

Ingroup Glorification, Common Ingroup Identity with, Ambivalence towards, Outgroup Members, and Positive Intergroup Action Tendencies: A Moderated-Mediation Model

Sandro Costarelli

University of Sassari, Sassari, Italy

Abstract: *One study tested a moderated-mediation model exploring the moderating role of the glorification mode of ingroup identification on the causal path linking perceived common ingroup identity, cognitive outgroup ambivalence, and positive 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" levels as well as their perceptions of common ingroup identity with, and their outgroup ambivalence towards, outgroup members. As expected, findings indicate that after expressing prejudice in a normative context inducing prejudice suppression, when participants self-reported positive outgroup-directed, action tendencies after the expression of ambivalent beliefs concerning the outgroup, for participants weakly glorifying their ingroup, the greater their willingness to social inclusiveness of outgroup members, the weaker their ambivalence towards such outgroup members, and the greater was their intention to act positively towards them.*

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent research suggests that outgroup ambivalence can promote more hostile outgroup-directed action tendencies because it elicits feelings of covertly voicing a normatively sanctioned outgroup attitude whose consistent adverse behavioural byproducts can thus be overtly displayed (e.g., Costarelli & Gerłowska, 2015 [1]). However, we argue that the existing literature has not fully considered the conditions under which the instruction to conform to anti-prejudice norms may be complied with. Specifically, we suggest that people who are already weakly pre-disposed to intergroup hostility (by their scarce supremacist identity content) may be responsive in peculiar ways, as yet unexplored, to the instruction to conform to anti-prejudice norms.

Social-psychological research has long highlighted that the mere everyday casual meeting of the members of those groups that are the target of one's 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 behavioural domains. However, the Common Ingroup Identity Model (CIIM: Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 [4]) proposes that intergroup contact has the potential to counter this adverse behavioural tendency by fostering social 're-categorization' (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 behaviour 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 re-categorization at a superordinate level reduces not only pro-ingroup biased evaluation (e.g., Gaertner, Dovidio, Rust, Nier, Banker, & Ward, 1999 [6]) but also behaviour (e.g., Dovidio, Gaertner, & Validzic, 1998 [7]). Based on this prior theoretical and empirical work, interventions at the societal level promoting intergroup contact are often employed to decrease the prevalence and strength of negative attitudes and consistent adverse behavioural tendencies (e.g., pro-ingroup biased actions) 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 pro-social behavioural consequences of conditions that can decrease the strength 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 since group members can be motivated to express ambivalent attitudes towards outgroups to cover pro-ingroup biased attitudes and behavior, the decreased expression of such ambivalence has the potential to be bound to positive 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, structurally one-dimensional outgroup attitudes (prejudice) and bidimensional (ambivalence) appear to be inherently incompatible with those held by the same individual. However, the attitudinal condition of being ambivalent and its relation with being prejudiced relies on 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 non-prejudiced self-image, prior research shows that individuals can feign rejection of prejudice while still managing to express it (e.g., Monin & Miller, 2001 [8]). Importantly, Brauer and colleagues (Brauer, Er-rafy, Kawakami, & Phillips, 2012 [11]) found empirical support for the notion that the expression of ambivalence is considered a balanced and acceptable attitude when it is expressed regarding 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 an outgroup (Maio, Greenland, Bernard, & Esses, 2001 [12]). 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 role played by the expression of outgroup ambivalence on the pro-social effects of perceiving outgroup members as fellow group members of a superordinate inclusive on positive intergroup action tendencies, as detailed later.

To begin with, according to Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986 [3]), since groups exist by their reciprocal distinctiveness, group members are concerned with the need to differentiate the ingroup from other groups and, hence, they portray their own group as better (prejudice) than relevant comparison outgroups and more worth of being favoured (discrimination). For example, this tendency applies to intergroup helping behavior, as suggested by prior research showing that a salient ingroup/outgroup distinction resulted in the tendency to favour ingroup members over outgroup members for offering help (e.g., Levine & Crowther, 2008 [17]). However, other research shows that it is by re-categorizing ingroup and outgroup members to a higher level of social inclusiveness that pro-ingroup biased behavior can be eliminated by diverting it to a more inclusive level of social categorization (e.g., Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005 [18]; also see Costarelli, 2020 [19], 2021 [20]).

As a consequence, consistent with the CIIM (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000 [4]), based on this prior empirical work, we expected that perceptions of newly-acquired fellow group members as resulting from social re-categorization of one's own and other groups at a superordinate level of social inclusiveness would be negatively associated to the expression of cognitive ambivalence towards these former outgroup members. This should be the case because, first, extensive empirical work has shown, for example, 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]). Based on 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. Besides, since research shows that cognitive outgroup ambivalence elicits greater levels of outgroup-directed negative action

tendencies (e.g., Costarelli & Gerłowska, 2015 [1], we expected that cognitive outgroup ambivalence would be negatively associated with outgroup-directed positive action tendencies.

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 the expression of prejudice should be particularly functional for those individuals who,

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]). Based on this prior theoretical and empirical work, Roccas and colleagues (2006 [24]) argued that a unidimensional conceptualization of ingroup identification obscures qualitative differences in individuals concerning 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 ingroup glorification in understanding the diverging effects of perceptions of outgroup members as sharing an affiliation in a superordinate inclusive group on outgroup-directed positive action tendencies as mediated by 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 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 members as sharing an affiliation in a superordinate inclusive group would be an indirect positive predictor of positive actions tendencies towards the outgroup through outgroup ambivalence (the mediator) for low-glorifiers but not high-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 (e.g., Berndsen & Gausel, 2015 [25]; Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, & Jayawickreme, 2009 [26]; Roccas et al., 2006 [24]).

To sum up, first, for people low but not high in ingroup glorification we predicted that perceptions of common ingroup identity with outgroup members would be indirectly and positively related to outgroup-directed positive action tendencies, as mediated by lower levels of outgroup ambivalence. Taken together, we therefore expected a moderated-mediation effect (Muller, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2005 [28]).

II. METHOD

2.1 Participants and Design

One hundred eighty-five university students (112 women; age: $M = 21.01$, $SD = 2.12$) volunteered to take part in the current study. The dependent variable was positive 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 < 2.50, 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, on the first page of the questionnaire, their responses to the 'glorification' scale, 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 favour members of one's own ethnic group over people of other ethnic groups'. Next, on the following page of the questionnaire, participants were presented with a task that was

relevant to the preceding normative request. Specifically, they were allowed to express their prejudice toward the outgroup. Importantly, before completing the prejudice items, participants read in the questionnaire 'Please answer the following questions regarding how you evaluate African immigrants for nationals' 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 positive action tendencies towards the outgroup (the dependent measure). Then, the manipulation checks of the 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 Glorification Mode of Ingroup Identification

Participants were asked to write down, on the first page of the questionnaire their responses to the 'glorification' scale developed by Roccas and colleagues (2006), as adapted for the current target ingroup. The glorification scale (Cronbach's $\alpha = .74$; $M = 2.92$, $SD = 0.95$) proved to be reliable and was thus averaged into a composite score.

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, a composite scale score was created by averaging ratings across items ($\alpha = .77$; $M = 3.27$, $SD = 0.89$).

2.3.3 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)' ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.53$).

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/opinions/beliefs about them are conflicted*). The scale items showed good consistency and were thus averaged into a composite score of cognition-based ambivalence ($\alpha = .86$; $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.16$).

2.3.5 Outgroup-directed Positive Action Tendencies

The measure of 'positive' behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup consisted of positive-benevolent approach behaviors (*talking to, mingling with, and finding out more about 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 63% 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 .87 to .88). Thus, a composite positive action tendency index was computed, measuring positive action tendency ($\alpha =$

0.71; $M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.89$). Participants' scores on this measure were 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 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

To rule out the possibility of having made salient a local group norm that participants did not 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 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 glorification as a predictor variable. The variable was previously mean-centered (Aiken & West, 1991 [32]). Yielding no main effects, $t_s < -1.68$, $p_s > .95$, $\eta^2 = .015$, the analysis revealed that participants' perception of the salient local norm was independent of the predictor and quite salient as they were self-reporting their prejudicial attitudes ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.65$). This confirmed that the anti-prejudice normative context of participants' prejudice expression was salient for all participants as intended.

3.2 Ambivalence Basis Manipulation Check

We performed a preliminary 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, $t_s < -0.72$, $p_s > .46$, $\eta^2 = .003$, which revealed that participants' perception of cognitively-based outgroup ambivalence was independent of the predictor as they were self-reporting their prejudicial attitudes ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.26$). 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 predictor.

3.3 Path Analysis

Our moderated-mediation hypothesis specifies the processes through which the glorification mode of identification affected the effects of perceiving outgroup members as belonging to a common ingroup on intergroup positive action tendencies through ambivalence towards the outgroup when under conditions of high salience of an anti-prejudice local norm. However, if indeed lack of 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 predict negatively reported outgroup ambivalence. By the same token, the latter variable should sequentially predict negatively increased tendencies to outgroup-directed positive action in line with the normative salience of an anti-prejudice local norm.

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-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 positive intergroup action tendencies. Consistent with our diverging hypotheses for distinct modes of ingroup identification, we conducted the moderated-mediation model analysis

for the moderator variable (ingroup glorification). To this end, we conducted a moderated-mediation analysis, in which common ingroup identity perceptions were entered as the IV, outgroup-directed positive action intentions as the DV, outgroup ambivalence as the mediator, and ingroup glorification as the moderator (Hayes, 2018 [33]). Regression analyses were used to investigate our hypotheses.

Results indicated that, at low levels of glorification, common ingroup perceptions decreased outgroup ambivalence ($B = -0.20$, $SE = .07$, 95% CI [-0.35, -0.04]), and that ambivalence decreased positive behavioral intentions ($B = -0.12$, $SE = .06$, 95% CI [-0.23, -0.01]), while common ingroup was not a significant predictor of positive behavioral intentions after controlling for the mediator, outgroup ambivalence ($B = .03$, $SE = .04$, 95% CI [-0.05, .11]). These results support the mediational hypothesis. The moderated-mediation index was significant for outgroup ambivalence (-0.01, $SE = .01$, 95% CI [-0.04, -0.01]). In line with predictions, no indirect effects were significant at high levels of glorification (boot coefficients $< .04$, 95% CIs [-0.07, .16]).

Overall the findings strongly corroborate our hypothesis that, under conditions of a salient anti-prejudice normative context, stronger perceptions of a common superordinate ingroup identity with outgroup members elicit more positive behavioral intentions by decreasing ambivalence towards those group members at lower but not higher levels of ingroup glorification. The negative association between perceiving a common ingroup identity with outgroup members and the expression of ambivalence towards the members of that group 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 weaker outgroup ambivalence is predictive of more positive outgroup-directed action tendencies.

IV. CONCLUSION

Over the last decades, European countries have been facing increasing migration inflows accompanied by a high prevalence of negative prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants among the 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., 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 low- but not high-ingroup glorifiers, increases in perceptions of a common ingroup identity with outgroup members would show compliance with anti-prejudice norms because such perceptions predict more positive actions tendencies directed at the outgroup. Specifically, such increased perceptions of a common ingroup identity with outgroup members, in turn, would be associated with a sequential pathway to positive action tendencies via outgroup ambivalence, whereby increases in common ingroup identity perceptions would be associated with concurrent decreases in outgroup ambivalence and, hence, with increases in positive action tendencies directed at the outgroup.

Consistent with our hypothesis, unlike people who were more glorifying the ingroup, for the low-glorifier participants, the greater their willingness to social inclusiveness of outgroup members, the weaker their ambivalence towards such outgroup members, and the stronger their intention to act positively towards them. Specifically, at lower but not higher levels of ingroup glorification, we found significant indirect effects of perceptions of a common superordinate ingroup identity with outgroup members on higher levels of outgroup-directed positive action tendencies in the context of an anti-prejudice social norm made salient. These indirect effects were statistically mediated through lower levels of ambivalence towards outgroup members. In other words, for low-glorifiers, the negative association between perceived common superordinate ingroup identity with outgroup members and expressed ambivalence towards the outgroup indicates complying with anti-prejudice norms through subsequent non-discriminatory intergroup behavior (positive action tendencies) and hence refraining from the prior expression of their attitudes 'covering' outgroup prejudice (outgroup ambivalence). As also predicted, tests of the indirect effects were not significant at higher levels of ingroup glorification. More generally, these results showed that the behaviorally pro-social mediating effects of weakly expressing ambivalence towards outgroup members depend critically on the content (mode) of social identification (Roccas et al., 2006 [24]).

The contribution of the current work is the extension of prior evidence (e.g., Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 2001 [35]) by showing the positive behavioral consequences of societal attempts to promote a view of the various social groups as sharing a common superordinate group identity ('re-categorization' approach: Gaertner et al., 1989 [5]) for individuals who weakly identify with the ingroup and are weakly ambivalent in their cognitions regarding the outgroup.

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). The findings of the present study show that this specific perspective on national identity can have peculiar implications for intergroup behavior, depending on its centrality to the self.

Accordingly, appeals which seek to increase public support for immigrants and refugees might consider these two different audiences (i.e. lower and higher ingroup identifiers) when developing their strategies. In this respect, the present research may contribute to developing interventions to ameliorate the climate of extant intergroup relations by clarifying the conditions under which (e.g., Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 2001 [35]) and ambivalence towards outgroups will or will not intensify proneness to intergroup positive behavior for ingroup-glorifying group members, to design informed strategies to minimize intergroup conflict covering the whole range of group identification modes that occur at the societal level.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was financially supported by the "Finanziamento straordinario di Ateneo una tantum per la ricerca 2020" which 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-rafy, 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:10.1037/0022-3514.55.6.893.
- [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., (2020). Ambivalence as A Contribution to the Outgroup and Negative Action Tendencies. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Studies*, 5, 10, 28-38, ISSN: 2582-1601, www.ijahss.com.
- [20] Costarelli, S., (2021). Ingroup Glorification and Attachment, Cognitive Ambivalence towards, and Negative Action Tendencies against, Outgroups. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Studies*, 6, 2, 19-22, ISSN: 2582-1601, www.ijahss.com.
- [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] 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.