

University of Groningen

Types of Identification and Intergroup Differentiation in the Russian Federation

Minescu, Anca; Hagendoorn, Louk; Poppe, Edwin

Published in:
Journal of Social Issues

DOI:
[10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00564.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00564.x)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2008

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Minescu, A., Hagendoorn, L., & Poppe, E. (2008). Types of Identification and Intergroup Differentiation in the Russian Federation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64(2), 321. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00564.x

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Types of Identification and Intergroup Differentiation in the Russian Federation

Anca Minescu,* Louk Hagendoorn, and Edwin Poppe

Utrecht University

The fall of the Soviet Union affected the established identity patterns and intergroup relations in the Russian Federation. A survey investigates the effect of Russians' and titulars' identifications with their ethnic group, their republic, and the Russian Federation on intergroup stereotypes. We hypothesized that identification at various inclusiveness levels is differently reflected in the positive/negative stereotypes about in-group and out-groups. While in-group stereotypes would be positively affected by all types of identification, out-group stereotypes would turn more negative by ethnic identification and more positive by republican and federal identification. Further, we expected that republican identification would improve titulars' in-group stereotypes and Russians' out-group stereotypes, while federal identification would enhance Russians' in-group stereotypes and titulars' out-group stereotypes. Russians favored their in-group mostly in positive terms. Titular minorities favored their in-group mostly on negative stereotypes. A model of intergroup differentiation is proposed that takes into account social identification at different inclusiveness levels. This model makes clear the potential threat posed by republican identifications to the stability of intergroup relations in Russia.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 resulted in the independence of 14 borderland Union Republics from the Russian Federation (Hagendoorn, Linssen, & Tumanov, 2001). The complex administrative structure of the former Soviet state was designed to govern a mosaic of some 128 national, ethnic, and cultural groups (Tishkov, 1997). However, it did not eventually prevent the emergence of the nationalistic aspirations that contributed to its own demise. The same complex administrative system characterizes the remaining Russian Federation since 1991 (Brubaker, 1996; Hagendoorn et al., 2001; Laitin, 1998; Tishkov, 1997). This study focuses on the intergroup relations between the two main ethnic groups in

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anca Minescu, ERCOMER, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University, PO Box 80140, 3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands [e-mail: A.Minescu@uu.nl].

autonomous republics of the Russian Federation, the Russians, and the so-called titulars, that is, the ethnic group after which the republic is named (e.g., Tatars in Tatarstan, Karelians in Karelia). The question is whether there is a lot of tension between the Russians and titulars and which factors affect the intergroup relations. First, we will discuss previous research on the intergroup situation in some former Soviet Union republics and then present new findings on the emerging identifications and intergroup differentiations of Russians and titulars in the Russian Federation.

Intergroup Polarization in Former Soviet Republics

The breakdown of the Soviet regime resulted in a reversal of the intergroup position of Russians and titulars in the newly independent republics bordering Russia. From a favored high-status dominant majority, Russians became the less powerful minority, while titulars, incited by nationalistic independence movements, fought themselves in higher-status positions (Laitin, 1998).

In previous research we focused on the intergroup relations in former Soviet republics by examining Russians' and titulars' national-ethnic identifications, their mutual stereotypes, and their negative intergroup stereotypes and attitudes (Hagendoorn, 1993; Hagendoorn, Drogendijk, Tumanov, & Hraba, 1998; Hagendoorn et al., 2001; Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2001; Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2003). Hagendoorn et al. (2001) used the term *intergroup polarization*, in a study among Russians and titulars in five former Soviet republics, to describe "the pattern of associations between the attachment to the national ingroup and the negative evaluations of national outgroups." One of the strongest negative correlations was found between national identification and an ethnic definition of citizenship by which out-groups are excluded. This shows one of the important factors leading to out-group exclusion: the denial of civic citizenship. National identification was also related to negative stereotypes of the out-group and positive stereotypes of the in-group. In addition, negative stereotypes appeared to be affected by perceived competition and relative deprivation, whereas positive in-group stereotypes were affected by speaking the in-group language and ethnic homogeneity of the family. These associations were further strengthened by perceived threats, such as the fear of an economic crisis, the possible disloyalty of the Russians, and the threat of Russian intervention (Hagendoorn et al., 2001). Hence, national identifications as well as perceived realistic causes of conflict and language and family composition affected the intergroup evaluations. At the aggregate level, the group attachments of one group appeared to affect those of the other group. For example, titulars seemed to have stronger feelings of national superiority if Russians identified stronger with the republic and felt more attached to it (republican patriotism). Similarly, Russians' feelings of national superiority were stronger in republics in which titulars had positive stereotypes of Russians. In other words, across

republics, positive views of out-groups covaried with the feelings of superiority among these out-groups.

A further analysis showed that (national) identification is a multidimensional phenomenon, both Russians and titulars did not identify with just one group, but with several groups to different degrees. Besides ethnic and national identification, people simultaneously identified with their republic of residence and with the Russian Federation. This made clear that there are different patterns of identifications, reflecting ethnic segregation at the one extreme and civic integration at the other extreme (Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2001). Specific individual-level factors as well as aggregate factors relate to specific patterns of identification. If the Russians are better integrated in the republic, then their identification as Russians and as republican citizens were more strongly connected, and this was also true if the titulars were more accepting and less derogative of Russians. However, most of the aggregate-level effects on national identification could be explained by a differential distribution of individual-level factors, which shows that the aggregate-level effects are actually composition effects. For example, a larger Russian minority and a poor economic situation in the republics affected Russians' national identification through the effects they had on perceived ethnic competition (Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2003).

To sum up, it appears that there is a complex circular relationship between national identification, and the positive and negative stereotypes of the respective out-groups, stimulated by perceived intergroup competition and threat. This outcome is in certain respects counterintuitive. It would be expected that positive stereotypes about out-groups would always lead to better intergroup relations, but they seem to fuel the superiority feelings of the members of the out-groups. In return, feelings of national superiority fired negative intergroup reactions, especially if the identification with the superior in-group was strong and the competition from the out-group was feared.

In this article we will extend the analysis of how different types of identification are connected. We will do this on the basis of new data gathered in the Russian Federation in 1999 and 2000. We focus on the question of how intergroup polarization varies with respect to different types of identification. Additionally, given the crucial role played by intergroup competition as indicated above, we control for this factor in order to better identify the predictive power of identification types.

From the Republics of the Former Soviet Union to the Russian Federation

For the political elite of the Russian Federation, it is vital to prevent ethnic conflict and keep all the ethnic and national groups together in the federation. The republics of the Russian Federation have a multiethnic composition. The titular populations are an important demographic force in various parts of the Russian Federation; they are a demographic majority in 15 out of the 21 autonomous

republics (Tishkov, 1997). Politically, this raises the question of defining “what is a Russian?” and “who is a Russian?” The answers differ from a titular, a Russian, and a federal nationalistic perspective (Tishkov, 1997). Russian national identity is an issue on which individuals as well as political administrators struggle. From this perspective it is obvious that a proper understanding of the intergroup differentiation in the Russian Federation has to start with an analysis of the relevant dimensions of the identifications of Russians and titulars.

The multinational Russian Federation has no tradition of civic principles and citizenship. In the Soviet era the common identity was the Soviet identity. Soviet people were perceived as united by the Russian language, a common ideology, and an interdependent economic and social infrastructure. The dissolution of the Soviet Union transferred the Soviet institutions to the new political elite of the Russian Federation, but the Russian Federation was the only one unit in the Soviet Union that lacked internal cohesion. Hence, the Russian Federation as a true federal state, based on civic rather than ethnic principles of national belonging, had to be built up from the beginning. It was a political entity that did not incite strong feelings of identity. By the same token, as a multiethnic system, the Russian Federation will only be able to survive if a federal identity overarches and includes the full variety of the different and potential conflicting ethnic identifications and thus prevents the resurgence of new national aspirations. Our analysis will focus on the potential of civic identifications that have to fulfill this role, that is, to improve the stereotypes of out-groups as well as of the in-group. To put it differently, the question is whether or not identifications at a higher level of inclusiveness (i.e., civic in contrast to ethnic, federal in contrast to republican) have the potential to reduce the intergroup polarization.

A Social–Psychological Approach to Intergroup Differentiation

We approach the question of the associations between different types of identifications and intergroup differentiation from the perspective of social identity theory (SIT) (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social identity theory poses that intergroup differentiation results not only from conflicts of interests, but also from the psychological need to positively distinguish one’s group from others. In this view intergroup differentiation is dependent on the manner in which group members comparatively define their place (identity) in society in relation to other groups (Hogg & Abrams, 1990). Individuals’ desire for positive self-evaluations may result in opinions, attitudes, and behaviors that will favor the in-group to the detriment of out-groups (Bourhis, Turner, & Gagnon, 1997). Within this frame of reference we pose the question: What are the consequences of social identifications at different levels of inclusiveness?

National identification is one of the most prevalent forms of social identity in contemporary societies (Billig, 1994). While national states usually hold the

monopoly of violence and protection, national identification defines where individuals belong and which are the others that do not belong. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the newly independent states including the remaining Russian Federation became contested domains. This implied that the solidarity and self-esteem found through belonging to social group shifted from higher to lower levels of inclusiveness, eventually locating the primordial feelings of identity in ethnic and national belonging (Hagendoorn et al., 2001). However, the identifications of the previous period did not immediately wither away and thus a system of “multiple, multi-layered, overlapping or embedded national, ethnic, civic or supra-national categories” remained of which the ultimate balance was yet unknown (Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2001, p. 59).

Types of Identification in the Context of the Russian Federation

In the Russian Federation, at least three types of politically significant social identifications are relevant for Russians and titulars: ethnic, republican, and federal identification. Along the inclusiveness dimension, the republican and the federal identifications are superordinate to the ethnic identification, whereas the republican identification is subordinate to the federal identification. The concept of *concentric loyalties* (Brewer, 1999) suitably captures Russians' and titulars' simultaneous membership in an ethnic group, within an autonomous republic, within the Russian Federation.

Ethnic identifications are at the forefront of public preoccupations in the Russian Federation because ethnonationalism is a threat to the unity of the federation and an important tool of political mobilization (Tishkov, 1997). In the autonomous republics, the numerical differences between the Russians and the titulars make republican identification an important political factor. The identification with the Russian Federation is the most encompassing type of identification, and this makes it an important tool for keeping the federation together. The Russians hold the demographic majority position within the Russian Federation while the autonomous republics are the strongholds of the non-Russian populations that bear their name. This intergroup situation implies that the titulars have a special affinity with the (superordinate) republican identification and that the Russians have a special affinity with the (superordinate) federal identification. These affinities and the implied claims of legitimacy may lead to a projection of norms onto the superordinate categories in which the in-group offers the typical standard for conduct, which may lead to explicit negativity toward the other groups (Waldzus, Mummendey, & Wenzel, 2005; Wenzel, Mummendey, Weber, & Waldzus, 2003; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003). Now we can further specify our initial question: Which type of (inclusiveness of) identification is most likely to promote a positive intergroup relation for Russians as well as for titulars? If the two superordinate identifications have a different inclusive potential for Russians

and titulars, do they cancel out each other's effects? Does identification at higher levels of inclusiveness reduce the intergroup differentiation equally for Russians and titulars?

Intergroup Differentiation: Hypotheses on In-Group and Out-Group Stereotypes

We are interested in the associations between identification at different inclusiveness levels and intergroup differentiation as reflected in in-group and out-group stereotypes. In our view identification comes first and stereotypes are the expression of the evolving evaluation of relative group positions. Motivated by the search for a positive social identity, people represent intergroup differences along various hierarchies. Research into ethnic hierarchies shows that stereotypes express people's tendencies to positively value those perceived as closer to the in-group and negatively devalue those who are to be excluded from the in-group (Hagendoorn, 1993). The pattern of evaluative biases reflected in such stereotypes does reflect the actual intergroup dynamics, albeit in a static "one-moment-in-time" picture (Spears, Oakes, Ellemers, & Haslam, 1997). The positive–negative stereotypes of the out-group (as compared to the in-group) can be seen as a step in the direction of intergroup tension (Brewer, 2001).

The empirical question is whether superordinate identifications will lead to the increased acceptance (positive stereotypes) of other ethnic groups, and whether this pattern is opposite to the effects of ethnic identifications, which should lead to more rejection (negative out-group stereotypes). However, if we take into account that intergroup discrimination is considered illegitimate and objectionable in most societies, then it should be expected that intergroup evaluations generally will be less discriminative in terms of negative than in terms of positive criteria. This effect is known as the positive–negative asymmetry effect (Mummendey & Otten, 1998). Various studies have shown that the positive–negative asymmetry effect is less present under specific circumstances, for instance when the out-group has low social status (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992; Mummendey & Otten, 1998; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1991). Therefore, we expect that Russians in the Russian Federation, where titular populations have a subordinate position, show a stronger positive–negative asymmetry effect than the titulars (Hypothesis 1).

Inclusive versus Exclusive Identifications and Intergroup Differentiation

The consequences of different levels of inclusiveness of group categorization for people's behaviors are recognized by self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). *Category inclusiveness* is defined as the extent to which a categorization subsumes other social categories in the immediate intergroup context (Crisp, Ensari, Hewstone, & Miller, 2002). In the context of our

research, the political administrative structure of the Russian Federation determines the various levels of inclusiveness: the federal, republican, and the ethnic level.

In order to derive hypotheses about the effect of identifications at different levels of inclusiveness on intergroup differentiation, we briefly have to consider which theoretical positions are relevant. The first is optimal distinctiveness theory and the second is the common in-group identity model. Brewer (2001) developed the optimal distinctiveness model of social identity, arguing that an optimal social identity is achieved when one's distinctiveness and inclusiveness needs are simultaneously satisfied. In this view, the expanding boundaries of superordinate identifications reduce distinctiveness, and higher levels of inclusiveness therefore lead to more intergroup discrimination (Brewer, 2001; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). The common in-group identity model, however, leads to the expectation that the opposite effect will occur (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993). Recategorization at a superordinate level will decrease the discrimination between the previous subgroups, because they now share common in-group boundaries. Thereby, the processes of in-group favoritism are shifted away from the level of subgroups to the level of the superordinate identification.

A third model, the mutual intergroup differentiation model, tries to integrate these conflicting predictions (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). The reasoning is that the extension of group boundaries does not lead to a loss of distinctiveness if the lower-level in-group boundaries remain intact in parallel with a superordinate (re-) categorization. The maintenance of a dual identity ("different groups on the same team") leads to decreased discrimination, and to the generalization of positivity (Gaertner et al., 1993; Gonzalez & Brown, 2003; Hewstone & Brown, 1986).

Consequently, what is required is a test of the simultaneous additive effects of social identifications (Gaertner et al., 1993; Reicher, Hopkins, & Condor, 1997; Van Knippenberg & Ellemers, 1990). On the basis of the mutual intergroup differentiation model we expect that the positive effects of superordinate identifications are manifest (also) in the presence of subgroup identifications.

In-Group and Out-Group Stereotypes

To study the impact of various types of identifications on intergroup differentiation, we analyze in-group and out-group stereotypes. By examining in-group stereotypes separately from out-group stereotypes, the two sides of intergroup differentiation: "in-group focused" (what factors affect in-group evaluations) and "out-group focused" (what influences out-group evaluations) can be investigated (Brewer, 2001; Verkuyten, 2005). We expect that the identification types have a positive effect on in-group stereotypes but do not necessarily have a negative effect on out-group stereotypes. The effects of different levels of identification are expected to follow the assumption that the smallest group (most clearly and

exclusively defined) provides more positive images of the in-group than the higher-order ones (Brewer & Schneider, 1990). Ethnic groups, rather than more inclusive civic types of groups, should contribute more to the creation of a secure (“optimal”) sense of self. Therefore, ethnic identification should have stronger positive effects on the in-group stereotypes than the republican and federal identifications (Hypothesis 2a).

Out-group stereotypes should be affected differently. Dichotomous categorizations in terms of “us–them,” usually along primary identities like ethnicity or religion, have an inherent dimension of intergroup comparison. They are built through opposition against the “other” (negative interdependence), being more likely to lead to intergroup differentiation and conflicts than other types of identification (Brewer, 2001; Simon, Kulla, & Zobel, 1995). Identification at lower inclusive levels (such as ethnic vs. civic, or republican vs. federal) will result in more negative out-group evaluations than higher superordinate identifications. Based on the mutual differentiation model, we expect that (in the presence of ethnic identification) republican and federal identifications will strengthen the positive stereotypes of the ethnic out-group (Hypothesis 2b).

Effects of the Superordinate Identifications on In-Group and Out-Group Stereotypes

A last set of hypotheses considers the differences in the effects that the superordinate identifications have on the in-group–out-group evaluations of Russians compared to titulars. In the context of the Russian Federation, the two superordinate identifications, republican and federal, have a different meaning for Russians than for titulars. The autonomous republics were named after the titular populations, which gives them a claim of ownership to the superordinate republican identification. At the federal level, Russians are a majority group, which allows them to claim the natural ownership of the federal identification.

According to the in-group projection model (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999), a superordinate category that is typically claimed by one of the subgroups will lead to the exclusion of the other subgroups (more negative evaluations of the out-groups). Therefore, we assume that the republican and federal identification will have differential effects for Russians and titulars. Republican identification will have more inclusive effects for the Russians than for the titulars. A Russian who identifies with the republic is expected to have more positive stereotypes of the titulars than a (similarly identified) titular will have of Russians. The opposite should be true for the federal identification: a titular who identifies with the Russian Federation will have more positive stereotypes of the Russians than a Russian who does the same will have of titulars (Hypothesis 3a). Similar effects should be found for in-group stereotypes: a republican identification contributes more to

positive in-group stereotypes for titulars than it does for Russians and a federal identification contributes more to positive in-group stereotypes for Russians than it does for titulars (Hypothesis 3b).

The hypotheses will be tested by controlling for the effects of perceived intergroup competition. We may expect that sharing group membership at a higher level of inclusiveness will reduce competition. Gaertner et al. (1993) illustrated how intergroup co-operation reduced intergroup differentiation by inducing members to conceive of themselves as one superordinate group, instead of two groups. In order to isolate the independent contribution of identification types to in-group and out-group evaluations, besides and in addition to the effects of intergroup competition, we control for the centered competition variable (Aiken & West, 1991). No specific predictions are formulated with respect to this variable, as the focus of this research is on the differential impact of identification types, rather than the well-documented impact of intergroup competition on intergroup attitudes (see e.g., Hagendoorn et al., 2001).

Survey Study

This study is based on two data sets of comparative samples of Russians and titulars in 10 autonomous republics of the Russian Federation in 1999 and 2000: Karelia, Adigey, Udmurtia, Komi, Yakutia, Tatarstan, Tuva, Bashkortostan, Kabardino–Balkaria, and Daghestan.¹ The surveys were carried out in urban areas with a minimum of 10% Russians. All republic capital cities were included, other cities being chosen at random.² Respondents were selected using random procedures: Within the cities, an alpha-numerical pool randomly identified street names, house numbers were randomly picked, and if older than 15 years, respondents were randomly chosen if their birthday was closest to the day of the interview.

Participants

Nationality was asked before the start of the interview, and only respondents who considered themselves Russian or titular were selected. Participation was on a voluntary basis, and nonresponse was less than 3%. Approximately 500 respondents of each ethnic group in each republic, and about 600 of each group in

¹ The survey data were collected by the OPINIO Centre for Sociological Studies, based in Moscow State University, the Russian Federation, during two joint projects with the European Research Centre of Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER) from Utrecht University, funded by the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO).

² The cities were Maykop, Ufa, Beloreck, Neftekamsk, Sterlitamak, Salavat, Meleuz, Machatchkala, Kielyar, Naltchik, Naptkala, Trnauz, Prochladni, Maickii, Bakcan, Petrozavodsk, Pitk-jaranta, Olonec, Suojarvi, Sictvkar, Uchta, Petchora, Emva, Yakutsk, Njurba, Pokrovsk, Kazan, Naberechne Tchelni, Almetebks, Elabuga, Mendeleevsk, Zainsk, Kyzyl, Shagonar, Turan, Ishevsk, Votkinsk, Glazov, and Moshga.

Tatarstan were interviewed. In total, 5,182 titulars and 5,233 Russians participated, 44.4% were males and 55.6% females. Respondents were aged between 16 and 98 years, with a mean of 40.56.

Dependent and Independent Variables

The dependent variables were constructed from survey questions on attributions of positive and negative traits to the in-group and the out-group. The questions were formulated in terms of percentages of target group characterized by the respective trait: "How many Russians/titulars, in your opinion, have the following characteristic. . .?" with a continuous answering scale from 0% to 100%. The traits were *honest, smart, peaceable, lazy, hostile, showing initiative, rude, and deceitful*. The selection of these traits was based on previous research that illustrated the potential of these stereotypical traits in differentiating between groups in Eastern European and former Soviet Union contexts (Hagendoorn et al., 2001; Poppe & Linssen, 1999). Simultaneous component analysis (SCA) was performed on these questions, for the 20 groups (Russians and titular groups in 10 republics), on in-group stereotypes and out-group stereotypes. SCA identifies principal components that optimally account for the variance in all 20 groups simultaneously, making them comparable across populations. Both in-group stereotypes and out-group stereotypes appeared to have two components (explained variance of 52.59%, and 53.30%, respectively), that is, a positive (*honest, smart, peaceable, showing initiative*) and a negative one (*lazy, hostile, rude, and deceitful*). Across groups, for in-group stereotypes, Cronbach's alpha of the positive component ranged between .40 and .67, and for the negative component: between .58 and .83; for out-group stereotypes, they ranged between .31 and .78, and between .55 and .80, respectively. Although the reliability coefficient is rather low among a few of the 20 groups, it is adequate across groups and the dimensions are optimal for group comparison according to SCA. Therefore, we computed four variables as the mean scores of the respective traits: in-group positive, in-group negative, out-group positive, and out-group negative stereotypes.

Identification variables were constructed on the mean score of two questions in which the participants indicated on a 5-point scale the degree of agreement with respect to the importance and pride of group membership (see Appendix A). Cronbach's alphas are for ethnic identification 0.84 for Russians and 0.91 for titulars, 0.71 for republican identification and .86 for identification with the Russian Federation. The variable *perceived intergroup competition* was computed as a mean score of three questions on jobs, economic interest, and political competition (see Appendix); Cronbach's alpha is .73.

All the independent variables were centered (Aiken & West, 1991). In this way, the effects of the superordinate identifications are interpreted when ethnic identification and intergroup competition are at average values (rather than at the value of zero).

Analysis and Results

Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the degree of identification of Russians and titulars on the various identification types. As expected, the titulars have a stronger republican identification, and the Russians have a stronger federal identification.

The different patterns of identification of the Russians and the titulars are also reflected in the higher correlations between the ethnic and republican identification among titulars, and the higher correlation between ethnic and federal identification among Russians (Table 2). The significance of these correlation differences was estimated using the Fisher's Z' transformation that converts Pearson r s to the normally distributed variable Z' . For the difference between the correlations between the ethnic and republican identifications (titulars: $r_t = .532$, $N = 5,182$; and Russians: $r_r = .037$, $N = 5,067$; $r_t - r_r = .495$), a 95% confidence interval with the lower limit of .47 and upper limit of .52. was identified. Similarly, for the difference in correlations between ethnic and federal identifications (titulars: $r_t = .110$ and Russians: $r_r = .373$; $r_t - r_r = -.263$), the interval was between $-.22$ and $-.30$. It seems therefore, that the differences between the correlations of titulars and Russians between the specific identification types are significant at the accepted levels.

Hypothesis 1: Intergroup Differentiation in the Russian Federation

In order to test the patterns of intergroup differentiation, repeated measurements multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on the four dependent variables, across the ethnic groups (Russians and titulars); two within-subject factors were generated: target group (in-group and out-group) and valence of trait (positive and negative).

The interaction effect between the within-subject factors predicted by Hypothesis 1 was significant, $F(1, 7,366) = 1,303.33$, $p < .001$, $B = 6.56$ ($SE = .18$): In-group evaluations and out-group evaluations varied as a function of the valence of traits. Across the two ethnic groups the differentiation in favor of the in-group was almost 3 times higher on the positive items, $F(1, 7,366) = 1,471.73$, $p < .001$, $B = -11.09$ ($SE = .19$), than on the negative items, $F(1, 7,366) = 533.39$, $p < .001$, $B = 3.79$ ($SE = .19$).³ The positive–negative asymmetry effect was confirmed (see Table 3 for the means on each stereotype component).

Additionally, we found a significant three-way interaction with ethnic groups, $F(1, 7,366) = 12.23$, $p < .001$, $B = .63$ ($SE = .18$), indicating differences between

³ The square root of the ANOVA F statistics is the t statistic as would be calculated in a regression analysis. A comparison of the F values is possible and valid as long as they are estimated within the same model. Similar to the t statistics of the regression models, F values indicate the strength of an effect.

Table 1. Identification Types and Differences Between Ethnic Groups

	Ethnic Identification	Republican Identification	Federal Identification
Titulars	4.18 (1.17)	4.36 (.91)	3.54 (1.28)
Russians	3.90 (1.26)	3.81 (1.19)	4.10 (1.13)
Univariate analysis results	.136 (.012) $F = 127.93^{***}$.273 (.010) $F = 678.72^{***}$	-.280 (.012) $F = 551.51^{***}$

Note. These are results of a multivariate analysis of variance on the three identification variables, with the Multivariate Pillais $\bar{L}(3,5,121) = 585.48$, $p < .001$, reflecting the overall significant differences between Russians and Titulars.

The values in the upper level of the table represent mean score on the identification variables, on a scale from 1 to 5; with standard errors between parentheses. The values in the lower level of the table are unstandardized regression coefficients (standard errors between parentheses) of the univariate MANOVA analysis concerning differences between Russians and titulars, $F(1,10,247)$ with significance levels: $^{***} p < .001$.

Table 2. Correlations Between Identification Types

		Republican Identification	Federal Identification	Intergroup Competition
Ethnic identification	Russians	.037**	.373***	.135***
	Titulars	.532***	.110***	.074***
	Overall	.263***	.202***	.080***
Republican identification	Russians		.237***	-.205***
	Titulars		.274***	.001
	Overall		.180***	-.165***
Federal identification	Russians			.049***
	Titulars			.056***
	Overall			.042***

** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Russians and titulars in the positive–negative asymmetry effect. Simple main effect analyses revealed that for Russians the differentiation between in-group and out-group stereotypes on positive traits was more than 8 times larger than on negative traits, $F(1, 7,366) = 871.64$, $p < .001$, $B = -6.01$ ($SE = .20$), and $F(1, 7,366) = 103.66$, $p < .001$, $B = 2.37$ ($SE = .23$), respectively. Similarly, for titulars, differentiation was higher on positive stereotypes, $F(1, 7,366) = 610.42$, $p < .001$, $B = -4.98$ ($SE = .20$) than on negative stereotypes, $F(1, 7,366) = 508.18$, $p < .001$, $B = 5.20$ ($SE = .23$), but of a much lower magnitude. Hypothesis 1 was fully confirmed. While both groups clearly favored their in-group over the out-group in allocating positive and negative traits, they are less extreme on the negative items. Titulars seem to negatively differentiate almost 5 times stronger than Russians between their in-group and the out-group; while Russians manifest the strongest effect in their differentiation on positive traits. The positive–negative

Table 3. Positive and Negative Stereotypes about In-Group and Out-Group

	Stereotypes			
	In-Group Positive	Out-Group Positive	In-Group Negative	Out-Group Negative
Titulars	61.20 (14.23)	54.16 (15.25)	29.56 (15.78)	36.92 (17.32)
Russians	59.63 (13.48)	51.13 (16.81)	33.65 (15.79)	37.00 (19.07)
Univariate analysis results	.79 (.16) $F = 23.73^{***}$	1.52 (.19) $F = 65.77^{***}$	-2.04 (.18) $F = 123.33^{***}$	-.04 (.21) $F = .04$

Note. These are results of a multivariate analysis of variance on the four stereotype variables, with the Multivariate Pillais $F(4, 3,680) = 55.56, p < .001$, reflecting the overall significant differences between Russians and titulars.

The values in the upper level of the table represent mean score on the stereotype dimensions, on a scale from 0 to 100; with standard errors between parentheses. The values in the lower level of the table are unstandardized regression coefficients (standard errors between parentheses) of the univariate ANOVA analysis concerning differences between Russians and titulars, $F(1, 7,366)$ with significance levels: $^{***}p < .001$.

asymmetry effect is most salient for the high-status Russian group, and much lower for the low-status groups of titulars, as predicted.

Hypothesis 2: Effects of Identification Types on Intergroup Differentiation

The main test concerned the effects of identification types on in-group and out-group stereotypes while controlling for perceived intergroup competition. The model included the ethnic groups as a factor (Russians and titulars), the two-way interactions between the factor and each identification type, and perceived competition. We employed multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), which allowed for the valid test of correlated dependent variables; the default regression approach was used, allowing for the correction of the individual effects for every other variable in the model (Aiken & West, 1991). MANCOVA also allowed for the test of the additive contributions of the identification types on intergroup stereotypes; this way the effect of each identification type on in-group–out-group evaluations could be identified while keeping constant (at average values) the identification with the other types as well as the perception of intergroup competition.

For the test of Hypothesis 2, we look at the main effects of the identification types. Hypothesis 2a predicts that, given its optimal distinctiveness, ethnic identification more than republican or federal identification would reinforce in-group stereotypes. This prediction was not confirmed: the effects of republican identification were twice as strong on both positive and negative in-group stereotypes, as the effects of ethnic identification, while the effects of federal identification were the weakest (see Table 4). It turns out that the republican superordinate identification contributes the most to people's self-evaluations when people identify on average at the ethnic and federal level. The main effects of the superordinate identifications

Table 4. Effects of Identification Types, Intergroup Competition, and Their Interactions with Ethnic Groups

Predictors	Multivariate Pillais <i>F</i> (4, 3,647)	Stereotypes			
		In-Group Positive	In-Group Negative	Out-Group Positive	Out-Group Negative
Ethnic identification	30.73***	.99 (.15) <i>F</i> = 43.45***	-.57 (.17) <i>F</i> = 10.87**	-.98 (.17) <i>F</i> = 34.52***	.10 (.19) <i>F</i> = .27
× ethnic groups	1.83, ns	-.22 (.15) <i>F</i> = 2.23	.40 (.17) <i>F</i> = 5.40*	-.18 (.17) <i>F</i> = 1.15	.03 (.19) <i>F</i> = .02
Republican identification	50.74***	1.70 (.18) <i>F</i> = 90.43***	-.97 (.21) <i>F</i> = 22.21***	2.37 (.20) <i>F</i> = 142.21***	-1.69 (.23) <i>F</i> = 56.11***
× ethnic groups	36.81***	.95 (.18) <i>F</i> = 27.95***	-.87 (.21) <i>F</i> = 17.99***	-1.50 (.20) <i>F</i> = 56.61***	1.17 (.23) <i>F</i> = 26.96***
Federal identification	4.98***	.43 (.14) <i>F</i> = 9.05**	-.12 (.17) <i>F</i> = .51	.64 (.16) <i>F</i> = 15.91***	.01 (.18) <i>F</i> = .00
× ethnic groups	19.64***	-.44 (.14) <i>F</i> = 9.37**	.38 (.17) <i>F</i> = 5.14*	1.06 (.16) <i>F</i> = 43.70***	-.51 (.18) <i>F</i> = 7.67**
Intergroup competition	177.33***	-.32 (.14) <i>F</i> = 4.78*	1.21 (.17) <i>F</i> = 52.41***	-2.84 (.16) <i>F</i> = 312.38***	4.31 (.18) <i>F</i> = 557.22***
× ethnic groups	13.38***	-.64 (.14) <i>F</i> = 19.41***	.17 (.17) <i>F</i> = 1.04	.23 (.16) <i>F</i> = 2.08	-.91 (.18) <i>F</i> = 24.84***
Ethnic groups	43.41***	.30 (.18) <i>F</i> = 2.78	-1.47 (.20) <i>F</i> = 51.43***	.37 (.20) <i>F</i> = 3.44	1.59 (.22) <i>F</i> = 50.00***

Note. All the effects presented in this table were estimated in one model, with the four dependent variables, as well as the factor “Ethnic groups,” covariates, and the two-way interactions between the factor and the covariates.

The values represent unstandardized regression coefficients (with standard errors between parentheses) of the univariate ANCOVA analysis $F(1, 7,299)$ with significance levels: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

on in-group stereotypes were qualified by significant interaction terms that will be discussed under Hypothesis 3b.

Hypothesis 2b predicts negative effects of ethnic identification and positive effects of the superordinate identifications on *out-group stereotypes*. Table 4 shows that the predictions on positive stereotypes were confirmed, with the effect of republican identification almost 4 times stronger than the effects of ethnic identification. Federal identification has the weakest effects. Neither the ethnic nor the federal identifications had a significant effect on the negative stereotypes, but the effect of republican identification was significant and in the predicted direction: those who identify stronger with the republic have more positive stereotypes of the out-group. The main effects of the superordinate identifications on out-group stereotypes were also further qualified by significant interactions with ethnic groups, which will be discussed under Hypothesis 3a.

In summary, the results show different effects of identification at different inclusiveness levels. The republican identification should have an intermediate inclusiveness effect, in between the more exclusive ethnic identification and the higher-order federal identification. However, republican identification contributes the most to improving the evaluations of the in-group as well as the out-group. By the same token, ethnic identification is the identification that is the most exclusive of out-groups (Brewer, 2001). Identification at the superordinate level of the Russian Federation has a much weaker impact: It has a significant effect only on the positive in-group and out-group stereotypes, while it did not affect the negative stereotypes.

Hypothesis 3: Differential Effects of the Superordinate Identifications for Russians and Titulars

Hypothesis 3a predicts that the superordinate identifications will have different effects on *out-group stereotypes* of Russians and titulars. The last two rows of Table 5 show the results of simple slope analyses that confirm the hypothesis. For Russians, republican identification improves positive and decreases negative stereotypes of titulars. For titulars, these effects are not significant for negative stereotypes and very weak for positive stereotypes. Similarly, federal identification improves positive and decreases negative stereotypes titulars have of Russians but has no significant effects among Russians.

Table 5. Superordinate Identifications and Ethnic Groups: Results of Simple Slope Analyses

Ethnic Groups	Republican Identification		Federal Identification	
	Russians	Titulars	Russians	Titulars
Multivariate Pillais <i>F</i> (4, 3,647)	89.36***	22.63***	7.00***	20.45***
Univariate results				
In-group positive stereotypes	.76 (.14) <i>F</i> = 14.07***	2.65 (.30) <i>F</i> = 80.11***	.88 (.22) <i>F</i> = 15.22***	-.00 (.18) <i>F</i> = .00
In-group negative stereotypes	-.10 (.23) <i>F</i> = .18	-1.84 (.34) <i>F</i> = 29.34***	-.50 (.26) <i>F</i> = 3.67	.26 (.20) <i>F</i> = 1.53
Out-group positive stereotypes	3.87 (.22) <i>F</i> = 298.43***	.87 (.33) <i>F</i> = 7.09**	-.42 (.25) <i>F</i> = 2.84	1.70 (.20) <i>F</i> = 71.17***
Out-group negative stereotypes	-2.86 (.25) <i>F</i> = 126.91***	-.52 (.37) <i>F</i> = 1.93	.51 (.28) <i>F</i> = 3.24	-.50 (.23) <i>F</i> = 4.75*

Note. These are the results of the simple slope main effect analysis of two interaction terms: the interaction between ethnic groups and republican identification (Multivariate Pillais' test: *F*(4, 3,647) = 36.81, *p* < .001) and the interaction between ethnic groups and Russian Federation identification. *F*(4, 3,647) = 19.64, *p* < .001).

The values represent unstandardized regression coefficients (with standard errors between parentheses) of the univariate ANCOVA analysis *F*(1, 7,299) with the respective significance levels: **p* < .05; ***p* < .01; ****p* < .001.

Hypothesis 3b refers to the analysis of the interaction effects between superordinate identifications and ethnic groups on *in-group stereotypes*. The first two rows of Table 5 summarizing the effects on in-group stereotypes confirm our expectations almost entirely. Republican identification (more typical for titulars) strongly contributes to improving in-group stereotypes for titulars, but it is much weaker in its effects for Russians, that is, the effect on positive stereotypes is 6 times weaker, and it is insignificant on negative stereotypes. Similarly, federal identification (more typical for Russians) has no effect on in-group stereotypes of titulars, while it does contribute to the positive stereotypes of Russians.

In conclusion, identification at more inclusive levels does not always reflect improving intergroup relations; its effect seems to depend on the typicality of the superordinate identification. Those subgroups who are not supposed to claim ownership of the superordinate category, but who do identify at the superordinate level are more positive about the other subgroup than those who are supposed to claim ownership. Russians' republican identification, for instance, results in improved stereotypes of titulars. On the other hand, those subgroups who are supposed to raise claims on being the typical representatives of the superordinate category seem to feel justified not to include other subgroups if they identify with the superordinate category: titulars' republican identification as well as Russians' federal identification less strongly or not significantly improve positive out-group stereotypes or weaken negative out-group stereotypes.

Finally, we present the effects of intergroup competition. Intergroup competition had a very strong effect on out-group stereotypes in particular (almost 4 times stronger than the maximum effect of republican identification), and more on negative than on positive stereotypes. These effects are in the expected direction: more perceived competition leads to more negative and less positive out-group stereotypes. However, perceiving higher intergroup competition also slightly lowers one's positive in-group stereotypes and increases the negative in-group stereotypes. This latter effect is surprisingly strong. The simple slope analysis of the interaction with the ethnic groups, as shown in Table 5, indicates that the perception of intergroup competition strengthens Russians' negative stereotypes of titulars (the effect is twice as strong as for titulars and for positive out-group stereotypes). This result is consistent with what could be expected from threat and the relative group positions theories: the dominant group (Russians) is more likely to feel threatened by a subordinate group (titulars) than vice versa.⁴ This implies that perceived intergroup competition may undermine the benign (inclusive) effects of the republican identification among Russians (republican identification highly improved Russians' stereotypes of titulars). Further studies should focus on the

⁴The mean scores on perceived intergroup competition were as follows: Russians: 2.66 ($SD = 1.17$), titulars: 2.19 ($SD = 1.09$). They are significantly different, with $F(1, 10,413) = 461.91, p < .001$. Russians perceive more intergroup competition between themselves and the respective titulars living in the same autonomous republic, than the titular groups do.

Table 6. The Effects of Intergroup Competition for Each Ethnic Group: Results of Simple Slope Analyses

Ethnic Groups	Intergroup Competition	
	Russians	Titulars
Multivariate Pillais <i>F</i> (4, 3,647)	130.93***	60.75***
Univariate results		
In-group positive stereotypes	.32 (.20) <i>F</i> = 2.53	-.95 (.21) <i>F</i> = 21.13***
In-group negative stereotypes	1.04 (.23) <i>F</i> = 19.91***	1.38 (.24) <i>F</i> = 33.17***
Out-group positive stereotypes	-3.07 (.22) <i>F</i> = 188.01***	-2.61 (.23) <i>F</i> = 128.13***
Out-group negative stereotypes	5.22 (.25) <i>F</i> = 420.49***	3.40 (.26) <i>F</i> = 168.64***

Note. These are the results of the simple slope main effect analysis of the interaction term between ethnic groups and intergroup competition (Multivariate Pillais' test: $F(4, 3,647) = 13.38, p < .001$).

The values represent unstandardized regression coefficients (with standard errors between parentheses) of the univariate ANCOVA analysis $F(1, 7,299)$ with the respective significance levels: *** $p < .001$.

possible interactions between intergroup competition and identification types, to specifically test this assumption (see Table 6). These dynamics were beyond the scope of the current analysis.

General Discussion and Conclusions

In addition to their primary ethnic identities, people are attached to multiple overlapping identification categories (Pope & Hagendoorn, 2001). The effects of multiple identifications on patterns of polarization between groups may be rather complex, in particular in the former Soviet Union where a hierarchically layered political structure was designed in order to prevent ethnic conflict. We investigated whether intergroup polarization between Russians and titulars in autonomous republics of the Russian Federation is moderated by superordinate civic identifications (i.e., republican and federal identification).

We found support for the claim that the civic superordinate identifications may ensure the desired regional stability. A higher identification with the republic relates to more positive stereotypes and less negative stereotypes of the out-group, whereas federal identification also relates to more positive outgroup stereotypes, but not affect negative stereotypes of the out-group.

The study shows that a simple dichotomy of in-group–out-group should be avoided. Ethnic identification was differentially connected to the republican and the federal identifications for the Russians and the titulars, and therefore it was obvious that the two superordinate identifications differed in their consequences

for Russians' and titulars' negative evaluations of out-groups. For this reason the effect of the superordinate identifications did not completely conform to the mutual differentiation model. Instead, the effects were qualified by the meaning Russian and titulars attached to the superordinate categories and are therefore more in line with the predictions of the in-group projection model (Waldzus et al., 2003). In other words, the more attached a group is to the superordinate identification, the more it emphasized its own positive characteristics and the less it emphasized the positive attributes of the other subgroup subsumed under the shared higher-level category.

The meaning of the two superordinate categories (republic and federation) for Russians and titulars in our research is defined by the political reality of the intergroup relations in the current Russian Federation. This reality determines the optional identification choices for both ethnic groups. The social psychological consequences of their choices are as complex as the hierarchically embedded structure of autonomies of the Russian Federation. It is not the case that the higher-level units simply unify the lower-level units. The higher-level units rather emerge as a new field of struggle for dominance. The titulars generally seem to claim a special "right" on the republican level (which bears their ethnic name), and Russians claim to be the "true owners" at the federal level. Therefore, it appeared that the superordinate categories did their work as unifiers only halfway for Russians, the republican identification did indeed lead to more positive stereotypes of titulars, but the same was not true for the stereotypes by titulars of Russians. The same dynamic reappeared at the federal level: here the evaluations of Russians by titulars improved, but not those of titulars given by Russians. The two superordinate identifications, in addition, affected the in-group stereotypes in such a way that the polarization between the groups only increased. Hence, the effects of the superordinate categories on the in-group side of the intergroup differentiation were negative.

There was another important finding, namely that Russians were much more reluctant than titulars to be explicitly negative about the out-group. While titulars favored their in-group on both negative and positive evaluations, the dominant Russian group favored their in-group only on the positive stereotypes. Hence, also the positive-negative asymmetry manifested itself only halfway, namely for the dominant (Russian) group of the Russian Federation. This finding has to be qualified, Russians' discrimination (expressed by the reduction of their positive stereotypes of the titulars) exceeded the discrimination manifested by the titulars.

In addition to the literature on intergroup relations between Russians and titulars in the borderland republics of Russia (e.g., Hagendoorn et al., 2001), this study indicates the tensions present between Russians and titulars within the Russian Federation itself. Russians seem insecure about their position in the autonomous republics in the Russian Federation. They seem to hesitate between integration in the republic and acknowledging that large conflicts of interest with the titulars are possible. Although Russians perceive the republic in principle as an

inclusive unit that grants them an equal position, titulars perceive their republic more as a platform that guarantees their dominance. This antagonistic dynamics is not fully counterbalanced by the inclusive effects of identifying with the federation. Meanwhile, it should not be denied that the superordinate republican identification is partially fulfilling its role for maintaining peaceful intergroup relations: it makes Russians feel included in the lower administrative levels of the federation, at the price of fueling feelings of pride and ethnic belonging of titulars.

The pattern of associations between identification types and intergroup polarization suggests that political entrepreneurs in Russia can easily destroy the beneficial effects of superordinate identifications by trying to mobilize groups: appealing to republican identity for titulars and federal identity for Russians.

Our findings show that identification at a superordinate level affects intergroup evaluations, rather than triggering the personalization of group members (Brewer & Schneider, 1990). Therefore, also superordinate identifications can be used for collective mobilization. This study shows this strategic potential of social identifications and thus complements the previous studies in which this role was assigned only to intergroup competition and threat (Hagendoorn et al., 2001; Poppe & Hagendoorn, 2001, 2003), and it raises new questions about the forms this political mobilization may take.

In any social context, different identity categories can be defined in more or less exclusive terms, reflecting asymmetric claims of entitlement to specific rights. Analyzing the implications that specific categories have on the intergroup relationship, as a function of the meanings attributed to these categories by the groups involved, could be a fruitful contribution of social psychology to understanding real-life power struggles (cf. Reicher et al., 1997). Currently, too little attention is paid to the constructed and disputed character of identity categories. While the strength of our findings lies in testing the consequences of the assumed meanings of the identification types for Russians and titulars, here lies also one limitation of this research: the lack of measurement of the perceived typicality of the superordinate categories, or individual understanding of the political reality. Future quantitative and qualitative studies should address the way people relate to the political reality of their intergroup context. Currently, we addressed the way identification at various levels reflect the administrative layers that confer differential power and legitimacy to entitlement claims to the groups of Russians and titulars. Future research could also focus on the impact of different ideologies, such as multiculturalism or assimilation, on defining the inclusiveness or typicality of certain identity categories (cf. Billig, 1994).

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1990). *Social identity theory. Constructive and critical advances*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. London: Sage Publications.
- Billig, M. (1994). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Brewer, M. B. (2001). Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict. When does ingroup love become outgroup hate? In R. D. Ashmore, L. Jussim, & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Rutgers series on self and social identity: Vol. 3. Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction* (pp. 17–41). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love or outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429–444.
- Brewer, M. B., & Schneider, S. K. (1990). Social identity and social dilemmas: a double-edged sword. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory. Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 169–184). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Bourhis, R. Y., Turner, J. C., & Gagnon, A. (1997). Interdependence, social identity and discrimination. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.) *The social psychology of stereotyping and group Life* (pp. 273–296). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the new Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Crisp, R. J., Ensari, N., Hewstone, M., & Miller, N. (2002). A dual-route model of crossed categorization effects. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 13, 35–73.
- Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B. A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common ingroup identity model: Recategorization and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology*, Vol. 4 (pp. 1–26). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Gonzalez, R., & Brown, R. (2003). Generalization of positive attitude as a function of subgroup superordinate group identifications in intergroup contact. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 195–214.
- Hagendoorn, L. (1993). Ethnic categorization and outgroup exclusion: Cultural values and social stereotypes in the construction of ethnic hierarchies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16, 226–251.
- Hagendoorn, L., Drogendijk, R., Tumanov, S., & Hraba, J. (1998). Inter-ethnic preferences and ethnic hierarchies in the former Soviet Union. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 483–503.
- Hagendoorn, L., Linssen, H., & Tumanov, S. (2001). *Inter-group relations in states of the former Soviet Union: The perception of Russians*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Hewstone, N., & Brown, R. J. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the contact hypothesis. In M. Hewstone & R. J. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 1–44). New York: Blackwell.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subgroup relations: A comparison of mutual intergroup differentiation and common ingroup identity models of prejudice reduction. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*, 26, 242–256.
- Laitin, D. (1998). *Identity in formation, The Russian-speaking populations in the Near Abroad*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, J. (1992). Ingroup bias as function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 103–122.
- 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.
- Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (1999). Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: Reactions to intergroup difference. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 158–174.
- Poppe, E., & Hagendoorn, L. (2001). Types of identification among Russians in the near abroad. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 53, 57–71.
- Poppe, E., & Hagendoorn, L. (2003). Titular identification of Russians in former soviet republics. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 55, 771–787.
- Poppe, E., & Linssen, H. (1999). Ingroup favoritism and the reflection of realistic dimensions of difference between national states in Central and Eastern European nationality stereotypes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 85–102.

- Reicher, S., Hopkins, N., & Condor, S. (1997). Stereotype construction as a strategy of influence. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 94–118). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Sachdev, I., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1991). Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *21*, 1–24.
- Simon, B., Kulla, C., & Zobel, M. (1995). On being more than just a part of the whole: Regional identity and social distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 325–340.
- Spears, R., Oakes, P. J., Ellemers, N., & Haslam, S. A. (1997). *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tishkov, V. (1997). *Ethnicity, nationalism and conflict in and after the Soviet Union*. London: Sage Publications.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Van Knippenberg, A., & Ellemers, N. (1990). Social identity and intergroup differentiation processes. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 137–169). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. Hove and New York: Psychology Press.
- Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., & Wenzel, M. (2005). When “different” means “worse”: Ingroup prototypicality in changing intergroup contexts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *41*, 76–83.
- Waldzus, S., Mummendey, A., Wenzel, M., & Weber, U. (2003). Towards tolerance: Representations of superordinate categories and perceived ingroup prototypicality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *39*, 31–47.
- Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., Weber, U., & Waldzus, S. (2003). Ingroup as pars pro toto: Projection from the ingroup onto the inclusive category as a precursor to social discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 461–473.

ANCA MINESCU is a University College Utrecht graduate, currently working on her PhD project at ERCOMER, within the ICS, at Utrecht University. She has a research master degree in Migration, Ethnic Relations, and Multiculturalism (2004). Her research interests lie at the intersection between social psychology, sociology, and political science. Her doctoral thesis is about the effects of relative group size on intergroup attitudes, varying from stereotypes, intergroup competition, minority rights, and political separatism. Specific conditions that catalyze or moderate the effects of group size as well as social psychological mediation of these interactions are analyzed. The aim is to develop and test a theory on the generalization of group size effects on intergroup attitudes.

LOUK HAGENDOORN is Professor of Social Sciences and Dean of the Graduate School of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. He was the Academic Director and cofounder of the European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER) in Utrecht. His research is focused on intergroup relations, prejudice, and political psychology. He did research in Western and Eastern Europe and published on ethnic relations, stereotypes, and nationalism in sociology, social psychology, and political science journals. Recent publication is *When ways of life collide. Multiculturalism in the Netherlands and its discontents* (with P. Sniderman), 2007.

EDWIN POPPE is Assistant Professor at the Department of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences and staff member of ERCOMER at Utrecht University. He conducted a survey study in six Central and Eastern European countries on national and ethnic stereotypes and was involved in various survey studies in the Russian Federation and other republics of the former Soviet Union. He has published on the content of stereotypes in social psychology journals and on the identification of Russians in journals focusing on the former Soviet Union. His lecturing activities include the topics of intergroup relations, migration, ethnic prejudice, and nationalism.

Appendix. Scale Items for the Predictors

Predictor	Scale Items
Ethnic identification	<p>"It is of great importance for me to be a Russian/to be regarded as a fellow titular by the titular population"</p> <p>"I am proud to be a Russian/to be regarded as a titular person"</p>
Republican identification	<p>"I feel attached to the republic in which I live"</p> <p>"I am proud of the republic in which I live"</p>
Federal identification	<p>"It is of great importance for me to be a citizen of the Russian Federation"</p> <p>"I am proud to be a citizen of the Russian Federation"</p>
Perceived intergroup competition	<p>"The titular population/Russian people in our republic have better job opportunities than the Russians/titulars"</p> <p>"The economic interests of the titular population in the republic are in conflict with the Russians in this republic"</p> <p>"The political interests of the titular population in the republic are in conflict with the Russians in this republic"</p>