Testing the social identity-intergroup differentiation hypothesis: 'We're not American eh!'

Richard N. Lalonde
York University, Toronto, Canada

The social identity-intergroup differentiation hypothesis is a hotly debated issue among social identity researchers (Brown, 2000; Turner, 1999); it states that individuals having a stronger in-group identification will perceive greater differences between their in-group and a relevant out-group. This study examines the importance of three factors when testing this hypothesis: the strength and salience of in-group identification, the relevance of the out-group for social comparison, and the relevance of the dimension of social comparison. The hypothesis was examined in relation to the national identity of a sample of Canadian students. Perceptions of the in-group and out-groups were measured at Time 1 ($N = 171$). The same measures were given at Time 2 ($N = 77$), along with a variety of measures of social identity. It was predicted that this hypothesis would be supported when the dimension of social comparison was of high relevance and only for an important social comparison group (i.e. Americans). Finally, the ability of identity to predict differentiation at another point in time was examined in order to examine the issue of identity salience and stability. Results generally supported the hypotheses and are discussed in relation to prior research and the conceptualization of a minority identity.

When it comes to defining a nation, group boundaries and social allegiances are particularly important. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) provides a useful framework for explaining and predicting social identity processes related to national identity. One hypothesis that has been derived from social identity theory (but never stated in the original statements of the theory) is that greater intergroup differentiation will be associated with stronger in-group identification (e.g. Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Kelly, 1988). In other words, individuals having a stronger group identification will perceive greater differences between their in-group and a relevant out-group. For the sake of simplicity and ease of presentation, this is called the 'identity-differentiation hypothesis'.

The legitimacy of the identity-differentiation hypothesis has been hotly debated by social identity theorists. Turner (1999) has stated that the hypothesis cannot explicitly be derived from the theory (see also McGarty, 2001; Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1999) and has offered a detailed critique of some of the studies that have tested the

hypothesis (e.g. Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, & Williams, 1986). Brown (2000) has responded to Turner's criticisms and argued that the identity-differentiation hypothesis falls within the scope of social identity theory (see also Mummendy, Klink, & Brown, 2001). The purpose of the present study was to shed some light on this debate by examining the importance of three factors when testing the identity-differentiation hypothesis: the strength and salience of in-group identification, the relevance of the out-group for social comparison, and the relevance of the dimension of social comparison. Moreover, certain measurement and statistical issues were considered. Before presenting these factors, however, it is necessary to present a brief review of the variety of studies that have tested the link between identity and intergroup differentiation.

Studies of the identity-differentiation hypothesis

In a review of 14 studies that tested the identity-differentiation hypothesis, Hinkle and Brown (1990) reported that only two studies found 'consistent and robust' support for the hypothesis. One study, conducted by Abrams (1984), examined intergroup processes in two rival schools. The other, conducted by Kelly (1988), examined differentiation among supporters of different British political parties. Another of the studies reported in the review (Hinkle, Taylor, Fox-Cardamone, & Crook, 1989) also found weak, but consistent, support for the hypothesis. Despite this disappointing history of results, Hinkle and Brown stated that there should be 'strong' support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis, but that support for this hypothesis would be observed only under certain conditions. They proposed a taxonomy of groups that included an *individualism-collectivism* dimension and a *comparative ideology* dimension (also referred to as a relational ideology; see Brown *et al.*, 1992). Hinkle and Brown hypothesized that support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis would be strongest when looking at collectively inclined individuals in situations with a salient comparative ideology, and weakest for individualists in an autonomous situation (i.e. low comparative ideology).

A few studies have tested Hinkle and Brown's hypothesis. The hypothesis was supported in three studies conducted by Brown *et al.* (1992). Van Knippenberg and Coolen (1993), however, did not find support for the Hinkle and Brown hypothesis but found evidence of an identity–differentiation relationship for both individualists and collectivists regardless of their relational ideology. Meeres and Grant (1999) also tested the Hinkle and Brown hypothesis, but in relation to a third variable: goal compatibility. While they found support for the hypothesis in an experimental situation where two groups had compatible goals, they did not find support for the hypothesis in an experimental situation where groups had incompatible goals. Finally, Capozza, Voci, and Licciardello (2000) conducted two field studies: one with students from Northern Italy and one with Southern students. Both studies provided results that contradicted the Hinkle and Brown model because identity was a more consistent predictor of differentiation for idiocentric individuals than for allocentric individuals.

Individualism-collectivism and relational ideology are not the only factors that have been examined in relation to the identity-differentiation hypothesis. Grant (1992, 1993) has found some experimental evidence that an intergroup threat may be one precondition for the identity-differentiation hypothesis. In a first experiment involving small groups based on gender, Grant (1992) found support for the hypothesis, but only under a high-threat condition along a female sex-stereotype dimension and an attitude

dimension. In a second experiment, Grant (1992) found support for the hypothesis under high- and low-threat conditions. A further study conducted by Grant (1993) found support for the hypothesis only under a high-threat condition. Thus, two of three experiments conducted by Grant provide support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis under conditions of high threat. In a similar vein, Perreault and Bourhis (1998) used a minimal group paradigm and found more consistent support for identity-differentiation after respondents had experienced discrimination (a threatening situation) in comparison with a pre-discrimination assessment. Bourhis and his colleagues also found some support for the hypothesis in two other minimal group studies (Gagnon & Bourhis, 1996; Perreault & Bourhis, 1999), and Moreland and McMinn (1999) provide data supporting the hypothesis from a laboratory study involving small groups. Finally, the link between threat, identification and differentiation was also examined by Branscombe and Wann (1994). They found a stronger relationship between American identification and 'distance from Russians' (an indirect measure of differentiation) in an identity-threatening condition compared with an identity-bolstering condition.

Since the review by Hinkle and Brown (1990), a number of field studies have also found moderate support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis. Simon, Kulla, and Zobel (1995) found that a stronger regional identity of the members of two political parties in Germany was related to greater differentiation between their regional identity and a national identity. Kelly (1990) found that strength of identification with a political candidate was related to the degree to which an individual differentiated between his or her own position on certain political issues and the position of out-group members on these same issues; this was found for supporters of both a minority position and a majority position in a political campaign. Terry (personal communication, 23 November 1999, with reference to Terry, Carey, & Callan, 2001) found that the strength of identity for pilots from two airlines involved in a merger was related to differentiation on a status-irrelevant dimension; identity was also related to differentiation on a status-relevant dimension, but only for pilots belonging to the higher-status airline. Smith (personal communication, 4 June 2001, with reference to Smith & Tyler, 1997) found that two components of social identity, pride and respect, were positively related to intergroup differentiation on a set of positive trait ratings for members of sororities. Hennessy and West (1999) also found moderate support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis in a work setting when the measure of differentiation was based on a multi-item measure. Finally, Verkuyten and his colleagues (Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Verkuyten, 1991; Verkuyten & Kwa, 1996; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999) examined the identity differentiation hypothesis with a number of ethnic groups in the Netherlands in relation to the majority Dutch and found weak, but consistent, support for the hypothesis.

In summary, more support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis has been found since the Hinkle and Brown (1990) review. This support has been found in laboratory studies under conditions of intergroup threat (e.g. Grant, 1993) and in field studies where there is a well-established history and potential for conflict (i.e. intergroup threat) between groups. Moreover, Aberson, Healy, and Romero (2000) recently conducted a meta-analysis of the relation between self-esteem and in-group bias. As part of their analysis, they looked at the relation between group identification and in-group bias on the basis of eight studies, as well as the relation between collective self-esteem and in-group bias (16 studies). The mean effect size for group identification was quite strong (.56) in comparison with the effect size for collective self-esteem (.09).

Turner's critique of the identity-differentiation hypothesis

Turner (1999) has been critical of interpretations of the identity-differentiation hypothesis in general and of the taxonomy proposed by Hinkle and Brown (1990). Turner states that social identity theory does not advance a direct relationship between identification and intergroup differentiation (i.e. in-group bias). He argues that this relationship will be mediated by a number of other factors such as the salience of a social identification in a comparative context, perceptions of the intergroup structure, the relevance of the dimension of social comparison, and the relevance of the out-group for social comparison (see also van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1990). Three of these factors were addressed in the current study.

Strength and salience of in-group identification

In his critique of the identity-differentiation hypothesis, Turner (1999) argues that the degree of in-group identification should *not* be approached from an individual difference perspective that assumes a stable self-structure. His position is that identity is discontinuous and that people act either as individuals or as group members. Nonetheless, he recognizes that individual differences can be observed in the readiness to use certain social categories once an intergroup context has been made salient. Turner, therefore, makes a distinction between strength of identity and identity salience (see also Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998). It is the salience of a social identity that moves behaviour from the interpersonal realm to the intergroup realm of behaviour. According to Turner, therefore, a social identity must be made salient before individual differences in identity strength can be linked to differentiation. One interpretation of Turner's position would be that strength of identity should be more predictive of intergroup differentiation in a situation where social identity has been made salient in comparison with a situation where social identity is less salient (or latent).

The position adopted in this study, however, is that minority groups defined in terms of status or power (e.g. Canadians in relation to Americans) have a lower threshold for identity salience (see Doane, 1997). Huddy (2001) adopts a similar position in her recent discussion of social identity and points to a number of studies (e.g. Ethier & Deaux, 1994) that indicate a stability in partisan and ethnic identity over time. When you are a minority group member, the simple act of thinking about in-group membership may be enough to move behaviour into the intergroup realm. According to this perspective, strength of identity should be equally predictive of intergroup differentiation in a situation where social identity has been made salient in comparison with a situation where social identity is less salient.

Relevance of the out-group for social comparison

Turner (1999) has been quite critical of some of the past research on the identity-differentiation hypothesis for not using an appropriate out-group for social comparison (e.g. Brown *et al.*, 1986). Field studies finding support for the hypothesis have looked at relevant out-groups that are (or can be) in a potential situation of conflict with the in-group: Abrams (1984) focused on rival public schools; Kelly (1988, 1990) studied supporters of political parties or factions within parties; Simon *et al.* (1995) examined a regional identity in relation to Germans in general; Terry *et al.* (2001) examined pilots from two different airlines who were forced into a merger; and Verkuyten and his colleagues (e.g. Verkuyten, 1991) looked at ethnic minorities in relation to a

majority group. The potential for conflict can lead to perceptions of intergroup threat, and as Grant's (1992, 1993) laboratory work has demonstrated, situations of intergroup threat are conducive to finding support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis.

Given the consistent support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis evidenced in the field studies, it can be argued that individual differences in social identity develop following a history of interaction between person factors (individual identity) and group level factors (repeated exposure to intergroup conflict or competition). Group identification reflects the developmental crystallization of accumulated group salience within individuals, and it will often be tied to a particular out-group. In theoretical terms, social identity strength and group salience are not independent events.

In the current study, two different out-groups were examined: one was chronically accessible in terms of the potential for conflict and similarity, and the other was not. It was expected that the identity-differentiation hypothesis would only be supported when the in-group was differentiated from a salient or appropriate out-group for social comparison.

Relevance of the dimension of social comparison

All discussions of intergroup comparisons in the context of social identity theory stress the importance of examining dimensions of social comparison that are relevant (e.g. Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Turner, 1999). But what is the nature of these dimensions? While there may be a variety of dimensions, much of the discussion has focused on socially shared stereotypes (see Tajfel, 1981). Gardner (1994) has argued that the consensual nature of stereotypes (consensus being reached by members of an in-group) necessarily implies a group level of analysis (see also Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty, & Reynolds, 1998). It is not enough, however, to focus on stereotypic attributes when looking at the process of intergroup differentiation. In Grant's (1992, 1993) experiments, for example, support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis was found for attributes that were stereotypically female, but not for attributes that were stereotypically male. A close examination of Grant's results reveals that there was much more in-group/out-group differentiation (in terms of mean differences) on the female attributes than on the male attributes. Two criteria, therefore, can be identified when looking at differentiation on trait ratings: consensus in ratings (i.e. stereo-typicality) and the degree of differentiation. In the current study, consensus will be established by looking at attributes that were stereotypic. Furthermore, the degree of differentiation (high vs. low) was established by looking at where the mean ratings of the different groups fell on rating scales.

An exclusive focus on stereotypical trait attributes, however, does not fully capture the comparative process. When spontaneous intergroup comparisons are being made, they often involve dimensions of social comparison that are not captured by traits. For example, a comparison between members of different political parties might involve their positions on different social issues (see Kelly, 1990). The current study focused both on stereotypical trait ratings and on items related to social issues (see also Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994).

Measurement and statistical issues

There are measurement considerations involved in the assessment of intergroup differentiation. For example, many of the previous studies that failed to find support for the hypothesis focused on single-item measures of differentiation (e.g. Brown *et al.*, 1986; Brown & Williams, 1984; Oaker & Brown, 1986). All of the studies that have

demonstrated support for the hypothesis (beginning with Abrams, 1984) used more reliable indices of differentiation that were based on multiple items. It seems essential, therefore, to use multiple item indicators of differentiation when testing the identity-differentiation hypothesis.

A statistical issue regarding tests of the identity-differentiation hypothesis concerns the magnitude of the relationship. Although Hinkle and Brown believe that there should be a strong relationship, there are factors that can work against finding a strong relationship. The dimensions of social comparison for testing the hypothesis need to be salient. Salience in an intergroup context implies stereotyping, which in turn requires extremity and consensus in the perceptions of members of one group regarding their in-group and an out-group (see Gardner, 1994). Given that consensus involves little variability in perceptions of group members, it would be difficult to find a very strong relationship between identity and intergroup difference score (in-group − out-group) because the variability in group perceptions will be small and similar. Gardner and Neufeld (1987) have demonstrated that the correlation ($r_{A(Y-X)}$) between one variable (e.g. A: identity score) and the difference between two other variables (e.g. Y: in-group score − X: out-group score) is affected by the ratio of the standard deviations of these two other variables (X and Y). The smaller the ratio of these standard deviations, the smaller the expected correlation between one variable and differences in another. Stereotyping of an in-group and an out-group necessarily implies small standard deviations (i.e. consensus) in the perceptions of both groups, and it appears that the identity-differentiation correlation will be smaller when there is considerable and relatively similar consensus about an in-group and an out-group. Furthermore, the model presented by Gardner and Neufeld (1987) suggests that the correlation ($r_{A(Y-X)}$) between one variable and the difference between two other variables will be asymptotic. Similarly, McNemar (1969) has argued that correlation coefficients are attenuated when they involve the relationship between a difference score variable ($X - Y$) and some other continuous variable (A).

In summary, while support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis for relevant dimensions of social comparison is expected, the magnitude of the relationship may not be particularly strong because of statistical constraints. Thus, it was predicted that the strength of this relationship would only be moderate.

Overview and design of the current study

The current study focused on a sample of Canadian (in-group) students who were asked questions about Canadians, Americans and Australians. While both the USA and Australia are similar to Canada in many ways (e.g. primarily English-speaking, economically prosperous, high levels of immigration), the primary target group was Americans because they are viewed as the social comparison group *par excellence* for Canadians. The USA is Canada's only neighbour, and its presence looms large in terms of population size, financial power and cultural influence. Canadians are given information about the USA on a daily basis (e.g. political events, weather forecasts, strength of the Canadian dollar in comparison with the US dollar), and information about the USA and Americans begins at an early age, with children in Canadian public schools often learning about American geography and history. References to Americans as a social comparison group can be found in popular publications (*Maclean's*; Wallace, 1999) and even in popular Canadian children's books (e.g. Munsch & Daniel, 1990). The USA is often perceived by Canadians as a threat to their national and cultural identity, and

the debate over the distinctiveness of a Canadian identity is usually framed in reference to the USA (see Smith, 1994). It is my belief that all of these situational factors combine to establish Americans as a chronically accessible out-group for social comparison, particularly for Canadians who have a strong national identity. However, Canadians are taught very little about Australians, and they must actively search for information on this country and its inhabitants (the study was conducted before the 2000 Sydney Olympics).

Data were collected at two different times from a sample of Canadian students. At Time 1, they were asked to rate the three national groups (Australians, Americans and Canadians) on a series of scales, as well as their perceptions of social issues and policies in each of the three countries. Time 1 data were used to establish the relative importance of the out-groups for social comparison and to identify relevant dimensions of social comparison. Time 2 data, collected approximately 4 months later, were used to test the central hypotheses of the study.

TIME 1

One purpose of the first part of the study was to establish the relative importance of two out-groups (Americans and Australians) with regard to the in-group (Canadians). Relative to Australians, Americans should be viewed as a more important out-group for Canadians. A second purpose of this part of the study was to identify key dimensions for intergroup social comparison that could be used in the second part of the study. The hypotheses that are specific to this first period of testing, but not the central hypotheses of the study, were as follows:

H_1.   There will be greater differentiation between the in-group (Canadians) and a relevant out-group (Americans) than with a less-relevant out-group (Australians). This differentiation will be reflected in the number and significance of the group differences on the semantic-differential scales and the social issue items.

H_2.   The relevant out-group (Americans) will be stereotyped to a greater extent than the less-relevant out-group (Australians).

Method

Respondents and procedure

A total of 171 students from an introductory psychology course participated in this study as a class demonstration; 16 were excluded from the analyses because they were not Canadian citizens, leaving 135 women and 20 men. The mean age of the participants was 19.53 years.

In the questionnaire, students were asked to rate the three national groups (Australians, Americans and Canadians) using a series of 30 semantic-differential 7–point scales (see Table 1). The order of presentation of each of the groups was counterbalanced. Students were then asked for their perceptions of social policies and social issues in each of the three countries for five items (promotion of multicultural-ism, lack of ethnic conflict, tolerance of different ethnic/racial groups, treatment of Native/Aboriginal people, and lack of racial tensions) using 7–point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree). Finally, contact with the out-groups was assessed with four items (information about group members, personal contact with group members, travel in country: reading about country; Americans, α=.76; Australians, α=.69).

Table 1. Mean ratings and stereotypicality for each of the target groups

	Canadians	Americans	Australians
1 Happy-go-lucky/serious	3.42$_a$	3.51$_a$	2.61$_b$*
2 Humble/proud	4.61$_a$	6.51$_b$*	4.76$_a$
3 Subtle/straightforward	4.14$_a$	5.68$_b$*	4.91$_c$
4 Unnationalistic/nationalistic	5.10$_a$	6.49$_b$*	5.25$_a$*
5 Progressive/conservative	4.29$_a$	3.58$_b$	3.88$_{ab}$
6 Lazy/hardworking	5.10$_a$*	4.05$_b$	4.87$_a$
7 Reserved/boisterous	3.48$_a$	5.41$_b$*	4.53$_c$
8 Unathletic/athletic	5.15$_a$*	5.58$_{ab}$*	4.89$_b$
9 Just/unjust	2.89$_a$*	4.17$_b$	3.18$_a$
10 Drinkers/abstainers	3.29$_a$	2.86$_b$*	2.97$_{ab}$
11 Polite/rude	2.26$_a$*	5.29$_b$*	2.80$_c$*
12 Materialistic/spiritualistic	3.26$_a$	2.14$_b$*	4.18$_c$
13 Uneducated/educated	5.72$_a$*	4.28$_b$	5.07$_c$*
14 Practical/idealistic	3.56$_a$	4.48$_b$	3.55$_a$
15 Law abiding/reckless	2.63$_a$*	4.41$_b$	3.41$_c$
16 Timid/confident	4.54$_a$	5.83$_b$*	5.18$_c$*
17 Stubborn/flexible	4.79$_a$	2.84$_b$*	4.25$_c$
18 Industrious/lazy	3.01$_a$*	3.72$_b$	3.33$_a$
19 Tolerant/intolerant	2.63$_a$*	5.00$_b$	3.16$_c$
20 Friendly/unfriendly	1.99$_a$*	4.35$_b$	1.95$_a$*
21 Arrogant/humble	4.89$_a$	2.49$_b$*	4.50$_a$
22 Individualistic/collectivistic	3.76	4.03	3.95
23 Reserved/outgoing	4.12$_a$	5.25$_b$*	5.25$_b$*
24 Unscientific/scientific	4.61$_a$	4.74$_a$	4.11$_b$
25 Quiet/loud	3.82$_a$	5.98$_b$*	4.80$_c$
26 Open minded/closed minded	2.52$_a$*	4.49$_b$	2.99$_a$*
27 Passive/aggressive	3.35$_a$	5.66$_b$*	4.17$_c$
28 Pleasant/unpleasant	2.13$_a$*	4.27$_b$	2.25$_a$*
29 Religious/irreligious	3.57$_a$	3.87$_{ab}$	3.95$_b$
30 Patriotic/unpatriotic	2.81$_a$	1.52$_b$*	2.55$_a$*

*This mean is associated with a one sample *t*-test value greater than an absolute of 10.00.
Each mean is based on the maximum number of observations (*N*s range from 148 to 155).
Means showing the same subscript are not significantly different.

Results

Contact differences
As expected, Canadian respondents reported greater contact with Americans ($M=3.62$) than with Australians ($M=1.81$; t (154) $=27.32$, $p<.001$).

Evidence of differentiation
It was hypothesized that there would be greater differentiation between the in-group (Canadians) and a relevant out-group (Americans) than with a less-relevant out-group (Australians). A MANOVA was conducted using target group (Canadian, American, Australian) as the within-participants factor and the 30 semantic-differential trait scales as the dependent variables. The multivariate effect for group was significant

(F(60,71)=10.85, p<.001). The means associated with the univariate effects (29 were significant at p<.005) are presented in Table 1; they were compared using a Scheffé procedure (p<.01). As predicted, there were more significant Canadian–American differences (25 scales) than Canadian–Australian differences (15 scales). Moreover, ratings of Americans and Australians differed significantly on 24 of the scales; typically, Australians were associated with mean ratings that fell between the mean ratings associated with American and Canadians (23 of 30 scales).

Differentiation was further examined by looking at the five social policy items in a MANOVA with target country (Canada, USA, Australia) as a within-participants factor and policy items as the dependent variables (N=152). The multivariate effect for country was again significant (F(10,142)=80.97, p<.001). The univariate effects were all significant, and an examination of the group means using a Scheffé procedure (p<.01) revealed that all three target groups means differed significantly from each other for four of the items. The hypothesis of greater differentiation between Canadians and Americans than between Canadians and Australians was supported for the multiculturalism and tolerance items. Canada was perceived as a country that promoted multiculturalism (M=6.31) and that was tolerant of different ethnic groups (M=5.78) in comparison with Australia (Ms=3.80, 4.32); Australia in turn received higher mean ratings than the USA (Ms=3.33, 3.74). For two of the other items, however, Canadian ratings fell in the middle. Australia was perceived as freer of racial tensions (M=2.57) and of ethnic conflict (M=3.74) than Canada (Ms=1.91, 3.03), which in turn received higher mean ratings than the USA (Ms=1.32, 1.95). Finally, Australia was viewed as having treated its native people more fairly (M=3.70) compared with Canada (M=2.76) and the USA (M=2.45).

Evidence of stereotyping

In order to determine the stereotypicality of each trait rating, a stereotype differential procedure was used (see Gardner, Lalonde, Nero, & Young, 1988). The assumption of this procedure is that stereotypicality is based on the consensus and extremity of ratings. Both of these criteria are captured by comparing the mean rating on a scale to the neutral point of 4 on the 7-point scale using a one-sample t statistic and then adopting a conservative (i.e. meaningful) criterion for significance, following Gardner *et al.*'s recommendation of going beyond the issue of significance. Only traits associated with t values greater than the absolute value of 10.00 were considered to be stereotypic. These analyses, and the means in Table 1, were based on the maximum number of observations for each rating (Ns ranged from 148 to 155). It was hypothesized that the relevant out-group (Americans) would be stereotyped to a greater extent than the less-relevant out-group (Australians). The out-group 'American', was associated with 15 stereotypic attributes (M_t=19.14) and as predicted, the less relevant out-group, 'Australian', was associated with fewer attributes, 10 in total (M_t=13.94). The in-group, 'Canadian', was associated with 11 stereotypic attributes (M_t=14.93).

Dimensions of intergroup differentiation

Ratings on the 30 semantic-differential scales were factor-analysed separately for the Australians, Americans and Canadians in order to extract a few measures that could be identified consistently for each group. The scree plots revealed that a five-factor solution was most suitable for extraction and rotation in each case. In order to include an item in the interpretation of a particular factor, the item had to have a minimal loading

of .45 and to load higher on this factor than on any other factor. Once factors were identified, a comparison was made to identify factors that were consistent across the three analyses. Two factors emerged.

The first factor was defined by nine items: just, polite, law abiding, flexible, tolerant, friendly, humble, open-minded and pleasant. The factor clearly involved positive 'evaluation'. The internal consistency of a composite measure based on these items was very good: (American: $\alpha=.86$; Canadian: $\alpha=.85$; Australian: $\alpha=.85$). There are two distinctive features to note about the items for the Canadian and American groups. First, each item (or its polar opposite) was stereotypic of either Americans (three items) or Canadians (seven items) or both (one item). Second, the mean ratings of Canadians and Americans on these items always fell on *opposite sides of the neutral point of 4*. A repeated-measures ANOVA of the composite measure was significant ($F(2,282)=273.48$, $p<.001$). Tests of means indicated that the three groups differed significantly from each other, with Canadians ($M=5.39$) receiving the most positive evaluation, followed by Australians ($M=4.97$) and Americans ($M=3.25$).

The second consistent factor, labelled 'patriotic', was defined by three items: proud, nationalistic and patriotic. The internal consistency of a composite measure based on these three items was moderate for all groups (American: $\alpha=.68$; Canadian: $\alpha=.76$; Australian: $\alpha=.57$). Again, there are two distinctive features about these three items for the Canadian and American groups. First, each of the items was stereotypic of Americans. The other is that the mean ratings of Canadians and Americans on these three items always fell *on the same side of the neutral point of 4*. In terms of the composite scores, a repeated-measures ANOVA was significant ($F(2,292)=107.58$, $p<.001$), and tests of means indicated that Americans ($M=6.50$) received significantly higher ratings than Canadians ($M=4.96$) and Australians ($M=5.14$).

Ratings on the five social issue items were also factor-analysed separately for Australia, the USA and Canada. The scree plot suggested that a three-factor solution was suitable for extraction and rotation. All items had a minimal loading of .45 on their respective factor (except for one), and all loadings associated with an item were higher on their defining factor. Two factors emerged. One was labelled 'multicultural tolerance' (promotion of multiculturalism and tolerance of different ethnic groups), and the other was labelled 'ethnic/racial conflict' (lack of ethnic conflict and lack of racial tensions). The internal consistency of composite scores based on these items was fair at best (multicultural tolerance: Australia $\alpha=.60$; USA $\alpha=.70$; Canada $\alpha=.44$; ethnic/racial conflict: Australia $\alpha=.60$; USA $\alpha=.30$; Canada $\alpha=.71$). A repeated-measures ANOVA comparing countries on the multicultural tolerance measure was significant ($F(2,304)=231.18$, $p<.001$). All means differed significantly from each other (Canada: $M=6.05$; Australia: $M=4.06$; USA: $M=3.53$). The repeated-measures ANOVA also was significant for the measure of ethnic-racial conflict ($F(2,304)=114.61$, $p<.001$), and all means differed again from each other (Australia: $M=3.17$; Canada: $M=2.47$; USA: $M=1.63$).

Discussion

The results from this first session of testing established a number of important findings that could be used for the more critical hypotheses tested at Time 2. As hypothesized, Americans represent a more relevant social comparison out-group than Australians. Respondents reported having more contact with Americans than with Australians, and Americans were stereotyped to a much greater extent than Australians. Moreover,

differentiation between Canadians and Americans was observed on almost all of the measures. It is clear that for Canadian respondents, Americans represent a more relevant out-group for social comparison than Australians.

The results also permit the identification of relevant dimensions of intergroup social comparison that are based in trait attributions (evaluative and patriotic) as well as ratings of social issues (multicultural tolerance and ethnic/racial conflict). Moreover, these dimensions can be distinguished in terms of their relevance for intergroup differentiation. The evaluative and multicultural tolerance dimensions can be described as high-relevance dimensions, as mean ratings for Canadians and Americans were significantly different from each other and fell on opposite sides of the mid-point on the scale. However, although the mean ratings of Canadians and Americans were significantly different from each other on the patriotic and ethnic/racial tolerance dimensions, they can be characterized as lower-relevance dimensions because their mean ratings for the two groups fell on the same side of the mid-point on the scale.

TIME 2

The second part of the study was conducted approximately four months after the first testing. The purpose of data collection at this point was to test the central hypotheses. In order to do so, various measures of identity were administered. These included a relatively generic measure of Canadian identity (Cameron, Sato, Lalonde, & Lay, 1997) similar to that used by Hinkle *et al*. (1989), as well as more specific measures of identity that have been developed in the context of nationality (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). Measures of differentiation were based on the same semantic-differential and social issue items that were used at Time 1.

The hypotheses were as follows:

H_1 Given that social identity was primed to a greater extent at Time 2 than at Time 1, it was predicted that greater intergroup differentiation would be observed at Time 2 than at Time 1.

H_2 There are two competing hypotheses regarding the identity-differentiation hypothesis in relation to identity salience. From Turner's (1999) perspective, a social identity must be made salient before individual differences in identity strength can have predictive value. Strength of identity scores should be more predictive of intergroup differentiation scores at Time 2 when social identity has been made more salient in comparison with differentiation scores at Time 1 where social identity was less salient. The position adopted in this study, however, is that minority groups defined in terms of status or power (e.g. Canadians in relation to Americans) have a lower threshold for identity salience. According to this perspective, strength of 'minority' identity scores should be equally predictive of intergroup differentiation in a situation where social identity has been made salient in comparison with a situation where social identity is less salient.

H_3 The identity-differentiation hypothesis will be supported for high-relevance dimensions of social comparison (evaluation and multicultural tolerance) but not for lower-relevance dimensions of social comparison (patriotism and racial/ethnic conflict).

H_4 The identity-differentiation hypothesis will be supported for a relevant social comparison group (Americans) but not for a less relevant social comparison group (Australians).

Method

Respondents and procedure

A total of 77 students were recruited from the initial pool; 64 were matched with Time 1 data on the basis of a code, and four were excluded because they did not have Canadian citizenship. The 60 remaining respondents, 51 women and nine men, had a mean age of 19.43 years.

Respondents first were asked three open-ended questions about Canadian identity 'What does it mean to you?'; 'How are Canadians different or unique to people from other countries?'; 'How is Canada different or unique relative to other countries?'. The second and third parts of the questionnaire were counterbalanced in their presentation. Half the participants were first given the same set of 30 semantic-differential scales in association with Canadians and Americans (counterbalanced) followed by the same five social issue items and the Canadianism scale (Berry & Kalin, 1995). The other half of the respondents were first given a series of items belonging to the York Ethnic Identification (YETI) Scale (Cameron *et al.*, 1997) and the Patriotism–Nationalism Questionnaire (PNQ; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). A 5–point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) was used for these items. Respondents received course credit for their participation and were given a verbal debriefing upon completion of the study.

Measures of social identity

York Ethnic Identification (YETI) Scale
This 28–item scale (14 negatively keyed) developed by Cameron *et al.* (1997) is a generic measure of identity that has been used in the context of ethnicity (Cameron *et al.*, 1997), race (Boatswain & Lalonde, 2000) and gender (Cameron & Lalonde, 2001). The psychometric properties of the scale are presented in Cameron and Lalonde (2001). In the current study, items were worded to focus on a Canadian national identity. A total score was calculated ($\alpha=.94$), as well as scores for centrality ($\alpha=.88$), affect ($\alpha=.81$) and in-group ties ($\alpha=.87$) components. Higher scores indicate a greater importance of this identification for self-definition (centrality: 'Being a Canadian is an important part of my self-image'), more positive feelings about this identification (affect: 'I feel good when I think about myself as being Canadian'), and a sense of belonging with in-group members (ties: 'I feel I have a lot in common with other Canadians').

Patriotism–Nationalism Questionnaire (PNQ)
In all, 46 items taken from Kosterman and Feshbach (1989) were adapted by changing the wording from American to Canadian. A principal-components factor analysis was performed on the items, and the scree plot suggested a four-factor solution. Items associated with factor loadings greater than .45 were considered in the interpretation of factors. Only three of the six factors identified by Kosterman and Feshbach were clearly identified: patriotism (e.g. 'I love my country'), smugness (e.g. 'The Canadian flag is the best in the world') and internationalism. This latter factor was ignored because it addressed a global form of identity. Composite scores were computed for the 10 patriotism items ($\alpha=.87$) and the four smugness items ($\alpha=.73$).

Canadianism
Berry and Kalin (1995) developed this eight-item measure (e.g. 'More should be done to make Canadians feel proud to be Canadian citizens'). A high score on this

scale indicates a strong commitment and sense of attachment to Canada as a nation (α = .76).

Measures of intergroup comparison
Time 1 and Time 2 Cronbach alphas for each of the trait and social issue dimensions were respectively as follows: evaluative: Canadians (αs = .79 and .82), Americans (αs = .84 and .84) and Australians (Time 1 only: α. = 87); patriotic: Canadians (αs = .61 and .74), Americans (αs = .73 and .64) and Australians (α = .40); multicultural tolerance: Canada (αs = .66 and .60), USA (αs = .62 and .66) and Australia (α = .71); and ethnic/racial conflict: Canada (αs = .56 and .81), USA (αs = .49 and .69) and Australia (α = .32).

Results

Open-ended responses
Responses to the open-ended questions on Canadian identity were examined to establish the importance of Americans as an out-group for social comparison and the relevance of certain dimensions of social comparison. In terms of social comparison, Americans (or the USA) were mentioned spontaneously in responses by 17 respondents (28%); this frequency is much greater than all of the other countries or regions of the world that were mentioned by eight respondents (13%). In terms of the most frequently cited defining features of Canada and Canadians, 29 respondents (48%) mentioned multiculturalism or its multicultural nature, 29 stated that Canadians were open-minded or tolerant, and 13 (22%) stated that Canadians are polite.

Intergroup differentiation
It was expected (H_1) that identity would be more salient at Time 2 (Canadian identity prime) than at Time 1 (no prime) and that this would be reflected by a greater intergroup differentiation at Time 2 than at Time 1. As predicted, greater differentiation at Time 2 was observed within significant time×group interactions for the positive evaluation trait dimension ($F(1,57) = 4.69$, $p = .035$) and the patriotic dimension ($F(1,57) = 5.83$, $p = .019$). A simplified analysis indicated that the mean Canadian–American difference score on the positive evaluation dimension was greater at Time 2 ($M = 2.31$) than at Time 1 ($M = 2.08$; $t(57) = 2.16$, $p = .035$). Similarly, the mean Canadian–American difference score on the patriotic dimension was greater at Time 2 (= 1.72) than at Time 1 ($M = 1.34$, $t(57) = 2.42$, $p = .019$). This pattern of findings was not found for the social issue dimensions.

Correlational analyses
In order to test the identity-differentiation hypothesis, a number of differentiation scores were computed. Canadian–American differentiation scores were calculated for Time 1 and Time 2 measures, and Canadian–Australian scores were calculated for the Time 1 measures. In all cases, the out-group mean was subtracted from the in-group mean. All of these differentiation scores were then correlated with the identity measures.

Table 2 presents the correlations between the identity measures and the differentiation scores for the two trait dimensions. In all cases of significance, the higher the individual's identity score, the more the in-group (Canadians) was differentiated from

Table 2. Correlations between identity scores and intergroup differentiation scores on trait dimensions

Differentiation:	Canadian–American				Canadian–Australian	
Dimension	Evaluative		Patriotic		Evaluative	Patriotic
Time	1	2	1	2	1	1
YETI scale						
Total	.34**	.32**	−.05	.11	.13	.06
Cognitive centrality	.32*	.29*	−.03	.13	.18	.04
Affect	.31*	.23ˣ	−.18	−.05	.05	.14
In-group ties	.37**	.35**	−.02	.15	.15	.03
Pat/nat scale						
Patriotism	.22	.21	−.05	.03	.04	.16
Smugness	.16	.26*	−.17	−.13	.15	−.10
Canadianism	.19	.26*	−.11	.13	−.04	.14

**p<.01; *p<.05; ˣp<.10 (all two-tailed tests of significance).

the out-group (Americans) on this evaluative dimension. As predicted (H_3), the identity-differentiation hypothesis was supported when examining the correlation involving the Canadian–American differentiation scores on the high-relevance evaluative dimension. Moreover, this relationship (H_2, 'minority' perspective) was robust over the two time periods, particularly for the YETI Scale and subscales for which all four correlations at Time 1 and Time 2 were significant. The other significant identity predictors, smugness and Canadianism, were only correlated with the Time 2 (identity salient) differentiation scores (H_2, Turner perspective).

It can also be seen in Table 2 that, as predicted in H_3, identity scores did not correlate with differentiation on the low-relevance dimension of Canadian–American differentiation, patriotism. Also as predicted in H_4, identity did not correlate with differentiation of the in-group from the less relevant out-group, Australians.

Table 3 presents the correlations between identity scores and differentiation on the two social issue dimensions. Clear support for H_3 was evidenced by the significant correlations between the different identity measures and the high-relevance multicultural tolerance dimension. All Time 2 (identity salient) correlations were significant (H_2, Turner perspective), although 3 of the 7 of Time 1 correlations were significant (H_2, 'minority' perspective). Although the identity-differentiation correlations for Time 1 were weaker than Time 2 correlations, only the correlations associated with patriotism ($z=2.85$, $p<.005$) and smugness ($z=1.96$, $p<.05$) measures differed from each other.

As expected, the effects were somewhat weaker for the low-relevance ethnic/racial conflict dimension (H_3). Nonetheless, the correlations of the YETI Scales and two of its subscales were significantly related to differentiation at Time 2 and at Time 1 (H_2, 'minority' perspective). None of the Canadian–Australian differentiation scores on the social issue measures were found to be significantly correlated with the different identity measures (H_4).

Table 3. Correlations between identity scores and intergroup differentiation scores on social issue dimensions

| Time: | Differentiation score (Canadian–American) | | | |
| | Multicultural tolerance | | Free of ethnic/ racial conflict | |
	1	2	1	2
YETI scale				
Total	.23^x	.41***	.24^x	.31*
Cognitive centrality	.21	.38**	.26*	.31*
Affect	.19	.32*	.21	.28*
Ingroup ties	.25^x	.35**	.23^x	.21
Pat/nat scale				
Patriotism	.16	.38**	.15	.22^x
Smugness	.10	.32*	.11	.12
Canadianism	.27*	.44***	.25*	.18

***$p<.001$; **$p<.01$; *$p<.05$; $^x p<.10$ (all two-tailed tests of significance).

Discussion

The results of this study provide support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis. Support is limited, however, to a set of conditions that was outlined in the introductory text above. As predicted, the hypothesis was supported for dimensions of social comparison on which there was consensus (i.e. stereotypical attributes) and for dimensions of social comparison that were relevant (i.e. for which clear differentiation was established). In terms of trait attributes, support for the hypothesis was found for the evaluative dimension, for which there was clear intergroup differentiation, but not for the patriotic dimension, for which intergroup differentiation was much weaker. Differentiation on traits falling on an evaluative dimension may represent support for a specific form of the identity-differentiation hypothesis, namely an in-group bias or in-group favouritism effect. An evaluative measure of differentiation was also used by a number of other recent studies that have found support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis (Brown *et al*., 1992; Meeres & Grant, 1999; Simon *et al*., 1995). Given that much in-group stereotyping occurs on evaluative dimensions (Lalonde & Gardner, 1989), it is quite probable that these are the types of traits that will be associated with strong differentiation.

Clear support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis also was found for the high-relevance social issue dimension relating to multiculturalism, and some support was found for the low-relevance ethnic/racial conflict dimension. These results, along with those obtained by Kelly (1990), indicate a real benefit in going beyond the typical trait ratings when examining the process of differentiation. When looking at naturally occurring groups, it is clear that individuals will access their group's history and its related social issues when making spontaneous comparative judgments. Half of the respondents in the current study spontaneously raised the issue of multiculturalism when they were asked what made their group or country different from others.

As predicted, support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis was found only for an appropriate social comparison group (i.e. Americans), but not for a less relevant social comparison group (i.e. Australians). Given that a less important social comparison group is not one for which there will be a relevant intergroup dimension of social comparison, this is not surprising. As pointed out by Turner (1999), some of the past research may not have found support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis because the focus was not on the more important out-group for social comparison. For example, Brown *et al*. (1986) chose to look at differentiation between subgroups of workers in a paper factory rather than looking at differentiation between these workers and management. It was clear in the current study that Americans are a salient out-group of social comparison for Canadians given the number of references that were made to Americans in open-ended questions on Canadian identity. The results of the current study, as well as the research of Simon *et al*. (1995), suggest that the area of national and regional identity is a fertile ground for identifying social comparison groups in terms of their salience and appropriateness because we can refer to the social and political histories (past and present) between these groups.

There are two final related issues that can be examined in light of the results of this study. One is in regard to the hypothesized ability of identity to predict differentiation over time, and the other pertains to the relative merits of the different social identity measures that were used in this study. Support for the hypothesis was found for most of the measures of social identity when the measures of differentiation were taken concurrently. This was done at Time 2 of the study by having respondents first write out answers to questions regarding their Canadian identity. From Turner's (1999) perspective, therefore, there is evidence that the identity-differentiation hypothesis will be supported when there is a momentary salience of social identity. When identity measures were used to predict differentiation scores at an earlier time when social identity was made less salient, the YETI Scale (Cameron *et al*., 1997), the more generic measure of identity, was still successful at predicting intergroup differentiation on the high-relevance evaluative dimension. This latter finding suggests a readiness for differentiation at an evaluative level, regardless of the salience of identity. It is possible that for certain groups, and in particular groups who feel that their social identity is in constant threat (see Grant, 1992), there will always be an easily accessible identity that can be expressed in evaluative terms. The push for distinctiveness may be most easily expressed as a form of in-group favouritism (e.g. we are better than them), and differentiation on more complex dimensions of social comparison (i.e. social issues) may require a more salient form of identity. The results also suggest that the YETI may be more sensitive in capturing individual differences in identity in situations where identity may not be as salient than the more specific national identity measures taken from the PNQ or the Canadianism measure. What is clear from the Time 2 assessment is that a variety of indices of social identity can capture the differentiation process as long as it occurs on dimensions of social comparison that are of relevance.

A final point that needs to be discussed is the relationship between the identity-differentiation hypothesis and social identity theory. As indicated at the beginning of this article and as argued by Turner (1999), social identity theory does not explicitly make the prediction that strength of identity should be linked to differentiation. It is clear, however, that the theory predicts that differentiation will occur in situations where identity is salient. Identity when measured with a scale, however, is different from salience and often refers to a more stable attribute. It can be argued that a stable social identity is the result of a developmental course of salient group experiences (see

also Huddy, 2001). Moreover, salient group experiences are more likely for members of minority or oppressed groups. The results of the current study suggest that national identity may be chronically salient for Canadians when they compare themselves with Americans: this is one instance of a minority identity that has had the chance to develop historically at the group level, and as a result, at the individual level as well. When we look at the consistent support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis in field studies and the results of the current study, it appears that the identity-differentiation hypothesis can be supported with a minimal amount of salience.

Conclusion

The current correlational study addresses the relationship between social identity and intergroup differentiation in the context of Canadian national identity. As noted by Turner (1999), there are complicating factors in field studies where social identity is not manipulated and where identity is an individual difference measure. The current results suggest that it is possible to identify the conditions that are conducive to finding support for the identity-differentiation hypothesis despite these complicating factors. An appropriate test of the identity-differentiation hypothesis requires isolating the appropriate out-group for social comparison and the relevant dimensions of social comparison, while understanding the history and social context of the groups involved.

Acknowledgements

References

Aberson, C. L., Healy, M., & Romero, V. (2000). Ingroup bias and self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 157–173.

Abrams, D. (1984). *Social identity, self-awareness and intergroup behaviour*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kent at Canterbury.

Berry, J. W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 27*, 301–320.

Boatswain, S. J., & Lalonde, R. N. (2000). Social identity and preferred ethnic/racial labels for Blacks in Canada. *Journal of Black Psychology, 26*, 216–234.

Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1994). Collective self-esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 24*, 641–657.

Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, 745–778.

Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 273–286.

Brown, R., Hinkle, S., Ely, P. G., Fox-Cardamone, L., Maras, P., & Taylor, L. (1992). Recognizing group diversity: Individualistic-collectivistic and autonomous-relational social orientations and their implications for intergroup processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 327–342.

Brown, R., & Williams, J. (1984). Group identification: The same to all people? *Human Relations*, 37, 547-564.

Cameron, J. E., & Lalonde, R. N. (2001). Social identification and gender-related ideology in women and men. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 59-77.

Cameron, J. E., Sato, T., Lalonde, R. N., & Lay, C. (1997, June). *Developing a multidimensional measure of ethnic identity*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Toronto.

Capozza, D., Voci, A., & Licciardello, O. (2000). Individualism, collectivism, and social identity theory. In D. Capozza & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research* (pp. 62-80). London: Sage.

Doane, A. W. Jr. (1997). Dominant group ethnic identity in the United States: The role of 'hidden' ethnicity in intergroup relations. *Sociological Quarterly, 38*, 375-397.

Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 243-251.

Gagnon, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1996). Discrimination in the minimal group paradigm: Social identity or self-interest? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 1289-1301.

Gardner, R. C. (1994). Stereotypes as consensual beliefs. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 7, pp. 1-31). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., Nero, A. M., & Young, M. Y. (1988). Ethnic stereotypes: The implications of measurement strategy. *Social Cognition*, 6, 40-60.

Gardner, R. C., & Neufeld, R. W. J. (1987). Use of the simple change score in correlational analyses. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*, 849-864.

Grant, P. R. (1992). Ethnocentrism between groups of unequal power in response to perceived threat to social identity and valued resources. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24, 348-370.

Grant, P. R. (1993). Reactions to intergroup similarity: Examination of the similarity-differentiation and the similarity-attraction hypotheses. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 25, 28-44.

Haslam, S. A., Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., McGarty, C., & Reynolds, K. J. (1998). The group as a basis for emergent stereotype consensus. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 203-239). New York: Wiley.

Hennessy, J., & West, M. A. (1999). Intergroup behavior in organizations: A field test of social identity theory. *Small Group Research, 30*, 361-382.

Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. J. (1990). Intergroup differentiation and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 48-70). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Hinkle, S., Taylor, L. A., Fox-Cardamone, D. L., & Crook, K. F. (1989). Intragroup identification and intergroup differentiation: A multicomponent approach. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 305-317.

Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology, 22*, 127-156.

Kelly, C. (1988). Intergroup differentiation in a political context. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 27*, 319-332.

Kelly, C. (1990). Social identity and intergroup perceptions in minority–majority contexts. *Human Relations*, 43, 583-599.

Kinket, B., & Verkuyten, M. (1999). Intergroup evaluations and social context: A multilevel approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 219-237.

Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.

Lalonde, R. N., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). An intergroup perspective on stereotype organization and processing. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 289-303.

McGarty, C. (2001). Commentary—Social Identity Theory does not maintain that identification produces bias, and Self-Categorization Theory does not maintain that salience is identification: Two comments on Mummendy, Klink and Brown. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 173–176.

McNemar, Q. (1969). *Psychological statistics* (4th ed.). Toronto: Wiley.

Meeres, S. L., & Grant, P. R. (1999). Enhancing collective and personal self-esteem through differentiation: Further exploration of Hinkle & Brown's taxonomy. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 21–34.

Moreland, R. L., & McMinn, J. G. (1999). Gone but not forgotten: Loyalty and betrayal among ex-members of small groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 1476–1486.

Mummendy, A., Klink, A. A., & Brown, R. (2001). A rejoinder to our critics and some of their misapprehensions. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 187–191.

Munsch, R., & Daniel, A. (1990). *Good families don't*. Toronto: Dell.

Oaker, G., & Brown, R. (1986). Intergroup relations in a hospital setting: A further test of social identity theory. *Human Relations*, *39*, 767–778.

Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1994). *Stereotyping and social reality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Perreault, S., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1998). Social identification, interdependence and discrimination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *1*, 49–66.

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

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

Simon, B., Kulla, C., & Zobel, M. (1995). On being more than just part of the whole: Regional identity and social distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 325–340.

Smith, A. (1994). *Canada—an American nation? Essays on continentalism, identity, and the Canadian frame of mind.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: The impact of group membership on self-esteem and group-oriented behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *33*, 146–170.

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

Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J.C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 144–167). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

Terry, D. J., Carey, J., & Callan, V. J. (2001). Employee adjustment to an organisational merger: An intergroup perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 276–280.

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

van Knippenberg, A., & Coolen, P. (1993, September). *Social identification, intergroup differentiation and self-esteem*. Paper presented at the Congress of the European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, Lisbon.

van Knippenberg, A., & Ellemers, N. (1990). Social identity and intergroup differentiation processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *1*, 137–169.

Verkuyten, M. (1991). Self-definition and ingroup formation among ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *54*, 280–286.

Verkuyten, M., & Kwa, G. A. (1996). Ethnic self-identification, ethnic involvement, and group differentiation among Chinese youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *136*, 35–48.

Verkuyten, M., & Nekuee, S. (1999). Ingroup bias: The effects of self-stereotyping, identification and group threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 411–418.

Wallace, B. (1999, 20 December). What makes a Canadian? *Maclean's*, pp. 32–36.