



University of Richmond
UR Scholarship Repository

Jepson School of Leadership Studies articles,
book chapters and other publications

Jepson School of Leadership Studies


2015

Political ideology and American intergroup discrimination: A patriotism perspective

Crystal L. Hoyt
University of Richmond, choyt@richmond.edu

Aleah Goldin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/jepson-faculty-publications>

 Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

This is a pre-publication author manuscript of the final, published article.

Recommended Citation

Hoyt, Crystal L., and Aleah Goldin. "Political ideology and American intergroup discrimination: A patriotism perspective." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 156, no. 4 (2015): 369-381. doi:10.1080/00224545.2015.1106434.

This Post-print Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jepson School of Leadership Studies articles, book chapters and other publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

Political ideology and American intergroup discrimination: A patriotism perspective

Crystal L. Hoyt and Aleah Goldin

University of Richmond, Richmond, VA, US

Manuscript word count: 6470 words

Author Note

Crystal L. Hoyt, Department of Psychology and Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond; Aleah Goldin, Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond.

We acknowledge and thank Conor Flanagan, Lindsay Hudson, and Colin Sweeney for their contributions to this research.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Crystal L. Hoyt, Jepson Hall, University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia, 23173; Email: choyt@richmond.edu.

Abstract

In this research we take the theoretical approach advocated by Greenwald and Pettigrew (2014) and demonstrate the powerful role of ingroup favoritism, rather than hostility, in American intergroup biases. Specifically, we take a novel perspective to understanding the relationship between political ideology and discrimination against ethnic-minority Americans by focusing on the role of patriotism. Across three studies, we show that political ideology is a strong predictor of resource allocation biases and this effect is mediated by American patriotism and not by prejudice or nationalism. Conservatives report greater levels of patriotism than liberals, and patriotism is associated with donating more to American, as opposed to ethnic-minority American, organizations. We further show that the link between patriotism and partiality to the national group is mediated by stronger ‘American=White’ associations. These findings have important implications for intergroup relations and diversity-related policy issues in the United States.

Keywords: Political ideology, patriotism, discrimination, intergroup biases, favoritism

Political ideology and American intergroup discrimination: A patriotism perspective

As a patchwork nation of diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds, the United States struggles with complicated intergroup relations. The diversity of Americans has increased in the last few decades as a result of both increased immigration as well as differential birth rates across ethnic groups (Sears, Citrin, Cheleden, & van Laar, 1999). Concomitant with this increasing recognition of ethnic identities in politics, law, and social organizations have been increasing tensions, at both the institutional and the individual level, with finding the “proper balance between the national ‘one’ and the ethnic ‘many’” (Citrin, Wong, & Duff, 2001; p. 71).

In this research we examine American intergroup relations by focusing on the tensions between support for ‘Americans’ versus support for ‘ethnic-minority Americans.’ These tensions are directly relevant to political battles over key diversity-related policy issues such as affirmative action and immigration and are strongly informed by political ideologies. The prevailing approach to understanding intergroup relations within the United States has been to focus on hostility, or negative attitudes. In this research we take the theoretical approach advocated by Greenwald and Pettigrew (2014) and demonstrate the powerful role of ingroup favoritism, rather than hostility, in American intergroup biases. Specifically, we take a novel perspective to understanding the relationship between political ideology and discrimination against ethnic-minority Americans by focusing on the role of patriotism.

Political ideology has been shown to play an important role in intergroup biases (Hoyt, 2012; Jost & Sidanius, 2004). Political ideologies are a powerful set of beliefs that influence a wide variety of attitudes, behaviors, and decisions (Jost, Federico, & Napier, 2009; Jost, Nosek, & Gosling, 2008). Ideological differences amongst conservatives and liberals are often construed as having two core dimensions: the extent to which they advocate for (liberals) or are resistant to

(conservatives) social change, and the extent to which they reject (liberals) or accept (conservatives) inequality (Jost et al., 2008; Kerlinger, 1984). In general, liberals are more likely than conservatives to endorse multiculturalism (Citrin, Sears, Muste, & Wong, 2001). For example, when asked the extent to which they believe that the increasing diversity in the US that is created by immigrants impacts American culture, more liberals said it improves (53%) than said it threatens (31%) the culture whereas more conservatives indicated it threatens American culture (44%) than said it improves it (40%; Gallup Poll, March 2001).

In this research we seek to understand the mechanism driving the differences between liberals' and conservatives' behaviors toward American minority groups. The prevailing social psychological approach to understanding intergroup relations has been to focus on hostility, or negative attitudes, with the research literature showing robust moderate associations between conservatism and prejudicial hostility (Hodson & Busseri, 2012). Beyond hostility, however, much intergroup prejudice and discrimination is motivated by partiality toward one's ingroup (Brewer, 1999; Greenwald & Pettigrew, 2014). In their recent review, Greenwald and Pettigrew note that "ingroup favoritism is plausibly more significant as a basis for discrimination in contemporary American society than is outgroup-directed hostility" (p. 1). Adopting this perspective, we test the prediction that it is ingroup favoritism, in the form of American patriotism, which drives ideologically-based differences in American intergroup discrimination.

Patriotism is generally considered to be a good indicator of one's national attachment and commitment (Huddy & Khatib, 2007). Unlike nationalism, an ideology associated with perceived superiority of one's ingroup over other groups, patriotism is typically not associated with outgroup derogation (Kimmelmeier & Winter, 2008). Conservatives reliably show stronger national attachment and are more likely to endorse patriotism and loyalty toward one's group

than liberals (Bealey, 1999; Graham, Haidt, & Nosek, 2009; Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999; van der Toorn, Nail, Liviatan, & Jost, 2014). In a 2010 Gallup/USA Today poll, 48% of conservatives identified themselves as “extremely patriotic” whereas only 19% of liberals did; further, 14% of liberals described themselves as “not especially patriotic” whereas only 2% of conservatives used that self-description.

Finally, partiality to ‘Americans’ over ethnic-minority Americans might represent, to at least some extent, a partiality to ‘Whites’ over ethnic minorities. Although the category ‘American’ is not explicitly linked to any racial or ethnic group, Devos and Banaji have shown that the category of ‘American’ is generally implicitly associated with one particular ethnic group: ‘White’ (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Devos, Gavin, & Quintana, 2010). And this association is stronger the more people implicitly identify with America. In this research we investigate the extent to which associations of ‘American = White’ mediates the link between patriotism and American intergroup bias.

The Current Research

In this research we examine American intergroup discrimination by focusing on the role of patriotism in ideologically-driven differences in support of ‘Americans’ versus ‘ethnic-minority Americans.’ Across three studies we test the prediction that more conservative participants will show greater partiality to the national American group relative to ethnic-minority American groups in comparison to more liberal participants. In this research we use a measure of group partiality common in intergroup relations research: resource allocation (Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002; Mummendey & Otten, 1998). In the first two studies we test the prediction that these responses are driven by identification with the national group (patriotism) and not negative attitudes toward the ethnic groups (blatant or subtle

prejudice) or beliefs regarding the superiority of the United States over other groups (nationalism). In addition, we test how well our data fit the proposed model and compare this fit to an alternative model with political ideology mediating the link between patriotism and partiality. In study 3 we further test the prediction that the positive link between patriotism and partiality to the national group will be mediated by stronger beliefs that the category 'American' is associated with the category 'White.'

Study 1

Method

Participants and Procedure. Two hundred and eleven American students completed this online study. Participants were recruited to voluntarily participate in the study and were entered into a raffle for a chance to win a monetary prize. The ethnic-minority groups investigated in this first study were Arab, Chinese, and Jewish Americans. Across all studies participants who self-identify as belonging to the ethnic group(s) under investigation were not included in the sample. The sample was 70% female with a median age of 20 ($M = 21.79$, $SD = 6.96$) and was 83% White American, 10% African American, and 4% Latino/a American. After giving consent, participants answered two open-ended questions followed by a word scramble task before completing the questionnaires of interest.¹ After responding to the measures of prejudice, political ideology, and patriotism, participants were given an opportunity to donate money to various American charities. At the completion of the study, the researchers donated the funds to the various organizations.

Measures.

Political Ideology. Liberalism and conservatism were assessed independently in this first study (Lambert & Chasteen, 1997). Using a 6-point scale ranging from strongly do not agree to

strongly agree, participants indicated their agreement to the following two items: “I am very conservative” and “I am very liberal.” The items were combined such that higher values indicate greater conservatism ($r = -.58, p < .001$).

Patriotism. Previous research has shown that patriotism defined in terms of national identity, the extent to which people see themselves or describe themselves as American, is a powerful and positive ideology for both liberals and conservatives (Huddy & Khatib, 2007). Using the same 6-point scale as above, patriotism was assessed with a single item measuring the extent to which they agree with the statement “I am very American.”

Hostile prejudicial attitudes. Using a modified version of Pettigrew and Meerten’s (1995) blatant and subtle prejudice scale, participants indicated their attitude toward the three ethnic-American groups focused on in this study: Arab, Chinese, and Jewish Americans. Using a 6-point scale, participants responded to 8 blatant prejudice items and 9 subtle prejudice items for each ethnic-minority American group (see Appendix). The blatant and subtle items were combined to form a global prejudice measure (Neumann & Seibt, 2001) and the scale for each of the ethnic-American groups was highly reliable (all α s $> .80$). A composite score of the attitudes of all three sub-groups was computed with higher scores indicating greater levels of prejudice.

Resource allocation: Monetary donation task. Participants were told that as a thank you for completing the survey, we would donate \$1 to the organization(s) of their choice. Participants were shown a list with one American (American Education Services) and three ethnic-minority American organizations (American Chinese Culture and Education Foundation, American Islamic Congress, and Jewish Federation of North America). The \$1 donation could be given in a \$1 increment, two 50 cent increments, or four 25 cent increments. Participants were told that a donation would not be made if they went over the \$1 benchmark. Resource allocation bias is

examined in this zero-sum allocation task by assessing the dollar amount given to the *American* charity (American Education Services), not the *ethnic-minority American* charities.²

Results and Discussion

In all studies a few people failed to properly complete the resource allocation task (most of them contributed more than the allotted amount). Analyses with and without these individuals yield similar results; thus, we retain all participants for analyses across all studies. Although the predicted effects were not expected to be limited to White Americans, for each study separate analyses controlling for ethnic identity (categorized as either majority or minority) reveal similar outcomes; we report results that do not control for identity.

In this study, the patriotism variable was slightly negatively skewed. A reflection and square root transformation reduced the skewness and analyses with the transformed and untransformed variables are indistinguishable; analyses with the untransformed variable are presented. Table 1 presents the scale means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the study variables. As can be seen from the correlational data, greater levels of conservatism are associated with greater levels of patriotism, greater levels of reported prejudice, and a greater likelihood to donate to the national organization. The significant yet moderate correlations between political ideology and patriotism across all studies support the argument that the constructs are related but distinct.

To test the prediction that patriotism, and not hostile prejudicial attitudes, mediates the impact of political ideology on donation bias, Hayes' Process macro (2013) Model 4 was used to compute bootstrap-based confidence intervals (95%) for the estimates of the conditional indirect effects of political ideology on donation bias through both patriotism and prejudice (see Figure 1). Results indicate that the indirect effect of patriotism on monetary donation bias was

significant with a 95% confidence interval of {.255, 2.326}. However, the indirect effect of prejudice was not significant {-.376, 1.860}. In sum, the direction of the paths indicate that more conservative ideologies are associated with greater levels of patriotism and greater levels of prejudice however only patriotism predicts greater donation to the American organization.

Finally, to augment the direction of causality in our argument we examined the fit of our model, patriotism mediating the link between ideology and donation bias, compared to an alternative model with ideology mediating the link between patriotism and donation bias. In support of our argument, the ideology-patriotism-donation bias model indicated an adequate fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 1.99, p = .159$; RMSEA = .069; CFI = .938) whereas the patriotism-ideology-donation bias model did not ($\chi^2 = 6.17, p = .013$; RMSEA = .157; CFI = .678).

Study 2

To test the generalizability of the findings across forms of measurement, all constructs were assessed with alternative measures in this study. Additionally, measures of nationalism were assessed to demonstrate that these partiality effects are independent of beliefs regarding the superiority of the United States over other groups. Furthermore, to simplify our understanding of the data, the remaining studies focus on one ethnic-minority group: Arab Americans.

Method

Participants and Procedure. One hundred and fifty-seven American students took part in this online study and were entered into a raffle for a chance to win a monetary prize. The sample was 73% female with a median age of 19 ($M = 19.69, SD = 3.48$) and was 78% White American, 11% Asian American, and 7% African American. After providing informed consent, participants completed a survey that included measures of their self-reported prejudice,

nationalism, political ideology, and patriotism before they were given an opportunity to donate money to various American charities.

Measures.

Political ideology. In this study participants indicated their political ideology on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (liberal) to 9 (conservative; Jost et al., 2009).

Patriotism. Using a 9-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, patriotism was assessed with a 12-item scale including items from the scale in the American National Election Studies (ANES; Conover & Feldman, 1987) and Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth and Malle's (1994) scale (see Appendix). Items include "I am proud to be an American" and "Patriots are the ones who have made America great" ($\alpha = .93$).

Nationalism. Nationalism was assessed with a 4-item scale modified from Neuliep and McCroskey's (1997) scale. Participants indicated their agreement on a 9-point scale to statements including "Americans should be the role model for non-Americans," and "Non-Americans are smart to look up to Americans" ($\alpha = .79$).

Hostile prejudicial attitudes. Using a modified, 8-item, version of Echebarria-Echabe and Fernandez-Guede's (2007) anti-Arab prejudice scale, participants indicated their attitude toward Arab-Americans using a 9-point scale. For example, participants indicated the extent to which they agree that Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East "are a future threat for America" and "are not patriotic" ($\alpha = .81$).

Resource allocation: Monetary donation task. Similar to Study 1, participants were told that we would donate \$1 to the organization(s) of their choice to thank them for completing the survey. Participants were shown a list of 2 organizations: American Institute and Arab-American Institute. Participants were told that a donation would not be made if they went over the \$1

benchmark and this time the \$1 donation could be given in 10 cent increments. Again, the amount donated to the American charity (American Institute) is used as the primary dependent variable and the money was donated to the organizations at the completion of the study.

Results and Discussion

Table 2 presents the scale means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the variables. As can be seen, greater levels of conservatism are associated with greater levels of patriotism, nationalism, and a greater likelihood to donate money to the American organization.

Similar to Study 1, indirect effect analyses using the bootstrapping approach were conducted to test the prediction that patriotism, and not prejudice or nationalism, mediates the impact of conservative ideology on monetary donation bias (see Figure 2). Results indicate that the indirect effect of patriotism on donation bias was significant with a 95% confidence interval of {.592, 4.249}. However, the indirect effects of prejudice {-.144, 1.097} and nationalism {-1.391, .658} are not significant. The direction of the paths indicate that more conservative ideologies are associated with greater levels of patriotism and nationalism however only patriotism mediates the link to greater bias in donating money to the American organization.

Finally, our ideology-patriotism-donation bias model indicated a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = .24, p = .621$; RMSEA = .000; CFI = 1.0) whereas the alternative patriotism-ideology-donation bias model did not fit the data ($\chi^2 = 9.68, p = .002$; RMSEA = .235; CFI = .862).

Study 3

The primary goal of Study 3 was to test the prediction that patriotism is associated with bias in donating to American groups over ethnic-minority American groups in part because the category 'American' is associated with one ethnicity: 'White.' First, we seek to replicate the findings from the first two studies: political ideology strongly predicts donation bias, this effect

is driven by American patriotism and not by nationalism, and the reverse causal model does not fit the data well. Next, we test the prediction that the link between patriotism and donation bias is mediated by stronger associations of White Americans, relative to Arab Americans, with the category ‘American.’

Method

Participants and Procedure. Ninety-six Americans recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk took part in this online study and were compensated 25 cents (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). The sample was 56% female with a median age of 31 ($M = 36.27$, $SD = 13.65$) and was 69% White American, 9% Asian American, and 9% African American. After providing consent, participants completed a survey that included measures of their self-reported nationalism, political ideology, and patriotism as well as a monetary resource allocation measure.

Measures.

Political ideology. In this study we honed in more directly on the element of political ideology associated with the proposed model: political ideological views on social issues. Thus, in this study participants used a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (liberal) to 9 (conservative) to rate their relative conservatism or liberalism generally, on social issues, and on fiscal issues. We use the measure of political ideology on social issues in analyses.

Patriotism. Using a 9-point scale, patriotism was assessed with a 6-item measure including items from Huddy and Khatib (2007; see Appendix). Specifically, this measure contains items from each of the four factors identified in their 2004 study: national identity, symbolic patriotism, constructive patriotism, and uncritical patriotism. Items include “How important is being an American to you?” (Not important to Important) and “How does it make you feel when you see the American flag flying?” (Terrible to Great; $\alpha = .83$).

Nationalism. Ethnocentrism was assessed with a 3-item scale modified from Neuliep and McCroskey's (1997) scale. Participants indicated their agreement on a 9-point scale to statements including "Most other countries are backward in comparison with the United States" ($\alpha = .93$).

'American=White' bias. The extent to which participants associated White Americans more than Arab Americans with the national category 'American' was measured using items from Devos and Banaji (2005). Participants were asked to respond on a 9-point scale, Not American to Very American, to the following question in regard to Caucasian and Arab Americans: "How American are people who belong to the following groups? That is, how strongly are they identified with American and all things American?" American ethnic association bias was computed by subtracting the Arab evaluation from the White evaluation. This relative difference measure is a common method of assessing intergroup bias (Craig, DeHart, Richeson, & Fiedorowicz, 2012; Hoyt & Burnette, 2013; Levin, Federico, Sidanius, & Rabinowitz, 2002; Sears & Henry, 2003). Bias scores above zero indicate a pro-White ethnic American association bias and scores below zero indicate a pro-Arab bias, and numbers further from zero indicate greater bias in general.

Resource allocation: Monetary donation task. Participants were asked to imagine they had enough money to donate \$10 to the local non-profit organization(s) of their choice. They were presented with two organizations: American Education Organization and Arab American Education Organization. They were told they could divide the money between organizations but they could not donate more than \$10 total. The donation was made in \$1.00 increments and the amount donated to the American Educational Organization is used in analyses.

Results and Discussion

Table 3 presents the scale means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the variables. Political ideology on social issues is a stronger predictor of patriotism than the general ideology measure. Greater levels of conservatism are associated with greater levels of patriotism, nationalism, associating White as opposed to Arab Americans with America, and a greater likelihood to donate money to the American organization.

Testing the parallel multiple mediator model in which both patriotism and nationalism link political ideology to donation bias (see Figure 3), results indicate that the indirect effect of patriotism on monetary donation bias was significant with a 95% confidence interval of {.018, .307}. However, the indirect effect of nationalism was not significant {-.098, .138}. The direction of the paths indicate that more conservative ideologies are associated with greater levels of patriotism and greater levels of nationalism, however, only patriotism in turn predicts greater bias in donating money to national organizations relative to Arab-American organizations. Furthermore, examination of model fit indices reveals that the ideology-patriotism-donation bias model fit the data well ($\chi^2 = 1.71, p = .190$; RMSEA = .087; CFI = .97) whereas the alternative model with ideology mediating the link between patriotism and donation bias did not ($\chi^2 = 9.82, p = .002$; RMSEA = .305; CFI = .637).

Finally, the primary goal of this study was to test the hypothesized serial mediation process model wherein the link between patriotism and donation bias is in turn mediated by 'American=White' bias (see Figure 4). We tested this hypothesis by using Model 6 from Hayes' (2013) Process macro that specifies a serial mediator model assuming a specified causal chain linking the mediators. Results indicate that in addition to the indirect effect of political ideology on donation bias through patriotism being significant with a 95% confidence interval of {.017, .254}, the indirect effect flowing from ideology, to patriotism, to 'American=White' bias, to

donation bias is significant $\{.006, .101\}$. Specifically, more conservative ideologies predict greater levels of patriotism which are associated with greater ‘American=White’ bias which in turn predicts greater donations to the American relative to the Arab-American organization.

General Discussion

The United States is a multicultural, immigrant nation that has struggled with complicated relationships between ethnic identities and the national American identity (Citrin et al., 2001). In an attempt to better understand these complex relationships, we examined the role of political ideology in moderating partiality to the national group relative to ethnic-minority American groups. Across three studies, political ideology strongly predicted resource allocation biases and this effect was mediated by American patriotism. Specifically, conservatives reported greater levels of patriotism than liberals, and these greater levels of patriotism were associated with donating more to American, as opposed to ethnic-minority American, organizations. Importantly, these findings were observed when controlling for measures of prejudice and nationalism and were observed across differing measures of political ideology, patriotism, and resource allocation. Further, the link between patriotism and partiality to the national group was mediated by stronger associations of the category ‘American’ with the category ‘White.’

This research makes important theoretical contributions to the nascent literature demonstrating the powerful role of ingroup favoritism, versus outgroup antipathy, in enabling discrimination (Greenwald & Pettigrew, 2014). By focusing on the tensions that arise between the national group and ethnic-minority subgroups in the United States, we broaden the construal of ingroups and outgroups. Examining support for the superordinate American *ingroup* relative to ethnic-minority American *outgroups*, our data support the favoritism perspective, showing that it is loyalty to one’s national group, patriotism, and *not* hostility toward ethnic group

members that undergirds discriminatory allocation choices. Furthermore, our findings suggest that these intergroup biases are driven not simply by partiality for the overarching ‘American’ ingroup relative to ‘ethnic-minority American’ outgroups, but rather it is also driven by bias in favor of one particular subgroup of Americans: White Americans. Finally, as Greenwald and Pettigrew note (2014), the dearth of studies that directly assess the relative contribution of ingroup favoritism versus outgroup hostility to discrimination stems largely from methodological limitations. Our research offers a new methodological approach for researchers’ toolboxes.

In addition to the theoretical and methodological advancements, this research has important practical significance for intergroup relations in multicultural, pluralist societies such as the United States. The dynamics involved in supporting the national American group versus the cross-cutting various ethnic groups are relevant to important policy arguments such as immigration or affirmative action (Brewer, 2009; Citrin et al., 2001; Crisp & Hewstone, 2007). Because the category ‘American’ is associated with Whites, partiality to the national group represents, at least in part, a partiality to White, relative to ethnic-minority, Americans. This work suggests that although promoting American patriotism might serve to increase this partiality, efforts to foster the association between the category ‘American’ and the ethnic and racial patchwork that actually constitutes the nation might serve to reduce this bias. Furthermore, given the role of favoritism in this discrimination, a potentially fruitful approach to redressing this bias might be “adopting policies of targeted outgroup helping, in effect seeking to level the ingroup-favoritism playing field” (Greenwald & Pettigrew, 2014, p. 12).

Although our findings have both theoretical and applied implications, there are limitations that can open up avenues for future research. A more comprehensive understanding of these complex relationships between ethnic and American identities necessitates further

investigations focusing on the role of both perceivers' and the target groups' ethnic identity. The majority of our participants were White Americans with the remainder belonging to various ethnic-minority groups. Although our findings were similar both with and without controlling for participants' ethnic identities, these identities could play a role in understanding these complex social identity dynamics. For example, levels of national identification vary across subgroups of Americans with White Americans showing greater levels than other groups (Devos et al., 2010; Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001). Additionally, future research should comparatively test evaluations of various ethnic-minority groups. Given the pervasive ethnic hierarchies in America, ethnic-minority groups vary in the extent to which they have status and power and are perceived to be prototypical of America (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

In sum, this research demonstrates the powerful role of political ideology and patriotism in influencing partiality to the higher-order national ingroup ('American') relative to specific ethnic-minority American groups. These partiality questions are of great consequence to a nation riddled with tensions surrounding the "proper balance between the national 'one' and the ethnic 'many'" (Citrin et al., 2001; p. 71). Research focused on understanding factors that guide intergroup discrimination can have important implications particularly for diversity-related policy issues in the United States and holds great potential for advancing racial and ethnic justice.

References

- Bealey, F. (1999). Political ideologies. In F. Bealey, R. A. Chapman, & M. Sheehan (Eds.), *Elements in political science*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The Psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444. doi: 10.1111/0022-4537.00126
- Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The Psychology of Intergroup Attitudes and Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 36(1), 219-243. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.36.020185.001251
- Brewer, M.B. (2009). Social identity and citizenship in a pluralistic society. In E. Borgida, C.M. Federico, & J.L. Sullivan (Eds.), *The Political Psychology of Democratic Citizenship* (pp.153-175). Oxford University Press.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk A New Source of Inexpensive, Yet High-Quality, Data?. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-5, doi: 10.1177/1745691610393980
- Citrin, J., Sears, D.O., Muste, B., & Wong, C. (2001). Multiculturalism in American public opinion. *British Journal of Political Science*, 31, 247-275. doi: [10.1017/S0007123401000102](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123401000102)
- Citrin, J., Wong, C., & Duff, B. (2001). The meaning of American national identity: Patterns of ethnic conflict and consensus. In R. Ashmore, L. Jussim, and D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction* (pp. 71-100). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Conover, P., & Feldman, S. (1987). *Measuring patriotism and nationalism* (Pilot Study Report, No. nes002263). Retrieved from Stanford University and the University of Michigan's

American National Election Studies (ANES) website:

<http://www.electionstudies.org/resources/papers/documents/nes002263.pdf>

- Craig, M. A., DeHart, T., Richeson, J. A., & Fiedorowicz, L. (2012). Do unto others as others have done unto you? Perceiving sexism influences women's evaluations of stigmatized racial groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(9), 1107-1119. doi: 10.1177/0146167212445210
- Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2007). Multiple social categorization. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 39, pp. 163-254). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M.R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 447-466. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.447
- Devos, T., Gavin, K., & Quintana, F. (2010). Say 'adios' to the American dream? The interplay between ethnic and national identity among Latino and Caucasian Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16, 37-49. doi: 10.1037/a0015868
- Echebarria-Echabe, A., & Fernandez-Guede, E. F. (2007). A new measure of anti-Arab prejudice: Reliability and validity evidence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(5), 1077-1091. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00200.x
- Gallup (2001, March). <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1561/americans-ambivalent-about-immigrants.aspx>
- Gallup/USA Today Poll, June 2010. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/141110/One-Three-Americans-Extremely-Patriotic.aspx>

- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*(5), 1029-1046. doi: 10.1037/a0015141
- Greenwald, A. G., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2014). With malice toward none and charity for some: Ingroup favoritism enables discrimination. *American Psychologist*, *69*(7), 669-684. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036056>
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Helzer, E. G., & Pizarro, D. A. (2011). Dirty liberals!: Reminders of physical cleanliness influence moral and political attitudes. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 517-522. doi: 10.1177/0956797611402514
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 575-604. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135109
- Hodson, G., & Busseri, M.A. (2012). Bright minds and dark attitudes: Lower cognitive ability predicts greater prejudice through right-wing ideology and low intergroup contact. *Psychological Science*, *23*, 187-195. doi: 10.1177/0956797611421206
- Hoyt, C. L. (2012). Gender bias in employment contexts: A closer examination of the role incongruity principle. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 86-96. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.08.004
- Hoyt, C. L., & Burnette, J. (2013). Gender bias in leader evaluations: Merging implicit theories and role congruity perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *39*, 1306-1319. Doi: 10.1177/0146167213493643

- Huddy, L., & Khatib, N. (2007). American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science*, *51*(1), 63-77. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00237.x
- Jost, J. T., Federico, C. M., & Napier, J. L. (2009). Political ideology: Its structure, functions, and elective affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*(1), 307-337. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163600
- Jost, J. T., Nosek, B. A., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Ideology: Its resurgence in social, personality, and political psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*(2), 126-136. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-6916.2008.00070.x
- Jost, J.T., & Sidanius, J. (2004). *Political Psychology*. New York: Taylor & Francis Books.
- Kimmelmeier, M., & Winter, D. G. (2008). Sowing patriotism, but reaping nationalism?: Consequences of exposure to the American flag. *Political Psychology*, *29*, 859-879. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00670.x
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1984). *Liberalism and conservatism: The nature and structure of social attitudes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lambert, A. J., & Chasteen, A. L. (1997). Perceptions of disadvantage vs. conventionality: Political values and attitudes toward the elderly vs. Blacks. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 469-481. doi: 10.1177/0146167297235003
- Levin, S., Federico, C., Sidanius, J., & Rabinowitz, J. (2002). Social dominance orientation and intergroup bias: The legitimation of favoritism for high-status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 144-157. doi: 10.1177/0146167202282002

- Mummendey, A. , & Otten, S. (1998). Positive-negative asymmetry in social discrimination. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 9, pp. 107-143). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Nail, P.R., McGregor, I., Drinkwater, A.E., Steele, G. M., & Thompson, A. W. (2009). Threat causes liberals to think like conservatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 901–907. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.04.013
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of a US and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Communication Research Reports*, *14*, 385-398, doi: 10.1080/08824099709388682
- Neumann, R., & Seibt, B. (2001). The structure of prejudice: Associative strength as a determinant of stereotype endorsement. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *31*(6), 609-620. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.69
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*(1), 57-75. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420250106
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 741-763. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, *20*, 151-174, doi: 10.1111/0162-895X.00140
- Sears, D. O., Citrin, J., Cheleden, S. V., & van Laar, C. (1999). Cultural diversity and multicultural politics: Is ethnic Balkanization psychologically inevitable. In D. A.

- Prentice & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 35-79). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sears, D. O., & Henry, P. J. (2003). The origins of symbolic racism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 259-275. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.259
- Sidanius, J., & Petrocik, J. R. (2001). Communal and national identity in a multiethnic state: A comparison of three perspectives. In R. Ashmore, L. Jussim, and D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction* (pp. 101-129). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Van der Toorn, J., Nail, P. R., Liviatan, I., Jost, J. T. (2014, in press). My country, right or wrong: Activating system justification motivation eliminates the liberal-conservative gap in patriotic attachment. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*.

Footnotes

¹In the first two studies we attempted to use subconscious approaches to increasing political conservatism based upon previous research. Specifically, in Study 1 we used a mortality salience threat manipulation (Nail, McGregor, Drinkwater, Steele, & Thompson, 2009) whereas in Study 2 we included a cleanliness manipulation by exposing people to pictures of dirty hands (Helzer & Pizarro, 2011). Neither of these manipulations were effective in altering political conservatism and are not discussed further.

²However, analyses using a discrepancy score computed by subtracting donations to the ethnic-minority organization(s) from the donations to the national organization reveal similar findings.

Appendix

Measures Study 1

Prejudicial attitudes

_____ Americans have jobs that Americans should have; _____ Americans who receive welfare support could get along without it if they tried.

Most politicians in USA care too much about American _____.

_____ Americans come from a less able race and this explains why they don't have the same economic standards as most Americans.

I would be willing to have sexual relations with a _____.

I would not mind if a suitably qualified _____ was appointed as my boss.

I would not mind if a _____ person joined my close family in marriage.

_____ living in American should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

Many groups have come to American and overcome prejudice. _____ should do the same without special favor.

If _____ only tried harder they could be as accepted as other Americans.

_____ living in American teach their children values different from those required to be successful in America.

How similar in honesty _____ Americans are compared to Americans like yourself.

How different are _____ from your family.

How different are _____ from you in the values they teach their children.

How different are _____ in terms of their beliefs.

How different are _____ from you in terms of their sexual values and practices.

How often do you feel sympathy for _____ living in America.

Measures Study 2

Nationalism

Americans should be the role model for non-Americans

Non-Americans should be try to be more like Americans

I'm not interested in the values and customs of non-Americans

Non-Americans are smart to look up to Americans

Patriotism

It makes me angry when I hear someone criticizing America.

I am proud to be an American.

It makes me angry when people burn the American flag in protest.

I feel good when I see the American flag flying.

I love America.

I get mad at people who sell American government secrets.

I feel proud when I hear the American national anthem.

Patriotism is an important qualification for an American politician.

With few exceptions, the American government does a good and honest job.

Other countries should be happy to have American intervention and influence.

We suffer when American patriotism wanes.

Patriots are the ones who have made America great.

Prejudice

Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East are unable to adapt to the present.

Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East respect human right.

We should recognize Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East as contributors to our society.

Crimes are most frequent in areas with Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East settlements.

Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East are not patriotic.

Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East should be under strict control measures.

Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East are a future threat for America.

Americans whose families are from the Arabic Middle East preach tolerance and peaceful coexistence.

Measures Study 3

Patriotism

How important is being an American to you?

How does it make you feel when you see the American flag flying?

How does it make you feel when you hear the national anthem?

How does it make you feel when people criticize the United States?

People should work hard to move this country in a positive direction.

People who do not wholeheartedly support American should live elsewhere.

Nationalism

The world would be better in more people from other countries were like Americans.

Most other countries are backward in comparison with the United States.

Lifestyles in other countries are just as valid as in the United States.

Table 1. Study 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3
1. Orientation	3.12	1.26	--		
2. Patriotism	4.77	1.17	.23***	--	
3. Prejudicial attitudes	2.76	.67	.21**	.18**	--
4. American Donation	60.19	37.83	.14*	.20**	.13+

2-tailed significance: + $p < .10$; * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 2. Study 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4
1. Political Ideology	4.53	1.95	--			
2. Patriotism	6.34	1.59	.56***	--		
3. Prejudicial attitudes	3.51	1.29	.11	.14+	--	
4. Nationalism	3.82	1.68	.35***	.46***	.39***	--
5. American donation	54.62	28.68	.21**	.32***	.25**	.17*

2-tailed significance: + $p < .10$; * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 3. Study 3: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Political Ideology	3.96	2.29	--					
2. PI: Social	3.45	2.19	.75***	--				
3. PI: Fiscal	4.61	2.34	.80***	.53***	--			
4. Patriotism	6.50	1.52	.30**	.34***	.16	--		
5. Nationalism	4.01	1.70	.33***	.33***	.23*	.55***	--	
6. 'American=White' bias	3.35	2.98	.19*	.22*	.04	.36***	.21*	--
7. American donation	6.82	2.97	.35***	.24*	.26*	.37***	.24*	.33***

2-tailed significance: * $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.