This, he argues, would encourage national citizens to focus on the similarities between the members of the various national groups rather than the differences. According to the social identity approach, it is possible that this may facilitate European identification. Cinnirella's suggestion would in effect move the comparative context for categorisation from 'European' to some other superordinate categorisation such as 'continental' or 'world'. 
According to self-categorisation theory, categorisation at the superordinate level requires subgroup members to think of themselves as belonging to the same superordinate group. Indeed, the study discussed in chapter seven indicated that focusing on the differences between the nation-states of the EU did not significantly affect European identification levels. Instead, consistent with self-categorisation theory the significant factor was the perception of intersubgroup similarities. Cinnirella's suggestion is consistent with self-categorisation theory's functional antagonism hypothesis (Turner et al., 1987). The inverse relationship between levels of self-categorisation implies that making European identity salient should lead to a perceptual discounting of the similarities at higher levels, e.g. between Europe and the USA or Japan, and a discounting of the differences that exist at a lower level, e.g. differences based on nationality in different EU nation-states. This leaves the current salient categorisation, in this case European, as the category that provides the best fit.

However, when the salient category (European) is believed to threaten the distinctiveness of a lower-order category (British) will individuals still perceptually discount the differences at the lower level? Social identity theorists (see for example Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b) have argued that the strategy for alleviating the negative arousal caused by threats to group distinctiveness is to accentuate the differences between the ingroup and outgroups. In situations of such negative arousal ‘nationality’ becomes an attribute that can be used to explain the differences between individuals in the proposed European categorisation and justifies the separate categorisation of EU citizens at the lower-level national groupings (McGarty, 1999).
8.1.2 **Intergroup Comparisons with Other EU Nation-states**

The study presented in chapter seven suggested that the process of engaging in intersubgroup comparisons per se did not impede (or facilitate) identification with Europe. Rather the effect of this process was moderated by the extent to which individuals believed the distinctiveness of their British identity was threatened. The effect on European identification levels from making these comparisons was accentuated when the groups were perceived as similar, both accentuating European identification in the absence of (attribute) threat and attenuating it in the presence of (attribute) threat. In other words, the previous study indicated that making intersubgroup comparisons within a European context per se does not necessarily act as a barrier to European identification.

Although theoretically valid, Cinnirella's suggestion implies that the higher 'continental' or 'world' context can be considered in isolation, i.e. without priming 'European' as a context that also frames EU nation-states. Such an approach mirrors the study of social identity and intergroup relations in a simple ingroup-outgroup context that has been assumed in most identity research, and does not consider the inter-relationships amongst multiple social identifications (Roccas & Brewer, 2002). It is true that the functional antagonism hypothesis inherent in self-categorisation theory is often considered in terms of two cross-level categorisations. The higher level provides the background similarity between stimuli (which are discounted) within which social comparisons take place and lead to their categorisation into different groups at a lower level (where their differences are discounted). However, categorisation is selective. It structures the world in a manner that is meaningful, relevant and useful in terms of the needs, goals and purposes of the perceiver (Oakes, Turner, & Haslam, 1991; McGarty, 1999). A salient categorisation implicates possible categorisations at both higher and lower levels to itself. Possible categorisations across multiple levels of self-abstraction are considered simultaneously and in conjunction with the needs of the perceiver. If, for example, the differences
on the basis of nationality cannot be discounted, the European category would not provide the best fit and self-categorisation in the European group cannot progress, but the search for a meaningful categorisation continues.

In others words, one interpretation of the functional antagonism hypothesis could be that multiple levels of possible categorisation are primed when a given category is made salient. The ‘continental’ or ‘world’ context that has the capacity to facilitate European identification may also make national groupings salient by priming the European context. Rapid shifts across these levels would then allow the individual to make the goal directed similarity/difference judgements required for the ‘best fit’ categorisation to be selected.

There is reason to assume that individuals will not ignore the repercussions to their national identity when European identity is salient. In other words, it is suggested that although a salient categorisation may be framed by the context of a categorisation at a higher level than itself, categorisations at lower levels to the salient one are also implicated in the process.

It can be argued that in considering European self-categorisation, an individual's nationality is only one attribute amongst many upon which to base one's judgements of category fit. However, the explicit association that exists between the national groupings and the European Union make it more likely that the activation of the European categorisation will also activate national categorisations. National citizenship is after all the single most significant factor in determining who is legally accepted as a citizen of the EU. Moreover, any search of public discourse reveals that politicians and the media generally speak of EU members in terms of the member countries not the individual citizens. In addition, research that has explored how European citizens construct their European identities has shown that “European identity is always conceived of with reference to national identity” (Chryssochoou, 1996: p.307). It is likely that undue focus
will be placed on this single differentiating attribute. While these differences may be discounted in individuals with harmoniously nested categorisations, when coupled with perceptions of threat to the lower-order national categorisation, differences in nationality make the fusing together of the EU national subgroups a logical anomaly and accentuate the illegitimacy of the new cognitive representation of social structure.

Social psychological researchers have argued that “perceived threat accentuates subgroup solidarity, sharpens intergroup boundaries, accentuates ethnocentric attitudes and behaviours, [and] inhibits superordinate identification” (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a, p.145). Branscombe & Wann (1994), for example, have shown that when social identity is threatened people are more likely to make intergroup comparisons that favour the ingroup. Although their study did not investigate how this may affect superordinate identification, their findings may provide a possible explanation for the results observed in chapter seven. Highly threatened individuals may have been more likely to make ingroup favouring comparisons in order to bolster the group identity. Together these observations may imply that in the context of superordinate categorisation and in the presence of subgroup threat, engaging in social comparisons with other subgroups may hinder superordinate identification.

Others however, have suggested that strategies that allow group members to maintain subgroup identities and positive distinctiveness are more likely to facilitate superordinate identification (Brewer & Gaertner, 2001). Hewstone (Hewstone, 2000; Hewstone & Brown, 1986), for example, argues that superordinate identification is facilitated when groups are encouraged to acknowledge their “mutual superiorities and inferiorities” (Hewstone, 2000, p.334). This perspective implies that being able to positively differentiate one’s subgroup should facilitate superordinate identification.
In the context of the current study then, making social comparisons with other EU nation-states should not necessarily interfere with European identification. Rather, the effects may be moderated by national distinctiveness threat. In the presence of threat, engaging in intersubgroup comparisons may hinder European identification, while in the absence of threat superordinate identification may be facilitated.

### 8.1.3 Intergroup Comparisons with Non-EU Nation-states

An alternative strategy in the pursuit of facilitating European identification in the British may be to encourage Britons to make international group comparisons between their own nation and other non-EU nations (such as the USA and Japan). In this way Britons may be able to fulfil group distinctiveness needs by engaging in social comparisons without distancing the group from other EU nation-states. Given that making comparisons with alternative outgroups is one of the proposed social creativity strategies for improving social identity in lateral intergroup contexts (see for example Hogg & Abrams, 1988b), it is possible that this strategy may also indirectly aid superordinate identification.

There are reasons however, why this strategy may prove to be ineffective. Self-categorisation and social comparison are mutually dependent and complementary processes, and the dependency among these two processes give social categorisations their functional antagonism that ties them to a social context (Turner, 1985). Self-categorisation then can only progress through relevant social comparison, and social comparison itself is framed by the higher-order categorisation. In the context of European integration, the relevant comparisons are likely to be between oneself as a Briton and other individuals on the basis of their nationalities, e.g. Italian, French, etc. Being citizens of member countries of the European Union provides the higher-order ‘background’ similarity which makes these comparisons relevant.
In addition, it is difficult to imagine how comparisons between Britain and non-EU nations can alleviate threats to national distinctiveness that are rooted in European integration. Predictions based on the social identity approach would imply that in the context of European integration, such comparisons are likely to be ineffective. Social identity theory for example, argues that a group's social identity is unaffected by intergroup comparisons with outgroups that are not relevant to the context (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). As British national identity is threatened in the European context and not in the 'continental' or 'world' contexts, it may be unlikely that this strategy will significantly elevate European identification, particularly in the presence of subgroup threat.

8.1.4 Temporal Comparisons

A different approach, suggested by Hilton, Erb, Dermot and Molian (1996) argues that "the existence of a troubled history may enable Europeans to construct a positive and coherent self-image through a comparison of Europe's present unity with her conflict-ridden past, such a strategy for creating a European identity has the advantage of not creating outgroups" (p.293). Basically, Hilton et al's proposal implies that comparisons between a negative past image of Europe and a present more positive image may aid superordinate identification. Thus, rather than making intergroup comparisons, one can instead make inter-temporal comparisons.

This proposal may indeed aid in the achievement of a positive self-image, but whether this will encourage European identification in individuals who believe their national group's distinctiveness and survival are threatened by the superordinate categorisation is somewhat questionable. In the presence of threat European identification is not attenuated by a negative image of the European group per se, rather it is a function of the perception that European categorisation may result in previously separate nations
becoming one homogenous entity. As with the previous strategy, this strategy too may prove ineffective, particularly in the presence of threat.

In summary, it is tentatively suggested that the relationship between European identification and intersubgroup comparisons will be moderated by threat to subgroup distinctiveness. That is, low levels of subgroup distinctiveness threat may facilitate European identification, while high levels may impede identification.

In addition, if either of the two further strategies discussed above (non-EU nation-state and temporal comparisons) are effective we would expect European identification to be facilitated by the application of these strategies. In other words, we would expect elevated European identity levels when people are encouraged to make non-EU and temporal comparisons.

8.2 Research Aims, Questions and Hypotheses

The aims of this study are to explore the effects on levels of European identification from the different social comparison strategies discussed above. To this end, British participants are given the opportunity to make one of three social comparisons: Britain versus other EU nation-states (EU condition); Britain versus non-EU nations (NE condition); or post-integration Europe versus and pre-integration Europe (Temporal – TP condition). In order to allow baseline comparisons a control condition was also included where participants made no comparisons. Following this European identity levels and perceptions of subgroup distinctiveness threat due to European integration were measured.
Research Questions

1. To what extent do intersubgroup comparisons facilitate or hinder superordinate identification?

2. To what extent do alternative contexts (to 1 above) for engaging in social comparisons facilitate or hinder superordinate identification?
   2a. Can outgroups external to the superordinate categorisation provide this context?
   2b. Can temporal comparisons between a positive post-integration European image and a negative pre-integration European image provide this context?

3. Do perceptions of subgroup distinctiveness threat and any of the above social comparison strategies have a joint effect on superordinate identification?

As the all the social comparison strategies are exploratory, no hypotheses are formulated.

8.3 Methodology

8.3.1 Questionnaire Design and Procedure

There were four versions of the questionnaire used in the current study (see appendices VI.A-VI.D): one corresponding to each of the three experimental conditions and one the control condition. Each participant was randomly assigned to one condition. The questionnaire consisted of two pages and the progression of the questionnaire sections were as follows.

The first page obtained participants' consent, and informed them of their rights and the 'reason for the study'. It also informed participants that the study was about 'British citizen's attitudes on the European Union', and reminded them that: 'Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. As members of the European Union all Britons, together with the citizens of all
the other European Union countries are now European citizens'. In this way simultaneous activation of both subordinate and superordinate group memberships was achieved.

The second page of the questionnaire invited participants to make social comparisons between either:

a. Britain and other EU nation-states (EU condition);
b. Britain and non-EU nations (NE condition);
c. Post-integration Europe and pre-integration Europe (TP condition); or
d. No comparisons (control 'C' condition).

Participants made social comparisons by indicating their agreement with four statements (on a 5-point Likert scale: 1=disagree – 5=agree). All statements across the conditions were positively worded in favour of the ingroup in order to avoid threatening the British national or European identity. In each experimental condition four statements covered the same four different areas of comparison (see also the full questionnaires in appendix VI):

(i) **National conflict**: e.g. ‘compared to other countries in the European Union, Britain’s approach to international conflict is better’ (EU condition);

(ii) **Human rights**: e.g. ‘since the European Union created the ‘Human Rights Charter’ people’s rights are better protected than before the European Union was formed’ (TP condition);

(iii) **Asylum**: e.g. ‘People who have been persecuted and victimised in their own countries have a better chance of gaining asylum in Britain than in Australia’ (NE condition); and

(iv) **Evaluations regarding which place is the better to live in**: e.g. Living in any country within the European Union is better now than it was before the European Union was formed’ (TP condition).
The six-item levels of European identity scale was presented next. A measure of lost national group distinctiveness then followed. This was presented in the following format:

'Some people argue that due to Britain’s membership in the European Union, British culture, traditions and 'ways of doing things' will become less distinctive; others argue that this will not happen. We would like to know what you think.

Do you think that Britain's distinctiveness will be lost or reduced?'

This item was scaled from 1=not at all to 5=yes, very much. Finally, in order to ensure that lost national distinctiveness was perceived negatively and therefore as a threat to the national group, participants were asked if they believed their response to the above question was a 'good thing or a bad thing'. Responses on this affective evaluation item were scaled from 1 – a very bad thing to 5 – a very good thing.

### 8.3.2 Participants

One hundred and sixty five participants were voluntarily recruited from three corporations and one university, all in London. Eighty eight participants were female and seventy seven were male. The mean age of the sample was 22.39 years. Random allocation of participants to the conditions resulted in 42 receiving questionnaires containing the European intergroup comparisons, 45 the non-European, 42 the historical and 36 the control.

### 8.3.3 Data Analyses

The internal consistency of the European identity scale was examined using Cronbach's reliability analysis. The main inferential analysis employed was a 2 (threat: low vs. high) by 4 (condition: EU vs. NE vs. TP vs. C)
independent groups ANOVA. The distinctiveness threat independent variable was constructed by grouping participant responses on the lost national distinctiveness item: responses 1-3 (corresponding to responses 'not at all', 'not very much' & 'yes a little', respectively) were classified as low threat, while responses 4-5 (corresponding to responses 'yes somewhat' & 'yes very much' respectively) were classified as high threat.

8.4 Results

8.4.1 Initial Analyses and Scale Reliabilities

As in the previous study the intention in this study was not to influence national distinctiveness threat perceptions. Rather the focus of the study was on superordinate identification levels and how these may be affected by different social comparison strategies and measured levels of subgroup threat. However, as the threat measure appeared after the social comparison items the possibility of influence could not be discounted. In order to ensure that levels of threat were unaffected by the manipulations a one-way ANOVA was conducted using threat as the dependent variable and conditions (EU vs. NE vs. TP vs. C) as the independent variable.

No significant differences were found in the level of threat reported by participants in the various conditions (F(3,161)=0.20, p=NS; European (EU) $\bar{x}=3.45$; non-European (NE) $\bar{x}=3.24$; Temporal (TP) $\bar{x}=3.26$; Control $\bar{x}=3.39$). This indicates that the different social comparison strategies did not influence threat perceptions directly.

In order to ensure that perceptions of lost national distinctiveness had the capacity to cause negative arousal and that this measure was indeed therefore a measure of threat, participants' responses on the lost national group distinctiveness measure and the affective evaluation measure were examined. The association between these two measures was high and
negative ($r(165)=-0.81$, $p<0.001$), indicating that a reduction in national
group distinctiveness was indeed perceived as 'a bad thing'.

Some research has found that people are more likely to make intergroup
comparisons that favour the ingroup when social identity is threatened (see
for example: Branscombe & Wann, 1994). In the EU condition, the
distancing of subgroups from each other in this manner may in itself explain
one's willingness to self-categorise at the superordinate level. Therefore a
comparison of the scores on the social comparison items between low and
high threat participants in this condition is warranted. As Hilton et al's
(1996) temporal strategy claims that elevations in superordinate
identification may be a function of achieving a positive self-image through
temporal comparisons, and a similar argument can be made for intergroup
comparisons with non-EU nations, scores from low and high threat
participants in these conditions were also examined.

A composite measure was created from the four comparison items
(Cronbach's $\alpha=0.71$) using the summation method ($\sum x_{i\text{items}}/N_{\text{items}}$).
Mean levels on the composite comparison measure were compared. Independent
samples t-tests indicated no significant differences by level of threat within
any of the conditions (see table 38). This eliminates the possibility that high
threat participants are more likely to use social comparison as a means of
achieving positive group distinctiveness.

Table 38: Positive Distinctiveness Comparisons by Level of Threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Low Threat $\bar{x}$ (SD)</th>
<th>High Threat $\bar{x}$ (SD)</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Dfs</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>3.18 (0.68)</td>
<td>3.51 (0.77)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3.64 (0.63)</td>
<td>3.96 (0.82)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>2.85 (0.66)</td>
<td>3.05 (0.47)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, the reliability of the European identity scale was examined and found to be satisfactory (α=0.76). Factor scores were computed using the summation method and this measure was used as the dependent variable in the following analyses.

8.4.2 Main Inferential Analyses

The effect of the different comparison strategies and level of national group distinctiveness threat on European identification were examined using a 2 (threat: low vs. high) by 4 (condition: EU vs. NE vs. TP vs. C) independent groups ANOVA.

The analysis indicated a significant main effect for level of distinctiveness threat (F(1,157)=22.66, p<0.001, partial η²=13%; see also table 39), indicating that low threat participants expressed significantly higher levels of European identity compared to high threat participants. There was no significant effect due to condition (F(3,157)=1.21, p=NS), but these main effects were qualified by a significant interaction (F(3,157)=5.37, p=0.002, partial η²=9%; see also figure XVI).

Table 39: European identity levels by level of threat and intergroup comparison condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Low Threat</th>
<th>High Threat</th>
<th>Marginal Means For Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ (SD)</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$ (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>*3.18 (0.66)</td>
<td>*2.03 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European</td>
<td>2.42 (0.73)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.76)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=22</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>-2.80 (0.56)</td>
<td>-2.33 (0.62)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=21</td>
<td>n=21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>*2.55 (0.52)</td>
<td>2.21 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Means For Level of Threat</td>
<td>$^\wedge$2.74</td>
<td>$^\wedge$2.24</td>
<td>Grand Mean = 2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p=0.012; *p=0.008; *p<0.001; $^\wedge$p<0.001;
Figure XV: European identity levels as a function of level of threat and social comparison strategy

The significant interaction was explored through simple effects analyses while controlling for type I errors. Effects due to level of threat will be reported followed by effects due to condition.

Effects due to level of threat were investigated within each condition. As in the previous study, given that all possible comparisons were being made, one-way independent groups ANOVAS were used and type I errors were controlled by calculating the f-ratios using the mean squares error from the original two-way ANOVA. These f-ratios were then evaluated using the degrees of freedom for the full model (see appendix VI.E for calculations).

The results indicated a significant difference between low and high threat in the EU condition ($f(1,157)=31.13$, $p<0.001$, partial $\eta^2=17\%$; $\bar{x}_{\text{low}}=3.18$; $\bar{x}_{\text{high}}=2.03$), and in the TP condition ($f(1,157)=5.16$, $p=0.02$, partial $\eta^2=3\%$;
Low threat EU and NE participants expressed significantly higher levels of European identity when compared to high threat participants from the same condition. It appears that European identification is moderated by level of subgroup distinctiveness threat but only in conjunction with social comparisons relevant to the superordinate categorisation. This moderating effect was not apparent when participants made intergroup comparisons with outgroups external to the superordinate context.

For effects due to comparison strategy, each experimental condition was compared to the control condition within each level of threat. Results indicated that for low threat significant differences were apparent between the EU and control conditions ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=0.64$, SE=0.21, $p=0.008$, Cohen's $d=1.06$, effect-size $r^2=47\%$), but not between the NE and control conditions ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=-0.13$, SE=0.20, $p=\text{NS}$), or the TP and control conditions ($\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=-0.25$, SE=0.20, $p=\text{NS}$). Only low threat EU participants expressed significantly higher levels of European identity ($\bar{x}=3.17$) when compared to the low threat controls ($\bar{x}=2.55$).

For high threat no significant differences were apparent in any of the comparisons between the experimental and control conditions (EU: $\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=-0.18$, SE=0.22, $p=\text{NS}$; NE: $\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=0.17$, SE=0.22, $p=\text{NS}$; TP: $\bar{x}_{\text{diff}}=0.12$, SE=0.23, $p=\text{NS}$).

Together these findings indicate that, in the presence of low levels of subgroup distinctiveness threat, making intergroup comparisons between one's own country and other EU nation-states facilitates identification with the superordinate group. The use of any other social comparison strategy did not significantly affect identification levels in low threat participants.
In the presence of high threat European identification was not significantly hindered by intersubgroup comparisons. In high threat participants superordinate identification was not significantly affected by any of the comparison strategies.

8.5 **Discussion**

The study presented in this chapter again evidenced the significant role national distinctiveness threat has in European identification. Low levels of national distinctiveness threat in interaction with intersubgroup comparisons provided the only conditions that had a significant effect on levels of European identification when these were compared to control conditions.

8.5.1 **Subgroup Distinctiveness Threat & European Identification**

Initially, main effect results indicated that subgroup distinctiveness threat significantly affects superordinate identification levels. However, this effect was qualified by a significant interaction with the type of social comparison strategy used. Levels of subgroup distinctiveness threat did not vary significantly by condition (experimental and control). This eliminated the possibility that threat was exacerbated or reduced by engaging in social comparisons per se, or by focusing on making these comparisons in different contexts.

Simple effects analyses revealed that threat to subgroup distinctiveness moderated European identification levels only when intergroup comparisons were relevant to the superordinate categorisation. European identification levels were moderated by threat only in participants who had made social comparisons between Britain – their national group, and other EU nation-states, or between pre- and post-integration Europe. Within both these conditions superordinate identification levels were significantly higher in
participants who felt the least threatened by the European integration process. However, the magnitude of the moderating effect was much greater in the intersubgroup comparison condition (explaining 17% of the variance in European identification), than in the temporal comparison condition (explaining only 3% of the variance).

8.5.2 Comparisons with Non-EU Outgroups

In an effort to provide an alternative context for intergroup comparisons participants were manipulated into using other EU nation-states as comparison groups. Participants in the non-EU condition were given the opportunity to achieve/maintain national distinctiveness through comparisons between their national group and non-EU national groups. This condition tested the possibility that European identification may be facilitated by fulfilling the nation's distinctiveness needs without involving other EU member groups.

Superordinate identification levels observed in this condition were similar to those obtained in the control condition. Indicating that distinctiveness from non-EU nations does not facilitate European identification. This non-significant observation was consistent across both levels of threat. As argued earlier, engaging intergroup comparisons that are not relevant to the EU context did not significantly affect European identification.

These results indicate that consistent with the social identity approach, achieving group distinctiveness is a context dependent process. Using national outgroups that are not involved in European integration left superordinate identification levels unaffected.
8.5.3 Social Comparisons with Pre-integration Europe

Participants in the temporal condition were given the opportunity to compare pre-integration Europe to post-integration Europe. This condition tested a strategy for elevating European identification levels based on Hilton et al’s suggestions (1996), i.e. comparing a more positive post-integration image of Europe with a more negative pre-integration image. The rationale here is that focusing on positive outcomes of the integration process may provide subgroup members with a more positive self-image achievable only through integration; this in turn may therefore aid superordinate identification.

Superordinate identification levels in this condition were moderated by levels of national distinctiveness threat: low threat participants were more willing to identify with the superordinate category than high threat participants. This observation indicates that focusing on the positive aspects of integration may have the capacity to facilitate European identification particularly in low threat individuals. European identity levels were higher in this condition when compared to the control condition; however, the influence of this strategy did not extend to a significant elevation in European identification when compared to the control participants.

One possible explanation for these observations may be that the temporal comparisons induce a sense of shared fate or superordinate goal achievement (e.g. less conflict between EU nations, better human rights, etc.). This may increase the entitativity of the superordinate group (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000a; Gaertner, Rust, Dovidio, Bachman, & et al., 1996) and highlight some of the potential advantages of European integration – thereby mildly elevating superordinate identification.
8.5.4 Intergroup Comparisons with EU Nation-states

In the final condition of the current study participants were given the opportunity to achieve/maintain national distinctiveness through comparisons between their national group and other EU nation-states.

This condition explored whether focusing on the intersubgroup context for group comparisons would significantly affect European identification. As in the temporal condition, superordinate identification levels in this condition were moderated by levels of national distinctiveness threat: low threat participants were more willing to identify with the superordinate category than high threat participants. Moreover, when compared to the control condition, low threat participants in the EU condition expressed significantly higher levels of European identification. European identification levels for high threat participants in this condition were the lowest observed across all the conditions, however they did not differ significantly from those in the high threat control condition.

These observations suggest that focusing on the intersubgroup context in the pursuit of group distinctiveness has the capacity to both facilitate and, to a lesser degree, hinder superordinate identification levels.

8.5.5 General Discussion

Taken together the results from the current study provide empirical support for predictions based on the mutual intergroup differentiation model and the social identity approach.

As in the study presented in chapter seven, the moderating effect of national group distinctiveness threat supports the contention forwarded by the mutual intergroup differentiation model – i.e. that in the context of a superordinate categorisation, the relative absence of subgroup distinctiveness threat facilitates superordinate identification. This proposal
was upheld in both the conditions relevant to the superordinate categorisation, i.e. the intersubgroup and temporal comparison conditions. However, although the temporal strategy suggested by Hilton et al (1996) did appear to elevate levels of European identification – particularly in the relative absence of subgroup distinctiveness threat, the effect was not strong enough to differentiate between temporal comparison and control condition participants.

In the introduction it was proposed that an alternative strategy in the pursuit of facilitating European identification in the British may be to encourage Britons to make international group comparisons between their own nation and other non-EU nations. It was argued that this may provide a context for the maintenance of national distinctiveness that would not distance the national group from other EU nation-states. Given that making comparisons with alternative outgroups is one of the proposed social creativity strategies for improving social identity in lateral intergroup contexts, it was possible that this strategy would also indirectly aid superordinate identification. However, the observation that superordinate identity was unaffected by such intergroup comparisons (in neither the presence nor relative absence of subgroup distinctiveness threat) provided no evidence for such a strategy.

The results obtained do provide some support for the mutual dependency of social comparison and self-categorisation processes. Turner’s (1985) proposal that self-categorisation can only progress through relevant social comparison was borne out in the current study. In the context of European integration self-categorisation at the superordinate European level was only facilitated following relevant lower-order social comparisons – i.e. between the self-category British and other EU nation-states. However this observation was confined to low threat participants. The results suggest that during intersubgroup comparisons, low threat participants were able to ‘perceptually discount’ (Turner et al., 1987: p. 49) any lower-order
differences based on nationality – thus allowing self-categorisation at the higher European level.

The same context however, did not have this effect in high threat participants. In these individuals intersubgroup comparisons had no significant effect on levels of European identification. The difference in European identification levels between high threat EU comparison participants and high threat control participants was non-significant. This indicates that even in the presence of high threat engaging in intersubgroup comparison does not further impede superordinate identification.

8.6 Progression to the Next Chapter

The study presented in this chapter concludes the empirical work of this thesis. In the next chapter the results observed across all the studies are discussed with reference to the theoretical issues raised in chapters two and three. The discussion also includes speculations regarding the utility of this research and suggestions for future work which may extend our knowledge in this area further.
CHAPTER NINE: GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

“For some Britain can only be saved if we have more Europe; for others, England can only be saved if we have less. For both, though, the question is central.”
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9.1 Major Issues of the Thesis

This investigation has focused on European identification and threats to national group distinctiveness. The aim was to identify processes that may be implicated as moderators of British-European identification. This thesis took a lower-order categorisation, one's national grouping, as the starting point from which to investigate people’s willingness to accept (or reject) the superordinate categorisation, European.

Threats to the distinctiveness of the group were conceptualised in two interrelated and complimentary ways. One related to the group definition itself and one to the intergroup context. The first is related to possessing a meaningful and distinct social identity, while the second is associated with differentiating the ingroup from relevant outgroups (c.f. Branscombe et al., 2000). Social change that threatens these forms of distinctiveness can have repercussions both in terms of how individuals define themselves and how they structure their social environment (c.f. Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b). Observations from survey research appear to indicate parallels between these theoretical propositions and two of the top three fears Britons express in relation to European integration. These are losing their national identity and culture and that their country will cease to exist (see for example Eurobarometer, 2002a).

In an effort to explore whether these theoretical propositions can be used to explain these fears this investigation approached the examination of barriers/facilitators to European identification in two main ways (briefly summarised below) and this also characterises how the research will be discussed in the subsequent sections.

Firstly, the investigation explored how the magnitude of national distinctiveness threat is related to the criterial value placed upon attributes ‘at risk’ from European integration. To this end, the first phase of the research focused initially on identifying different national identity content.
The research then explored how perceived national group distinctiveness threat was implicated in, (a) the perceived compatibility between the two cross-level identities, and (b) levels of identification with the European category. The second phase of the research explored how levels of European identification are affected by perceptions of intersubgroup similarity and intersubgroup comparisons, and how these interact with threats to national attributes in their effect.

9.2 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

9.2.1 British National Identity Content

In chapter three the discussion concentrated on exploring the conceptualisations of national attachment and patriotism that can be found in political science and political-social psychology. It begins by exploring the theoretical framework proposed by Kelman and Hamilton (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989a; Kelman, 1997) whose work identifies two sources of attachment – sentimental and instrumental (descriptive content), and the three orientations (patriotism) – role, rule and value (prescriptive content). It integrates this work with classifications that often involve defining nations as either civic or ethnic entities. Drawing also on the work of Staub (e.g. 1997) who defines patriotism in terms of good and bad forms. These are generally referred to as constructive and blind patriotism respectively, although the latter is also termed nationalism by some scholars.

In an effort to explore the content of British national identity, chapter three used these constructs as a basis to develop measures of descriptive and prescriptive norms. These were broadly based on the available definitions of the attachment and patriotism constructs respectively within the political psychological/science literature. The operationalisation took the form of traditional-cultural and civic descriptive norms which could be used to define different content domains of national identity, and group conformity
and critical evaluation prescriptive norms which could be used to support the two content domains respectively.

Evidence was presented in chapter five that Britons, like most people in most modern nations, represent their national identity in both cultural and civic terms. Although the two descriptive and the two prescriptive dimensions were apparent in the English sample, there was no systematic relationship between each pair. This suggests that these dimensions are not antinomic, rather both are used to varying degrees by English participants to define British identity. The results indicated however, that traditional-cultural aspects of national identity were supported by conformity driven behavioural expectations, while civic aspects were supported by a more evaluative and critical approach. This was evidenced through the significant positive association between traditional-cultural descriptive norms and group conformity prescriptive norms, and civic descriptive norms and critical evaluation prescriptive norms. This associates the aspect of Britishness that is characterised by such things as traditional religious beliefs and loyalty to the Monarchy, with unquestioning and staunchly supportive behavioural expectations, and the aspect that is characterised by such things as citizenship obligations and democracy with critical and questioning behavioural expectations.

The discussion in chapter five suggested that Britons may resist changes to those aspects of their British identity that are seen as traditional and symbolic because these provide them with a historical image of the group and a sense of continuity (see also: Billig, 1992), while a more evaluative and critical approach to the civic elements uphold the ideas of democracy and citizens' rights and obligations to effect change at the institutional level.

These findings generated some interesting questions regarding Britain's membership in the European Union. Given that an evaluative approach was assumed towards institutional national attributes and a conformist
approach to cultural aspects, would fears regarding the potential loss of cultural attributes be more threatening to Britons than the potential loss of institutional attributes? It was a possibility that deserved consideration. However, the survey and attitudinal research reviewed in chapter one had indicated that Britons are unwilling to cede authority on national decision-making to EU institutions (e.g. Eurobarometer, 2002a), in addition these findings were supported by social psychological research (Cinnirella, 1993; Sotirakopoulou, 1991). These questions were tackled in the subsequent study, and will be discussed in the next section. Before moving on to this discussion however, the implications regarding the manner with which national identity content was operationalised requires further review.

This phase of the research assumed a novel approach to the concepts of attachment and patriotism and in this way makes an original contribution to research in this area. While it identified some interesting aspects of how Britons use the operationalised constructs to define their national identities and posed some interesting potential implications in the context of European integration, it was however, limited to those particular constructs. The research allowed assessment of the cultural and institutional content domains as they had been defined in the research. This constrained the research to exploring rather narrow definitions of British identity. A valid next step to this research would be to allow national identity content to emerge from the participants. The problems encountered, for example in the first study (chapter four), indicate that for social psychologists, understanding how people construct their national identities is complicated. The uniqueness that differentiates each group member makes it difficult to draw general conclusions. Each person is uniquely situated in the social environment (Berger & Luckmann, 1971), and as such their social identities are likely to be influenced both by a unique set of social relations and the commonalities from their group memberships. An emphasis on the common elements that apply across individuals could lead to a better understanding of those elements of
national identity, however, identifying the similar components progresses at the cost of identifying the differences. There is a tension between making idiographic statements and nomothetic ones. However, an investigation that accounts for both these unique and common qualities is better suited to qualitative methodology.

The current analysis of national identity content was not meant to be exhaustive. Rather, it offered a different approach to the conceptualisation of national attachment and patriotism than that that is prevalent in the political science literature: one that is social psychological and based in group processes. In so doing it offers an alternative to the classification of sections of national populations as either passively compliant, supportively conformist or critically active on the basis of demographic and personality variables (see for example: Kelman & Hamilton, 1989c, and in particular p.269, table 11.1). In addition, it rejects an approach that measures 'patriotism' in a manner that that contaminates the measurement of behaviours with evaluative moralistic and individual characteristics. Such an approach supports the classification of different nations as either benign or destructive in their expression of 'patriotism'. This too is rejected in favour of an approach that acknowledges that both of these – and all the gradients between, exist in every nation.

However, although this area would be a useful avenue for further research, it was not conducive to the aims of this thesis. Although the importance of idiographic research is acknowledged, this thesis pursues a nomothetic approach. The focus of the next phase of the investigation was to explore, within the context of European integration, how threats to British identity distinctiveness may be moderated by the criterial importance afforded to different dimensions of national identity. In order to accomplish this, common dimensions of national identity were required. To this end, the two descriptive and two prescriptive dimensions discussed above were used.
9.2.2 Content Specific National Threat and European Identification

This next phase of the investigation explored whether perceptions of national distinctiveness threat were a result of perceived EU encroachments on national attributes (symbols, practices, institutional arrangements, etc.) in general or whether such threat was related to how criterial certain attributes were to an individual's definition of British identity.

This question arose in part from the observation that some aspects of European integration that generate intense, extended and perhaps somewhat excessive reactions from sections of the media, on behalf of British citizens, seemed somewhat superficial. Take for example the headline “EU cannot straighten our Bananas” (The Express, June 26, 2002; see also: The Independent, February 2, 1996). The shape of 'our' bananas is unlikely to be a central defining feature of British national identity, yet such 'trivial' encroachments seem to have the capacity to threaten British identity.

The question posed above was also instigated by research that has suggested that simply introducing a superordinate categorisation will instigate distinctiveness threats at a lower-level categorisation (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000b). The proposal in the current research (chapter six) was instead that threat would be experienced only on the specific identity dimension that Britons perceived as 'at risk' (i.e. loss or dilution) from the superordinate categorisation, and in addition the degree of threat experienced would be directly proportional to the criterial value assigned to a given identity dimension. The pattern of results presented in chapter six supported both these assertions.
The magnitude of the threat experienced was indeed proportional to the criterial value assigned to a given identity dimension\textsuperscript{16}. In addition, when the superordinate threat was perceived as affecting the distinctiveness of criterial national group attributes this negatively affected both the perceived compatibility between European and national identities, and the levels of European identification expressed.

The level of threat experienced was directly proportional to the criterial value placed upon the dimension subsequently presented as 'at risk'. If a given dimension had not been endorsed as defining national identity then exposure to potential loss of that particular dimension would not instigate national identity distinctiveness threat.

The conclusion draw from these observations is that subgroup distinctiveness threat cannot simply be assumed to result automatically from a superordinate categorisation. Knowledge of how an individual construes a subordinate-superordinate social identity relation, and which criterial subordinate dimensions are perceived as 'at risk' from the superordinate categorisation can help discern whether superordinate categorisation will result in distinctiveness threat at the subordinate level.

In the context of British-European identification these findings have implications is in terms of exposure to powerful anti-EU discourses, such as

\textsuperscript{16} The proportion of National distinctiveness threat was experienced only in relation to the dimension that had been presented during the manipulation as potentially 'at risk' from European integration. On the surface this observation may appear rather tautological. However, the criterial value placed upon all the different dimensions of national identity were measured prior to the presentation of the manipulation. How much a given dimension was endorsed could not have been influenced by the manipulation. As the European Union had not been mentioned prior to the manipulation, and the format and administration of the questionnaire ensured that participants did not read ahead, they could not have been influenced by this context either.
those found in the British media. These reports have been prevalent and inaccurate enough for the European Commission to commission and publish a report ‘naming and shaming’ the worst British offenders (The Guardian, April 13, 2000; but see The European Commission: Representation in the United Kingdom, September 1996 - July 2003). Discourses that perpetuate the idea that European integration will result in the loss of valued aspects of British identity, accentuate the level of national distinctiveness threat experienced by Britons. Such threat hinders both the perception of compatibility between British and European identities, rendering them incompatible or dissonant (Hoffman, 1988), and also impedes identification with the European category.

Supportive evidence for this suggestion has been obtained from research using a social representations approach (Moscovici, 1984). Sotirakopoulou's (1991) in depth analysis of British media discourses, for example, has shown how the impact of European integration is portrayed negatively and constructed in a manner that accentuates the perceived threat to both British national identity and sovereignty. In addition, these discourses contribute to the positioning of the EU nation-states in opposition to each other and position Britain as essentially different from the other EU nations (Lyons & Sotirakopoulou, 1991).

Congruent with conclusions drawn by other researchers, it appears that subordinate identity distinctiveness threats have a crucial role in determining superordinate identification and contribute to the disharmonious nesting of social identifications (Cinnirella, 1997; Medrano & Gutierrez, 2001).

A second implication is that fears relating to the loss of valued and distinctive national attributes feed the idea that, in the absence of these differentiating attributes, separate EU nation-states will eventually become so similar they will become a single group where the boundaries between
the EU nation-states are no longer discernable. This presents an additional barrier to European identification. It implies that the threat from European integration is twofold: the potential loss of valued national attributes, and the potential loss of an important reference group.

One limitation of the study discussed here is the correlational nature of the analysis. The testing and interpretation of the model presented here followed a specific course that was guided by previous research. However, it is acknowledged that the direction of effects may be otherwise interpretable.

### 9.2.3 Intersubgroup Similarity and Superordinate Identification

The study presented in chapter seven focused on the two forms of distinctiveness threat identified earlier, i.e. one related to possessing a distinct social identity and one relating to the quest for intergroup distinctiveness. Chapter seven explored how these interconnected threats may work together to impede European identification.

The potential loss of valued national attributes through European integration was measured, and the potential loss of the national group's independent existence was manipulated by presenting inter-EU nation-state similarity as a consequence of European integration.

When the EU nation-states were presented as similar, Britons who expressed higher levels of perceived threat to the group's attributes reported the lowest levels of European identity. However, Britons who expressed lower levels of perceived attribute threat reported the highest levels of European identity. Perceived intersubgroup similarity not only acted as a barrier to European identification, it also had the capacity to act as a facilitator.
These findings evidence the crucial role attribute threat has in moderating identification with the European category, and provides support for the arguments presented earlier regarding exposure to the type of anti-EU sentiments in the media: sentiments that focus on the loss of valued British attributes.

In terms of theory, an explanation for these findings may be in the manner with which category structures are represented. Individuals with lower levels of attribute threat have "subgroup identities that extend beyond the realm of the superordinate category" (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000c, p.253), what Hornsey and Hogg refer to as 'extended subgroups'. Whereas individuals with higher levels of attribute threat may represent the subgroups as fully enclosed within the superordinate category (what Hornsey & Hogg, 2000c call nested groups), accentuating the belief that the national groups are being assimilated by the European category. These suggestions are highly congruent with observations that higher levels of ingroup bias and intergroup competition are evident in 'nested' than in 'extended subgroup' structural representations (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000c).

An implication of these observations is that emphasising the superordinate category can effectively aid European identification – provided the integrity of subgroup cultures and identities is maintained. Promoting assimilationist images is instead detrimental and contributes to fears regarding national sovereignty. A fruitful approach to European integration may be to apply the lessons learned from assimilation and multiculturalism research (see for example Berry, 1984; Hutnik, 1991). In addition, an interesting and potentially useful approach may be to explore the effects on European identification from assuming different structural representations in response to the social changes instigated by European integration. Such research could incorporate structural representations proposed by Roccas and Brewer's (2002) identity complexity approach and those identified by Hornsey and Hogg (2000c).
Further support for the moderating role of attribute threat was obtained in the second condition of the study presented in chapter seven. Here participants were exposed to information reassuring them that differences between the EU nation-states can be retained in the context of European integration. As in the similarity condition, levels of European identification were moderated by attribute threat. However, although the differences between Britons expressing higher and lower levels of attribute threat were significant, neither of these differed significantly from the control condition; this only occurred in the similarity condition.

Assessed together with the observations from the similarity condition, these results provide further evidence that European identification is only significantly diminished when the threat is to the potential loss of valued national attributes and to the potential loss of the independent existence of the national group. However, it appears that simply drawing participants' attentions to intersubgroup relations causes some negative arousal that mildly affects European identification levels.

A further interesting observation was the absence of any significant differences in the levels of European identity expressed by low and high threat participants in the control condition. In the control condition no references were made to intersubgroup relations, instead participants were asked only to consider how British identity attributes would be affected by European integration.

---

17 In the control condition no information regarding the similarity or distinctiveness of the EU nation-states was presented.
18 Comparisons across conditions were between participants expressing the same levels of attribute threat.
In chapter seven it was speculated that the lack of any moderating effect from attribute threat on European identification in the control condition could be explained by participants adopting social creativity strategies. This may also apply, to a lesser degree, to those participants in the retained differences condition. The potential loss of valued national attributes may be countered by using social creativity strategies to maintain the distinctiveness of national identity. As long as the actual independent existence of the group is not threatened, social creativity strategies may provide the simplest means of retaining or maintaining a distinct group image. This strategy would have the advantage of not contradicting the social reality of European integration and the similarity between the nation-states that is bestowed upon them through their common category membership. As Branscombe et al (2000) argue “direct differentiation may sometimes be difficult, especially if it contradicts the social reality of the similarity between groups” (p.45). In this way self-categorisation at the national level provides a distinct and meaningful national identity without requiring direct intergroup differentiation.

This proposal also has the capacity to explain why lower threat participants in the similarity condition can identify more strongly with the superordinate group (those with an ‘extended subgroups’ representation); they too may employ social creativity strategies. The discordant group is the higher threat similarity group. For these individuals direct intersubgroup differentiation may be the only strategy appropriate for their needs. For these individuals societal restructuring would obscure national boundaries and threaten the independent existence of the national group. This may render social creativity strategies inadequate to deal with such a threat. As all social creativity strategies depend on intergroup comparisons, if one’s structural representation is a fully nested one this may accentuate the belief that the national group will be assimilated into the superordinate category, then there will be no group with which to make intergroup comparisons. In
such a situation resisting the new social order by rejecting the superordinate self-categorisation may be more appropriate.

Different forms of distinctiveness threat then may require different responses. In the context of a superordinate categorisation different social change strategies may be deployed in response to threats that are seen to have different repercussions at the subgroup level. Further research directed specifically at investigating these propositions is needed to discern whether they have any validity. The study discussed in the next section, was a first attempt in this direction.

9.2.4 Intersubgroup Differentiation and Superordinate Identification

The results obtained in the study discussed above raised the possibility that differentiating ones national group from other EU nation-states may be antinomic with European identification. The suggestion was that participants expressing lower and higher attribute threat in the similarity condition may have used different social change strategies as a response to the new social structure. In rejecting the superordinate self-categorisation higher threat participants may retain a structural representation that allows the continued differentiation between themselves and other EU nation-states. The question was: do the lower threat participants also continue to differentiate in this manner?

It is likely that Britons who expressed relatively high levels of European identity and low levels of national identity threat had the capacity to not only see themselves as both similar and different to other non-British EU citizens (see for example: Brewer, 1993), but also to maintain national group distinctiveness through intergroup comparisons between their national group and other EU nation-states. However, to my knowledge, this had not
been explored empirically. The final study in this thesis addressed this issue.

An alternative possibility however was that the lower threat participants used a different social creativity strategy – one that relied upon finding alternative groups for intergroup comparison. Such comparisons with non-EU nation-states could aid the maintenance of positive national distinctiveness without impeding European identification. This was also addressed in the final study. Given that other researchers (see Hilton et al., 1996) had suggested that European identification may be aided by making temporal social comparisons between a positive post-integration image of Europe and a negative pre-integration image, this was also incorporated into the design. There was a possibility that such temporal comparisons could highlight the positive aspects of European integration and thus provide Britons with positive self-evaluation that may aid European identification.

The results from this particular investigation indicated that for Britons who expressed lower levels of attribute threat (as compared with those expressing higher levels), the temporal and EU nation-state comparison strategies did appear to significantly elevate European identification levels. However, only intergroup comparisons between Britain and other EU nation-states had the capacity to significantly elevate European identification levels when compared to the control condition19. Furthermore, this effect was only apparent in the Britons expressing lower levels of threat.

---

19 Where no social comparisons were made.
The evidence obtained indicates that making intersubgroup comparisons has the capacity to facilitate superordinate identification in the absence of attribute threat but not necessarily impede it. The alternative two strategies tested had neither effect, although the temporal comparisons indicated a small facilitating effect in the absence of attribute threat.

These observations imply that comparing ones national group to other EU nation-states is not a barrier to British-European identification, but it can be a facilitator. They also evidence that deflecting intergroup comparisons towards nations external to the EU context are ineffectual.

These findings are congruent with the different structural representations proposed in the previous section. An extended subgroups representation (in Britons who express lower levels of attribute threat) would allow the existence of both common superordinate attributes from which to form a common membership group, and attributes that ‘extend beyond the realm of the superordinate category’, which can be used to differentiate one's national group. This may indicate that the extended subgroups representation facilitates the harmonious nesting of social identities.

9.3 Future Directions

During the course of this research a number of interesting avenues for further research were identified and these are discussed below.

The first issue concerns the importance of taking into account identity content when addressing multiple-identity relationships. It was shown that the manner with which one identity is defined affects the acceptance or rejection of other social identities. I argue that by addressing the conflicting content that can exist amongst social identifications give the researcher a fuller understanding of when and why some individuals from the same groups will accept self-categorisation with two multi-level groups while
others will not. This approach extends social identity theory's 'blurred boundaries' hypothesis to include considerations in terms of identity content conflict in addition to identity salience.

An additional crucial factor, beyond content, is the way in which individuals represent their multiple-identity structures. Research that explores the interaction between content-conflicts and the representations people have of the interrelationships among their multiple group identities would help clarify the above proposal further. Such research could include the models suggested by both social identity complexity (Roccas and Brewer, 2002) and dual categorisation (Hornsey and Hogg, 2000a).

The common modalities were suggested of such representations were suggested: the superordinate category fully assimilating the subgroup, overlapping with the subgroup or is completely dissociated from the subgroup. In the case of overlapping groups (e.g. the extended subgroup representation) it would seem necessary to understand the extent to which the overlap includes subgroup attributes that are important to subgroup distinctiveness.

A second issue concerns group members' responses towards different types of identity threats. As social identity theory proposes there are a number of strategies, both cognitive and behavioural, available to members of subordinate groups that can be deployed in the maintenance of social identity. In the context of a threatened social identity different types of threats are responded to in different ways. Some strategies may facilitate self-categorisation with multi-level groups while others may demand a choice between these groups. Social creativity strategies allow group members to diminish identity threat while stabilising the 'new' social context. On the other hand, social competition strategies involve the rejection of the 'new' social order in favour of either the existing or an alternative structure. For example, threats that dissolve or devalue
criterial group attributes may be dealt with using social creativity strategies, which, if successful, may facilitate identification with multi-level groups. On the other hand, threats that appear to homogenise the group and threaten its distinctive and independent existence may demand resistance and social competition.

It would seem to be a fruitful area for future research to examine the use of social change strategies and the effects upon identification within multi-level group identity structures. This will lead to a better understanding of how identity content, structural representations, and social change strategies interact with one another in the context of both multiple identifications and social change.

9.4 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The process of European integration has introduced a new social structure that implies, on one level, a perception of sameness – that which is bestowed upon them through their new common category membership. However, this new social structure also retains, on another level, a perception of difference – difference between groups that have a long history of competition and, at times, direct conflict.

In this thesis it has been suggested that the changes in the social environment set in motion by European integration, can have consequences at the national level that are perceived differently. It has further suggested that the extent to which the new membership category is accepted or rejected from individuals' identity structures may depend on whether the new category is seen to threaten not only valued attributes of self-definition, but also the very existence of an older and more valued membership group. Such threats may be responded to in different ways, ways that may determine whether the new membership category is accepted or rejected. Although throughout the thesis attribute threat has emerged as a consistent
barrier to European identification, the perception of threat itself may be a function of the structural representation adopted towards the new social environment. However, given that some of the work presented was based in correlational relationships, it is difficult to discern the direction of effect. It is nonetheless a beginning.

Social categorisation is about separation, exclusion and differentiation on the one hand, and integration, inclusion and similarity on the other. The social environment is a complex system within which the superordinate objectives of cooperation and assimilation are in competition with the subordinate objectives of opposition and disassociation. The challenge for social psychologists is to better understand how the tension between these opposing and inter-related objectives is negotiated.

I hope that the project reported in this thesis, through its discussions and investigations, has shown that the maintenance of distinctive group identities is not necessarily antinomic with higher-order sameness and cooperation. However, it has barely scratched the surface of this immense area of human interaction. It has left many questions unanswered, and hopefully, generated more lines of enquiry. I am confident however, that through the same processes we are investigating, i.e. through cooperation and opposition, more answers (and questions) will follow.
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Appendix I  STUDY ONE: PATTERNS OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

Appendix I.A  QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire is about some of your views. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that appear here. We are only interested in your opinions.

Please make sure you read each question or statement CAREFULLY before you respond to it. Answer ALL the questions on each paper in this questionnaire.

Before you begin, please read the declaration below and only continue if you agree with it.

Declaration:
I have read the information given above and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any point without penalty. I also understand that all the information I provide will be anonymous and confidential.

I agree with this declaration ☐ I disagree with this declaration ☐
(Please tick one box)

When you have finished this questionnaire please hand it back to me

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Tina Rothi
Section One: About You

1. How old are you? ____________ years

2. Are you male or female?  
   Male ☐  Female ☐

3. Are you British?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

4. Please state mother’s ethnic country of origin  
   ________________________________

5. Please state father’s ethnic country of origin  
   ________________________________

6. This question asks you to state your ‘ethnic group’. You should take the term ‘ethnic group’ to mean the group YOU would say YOU feel you belong to. For example, if your parents or grandparents originally came from India you may wish to use any of the following to define your ‘ethnic group’, Indian, British, Anglo-Indian, English, British-Indian, etc. EVERYONE should answer this question.

   My ethnic group is ________________________________

7. Where were you born? ________________________________ (please state city and country)

8. Please state how long you have lived in Britain. ____________ years

9. Have you always lived in Britain?  
   Yes ☐  No ☐

   If you have lived in another country please tell us the following:

   When this was: ________________________________

   Where this was: ________________________________

   How old you were at the time: _______ years old

   How many years you were there for: _______ years

10. Where was your father born? ________________________________

11. Approximately how long has your father lived in Britain?  

    ________________________________

    Is your father still in Britain?  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

    If no, approximately when did he leave? ________________________________

    Where is he now? ________________________________

12. Where was your mother born? ________________________________

13. Approximately how long has your mother lived in Britain?  

    ________________________________

    Is your mother still in Britain?  
    Yes ☐  No ☐

    If no, approximately when did she leave? ________________________________

    Where is she now? ________________________________

14. What is your religion? (e.g. Christian, Muslim, Atheist, etc...)  

    ________________________________
Section Two: About Being British

This section of the questionnaire contains questions and statements about being British. Being British refers to the fact that you are a citizen of the United Kingdom whatever your ethnic country of origin.

Please read every statement carefully and use the scale, numbered 1-5, on the right of each question to indicate your answer by placing a circle around the number that best represents your response. The numbers in the scale correspond to the options shown in the box below.

For example, if you strongly agree with a statement then circle the number 5, if you strongly disagree with a statement then circle the number 1. Please feel free to use any of the numbers in the scale depending on the strength of your disagreement or agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Being British is a central part of my identity. 1 2 3 4 5
16 I get a strong sense of who I am from being British. 1 2 3 4 5
17 I rarely think of myself as a British person. 1 2 3 4 5
18 I do not feel very committed to other Britons. 1 2 3 4 5
19 I feel a sense of loyalty to other Britons. 1 2 3 4 5
20 I do not feel like I belong to the British group of people. 1 2 3 4 5

Decisions regarding who can become a British citizen should be made ...
21 ... only by people who are either of English, Scottish, Welsh or Northern Irish descent. 1 2 3 4 5
22 ... by the Queen. 1 2 3 4 5
23 ... by the British immigration authority. 1 2 3 4 5
24 ... by all British citizens collectively regardless of their ethnic country of origin. 1 2 3 4 5
25 ... by the British parliament. 1 2 3 4 5
## Section Two Continued: About Being British

As British citizens we should ...

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>... follow all laws established by the British courts whether we agree with them or not.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>... accept Britain’s immigration policies whatever they are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>... vote whether we like Britain’s election process or not.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>... pay tax at the levels set by the British government.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>... accept the British government’s advice regarding lifestyle choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a British citizen ...

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>... I care enough about my country to vote in British elections.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>... I care enough about my country to show my support when British athletes take part in international events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>... I feel it is important for the country when a fellow Briton is recognised for an achievement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>... I care enough about my country to ensure I stay informed about new developments in British policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>... I care enough about my country to be involved in British community affairs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would support ...

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>... the way men and women are treated in British society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>... British parenting styles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>... the buying of British goods in order to support the national economy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>... the active involvement of every British citizen in British elections by voting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>... the active involvement of British citizens in the maintenance of a lawful British community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section Two Continued: About Being British

As **British** citizens we should be **committed** to ...  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>... the monarchy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>... celebrating important British historical events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>... ‘putting on a brave face’ in times of crisis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>... the British tradition of ‘fair play’.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>... teaching our children traditional British family values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

I feel **committed** to maintaining ...  

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>... British democracy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>... the British police force.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>... the British tax system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>... the British legal system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>... British Employee and worker rights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>... the British national health system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>... the British education system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Three: About Being European

This section of the questionnaire contains questions and statements about being European. Being European refers to the fact that you are a citizen of the European Union whatever your ethnic country of origin.

Please read every statement carefully and use the scale, numbered 1-5, on the right of each question to indicate your answer by placing a circle around the number that best represents your response. The numbers in the scale correspond to the options shown in the box below.

For example, if you strongly agree with a statement then circle the number 5, if you strongly disagree with a statement then circle the number 1. Please feel free to use any of the numbers in the scale depending on the strength of your disagreement or agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59 Being European is a central part of my identity. 1 2 3 4 5
60 I get a strong sense of who I am from being European. 1 2 3 4 5
61 I rarely think of myself as a European person. 1 2 3 4 5
62 I do not feel very committed to other Europeans. 1 2 3 4 5
63 I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans. 1 2 3 4 5
64 I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people. 1 2 3 4 5

Section Four: About Your Political Views

111 I would say my views are best represented by the Conservative party 1 2 3 4 5
112 I would say my views are best represented by the Labour party 1 2 3 4 5
113 I would say my views are best represented by the Liberal party 1 2 3 4 5
114 If the party that best represents your views is not included here please use this space to tell us which party best represents your views. ___________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix I.B  ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR 'PATTERNS OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT' ANALYSES

Figure A: Scree Plot

Table A: Factor Correlation Matrix Using PAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B: Structural Coefficients, Variance Explained and Cronbach's Alpha

**Using PAF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentimental Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should be committed to...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... 'putting on a brave face' in times of crisis.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... celebrating important British historical events.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British tradition of 'fair play'.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... teaching our children traditional British family values.</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the monarchy.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can call themselves British?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only people who are accepted as part of the British community by...</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most other British people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only someone thought of as British by the majority of the British population.</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only people who most other British people accept as British.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only those people who the British, as a group, decide can call themselves British</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to maintaining...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British education system.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British national health system</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... British Employee and worker rights.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentimental Rule</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a British citizen ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I care enough about my country to ensure I stay informed about new developments in British policies.</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I care enough about my country to vote in British elections.</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I care enough about my country to be involved in British community affairs.</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel it is important for the country when a fellow Briton is recognised for an achievement.</td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... follow all laws established by the British courts whether we...</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... accept Britain's immigration policies whatever they are.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... accept the British legislation regarding lifestyle choices.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... vote whether we like Britain's election process or not.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... pay tax at the levels set by the British government.</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel committed to maintaining...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British tax system.</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British legal system.</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... British democracy.</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the British police force.</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Value: Civic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would support ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the buying of British goods in order to support the national economy</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the way men and women are treated in British society.</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... the active involvement of British citizens in the maintenance of a lawful British community.</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>.84 .92 .81 .87 .71 .81 .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Explained</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I.C  \textit{Patterns of Personal Involvement} Inter-item Correlations

All correlations reported in this section significant at the 0.001 level (two-tailed).

\textbf{Table C: Sentimental Role}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table D: Sentimental Rule}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table E: Sentimental Value}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table F: Instrumental Role}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I.D  IDENTITY STRENGTH ITEMS AND INTER-ITEM CORRELATIONS

Table J: Structural Coefficients, Variance Explained and Cronbach’s Alpha for British Identity Strength Items Using PAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being British.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being British is a central part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Britons.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a British person.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the British group of people.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Britons.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Explained 48%
Cronbach’s Alpha 0.84

Table K: Structural Coefficients, Variance Explained and Cronbach’s Alpha for European Identity Strength Items Using PAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being European is a central part of my identity.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being European.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a European person.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Europeans.</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Explained 37%
Cronbach’s Alpha 0.77
All correlations reported in this section significant at the 0.001 level (two-tailed).

**Table L: British Identity Inter-item Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table M: European Identity Inter-item Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I.E  DESCRIPTIVE & INFERENTIAL STATISTICS FOR ANCOVAS

**Table N: ANCOVA Results for Rule Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DFs</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2, 254</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Role</td>
<td>1, 254</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Value</td>
<td>1, 254</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2, 234</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Role</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Value</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>2, 176</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Role</td>
<td>1, 176</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Value</td>
<td>1, 176</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table O: ANCOVA Results for Role Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DFs</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2, 254</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Rule</td>
<td>1, 254</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Value</td>
<td>1, 254</td>
<td>147.59</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2, 234</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Rule</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Value</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>123.46</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>2, 176</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Rule</td>
<td>1, 176</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Value</td>
<td>1, 176</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table P: ANCOVA Results for Value Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DFs</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>2, 254</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Role</td>
<td>1, 254</td>
<td>147.59</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Rule</td>
<td>1, 254</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td>2, 234</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Role</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>123.46</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Rule</td>
<td>1, 234</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Orientation</strong></td>
<td>2, 176</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Role</td>
<td>1, 176</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate: Rule</td>
<td>1, 176</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II  STUDY TWO: NATIONAL ATTACHMENT & PATRIOTISM

Appendix II.A  QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire is about some of your views. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that appear here. We are only interested in your opinions.

Before you begin, read the declaration below and only continue if you agree with it.

Declaration:
I have read the information given above and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any point without penalty. I also understand that all the information I provide will be anonymous and confidential.

(Please tick one box)
I agree with this declaration  
I disagree with this declaration  

When you have finished this questionnaire please hand it back to me.

Instructions:
Some of the questions and statements in this questionnaire are about being British. Being British refers to the fact that you are a citizen of the United Kingdom whatever your ethnic country of origin.

Please read every statement carefully and use the scales, numbered 1-5 to indicate your answer by circling the number that best represents your response. Answer ALL the questions on each paper in this questionnaire. Please note that there are questions on BOTH sides of each paper.
How old are you? ___________ years

What is your religion? (e.g. Christian, Muslim, Atheist) ___________________

Are you ... Black ☐  White ☐  Asian ☐
	Other ☐  Please state __________________________

Are you male or female?  Male ☐  Female ☐

Are you British?  Yes ☐  No ☐

Please state your mother’s ethnic country of origin __________________________

Please state your father’s ethnic country of origin __________________________

This question asks you to state your ‘ethnic group’. You should take the term ‘ethnic group’ to mean the group YOU would say YOU feel you belong to. For example, if your parents or grandparents originally came from India you may wish to use any of the following to define your ‘ethnic group’, Indian, British, Anglo-Indian, English, British-Indian, etc. EVERYONE should answer this question.

My ethnic group is __________________________

Where were you born? __________________________ (please state city and country)

How long you have lived in Britain?

All my life ☐  if not all your life how many years? __________________________

I would say my views are best represented by the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... Conservative party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Labour party.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Liberal party.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other ☐  Please state __________________________
Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Disagree nor Agree | Agree Somewhat | Strongly Agree
---|---|---|---|---
1 | When it comes to international affairs Britain is nearly always right. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
2 | If another country disagreed with an important British policy that I knew little about, I would still support my country's position. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
3 | I would support my country right or wrong. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
4 | I support British policies because they are the policies of my country. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
5 | Being good British citizens involves accepting all the decisions made on our behalf by our government. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
6 | Even if you personally disagree with your country's actions you should still support your country. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
7 | It is the duty of a good citizen to express discontentment with the national decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
8 | Questioning policy decisions is one's obligation as a citizen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
9 | Questioning national decisions will lead to the downfall of Britain. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
10 | When you love your country you should say when you think its actions are wrong. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
11 | Being positively critical of one's nation is the best thing I can do for my nation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
12 | In order to be a powerful nation we as citizens must accept the guidance of our national leaders without doubting them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
13 | In order to maintain a strong nation citizens should demand changes in government policies when they feel it is necessary. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
14 | All citizens should voice their opinions even if these opinions oppose the national status quo. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
15 | We should not tolerate citizens who challenge national decisions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
16 | As British citizens we should set aside any personal beliefs and never protest against national policies. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
17 | Simply accepting the actions of Britain when I disagree with them is bad for the nation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
18 | Britain can only remain a strong nation if we as citizens unite unquestioningly behind her. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
19 | Taking action against bad national policy is good for the country. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
20 | I prefer to recognise the faults in British policies rather than to blindly accept them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
21 | My willingness to challenge the 'wrongs' Britain commits allows the building of a better nation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
The following statements are all about what kind of characteristics make a person British. We would like you to tell us, by circling the appropriate number, which of the following you believe a person should be or do in order to be considered 'truly' British.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree nor</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my opinion a person is truly British if they ...

22 ... adhere to their obligations as citizens.

23 ... have family that has lived in Britain for many generations.

24 ... believe in maintaining British democracy.

25 ... are committed to British society.

26 ... adhere to a traditional British way of life.

27 ... have not been influenced by non-British cultures.

28 ... share traditional British religious beliefs.

29 ... believe in maintaining traditional British culture.

30 ... value their right to vote.

31 ... believe in the British legal system.

32 ... value important British historical events.

33 ... believe they have a role in British society.

34 ... think of Britain as their democratic 'home'.

35 ... can trace their British ancestry for many generations.

36 ... have not been influenced by non-British civic systems.

37 ... feel a sense of joint national responsibility with other Britons.

38 ... value having the Queen's head on British currency.

39 ... swear allegiance to the Queen.

40 ... are proud of the Monarchy.

41 ... share a common sense of allegiance to Britain.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix II.B ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR DESCRIPTIVE & PRESCRIPTIVE PCAS

Figure B: Scree Plot – Descriptive Norms

Table Q: Eigenvalues for Sample and Random Data Sets – Descriptive Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Sample Data</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Random Data Set 1</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Random Data Set 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.320</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>1.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>1.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>1.386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italics denote retained factors through parallel analyses
Figure C: Scree Plot – Prescriptive Norms

Table R: Eigenvalues for Sample and Random Data Sets – Prescriptive Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Sample Data</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Random Data Set 1</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Random Data Set 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.091</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>1.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.087</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>1.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics denote retained factors through parallel analyses*
### Appendix II.C  **SINGLE PCA – DESCRIPTIVE & PRESCRIPTIVE NORMS**

#### Table S: Structural Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>FII</th>
<th>FIII</th>
<th>FIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my opinion a person is truly British if they ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... adhere to a traditional British way of life.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in maintaining traditional British culture.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... share traditional British religious beliefs.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have not been influenced by non-British cultures.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value important British historical events.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have family that has lived in Britain for many generations.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... can trace their British ancestry for many generations.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value having the Queen's head on British currency.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... are loyal to the Monarchy.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... swear allegiance to the Queen.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... think of Britain as their democratic 'home'.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... share a common sense of allegiance to Britain.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... are committed to British society.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... feel a sense of joint national responsibility with other Britons.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe they have a role in British society.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in maintaining British democracy.</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... have not been influenced by non-British civic systems.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... believe in the British legal system.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... value their right to vote.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... adhere to their citizenship obligations.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to maintain a strong nation citizens should demand changes in government policies when they feel it is necessary.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My willingness to challenge the 'wrongs' Britain commits allows the building of a better nation.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you love your country you should say when you think its actions are wrong.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to recognise the faults in British policies rather than to blindly accept them.</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is the duty of a good citizen to express their discontentment with the national decisions.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking action against bad national policy is good for the country.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning policy decisions is one's obligation as a citizen.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply accepting the actions of Britain when I disagree with them is bad for the nation.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being positively critical of one's nation is the best thing I can do for my nation.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All citizens should voice their opinions even if these opinions oppose the national status quo.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S (continued): Structural Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would support my country right or wrong.</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if you personally disagree with your country’s actions you should still support your country.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being good British citizens involves accepting all the decisions made on our behalf by our government.</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As British citizens we should set aside any personal beliefs and never protest against national policies.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to international affairs Britain is nearly always right.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should not tolerate citizens who challenge national decisions.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be a powerful nation we as citizens must accept the guidance of our national leaders without doubting them.</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support British policies for the very reason that they are the policies of my country.</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If another country disagreed with an important British policy that I knew little about, I would still support my country’s position.</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain can only remain a strong nation if we as citizens unite unquestioningly behind her.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning national decisions will lead to the downfall of Britain.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural coefficients below 0.3 not shown; F1=Traditional-cultural descriptive; FII=Civic descriptive; FIII=Critical evaluation prescriptive; FIV=Group conformity prescriptive

Table T: Factor Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table U: Eigenvalues for Sample & Parallel Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Sample Data</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Random Data Set 1</th>
<th>Eigenvalue: Random Data Set 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8.574</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>2.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6.289</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>2.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2.874</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>2.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>2.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>1.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italics denote retained factors through parallel analyses.

Table V: Critical Evaluation Scores at Mean & ±1SD Levels of Traditional-cultural & Civic Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional-cultural</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D: Critical Evaluation Prescriptive Norms as a Function of Traditional-cultural & Civic Descriptive Norms (at mean & ±1SDs)
Appendix III  STUDY THREE: DEVELOPMENT STUDY

Appendix III.A  QUESTIONNAIRE WITH CULTURAL MANIPULATION

The following questionnaire is about some of your views. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that appear here. We are only interested in your opinions.

It is very important that you answer ALL questions as accurately and honestly as possible. All the information you give is completely anonymous and confidential.

Before you begin, read the declaration below and only continue if you agree with it.

Declaration:
I have read the information given above and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any point without penalty.

I agree with this declaration □
I disagree with this declaration □
(Please tick one box)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

General Instructions:
Please read every statement carefully and use the scales, numbered 1-5 to indicate your answer by circling the number that best represents your response. Answer ALL the questions on each paper in this questionnaire. Please note that there are questions on BOTH sides of each paper.

Please answer each question in the order it appears: do not read the questions in the latter sections until you have completed the preceding sections.
SECTION ONE

Please complete this section first.

Section One Instructions:
Many of the questions and statements in this section are about being British. Being British refers to the fact that you are a citizen of the United Kingdom whatever your ethnic country of origin.
Appendix III: Study Three – Development Study

How old are you? ____________ years

What is your religion? (e.g. Christian, Muslim, Atheist) _______________

Are you ... Black ☐ White ☐ Asian ☐ Other ☐ Please state ____________

Are you male or female? Male ☐ Female ☐

Are you British? Yes ☐ No ☐

Please state your mother’s ethnic country of origin __________________________

Please state your father’s ethnic country of origin __________________________

This question asks you to state your ‘ethnic group’. You should take the term ‘ethnic group’ to mean the group YOU would say YOU feel you belong to. For example, if your parents or grandparents originally came from India you may wish to use any of the following to define your ‘ethnic group’, Indian, British, Anglo-Indian, English, British-Indian, etc. EVERYONE should answer this question.

My ethnic group is ____________________________________

Where were you born? _______________________________ (please state city and country)

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life ☐

If not all your life how many years? ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>Quite a lot</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Compared to other nationalities the British are very different.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>When I think about people from other countries I believe there is nothing unique about being British.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Of all the countries in the world the British stand out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The British are similar to people from other nations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO

Please make sure you have completed section one of the questionnaire before reading the information contained in this section.

Section Two Instructions:
Overleaf you will find a summary of a survey that was conducted recently. Read the summary carefully, be sure you attend to the arguments it makes. At the end of the final section of this questionnaire you will be asked a number of questions relating to this summary.
Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people's attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain.

- Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey.
- The surveyed people were asked to consider three issues:
  1. the distinctiveness and uniqueness of Britain's culture, traditions and heritage;
  2. the fact that Britain and fourteen other countries have joined together to become one group i.e. the European Union; and
  3. that as members of the European Union all British citizens, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries, are now European citizens.
- They were then asked to consider whether they believed this distinctiveness of British culture, traditions and heritage would be lost or diluted due to influence from the European Union and the other countries within the European Union.
- Using the circle diagrams below the surveyed people indicated the quantity of British distinctiveness they believed would be lost or diluted.
- The circles represent all British culture, traditions and heritage and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Using the diagrams below please indicate which one best represents your views.

(a) □  (b) □  (c) □  (d) □  (e) □
SECTION THREE:

Make sure you have completed section one and two of the questionnaire before answering the questions contained in this section.

Please do not look back on your answers to the previous sections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The British are similar to people from other nations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compared to other nationalities the British are very different.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When I think about people from other countries I believe there is nothing unique about being British.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Of all the countries in the world the British stand out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION FOUR

Please make sure you have answered all the questions in sections one, two and three of the questionnaire before answering the questions contained in this section.

Section Four Instructions:
In section two you were asked to read a summary of a survey; in this section we would like your opinions on that summary as well as your opinions on being both a British and a European citizen.
### Appendix III: Study Three – Development Study

#### Do you think you can ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Probably Yes</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>... be loyal to both Britain and the European Union at the same time?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>... be a British citizen and a European citizen at the same time?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>... fulfil your citizenship obligations to both Britain and the European Union?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>... feel a sense of allegiance to both Britain and the European Union?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In your opinion are any of the following under threat from the European Union:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The British legal system</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>British traditions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>British institutional practices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>British heritage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>British distinctiveness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### In your opinion was the information about the survey ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>... credible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>... believable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you would like to make any comments about this questionnaire please use the space below to do so. Thank you.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix III.B  INSTITUTIONAL MANIPULATION FOR SECTION TWO

Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people's attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain.

- Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey.
- The surveyed people were asked to consider three issues:
  1. the distinctiveness and uniqueness of Britain's institutional practices, institutional practices are the rules and regulations British institutions use to make decisions and carry out their responsibilities (institutions such as the British court and legal systems, the military, the political system, the education system, and the police force amongst others);
  2. the fact that Britain and fourteen other countries have joined together to become one group i.e. the European Union; and
  3. that as members of the European Union, all British citizens, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries, are now European citizens.

- They were then asked to consider whether they believed this distinctiveness of British institutional practices would be lost or diluted due to influence from the European Union and the other countries within the European Union.
- Using the circle diagrams below the surveyed people indicated the quantity of British distinctiveness they believed would be lost or diluted.
- The circles represent all British institutional practices and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Using the diagrams below please indicate which one best represents your views.

(a) □  (b) □  (c) □  (d) □  (e) □
Appendix IV  STUDY FOUR: MAIN STUDY

Appendix IV.A  QUESTIONNAIRE WITH INSTITUTIONAL MANIPULATION

The following questionnaire is about some of your views. There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that appear here. We are only interested in your opinions.

It is very important that you answer ALL questions as accurately and honestly as possible. All the information you give is completely anonymous and confidential.

Before you begin, read the declaration below and only continue if you agree with it.

Declaration:
I have read the information given above and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any point without penalty.

I agree with this declaration □
I disagree with this declaration □
(Please tick one box)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

General Instructions:
Please read every statement carefully and use the scales, numbered 1-5 to indicate your answer by circling the number that best represents your response. Answer ALL the questions on each paper in this questionnaire. Please note that there are questions on BOTH sides of each paper.

Please answer each question in the order it appears: do not read the questions in the latter sections until you have completed the preceding sections. Once you have started a new section please do not look back on your answers to previous sections.
SECTION ONE

Please complete this section first.

Section One Instructions:
Many of the questions and statements in this section are about being British. Being British refers to the fact that you are a citizen of the United Kingdom whatever your ethnic country of origin.
Appendix IV: Study Four – Main Study

How old are you? __________ years

What is your religion? (e.g. Christian, Muslim, Atheist) _________________

Are you ... Black □  White □  Asian □  Other □  Please state _________________

Are you male or female?  Male □  Female □

Are you British?  Yes □  No □

Please state your mother's ethnic country of origin ____________________________

Please state your father's ethnic country of origin _____________________________

This question asks you to state your 'ethnic group'. You should take the term 'ethnic group' to mean the group YOU would say YOU feel you belong to. For example, if your parents or grandparents originally came from India you may wish to use any of the following to define your 'ethnic group', Indian, British, Anglo-Indian, English, British-Indian, etc. EVERYONE should answer this question.

My ethnic group is ____________________________

Where were you born? __________________________________ (please state city and country)

How long have you lived in Britain?  All my life □

If not all your life how many years? _______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... Conservative party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Labour party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Liberal party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other □  Please state _____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>4 Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>When it comes to international affairs Britain is nearly always right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If another country disagreed with an important British policy that I knew little about, I would still support my country's position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would support my country right or wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I support British policies because they are the policies of my country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Being good British citizens involves accepting all the decisions made on our behalf by our government.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Even if you personally disagree with your country's actions you should still support your country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is the duty of a good citizen to express discontentment with the national decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Questioning policy decisions is one's obligation as a citizen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Questioning national decisions will lead to the downfall of Britain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>When you love your country you should say when you think its actions are wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Being positively critical of one's nation is the best thing I can do for my nation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In order to be a powerful nation we as citizens must accept the guidance of our national leaders without doubting them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In order to maintain a strong nation citizens should demand changes in government policies when they feel it is necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>All citizens should voice their opinions even if these opinions oppose the national status quo.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>We should not tolerate citizens who challenge national decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>As British citizens we should set aside any personal beliefs and never protest against national policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Simply accepting the actions of Britain when I disagree with them is bad for the nation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Britain can only remain a strong nation if we as citizens unite unquestioningly behind her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Taking action against bad national policy is good for the country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I prefer to recognise the faults in British policies rather than to blindly accept them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My willingness to challenge the 'wrongs' Britain commits allows the building of a better nation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statements are all about what kind of characteristics make a person British. We would like you to tell us, by circling the appropriate number, which of the following you believe a person should be or do in order to be considered ‘truly’ British.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 ... adhere to their obligations as citizens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 ... have family that has lived in Britain for many generations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 ... believe in maintaining British democracy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ... are committed to British society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 ... adhere to a traditional British way of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 ... have not been influenced by non-British cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 ... share traditional British religious beliefs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 ... believe in maintaining traditional British culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 ... value their right to vote.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 ... believe in the British legal system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 ... value important British historical events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 ... believe they have a role in British society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 ... think of Britain as their democratic ‘home’.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 ... can trace their British ancestry for many generations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 ... have not been influenced by non-British civic systems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 ... feel a sense of joint national responsibility with other Britons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 ... value having the Queen’s head on British currency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 ... swear allegiance to the Queen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 ... are proud of the Monarchy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 ... share a common sense of allegiance to Britain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, in this section please answer the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 Compared to other nationalities the British are very different.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 When I think about people from other countries I believe there is nothing unique about being British.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO

Please make sure you have completed section one of the questionnaire before reading the information contained in this section.

Section Two Instructions:
Overleaf you will find a summary of a survey that was conducted recently. Read the summary carefully, be sure you attend to the arguments it makes. At the end of the final section of this questionnaire you will be asked a number of questions relating to this summary.
Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people's attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain.

- Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey.
- The surveyed people were asked to consider three issues:
  4. the distinctiveness and uniqueness of Britain's institutional practices. Institutional practices are the rules and regulations British institutions use to make decisions and carry out their responsibilities (institutions such as the British court and legal systems, the military, the political system, the education system, and the police force amongst others);
  5. the fact that Britain and fourteen other countries have joined together to become one group i.e. the European Union; and
  6. that as members of the European Union, all British citizens, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries, are now European citizens.

- They were then asked to consider whether they believed this distinctiveness of British institutional practices would be lost or diluted due to influence from the European Union and the other countries within the European Union.
- Using the circle diagrams below the surveyed people indicated the quantity of British distinctiveness they believed would be lost or diluted.
- The circles represent all British institutional practices and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Using the diagrams below please indicate which one best represents your views.

(a) □    (b) □    (c) □    (d) □    (e) □
SECTION THREE:

Make sure you have completed section one and two of the questionnaire before answering the questions contained in this section.

Please do not look back on your answers to the previous sections.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The British are similar to people from other nations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Of all the countries in the world the British stand out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Being European is a central part of my identity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being European.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a European.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Europeans.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION FOUR

Please make sure you have answered all the questions in sections one, two and three of the questionnaire before answering the questions contained in this section.

Section Four Instructions:
In section two you were asked to read a summary of a survey; in this section we would like your opinions on that summary as well as your opinions on being both a British and a European citizen.
Appendix IV: Study Four – Main Study

Do you think you can ... 

1 ... be loyal to both Britain and the European Union at the same time? 1 2 3 4 5
2 ... be a British citizen and a European citizen at the same time? 1 2 3 4 5
3 ... fulfil your citizenship obligations to both Britain and the European Union? 1 2 3 4 5
4 ... feel a sense of allegiance to both Britain and the European Union? 1 2 3 4 5

If you would like to make any comments about this questionnaire please use the space below to do so. Thank you.
Appendix IV: Study Four – Main Study

Appendix IV.B  CULTURAL MANIPULATION

Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people’s attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain.

- Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey.
- The surveyed people were asked to consider three issues:
  4. the distinctiveness and uniqueness of Britain's culture, traditions and heritage;
  5. the fact that Britain and fourteen other countries have joined together to become one group i.e. the European Union; and
  6. that as members of the European Union all British citizens, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries, are now European citizens.

- They were then asked to consider whether they believed this distinctiveness of British culture, traditions and heritage would be lost or diluted due to influence from the European Union and the other countries within the European Union.
- Using the circle diagrams below the surveyed people indicated the quantity of British distinctiveness they believed would be lost or diluted.
- The circles represent all British culture, traditions and heritage and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Using the diagrams below please indicate which one best represents your views.

(a) [ ]  (b) [ ]  (c) [ ]  (d) [ ]  (e) [ ]
Appendix V STUDY FIVE
Appendix V.A INDUCED SIMILARITY CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

British Opinions Questionnaire

The following questionnaire asks about some of your opinions and views. Please answer ALL the questions, your honest and accurate answers are very important and any information you give is completely anonymous and confidential. Please read the declaration below and only continue with the questionnaire if you agree with it.

Declaration
I agree to participate in this study, and have read the information given above. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any time without any penalty.

(Please tick one box)
I agree with this declaration □
I disagree with this declaration □

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS APPRECIATED. THANK YOU.

Instructions:
Please read all the questions carefully and using the scales numbered 1 – 7. Indicate your answers by circling the number that represents your response. For example, if you strongly disagree with a statement circle 1 and if you strongly agree circle 7. Please use any of the numbers in the scale that correspond to the strength of your disagreement or agreement.

Please read the following information carefully

The purpose of this study
Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. This study is about British citizens' attitudes on the European Union. Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people's attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain. Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey. The information gathered led the researchers to conclude the following.

"British people believe that all the countries of the European Union have their own distinctive culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices; they are unique in their own ways. The distinctiveness of each country has always been a source of pride to its citizens.

Britons also believe that the way the European Union has been formed has led all the involved countries to adopt similar ways of doing some things. They believe this is evident in such things as: the European court of law; the single European currency (the Euro); and common European fishing and agricultural policies that are in effect at present."

In this study we would like to know what you think.
The circle diagrams below represent British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices. Institutional practices are the rules and regulations British institutions use to make decisions and carry out their responsibilities (institutions such as the British court and legal systems, the military, the political system, the education system, and the police force amongst others).

Please use the circle diagrams below to indicate to what extent you believe the distinctiveness of British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices would be lost or diluted due to Britain’s membership in the European Union.

The circles represent all British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices, and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Select the one diagram that best represents your views.

(a)  (b)  (c)  (d)  (e)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Being European is a central part of my identity
- I get a strong sense of who I am from being European
- I rarely think of myself as a European
- I do not feel very committed to other Europeans
- I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans
- I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people

How old are you? __________ years

Are you... Male □ Female □

Are you British? Yes □ No □ Where were you born? __________________________

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □

If not all your life how many years? ________________
Appendix V.B  MAINTAINING DISTINCTIVENESS CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

British Opinions Questionnaire

The following questionnaire asks about some of your opinions and views. Please answer ALL the questions, your honest and accurate answers are very important and any information you give is completely anonymous and confidential. Please read the declaration below and only continue with the questionnaire if you agree with it.

Declaration
I agree to participate in this study, and have read the information given above. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any time without any penalty.

(Please tick one box)
I agree with this declaration  □
I disagree with this declaration   □

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS APPRECIATED. THANK YOU.

Instructions:
Please read all the questions carefully and using the scales numbered 1 – 7. Indicate your answers by circling the number that represents your response. For example, if you strongly disagree with a statement circle 1 and if you strongly agree circle 7. Please use any of the numbers in the scale that correspond to the strength of your disagreement or agreement.

Please read the following information carefully

The purpose of this study
Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. This study is about British citizens' attitudes on the European Union. Recently a reputable independent organisation published a survey about British people's attitudes towards the European Union and its effect on Britain. Ten thousand British people, randomly selected from all over Britain, took part in the survey. The information gathered lead the researchers to conclude the following.

"British people believe that all the countries of the European Union have their own distinctive culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices; they are unique in their own ways. The distinctiveness of each country has always been a source of pride to its citizens.

Britons also believe that the way the European Union has been formed has allowed all the involved countries to retain their valued differences. They believe this is evident in such things as: the use of different languages and social past-times; and, amongst many other things, different systems of government, education, health and tax."

In this study we would like to know what you think.
The circle diagrams below represent British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices. Institutional practices are the rules and regulations British institutions use to make decisions and carry out their responsibilities (institutions such as the British court and legal systems, the military, the political system, the education system, and the police force amongst others).

Please use the circle diagrams below to indicate to what extent you believe the distinctiveness of British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices would be lost or diluted due to Britain's membership in the European Union.

The circles represent all British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices, and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Select the one diagram that best represents your views.

(a) □  (b) □  (c) □  (d) □  (e) □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being European is a central part of my identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being European</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a European</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Europeans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How old are you? __________ years
Are you... Male □ Female □
Are you British? Yes □ No □ Where were you born? __________________________
How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □
If not all your life how many years? ________________
Appendix V.C  CONTROL CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

British Opinions Questionnaire

The following questionnaire asks about some of your opinions and views. Please answer ALL the questions, your honest and accurate answers are very important and any information you give is completely anonymous and confidential. Please read the declaration below and only continue with the questionnaire if you agree with it.

Declaration
I agree to participate in this study, and have read the information given above. I understand that I have the right to withdraw my consent at any time without any penalty.

(Please tick one box)
I agree with this declaration  ☐
I disagree with this declaration  ☐

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS APPRECIATED. THANK YOU.

Instructions:
Please read all the questions carefully and using the scales numbered 1 – 7. Indicate your answers by circling the number that represents your response. For example, if you strongly disagree with a statement circle 1 and if you strongly agree circle 7. Please use any of the numbers in the scale that correspond to the strength of your disagreement or agreement.

Please read the following information carefully

The purpose of this study
Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. This study is about British citizens’ attitudes on the European Union.

In this study we would like to know what you think.
The circle diagrams below represent British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices. Institutional practices are the rules and regulations British institutions use to make decisions and carry out their responsibilities (institutions such as the British court and legal systems, the military, the political system, the education system, and the police force amongst others).

Please use the circle diagrams below to indicate to what extent you believe the distinctiveness of British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices would be lost or diluted due to Britain’s membership in the European Union.

The circles represent all British culture, traditions, heritage and institutional practices, and the shaded areas represent the lost or diluted amount.

Select the one diagram that best represents your views.

(a) □  (b) □  (c) □  (d) □  (e) □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Disagree nor Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being European is a central part of my identity

I get a strong sense of who I am from being European

I rarely think of myself as a European

I do not feel very committed to other Europeans

I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans

I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people

How old are you? ___________ years

Are you... Male □  Female □

Are you British? Yes □  No □

Where were you born? _____________________________

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □

If not all your life how many years? __________
Appendix V.D  PILOT STUDY ITEMS

**Intersubgroup Similarity**

1. Compared to citizens from other EU nations the British are very different.

2. When I think about people from other EU nations I believe there is nothing unique about being British.

3. The British are similar to people from other EU nations.

4. Of all the citizens in the EU the British stand out.

---

**Appendix V.E  F-ratio Calculations for Simple Effects Due To Level of Threat By Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Level</th>
<th>MStreat</th>
<th>MSerror</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>40.276</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>8.662</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI  STUDY SIX:

Appendix VI.A  TEMPORAL COMPARISON CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire we ask you about some of your views.

Please read all the information carefully and respond to every statement.

Your answers are very important and any information you give will be completely anonymous and confidential.

You have the right to withdraw your consent at any time without penalty.

Please indicate whether you agree to participate in this study by ticking the appropriate box below (please tick one box).

I agree to participate in this study □
I do not agree to participate in this study □

Please read the following information carefully

The reason for this study

This study is about British citizens' attitudes on the European Union. Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. As members of the European Union all Britons, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries are now European citizens.

Please state your age: __________ years

Are you... Male □ or Female □

Are you British? Yes □ No □

Where were you born? __________________________

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □

If not all your life how many years? ________
Please read the following statements and indicate your answer by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>4 Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Now that Britain and fourteen other European countries have formed the European Union, conflicts, such as World War I and World War II, are unlikely to happen again.

Since the European Union created the 'Human Rights Charter' people's rights are better protected than before the European Union was formed.

People who have been persecuted and victimised in their own countries have a better chance of gaining asylum in the European Union than they did before the European Union was formed.

Living in any country within the European Union is better now than it was before the European Union was formed.

Being European is a central part of my identity

I get a strong sense of who I am from being European

I rarely think of myself as a European

I do not feel very committed to other Europeans

I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans

I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people

Some people argue that due to Britain's membership in the European Union, British culture, traditions and 'ways of doing things' will become less distinctive; others argue that this will not happen. We would like to know what you think.

Do you think that Britain's distinctiveness will be lost or reduced?

| Not at all | Not very much | Yes, a little | Yes, somewhat | Yes, very much |

Is this a good thing or a bad thing?

| A very good thing | A good thing | Neither good nor bad | A bad thing | A very bad thing |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix VI: Study Six

Appendix VI.B  NON-EUROPEAN COMPARISON CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire we ask you about some of your views.

Please read all the information carefully and respond to every statement.

Your answers are very important and any information you give will be completely anonymous and confidential.

You have the right to withdraw your consent at any time without penalty.

Please indicate whether you agree to participate in this study by ticking the appropriate box below (please tick one box).

I agree to participate in this study □

I do not agree to participate in this study □

Please read the following information carefully

The reason for this study
This study is about British citizens' attitudes on the European Union. Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. As members of the European Union all Britons, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries are now European citizens.

Please state your age: __________ years

Are you... Male □ or Female □

Are you British? Yes □ No □

Where were you born? ______________________________________

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □

If not all your life how many years? _________
Please read the following statements and indicate your answer by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>4 Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Britain's approach to international conflicts is better than that of the USA.

1 2 3 4 5

Britain offers better protection of human rights than Zimbabwe.

1 2 3 4 5

People who have been persecuted and victimised in their own countries have a better chance of gaining asylum in Britain than in Australia.

1 2 3 4 5

Compared to North Korea, Britain is a better country to in which to live.

1 2 3 4 5

Being European is a central part of my identity

1 2 3 4 5

I get a strong sense of who I am from being European

1 2 3 4 5

I rarely think of myself as a European

1 2 3 4 5

I do not feel very committed to other Europeans

1 2 3 4 5

I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans

1 2 3 4 5

I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people

1 2 3 4 5

Some people argue that due to Britain's membership in the European Union, British culture, traditions and 'ways of doing things' will become less distinctive; others argue that this will not happen. We would like to know what you think.

Do you think that Britain's distinctiveness will be lost or reduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>Yes, a little</th>
<th>Yes, somewhat</th>
<th>Yes, very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Is this a good thing or a bad thing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A very good thing</th>
<th>A good thing</th>
<th>Neither good nor bad</th>
<th>A bad thing</th>
<th>A very bad thing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix VI. C  EUROPEAN COMPARISON CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire we ask you about some of your views. Please read all the information carefully and respond to every statement. Your answers are very important and any information you give will be completely anonymous and confidential.

You have the right to withdraw your consent at any time without penalty.

Please indicate whether you agree to participate in this study by ticking the appropriate box below (please tick one box).

I agree to participate in this study □
I do not agree to participate in this study □

Please read the following information carefully

The reason for this study
This study is about British citizens’ attitudes on the European Union. Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. As members of the European Union all Britons, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries are now European citizens.

Please state your age: __________ years

Are you... Male □ or Female □

Are you British? Yes □ No □

Where were you born? _______________________

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □

If not all your life how many years? __________
Please read the following statements and indicate your answer by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Compared to other countries in the European Union, Britain's approach to international conflicts is better.  
1 2 3 4 5

Britain has always offered better protection of human rights when compared to any other country in the European Union.  
1 2 3 4 5

People who have been persecuted and victimised in their own countries have a better chance of gaining asylum in Britain than in any other country of the European Union.  
1 2 3 4 5

Compared to other countries in the European Union, Britain is a better country to live in.  
1 2 3 4 5

Being European is a central part of my identity  
1 2 3 4 5

I get a strong sense of who I am from being European  
1 2 3 4 5

I rarely think of myself as a European  
1 2 3 4 5

I do not feel very committed to other Europeans  
1 2 3 4 5

I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans  
1 2 3 4 5

I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people  
1 2 3 4 5

Some people argue that due to Britain's membership in the European Union, British culture, traditions and 'ways of doing things' will become less distinctive; others argue that this will not happen. We would like to know what you think.

Do you think that Britain's distinctiveness will be lost or reduced?  
Not at all | Not very much | Yes, a little | Yes, somewhat | Yes, very much

Is this a good thing or a bad thing?  
A very good thing | A good thing | Neither good nor bad | A bad thing | A very bad thing

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix VI.D  CONTROL CONDITION QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire we ask you about some of your views.

Please read all the information carefully and respond to every statement.

Your answers are very important and any information you give will be completely anonymous and confidential.

You have the right to withdraw your consent at any time without penalty.

Please indicate whether you agree to participate in this study by ticking the appropriate box below (please tick one box).

I agree to participate in this study □
I do not agree to participate in this study □

Please read the following information carefully

The reason for this study

This study is about British citizens' attitudes on the European Union. Britain and fourteen other European countries have joined together to form a single group called the European Union. As members of the European Union all Britons, together with the citizens of all the other European Union countries are now European citizens.

Please state your age: __________ years

Are you... Male □ or Female □

Are you British? Yes □ No □

Where were you born? __________________________

How long you have lived in Britain? All my life □

If not all your life how many years? __________
Please read the following statements and indicate your answer by circling the appropriate response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>4 Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being European is a central part of my identity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I get a strong sense of who I am from being European</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I rarely think of myself as a European</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not feel very committed to other Europeans</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel a sense of loyalty to other Europeans</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not feel like I belong to the European group of people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When you compare Britain to other countries in any way, which countries do you think of most often?

Please list the five countries in the order with which you use them. Place the most frequently used country first and the least frequently used last.

1. ______________________________________________________________
2. ______________________________________________________________
3. ______________________________________________________________
4. ______________________________________________________________
5. ______________________________________________________________

Some people argue that due to Britain's membership in the European Union, British culture, traditions and 'ways of doing things' will become less distinctive; others argue that this will not happen. We would like to know what you think.

Do you think that Britain's distinctiveness will be lost or reduced?

|   | Not at all | Not very much | Yes, a little | Yes, somewhat | Yes, very much |

Is this a good thing or a bad thing?

|   | A very good thing | A good thing | Neither good nor bad | A bad thing | A very bad thing |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix VI.E  F-RATIO CALCULATIONS FOR SIMPLE EFFECTS DUE TO LEVEL OF THREAT BY CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Level</th>
<th>MStreat</th>
<th>MSerror</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>31.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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