

Ambivalence as A Contribution to the Outgroup and Negative Action Tendencies

Sandro Costarelli

University of Sassari, Sassari, Italy

Abstract : *One study tested a moderated serial-mediation model exploring the moderating role of mode of ingroup identification (glorification vs. attachment) on the causal path linking perceived contribution of outgroup ambivalence to the outgroup, perceived common ingroup identity, cognitive outgroup ambivalence, and negative action tendencies towards outgroups. The current work argues that expressing outgroup ambivalence based on cognitive information is a strategy to justify one's otherwise suppressed prejudice, which may ultimately "cover" the discriminatory nature of outgroup-directed action tendencies, depending on individuals' ingroup 'glorification' but not 'attachment' levels as well as their perceptions of own outgroup ambivalence as a contribution to the outgroup and of common ingroup identity with outgroup members, their outgroup ambivalence. As expected, findings indicate that after expressing prejudice in a normative context inducing prejudice suppression, when participants self-reported action tendencies after the expression of ambivalent beliefs concerning the outgroup, unlike participants who were attached to the ingroup, the more participants glorified their ingroup, the less they perceived ambivalence towards outgroup members as a way to help the outgroup, the greater their unwillingness to social inclusiveness of outgroup members, the greater their ambivalence towards such outgroup members, and the greater was their intention to act negatively towards them.*

Keywords: *Ambivalence, Attachment, Discrimination, Glorification, Re-categorization.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Is ambivalence towards the members of groups other than one's own a balanced attitude with no hostile behavioral consequences? Emerging (but, as yet, unexplored) empirical evidence suggests not. Outgroup ambivalence can backfire, promoting more hostile outgroup-directed action tendencies, because it elicits feelings of covertly voicing a normatively sanctioned outgroup attitude whose consistent adverse behavioral byproducts can thus be overtly displayed (e.g., Costarelli & Gerlowska, 2015 [1]). We suggest that the existing literature has not fully considered the conditions under which the instruction to conform to anti-prejudice norms may be resisted and backfire. Specifically, we suggest that people who are already pre-disposed to intergroup hostility (by virtue of their supremacist identity content) may respond very differently to the instruction to conform to anti-prejudice norms. Our approach therefore differs from existing approaches by examining normative pressure to express non-prejudicial attitudes and covert expression of such attitudes (ambivalence) as parts of the process leading to resistance (expression of negative intergroup action intentions), rather than as outcomes of the method per se.

Social-psychological research has long highlighted that the mere every-day casual meeting the members of those groups that are the target of one's own prejudice can produce a psychological energy that serves as a spur to negative action tendencies directed at such group members (e.g., Brehm, 1999 [2]). According to Social Identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986 [3]), this results from the motivation to positively distinguish ingroup from outgroup members in various behavioral domains. However, the Common Ingroup Identify model (CIIM: Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 [4]) proposes that intergroup contact has potential to counter this adverse behavioral tendency by fostering social 'recategorization' (Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989 [5]), whereby group members perceive both themselves and outgroup members as belonging to a more inclusive superordinate social group. Pro-ingroup biased behavior stemming from perceptions of the ingroup/outgroup divide would be reduced thereby, as former outgroup members are now accorded the status of ingroup membership. Indeed, numerous studies support the notion that social recategorization at a superordinate level reduces not only pro-ingroup biased evaluation (e.g., Gaertner, Dovidio, Rust, Nier, Banker, & Ward, 1999 [6]) but also behavior (e.g., Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validzic, 1998 [7]). Based on this prior theoretical and empirical work, interventions at societal level promoting intergroup contact are often employed to decrease the

prevalence and strength of negative attitudes and consistent adverse behavioral tendencies towards traditionally prejudiced against social groups.

However, such interventions tackling the overt expression of prejudicial attitudes may indeed leave untouched some newly-formed ways of covertly conveying negative evaluations of and, hence, licensing the expression of subsequent consistent negative action tendencies directed at, traditionally prejudiced against social groups (Monin & Miller, 2001 [8]). The current research thus aimed to extend the existing literature and to explore the behaviorally adverse consequences of one of such ways, namely, attitudinal ambivalence (Scott, 1966 [9]). *Outgroup ambivalence* is an attitude occurring when the members of groups other than one's own are the target of a simultaneously positive and negative evaluation. While the consequences of prejudicial univalent negative attitudes are reasonably well-understood, much less is known about the implications of outgroup-targeting ambivalence for intergroup behavior. In the current contribution, we provide empirical evidence for the argument that group members can be motivated to express ambivalent attitudes towards outgroups, and such ambivalence has the potential to elicit subsequent negative action tendencies directed at those groups' members.

Traditionally, attitudes towards outgroups have been conceptualized as being one-sided, and specifically relatively negative (compared to ingroup attitudes). This phenomenon (prejudice) has been one of the core issues ever since the beginning of research and theorizing in social psychology. At first blush, outgroup attitudes that are structurally one-dimensional (prejudice) and bidimensional (ambivalence) appear to be inherently incompatible to hold by the same individual. However, the attitudinal condition of being ambivalent and its relation with being prejudiced relies in the self-presentational properties of this peculiar type of intergroup attitude. Indeed, to manage impressions of the self, people employ a range of tactics for presenting information about those groups that are the target of their prejudice (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980 [10]). In doing so, while fostering a nonprejudiced self-image, prior research shows that individuals can feign rejection of prejudice while still managing to express it (e.g., Monin & Miller, 2001 [8]). Of relevance for the scopes of the present study, Brauer and colleagues (Brauer, Er-rafiy, Kawakami, & Phills, 2012 [11]) found empirical support for this idea by showing that the expression of ambivalence is considered as a balanced and acceptable attitude when it is expressed with reference to outgroups. These findings suggest that outgroup ambivalence is regarded as a defensible and realistic reaction to one's appraisal of both the positive and the negative characteristics of a group (Maio, Greenland, Bernard, & Esses, 2001 [12]).

Despite the generally neutral attitude underlying the expression of balanced and realistic evaluations of social objects, we argue that people's natural aim in voicing ambivalence towards outgroups is perhaps not to grant outgroup members an evaluative-neutral evaluation. When social norms sanction the overt expression of negative outgroup evaluation, on the contrary, the motivated need to express such attitude might motivate group members to formulate it in ambiguous ways (ambivalence), which could pave the way to justifying the overt expression of negative action tendencies, and possibly even to enacting actual negative behavioral acts directed at such outgroup members. This tendency in expressing ambivalent attitudes towards outgroups, we argue, might be a key mechanism underlying those not uncommon sudden and unexpected outbursts of hostile behavior towards members of social groups which are publicly the target of 'just' ambivalent rather than negative (prejudicial) attitudes (e.g., various Asian minority groups living in Western countries).

Such notion of outgroup ambivalence as a self-presentational strategy for covertly conveying prejudicial evaluation has some intuitive appeal because ambivalence towards outgroups is prominent precisely where instances of prejudice are most frequent, that is, in intergroup contexts (Katz, Wackenhut, & Hass, 1986 [13]). Of relevance for the scopes of the present study, the Justification-Suppression model of prejudice expression (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003 [14]) supports this idea by viewing cognitive ambivalence towards outgroups—an attitude based on conflicting positive and negative beliefs about their attributes—as one of the many strategies capable at justifying the expression of prejudice. Indeed, consistent with previous correlational research (e.g., Fleming, Petty, & White, 2005 [15]; Katz & Hass, 1988 [16]), Costarelli and Gerłowska (2015 [1]) recently found empirical support for this idea by showing that the greater levels of outgroup-directed negative action tendencies that people report after expressing cognitive outgroup ambivalence are due to their feeling safe at publicly showing action tendencies consistent with a normatively sanctioned form of outgroup attitude (prejudice) that they have succeeded in voicing in a covert way (through ambivalence).

The present research builds upon this prior theoretical and empirical work and aims to extend it by applying it to the investigation of the *mediating* roles played in sequence by perceiving outgroup members as fellow group members of a superordinate inclusive group and expressing outgroup ambivalence on the adverse effects of perceiving cognitive outgroup ambivalence as a form of outgroup helping on negative intergroup action tendencies, as detailed later.

To begin with, people are generally more inclined to help ingroup than outgroup members, because the decision to help a member of another group is determined by the extent one's needs as a group member are met. Specifically, according to Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986 [3]), since groups exist by virtue of their reciprocal distinctiveness, group members are concerned with the need to differentiate the ingroup from other groups and, hence, both portray their group as better (prejudice) than relevant comparison outgroups and more worth of being favored (discrimination). This tendency also applies to intergroup helping behavior, as suggested by prior research showing that a salient ingroup/outgroup distinction resulted in the tendency to favor ingroup members over outgroup members with respect to offering help (e.g., Levine & Crowther, 2008 [17]). However, other research shows that it is by recategorizing ingroup and outgroup members to a higher level of social inclusiveness that pro-ingroup biased helping behavior can be eliminated by diverting it to a more inclusive level of social categorization (e.g., Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005 [18]). Of relevance for the scopes of the present study, prior empirical work shows that group members perceive expressing ambivalent views of the ingroup as a form of helping behavior towards fellow group members, whereby helping the ingroup to overcome its shortcomings and defaults *vis-à-vis* relevant outgroups in the intergroup context (e.g., Costarelli & Colis, 2016 [19]; Hornsey, 2005[20]). As a consequence, consistent with the CIIM (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 [4]), such perceptions of own ambivalence as a contribution to the ingroup should also apply to newly-acquired fellow group members as resulting from social recategorization of one's own and other groups at a superordinate level of social inclusiveness. On the basis of this prior empirical work, we expected that perceptions of cognitive ambivalence towards the members of a group other than one's own as a form of helping such group members would be positively associated to perceiving these former outgroup members as fellow members of a common superordinate group of belongingness.

Besides, extensive empirical work has shown that reduced tendencies to help outgroup members are often accompanied by negative attitudes towards them (e.g., Dovidio, Gaertner, Validzic, Matoka, Johnson, & Frazier, 1997 [21] ; Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, & Reicher, 2002 [22]; Levine et al., 2005 [18]). On the basis of the emerging notion of cognitive outgroup ambivalence as a way of covertly conveying prejudicial attitudes, thus, we expected a negative association between perceptions of outgroup members as sharing an affiliation in a superordinate inclusive group and cognitive ambivalence towards them.

Finally, consistent with research showing that cognitive outgroup ambivalence elicits greater levels of outgroup-directed negative action tendencies (e.g., Costarelli & Gerłowska, 2015[1]), we expected that these two variables would be positively associated.

In the present study, the moderating role played by ingroup identification in such processes was assessed. This methodological choice is driven by the theoretical argument that ambivalence towards outgroups as a form of justification for expression of prejudice should be particularly functional for those individuals that, consistent with Social Identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986 [3]), greatly identify with one's own group.

However, social identity may differ in meanings and content in ways that are inherently linked to intergroup relations (Livingstone & Haslam, 2008 [23]). Accordingly, it can be anticipated that the strength of the ambivalence-social identification statistical association is moderated by such differences, conceived as the distinct *modes* of ingroup identification proposed by Roccas and colleagues (Roccas, Klar, & Liviatan, 2006 [24]). According to these researchers, ingroup identification is composed of two distinct, but related, tendencies: *glorification* of the group and *attachment* to it. People who glorify their own group are devoted to the ingroup and its symbols. Such unconditional devotion to the group leads to rejecting any form of criticism about it and drives group-glorifiers' beliefs that the ingroup is superior compared to other groups (Roccas et al., 2006 [24]). Conversely, ingroup attachment entails being dedicated and committed to fellow group members but also allows for constructive criticism towards the ingroup with intentions for its improvement (Roccas et al., 2006 [24]). On the basis of this prior theoretical and empirical work, Roccas and colleagues (2006 [24]) argued that a unidimensional conceptualization of ingroup identification obscures qualitative differences in individuals with respect to these two different facets of ingroup identification between people who 'glorify' their group and people who are 'attached' to their group.

Accordingly, the present research considers the moderating role of mode of social identification (ingroup glorification vs. attachment) in understanding the diverging effects of perceptions of such outgroup ambivalence as a contribution to the outgroup on outgroup-directed negative action tendencies as sequentially mediated by perceptions of outgroup members as sharing an affiliation in a superordinate inclusive group and ambivalence towards such outgroup members. Importantly, based on prior research (e.g., Costarelli & Gerłowska 2015 [1]), this pattern of findings should only be found when outgroup ambivalence is functional to

justify participants' previous expression of prejudice and following consistent negative intergroup action tendencies.

In the current research we expected to find these effects on the dependent variable after asking participants to express prejudice while suppressing it (by complying with an anti-prejudice 'local' norm). Specifically, first, we expected to find a moderating role of the ingroup glorification mode of social identification, such that perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as a contribution to the outgroup would be an indirect positive predictor of negative actions tendencies towards the outgroup through perceptions of outgroup members as sharing an affiliation in a superordinate inclusive group (first-stage mediator) and ambivalence towards such outgroup members (second-stage mediator) for high-glorifiers but not low-glorifiers. This should be the case because ingroup glorification has been found to be associated with greater proneness to commit hostile and even violent acts towards the members of outgroups because these latter are perceived as being inferior (e.g., Berndsen & Gausel, 2015 [25]; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, & Jayawickreme, 2009 [26]; Roccas et al., 2006 [24]).

Besides, we did not expect to observe a moderation effect of the ingroup attachment mode of social identification on the expected causal path above. This should be the case because, first, attachment has been found to be associated with greater proneness to social inclusion of non-group prototypical individuals, that is, outgroup members (e.g., Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009 [27]). Furthermore, prior research has found that attached ingroup identifiers are prone to view positively ambivalence towards the ingroup because they perceive expressing not only positive but also negative views about fellow group members as a way to help the ingroup to overcome its shortcomings and defaults *vis-à-vis* relevant outgroups in the intergroup context (Roccas et al., 2006 [24]).

To sum up, first, for people high but not low in ingroup glorification we predicted that perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as contributing the outgroup would be indirectly and positively related to outgroup-directed negative action tendencies, as sequentially mediated by lower levels of common ingroup identity with outgroup members and higher levels of outgroup ambivalence. Second, we predicted that this pattern of effects would not be observed for people high (or low) in attached identification to their group. Taken together, we therefore expected a moderated (serial-)mediation effect (Muller, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2005 [28]). Our test controlled for the relationship between glorification and attachment (following Roccas et al., 2006 [24]).

II. Method

2.1 Participants and Design

Eighty university students (41 women; age: $M = 23.10$, $SD = 4.19$) volunteered to take part in the current study. The dependent variable was negative action tendencies towards the outgroup (i.e. African immigrants living in the country as a general category). Preliminary analyses revealed that participant gender neither had a significant main effect on the dependent measure, nor did it moderate any of the reported effects (all $F_s < 2.24$, ns). Thus, we do not discuss this variable further.

2.2 Procedure

Before the start of a regular lecture, an experimenter invited students to volunteer to participate in the study. Subsequently, respondents received a questionnaire. As a cover story, participants were told that the questionnaire would be focused on their attitudes towards ethnic groups in their native country. Participants were asked to write down, in the first page of the questionnaire, their responses to the 'attachment' and 'glorification' scales, as adapted for the current target ingroup. Immediately afterwards, participants read a request to complete the following tasks 'in line with the widespread societal agreement (according to recent research results) with the standard prescribing that one should not favor members of one's own ethnic group over people of other ethnic groups'. Next, on a following page of the questionnaire, participants were presented with a task that was relevant to the preceding normative request. Specifically, they were given an opportunity to express their prejudice toward the outgroup. Importantly, prior to completing the prejudice items, participants read in the questionnaire 'Please answer the following questions regarding how you evaluate African immigrants with respect to nationals' in order to maximize the salience of their subsequent prejudice expression. Then, participants were asked to report their perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as a contribution to the outgroup. Subsequently, participants expressed their perceptions of a common ingroup identity with outgroup members. Then, participants expressed their cognitively-based ambivalence towards the outgroup by evoking an ambivalent attitude that was based on outgroup-related cognitions but not one that was based on emotions.

Finally, participants expressed their negative actions tendencies towards the outgroup (the dependent measure). Then, the manipulation checks of salience of anti-prejudice normative standard and outgroup ambivalence basis followed. Finally, participants provided demographic data. After the data were collected, participants were debriefed.

2.3 Measures

Unless otherwise mentioned, all ratings were made on 6-point Likert-type scales with no neutral point ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*).

2.3.1 Attachment and Glorification Modes of Ingroup Identification

Participants were asked to write down, in the first page of the questionnaire their responses to the ‘attachment’ and ‘glorification’ scales developed by Roccas and colleagues (2006), as adapted for the current target ingroup. The attachment (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .77$; $M = 4.71$, $SD = 0.90$) and glorification ($\alpha = .74$; $M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.95$) scales proved to be reliable and were thus averaged into two separate composite scores.

2.3.2 Prejudice

Participants were asked to answer a modified version of the General Evaluation Scale (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Rott, 1997 [29]). Specifically, they were asked to describe how they felt about members of the ingroup and the outgroup by using an eight-item scale (*warm, cold, negative, positive, nasty, friendly, respect, contempt*). Each of the items was administered to participants on a 6-point bipolar scale with no neutral point that allowed the direct expression of prejudice, ranging from 0 (*It applies much more to compatriots than African immigrants*) to 6 (*It applies much more to African immigrants than compatriots*). Then, composite scale score was created by averaging ratings across items ($\alpha = .70$; $M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.88$).

2.3.3 Perceived Contribution to the Outgroup of Outgroup Ambivalence

Perceptions concerning the contribution to the outgroup of holding ambivalent beliefs concerning the outgroup were assessed by a two-item scale. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with two randomly-ordered statements (*Viewing African immigrants in a mixed/both positive and negative way can contribute to African immigrants’ group*). The scale items showed satisfactory internal consistency and were thus averaged into a composite score of contribution to the outgroup of cognitively-based outgroup ambivalence ($\alpha = .71$, $M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.55$).

Perceived Common Ingroup Identity. In line with research on the CIIM, one-group perceptions were assessed with a single item measure (Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989 [5]). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the statement *Compatriots and African immigrants living in Italy are members of a common group (country-residents)* ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 1.54$).

2.3.4 Outgroup Ambivalence

Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with three randomly-ordered statements, as adapted from the scale of cognition-based ambivalence developed by Priester and Petty (1996 [30]). Specifically, the items evoked an ambivalent attitude that was based on outgroup-related cognitions (*Thinking about African immigrants, my ideas/opinion/beliefs about them are conflicted*). The scale items showed good consistency and were thus averaged into a composite score of cognition-based ambivalence ($\alpha = .84$; $M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.04$).

2.3.5 Outgroup-directed Negative Action Tendencies

The measure of ‘aggressive’ behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup was adapted from Mackie, Devos, and Smith (2000 [31]). It consisted of *oppose them, argue with them, and confront them*. Participants were asked to describe their usual reaction to members of the target outgroup. Thus, they were asked to rate each action tendency on a 6-point bipolar scale with no neutral point, ranging from 0 (*It applies much more to compatriots than African immigrants*) to 5 (*It applies much more to African immigrants than compatriots*). A Principal-components analysis revealed a one-factor solution that accounted for 62% of the variance in the data set. After oblique rotation, all of the items loaded substantially on a single factor (obliquely rotated loadings ranged from .62 to .87). Thus, a composite negative action tendency index was computed, measuring an

aggressive action tendency ($\alpha = 0.70$; $M = 3.76$, $SD = 0.83$). Participants' scores on this measure was examined as a dependent variable.

2.3.6 Anti-Prejudice Normative Standard Salience Manipulation Check

Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with the statement *As I was completing the above assignments, I felt as relevant the standard prescribing that one should not favor members of one's own group over those belonging to other ethnic groups when evaluating them.*

2.3.7 Ambivalence Basis Manipulation Check

Participants had to answer the question *To what extent did you feel that the evaluation concerning negative and positive sides of African immigrants you were asked to express concerned your emotions and feelings or your ideas and opinions?*. All ratings were made on one bipolar 6-point scale with no neutral point, ranging from 1 (*It regarded much more my emotions and feelings than my ideas and opinions*) to 6 (*It regarded much more my ideas and opinion and than my emotions and feelings*).

III. Results

3.1 Norm Salience Manipulation Check

In order to rule out the possibility of having made salient a "local" group norm that participants did not actually perceive as being salient as they were self-reporting their prejudicial attitudes, we checked participants' perception of norm salience. To this end, we conducted a preliminary simultaneous multiple regression on the measure of the extent to which participants had perceived the content of the norm of prejudice suppression that was made salient to them as being relevant as they were completing the evaluation task. Specifically, we used ingroup attachment and ingroup glorification as predictor variables. The variables were previously mean-centered (Aiken & West, 1991 [32]). Yielding no main effects, $t_s < -0.73$, $p_s > .46$, $\eta^2 = .007$, the analysis revealed that participants' perception of the salient "local" norm was independent from the predictors and participants indeed perceived the relevant norm as being different from the scale mean ($t = 7.87$, $p = .0001$) and actually quite salient as they were self-reporting their prejudicial attitudes ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.36$). This confirmed that the anti-prejudice normative context of participants' prejudice expression was salient for all participants as intended. Preliminary addition of ambivalence and prejudice scores as an additional mean-centered continuous predictor in the model established that prejudice did not significantly account for variance in scores of the dependent variable (t_s for main and interaction effects $< |1.58|$, $p_s > .11$). As a consequence, ambivalence and prejudice were excluded from the reduced model and analyses were repeated.

3.2 Ambivalence Basis Manipulation Check

We performed a preliminary simultaneous multiple regression on the measure of the extent to which participants had perceived the ambivalent outgroup attitude that they were asked to express as evoking cognitions or emotions, testing the same model as in the previous analysis. We found no main effects, $t_s < |1.46|$, $p_s > .14$, $\eta^2 = .027$, which revealed that participants' perception of cognitively-based outgroup ambivalence was independent from the predictors and different from the scale mean ($t = 4.11$, $p = .0001$) as they were self-reporting their prejudicial attitudes ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.29$). This confirmed that the self-reported ambivalent attitude towards the outgroup had a cognitive attitudinal basis as intended irrespective of participants' scores on the above predictors. Preliminary addition of ambivalence and prejudice scores as additional mean-centered predictors in the model established that ambivalence and prejudice did not significantly account for variance in scores of the dependent variable (t_s for main and interaction effects $< |1.44|$, $p_s > .15$). As a consequence, prejudice was excluded from the reduced model and analyses were repeated.

3.3 Path Analyses

Our moderated serial-mediation hypothesis specifies the processes through which the mode of identification affected the effects of perceiving ambivalence towards the outgroup as contributing to that group on intergroup negative action tendencies when under conditions of high salience of an anti-prejudice local norm. However, if indeed perceived contribution of outgroup ambivalence to the outgroup is bound to perceived common ingroup identity with its members, to the extent that this latter variable functions as a mechanism inhibiting the expression of outgroup ambivalence, it should correlate negatively with reported outgroup ambivalence. By the same token, both variables should sequentially predict increased tendencies to outgroup-directed negative action as a reactance form to the normative salience of an anti-prejudice local norm.

In order to test our aforementioned predictions, we used bootstrapped mediation analyses with 5,000 samples and bias corrected 95% CIs to compute a confidence interval around the indirect effect (i.e., the causal path through the mediator) for testing effects in models with small samples. If zero falls outside this interval, mediation can be said to be present. We used a mediation package the SPSS PROCESS macro) that Hayes (2018 [33]) provides for this procedure. Hayes' moderated serial-mediation models test all possible relationships between mediators, moderators, independent, and dependent variables. This statistical approach allowed us to take into account both the interrelation and the functional synergy of common ingroup identity perceptions and outgroup ambivalence in eliciting adverse intergroup action tendencies. Consistent with our diverging hypotheses for distinct modes of ingroup identification, we conducted the moderated serial-mediation model analysis separately for moderator variable (ingroup glorification/attachment).

Consistent with our hypothesis, the extent to which participants perceived a common ingroup identity with outgroup members was negatively correlated with their expression of cognitive ambivalence towards outgroup members (with glorification: $r_{\text{partial}} = -0.15$, $p = .05$; with attachment: $r_{\text{partial}} = -0.12$, $p = .15$). This finding provided empirical support for proceeding with testing whether perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as contributing the outgroup is bound to intergroup negative action tendencies through the mediating roles of common ingroup identity perceptions and outgroup ambivalence.

To this end, we conducted a moderated serial-mediation analysis, in which perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as contributing the outgroup was entered as the IV, outgroup-directed negative action intentions as the DV, common ingroup identity perceptions as the stage-one mediator, outgroup ambivalence as the stage-two mediator, and ingroup glorification as the moderator (Hayes, 2018 [33]: Model 85). This model allowed us to test (a) the specific indirect effect through common ingroup identity perceptions, (b) the specific indirect effect through outgroup ambivalence, and (c) the indirect effect through common ingroup identity perceptions and outgroup ambivalence in serial, thus taking into account the relationship between the two variables.

As predicted, at high levels of glorification, the indirect effect of perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as contributing the outgroup on increased outgroup-directed negative action intentions through common ingroup identity perceptions was significant (*boot coefficient* = -0.09., 95% CI [-0.19, -0.02]), while the indirect effect through outgroup ambivalence was not significant (*boot coefficient* = .06, 95% CI [-0.01, .14]). In line with predictions, no indirect effects were significant at low levels of glorification (common ingroup identity: *boot coefficient* = 0.00, 95% CI [-0.05, .06]; outgroup ambivalence: *boot coefficient* = .04, 95% CI [-0.01, .10]). The moderated mediation index was significant for common ingroup identity (-0.05, 95% CI [-0.11, -0.01]). As expected, the analysis further revealed a significant indirect effect through common ingroup identity and outgroup ambivalence as serial mediators at high levels of identification (*boot coefficient* = -0.02, 95% CI [-0.06, -0.01]) but not at low levels of identification, (*boot coefficient* = 0.00, 95% CI [-0.01, .01]). Importantly, the overall moderated serial-mediation index was significant (-0.01, 95% CI [-0.03, -0.01]).

We also conducted the same moderated serial-mediation analysis using ingroup attachment as the moderator variable. Consistent with our hypothesis, no indirect effects through common ingroup identity or outgroup ambivalence were significant at high or low levels of attachment (*boot coefficients* < .06, 95% CIs [-0.16, .12]), nor was the overall moderated serial-mediation index significant (.03, 95% CI [-0.03, .05]).

Overall the findings presented above strongly corroborate our hypothesis that, under conditions of a salient anti-prejudice normative context, weaker perceptions of ambivalence towards outgroup members as contributing that group elicit less common superordinate ingroup identity with those group members ($B = .26$) and more ambivalence towards them at higher but not lower levels of ingroup glorification, whilst ingroup attachment does not qualify such adverse behavioral effects of perceived contribution to the outgroup of ambivalence towards its members. The negative association between perceiving the expression of ambivalence towards outgroup members as a way of helping the outgroup and a common ingroup identity with the members of that group ($B = -0.15$) indicates that outgroup ambivalence is linked with increased rather than decreased perceptions of intergroup boundaries -a necessary condition for identifying in a common superordinate group, according to the CIIM (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Hence, it is theoretically plausible to expect the emerged pattern of results showing that outgroup ambivalence is predictive of more negative outgroup-directed action tendencies ($B = .24$).

IV. Conclusions

Over the last decades, European countries have been facing increasing migration inflows accompanied by high prevalence of negative prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants among majority members of the host societies. Numerous psychological studies have focused on negative univalent attitudes towards immigrants. Yet this prior empirical work has seldom investigated the behavioral consequences of ambivalent outgroup attitudes. By contrast, the novelty of the present research is in its adoption of a structurally complex perspective on the

factors involved in such adverse effects of outgroup ambivalence, as opposed to their typical consideration in isolation from each other in previous research (e.g., Costarelli & Gerłowska, 2015 [1]; Golec de Zavala et al., 2009 [26]; Leidner, Castano, Zaiser, & Giner-Sorolla, 2010 [34]; Roccas et al., 2006 [24]).

The goal of the present study was to investigate the process behind non-compliance with anti-prejudice norms through cognitive outgroup ambivalence. To this end, we provided a test of the hypothesis that, when instructed to provide a non-prejudicial evaluation of the outgroup, for high-but not low-ingroup glorifiers decreases in perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as a contributing the outgroup would elicit non-compliance with anti-prejudice norms because it would activate negative actions tendencies directed at the outgroup. Specifically, such decreased perceptions of ambivalence as contributing the outgroup, in turn, would be associated with a sequential pathway to negative action tendencies via perceptions of a common ingroup identity with outgroup members and outgroup ambivalence, whereby decreases in common ingroup identity perceptions would be associated with concurrent increases in outgroup ambivalence and, hence, with increases in negative tendencies directed at the outgroup.

Consistent with our hypothesis, unlike people who were attached to the ingroup, the more people glorified their ingroup, the less they perceived ambivalence towards outgroup members as a way to help the outgroup, the greater their unwillingness to social inclusiveness of outgroup members, the greater their ambivalence towards such outgroup members, and the greater was their intention to act negatively towards them. Specifically, at higher but not lower level of ingroup glorification, we found significant indirect effects of perceived ambivalence as contributing the outgroup on higher levels of outgroup-directed negative action tendencies in the context of an anti-prejudice social norm made salient. These indirect effects were both sequentially mediated through higher levels of perceived common superordinate ingroup identity with outgroup members and lower levels of ambivalence towards outgroup members. For high-glorifiers, the positive association between perceived ambivalence as contributing the outgroup and perceived common superordinate ingroup identity with outgroup members indicates that refraining from outgroup helping was enacted as refraining from perceiving outgroup members as fellow group members of a superordinate group, and hence their expression of reactance through subsequent discriminatory behavior (negative action tendencies) was associated with their prior expression of non-prejudicial outgroup attitudes 'covering' outgroup prejudice (outgroup ambivalence). As also predicted, tests of the indirect effects were not significant neither at lower levels of ingroup glorification nor at either lower or higher levels of ingroup attachment.

More generally, these results showed that the behaviorally adverse indirect sequential effects of weakly perceiving the expression of ambivalence towards outgroup members as a way of helping the outgroup depend critically on the content (mode) of social identification (Roccas et al., 2006 [24]). The instruction to conform to the social norm of non-differential intergroup evaluation (in keeping with the anti-prejudice local norm made salient to research participants prior to expressing their intergroup evaluation) indeed resulted in active efforts to refrain from conforming to it for those higher in group glorifying identification and by contrast in reactance to it through counternormative behavior (outgroup-directed negative action tendencies). Hence, the mere instruction to conform with an anti-prejudice local social norm evokes an immediate reactance response (counternormative outgroup-directed negative action tendencies) thanks to the prior expression of a seemingly normative ingroup attitude (ambivalence towards outgroup members). Such active resistance suggests that those high in ingroup glorification attempt to re-establish their threatened freedom (by a normative context enforcing non-prejudicial evaluation) through counter-normative behavior, that is, not enacting non-discrimination of outgroups. This indirect path is theoretically explicable because of group glorifying identifiers' pre-existing (a) reluctance both to enact outgroup helping (through perceptions of outgroup ambivalence as a contribution to the outgroup) and to perceive decreased intergroup boundaries (through perceptions of outgroup members as fellow group members of a common superordinate ingroup), and (b) proneness to express ambiguous intergroup attitudes 'covering' prejudice (through outgroup ambivalence) and adverse intergroup behavior (through negative action tendencies directed at outgroup members).

The contribution of the current work is twofold. On the one hand, its findings extend recent scholarship identifying some of the adverse consequences of outgroup ambivalence for intergroup behavior by demonstrating that such effects are contingent upon qualitatively different modes of ingroup identification. On the other hand, in the current study, by inducing psychological reactance in the research participants (Brehm, 1966), the instruction to express cognitive outgroup ambivalence resulted in heightened tendencies to act negatively towards the outgroup for those higher in glorifying identification and ambivalence. The observed positive link between glorification and the tendency to negative actions towards the outgroup is evidence of active resistance, rather than a passive one. If high-glorification participants had been passively resisting then we would have observed null effects. Such active resistance suggests that those high in ingroup glorification attempt to re-establish their threatened freedom (to be overtly prejudiced) through counter-behavior, that is, by expressing counternormative (negative) actions tendencies towards the outgroup. This suggests that expressing

seemingly balanced and reasoned ambivalent beliefs regarding outgroups may in fact be uniquely capable at facilitating the development of intergroup hostile action tendencies for the more prejudiced individuals (ingroup glorifiers).

However, in the present study, high-attachment participants could reasonably also be argued to have as much high identification with their group as high-glorification ones. Yet this situation did not produce increases in outgroup-directed negative action tendencies as a function of their cognitive ambivalence towards outgroup members. This suggests that for group identifiers, salient boundaries separating various social groups need not necessarily heighten the magnitude of negative intergroup behavior. In so doing, the current findings support the argument that distinguishing ingroup glorification from attachment serves to reveal the positive impact of ingroup attachment on intergroup relations (Roccas et al., 2006 [24]). Indeed, in the present study such form of ‘critical loyalty’ to the group (Hornsey & Imani, 2004 [35]; Schatz & Staub, 1997 [36]) was associated with no willingness to engage in negative intergroup behavior towards the outgroup.

On the other hand, the present work further extends prior evidence showing the backlash behavioral consequences of societal attempts to promote a view of the various social groups as sharing a common superordinate group identity (‘recategorization’ approach: Gaertner et al., 1989 [5]) for individuals who strongly identify with the ingroup (e.g., Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 2001 [37]).

4.1 Practical Implications

Finally, there are some practical insights to be gleaned from the current research. At the time of writing, many Western industrialized countries are struggling to accommodate immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers. However, in these territories there is a popular and political division about the treatment of these non-nationals. The results of the current research point to qualitative differences in group identity content (mode of ingroup identification) as one important point of origin for understanding the schisms in public debate about immigrants and refugees. Specifically, some people think ‘what it means’ to be a national is consistent with strong nationalistic views (ingroup glorification); whilst for others the meaning of the national identity is characterized by a critical loyalty to their country (ingroup attachment). The findings of the present study show that these two perspectives on national identity have very different implications for intergroup behavior. Accordingly, appeals which seek to increase public support for immigrants and refugees might consider these two different audiences when developing their strategies. In this respect, the present research may contribute to develop interventions with the purpose of ameliorating the climate of extant intergroup relations by clarifying the conditions under which ambivalence towards outgroups and perceptions of a superordinate common ingroup identity will or will not intensify proneness to intergroup negative behavior for strongly ingroup-attached and -glorifying group members, with the goal of designing informed strategies to minimize intergroup conflict covering the whole range of group identification modes that occur at the societal level.

V. Acknowledgements

This research was financially supported by the ‘Finanziamento straordinario di Ateneo una tantum per la ricerca 2019’ that was awarded to the Author by the University of Sassari.

References

- [1] Costarelli, S., & Gerłowska, J. (2015). Ambivalence, prejudice, and negative behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup: The moderating role of attitude basis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 29, 5, 852-866. DOI: 10.1080/02699931.2014.950196.
- [2] Brehm, J. W. (1999). The intensity of emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 2–22. DOI: 10.1207/s15327957pspr0301_1.
- [3] Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Austin & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 7-24, Chicago: Nelson-Hall).
- [4] Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model* (Philadelphia: Psychology Press).
- [5] Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 239–249. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.239.
- [6] Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J., Rust, M. C., Nier, J. A., Banker, B. S., Ward, C. M. (1999). Reducing intergroup bias: Elements of intergroup cooperation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 388-402. DOI: 10.1080/14792779343000004.
- [7] Dovidio, J., Gaertner, S. L., & Validzic, A. (1998). Intergroup bias: Status, differentiation, and a common in-group identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 109-120. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.75.1.109.

- [8] Monin, B., & Miller, D. T. (2001). Moral credentials and the expression of prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 33–43. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.81.1.33.
- [9] Scott, W. A.. (1966). Measures of cognitive structures. *Multivariate Behavior Research*, *1*, 391-395. DOI: 10.1207/s15327906mbr0103_9.
- [10] Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *39*, 406–415. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.39.3.406.
- [11] Brauer, M., Er-rafiy, A., Kawakami, K., and Phills, C. E. (2012). Describing a group in positive terms reduces prejudice less effectively than describing it in positive and negative terms. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 757–761. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.11.002.
- [12] Maio, G. R., Greenland, K., Bernard, M., & Esses, V. M. (2001). Effects of intergroup ambivalence on information processing: The role of physiological arousal. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *4*, 355–372. DOI: 10.1177/1368430201004004005.
- [13] Katz, I., Wackenhut, J., & Hass, R. G. (1986). Racial ambivalence, value duality, and behavior. In F. Dovidio & E. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 35-39, New York: Academic Press).
- [14] Crandall, C.S., & Eshleman, A. (2003). A Justification-Suppression model in the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 414-446. DOI: 10.1037/00332909.129.3.414.
- [15] Fleming, M. A., Petty, R. E., & White, P. H. (2005). Stigmatized targets and evaluation. Prejudice as a determinant of attribute scrutiny and polarization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 496-507. DOI: 10.1177/0146167204271585.
- [16] Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *55*, 893-905. DOI:101037/0022-3514.55.6.893.
- [17] Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The Responsive Bystander: How Social Group Membership and Group size can encourage as well as inhibit Bystander Intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*:1429–1439. DOI:10.1037/a0012634.
- [18] Levine ,M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* *31(4):443-53*. DOI: 10.1177/0146167204271651.
- [19] Costarelli, S., & Colis, E. (2016). In-group attachment and glorification, perceptions of cognition-based ambivalence as contributing to the group, and positive affect. *Current Research in Social Psychology*. *31-39*. <https://uiowa.edu/crisp/current-research-social-psychology>.
- [20] Hornsey, M. J. (2005). Why being right is not enough: Predicting defensiveness in the face of group criticism. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *16*, 301–334. DOI:1080/10463280500436040.
- [21] Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Validzic, A., Matoka, K., Johnson, B., & Frazier, S. (1997). Extending the benefits of re-categorization: Evaluations, self-disclosure and helping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *33*, 401-420. DOI: 10.1006/jesp.1997.1327.
- [22] Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorisation and bystander intervention: Two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *7*, 1452–1463. DOI: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb01446.
- [23] Livingstone, A., & Haslam, S. A. (2008). The Importance Of Social Identity Content In A Setting Of Chronic Social Conflict: Understanding Intergroup Relations In Northern Ireland. *British Journal Of Social Psychology*, *41*, 1–21. DOI: 10.1348/014466607x200419.
- [24] Roccas, S., Klar, Y., & Liviatan, I. (2006). The paradox of group-based guilt: Modes of national identification, conflict vehemence, and reactions to the ingroup’s moral violations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 698-711. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.698.
- [25] Berndsen, M., & Gausel, N. (2015). When majority members exclude ethnic minorities: The impact of shame on the desire to object to immoral acts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45(6)*, 728–741. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.2127.
- [26] Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., Eidelson, R., & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism and its social consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 6, 496-507. DOI: 10.1037/a0016904.
- [27] Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V., & Brown, R. (2009). National identification and anti-immigrant prejudice: Individual and contextual effects of national definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *72*, 24–38. DOI: 10.1177/019027250907200104.

- [28] Muller, D., Judd, C. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2005). When moderation is mediated and mediation is moderated. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 852– 863. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.89.6.852.
- [29] Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Rott, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 19-34. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73.
- [30] Priester, J. R., & Petty, R. E. (1996). The gradual threshold model of ambivalence: Relating the positive and the negative bases of attitudes to subjective ambivalence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 431-449. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.3.431.
- [31] Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 602-616. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602.
- [32] Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. (Newbury park, CA: Sage).
- [33] Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. A regression-based approach* (London: The Guilford Press).
- [34] Leidner, B., Castano, E., Zaiser, E., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2010). Ingroup glorification, moral disengagement, and justice in the context of collective violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 8, 1115-1129. DOI: 10.1177/0146167210376391.
- [35] Hornsey, M. J., & Imani, A. (2004). Criticizing groups from the inside and the outside: An identity perspective on the intergroup sensitivity effect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 365–383. DOI: 10.1177/01461672032612.
- [36] Schatz R. T., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism: Personality correlates and individual-group relations. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 229-245, New York: Nelson-Hall).
- [37] Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. R. (2001). Similarity as a source of discrimination: The role of group identification. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*, 621–640. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.72.