

Nationalism and patriotism: National identification and out-group rejection

Amélie Mummendey* and Andreas Klink

University of Jena, Germany

Rupert Brown

University of Kent, UK

It is argued that the differentiation between nationalism and patriotism proposed in the literature can be seen as analogous to judgments based on different types of comparisons: intergroup comparisons with other nations are associated with intergroup behaviour that corresponds to nationalism, whereas temporal or standard comparisons are linked with behaviour that corresponds to patriotism. Four studies ($N = 103, 107, 96$ and 105) conducted in Germany and Britain examined the hypothesis that national identification and in-group evaluation only show a reliable relationship with out-group rejection under an intergroup comparison orientation. Participants were primed with either an intergroup comparison, a temporal comparison or no explicit comparison orientation. A subsequent questionnaire assessed in-group (own country) identification, in-group evaluation (i.e. national pride) and rejection of national out-groups. Across all four studies, both in-group identification and in-group evaluation show a stronger correlation with out-group derogation if participants were primed with an intergroup comparison orientation compared to temporal and control conditions. Results are discussed with regard to nationalism and patriotism as well as Hinkle and Brown's (1990) model on relational vs. autonomous orientations.

People like to think positively about themselves and the groups to which they belong. The latter proposition is one of the core assumptions of Social Identity Theory (SIT; e.g. Tajfel & Turner, 1986). One of the group memberships that may contribute to one's identity is that of one's national belongingness. Consequently, it can be assumed that if people identify as a member of their nation group, they attempt to evaluate positively the nation to which they belong. Faced with the relatively modest levels of national pride shown in opinion polls in Germany, some political scientists have even put forward the political claim to (re-)establish a sound and 'healthy' national pride in this country as a precondition for the stability of a democratic society (Noelle-Neumann & Köcher, 1987; Topf, Mohler, Heath,

* Requests for reprints should be addressed to Amélie Mummendey, Friedrich-Schiller Universität Jena, Institut für Psychologie, Lehrstuhl für Sozialpsychologie, Humboldtstr. 26, D-07743 Jena, Germany (e-mail: s7muam@uni-jena.de).

& Trompeter, 1990). However, positive feelings towards one's national in-group in the sense of nationalism may be directly related to out-group rejection and hostility (e.g. Blank & Schmidt, 1993, 1997; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Tajfel, 1969). Thus, the question is whether positive feelings towards one's own nation are to be considered valuable and necessary or whether they should be regarded as detrimental and avoidable. The present study addresses exactly this issue, investigating the social psychological antecedents of an association between a positive evaluation of one's own nation and rejection of foreigners.

Nationalism and patriotism

The problem of the desirability of a positive feeling towards one's own nation on the one hand and the derogation and rejection of foreigners as its inevitable consequence on the other is mirrored in social psychological discussions on nationalism and patriotism. According to Kosterman and Feshbach (1989), nationalism represents the detrimental facet of positive in-group evaluation since it includes the view that one's country is superior to others and hence should be dominant. However, patriotism is understood as an essentially valuable aspect, because it represents feelings of attachment to one's country (see also Blank & Schmidt, 1993). Reflecting its Janus-like character, Staub (1997) and Schatz and Staub (1997) differentiate among blind and constructive patriotism. In their accounts, 'blind patriotism' corresponds to the uncritical support for any action of the in-group. In contrast, 'constructive patriotism' represents critical awareness of and loyalty towards the in-group. Thus, in terms of SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), nationalism can be conceived as an intergroup differentiation whereas patriotism can be understood as part of a positive in-group evaluation. In a nutshell, nationalism is seen as inherently related to out-group derogation, whereas patriotism is expected to reveal a positive relation to own group *independent of* out-group derogation (Blank & Schmidt, 1993). In general, patriotism is understood as an affective attachment towards the in-group implying feelings of belongingness, responsibility and pride (e.g. Bar-Tal, 1993; Staub, 1997). It is also said to reflect the desire to belong to a group that is valued positively (Bar-Tal, 1993).

Empirical evidence seems to support the distinction between nationalism and patriotism. In factor analytic studies, discernibly different clusters of attitudes have been identified which seem to correspond to a positive but critical appreciation of one's own country (patriotism) and a 'my country right or wrong' orientation that also involves some derogation of other nations (Blank & Schmidt, 1993; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Schatz & Staub, 1997, but see Billig, 1995, for a critical discussion of the issue). Perhaps not surprisingly because both share a positive in-group evaluation, these two factors tend to be positively correlated, though only moderately (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). Leaving aside for a moment the question of whether nationalism and patriotism represent distinct psychological states of mind or distinct motivations, they nevertheless may be linked to different types of underlying processes owing to judgments based on different types of comparisons.

Nationalism/patriotism and types of comparisons

The proposition that people attempt to evaluate positively the groups they belong to is one of the central assumptions of SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). A further assumption is that such a positive in-group evaluation depends on favourable *social* comparisons with other relevant groups. Thus, it can be deduced that a positive evaluation of one's nation depends on favourable comparisons with other nations. Also, SIT predicts a positive correlation between in-group identification and intergroup differentiation, which implies that national identification and the derogation of other nations should be positively related (Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, & Williams, 1986).

However, Mummendey & Simon (1997) argue that *intergroup* comparisons are not the only means by which a positive in-group evaluation can be achieved. They identify three types of comparison as contributing to an in-group evaluation: intergroup, temporal, and in relation to some absolute criterion or abstract standard. Thus, one's country may be regarded favourably (or negatively) compared (1) to other countries, (2) to how that country had fared in the past (or might do in the future, or (3) to some socio-political prototype of an 'ideal' society. Mummendey and Simon further propose that the particular comparison orientation adopted will moderate the relationship between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation.

A similar argument is made by Hinkle and Brown (1990), who argue that intergroup comparisons are not the only means by which group identities are sustained. Some groups, or some group members, may use other types of comparisons to evaluate their in-group—for example, with reference to absolute standards. They proposed a dimension of social orientation called 'relational-autonomous' to describe this variation, and argued that the kinds of psychological processes identified by SIT would only apply to those groups (or group members) that were located towards the 'relational' pole of this continuum.¹ This implies, therefore, that the predicted correlation between group identification and in-group bias should be most noticeable under conditions which promote a relational orientation or among group members who habitually favour such an orientation. Some research already supports this contention (Brown, Hinkle, Ely, Fox-Cardamone, Maras, & Taylor, 1992; although cf. Brown, Capozza, Paladino, & Volpato, 1996, for some subsequent inconsistent findings).

While the research on the issue of relational vs. non-relational orientations has accumulated correlational evidence, to our knowledge, no attempt has yet been made to manipulate comparison orientations. Thus, the present research aims to manipulate respondents' comparison orientation and then examine the correlation between in-group evaluation, in-group identification and out-group derogation.

Applying these lines of theorizing to the field of nationalism and patriotism, we assume that a relational orientation leads to intergroup behaviour that corresponds to nationalism or 'blind' patriotism (i.e. an identification with and a positive

¹Hinkle and Brown (1990) also proposed a second dimension, orthogonal to autonomous-relational, which would also determine the applicability of Social Identity Theory. This was individualism and collectivism (Triandis *et al.*, 1988).

Table 1. Sample characteristics

	Respondents	Gender	Age	Nationality
Study 1	103 science students	All male	22.93 (SD=2.41; 19–31)	German
Study 2	77 students from a technical college	25 male 52 female	25.00 (SD=3.94; 20–36)	German
Study 3	96 pupils	57 male 39 female	13.54 (SD=.60; 12–14)	British
Study 4	105 students	45 male 60 female	22.39 (SD=7.87; 18–65)	British

evaluation of one's nation which is inherently related to a derogation of other nations). In contrast, a non-relational or autonomous orientation corresponds to 'constructive' patriotism (i.e. a national identification and positive regard which is independent of simultaneous derogation of other nations).

Hypotheses

H₁—Applying one of SIT's central assumptions, in-group evaluation should be positively related to in-group identification regardless of comparison orientation.

H₂—Only under induced intergroup comparison (relational) orientation would we expect a positive relation between in-group evaluation, in-group identification and outgroup derogation. Under non-intergroup comparison (autonomous) orientation, we expect no such associations.

Method

Respondents

These were 381 students from four educational institutions in Germany² and Britain. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the four samples.

Procedure

Respondents were provided with a booklet containing the manipulation and dependent measures. Comparison conditions were manipulated through a priming procedure. In each of the four studies, participants were asked to make a positive evaluation of their own nation either through intergroup comparisons with other (unspecified) nations (intergroup comparison orientation), or through temporal comparisons with the past (temporal or non-intergroup comparison orientation) or without any explicit reference to a particular comparison standard (control condition). During the priming

²For the study of national attitudes, the case of Germany seems of particular interest, because one of the remarkably stable characteristics of post-war Germany was the fact that German citizens held ambivalent, if not negative, attitudes towards the whole topic of a German nation. Compared to other countries, German survey data typically revealed either neutral, ambivalent or even rejective feelings toward Germany as a nation and towards one's identity as German (e.g. Noelle-Neumann & Köcher, 1987).

Table 2. Items to assess variables

	Identification	In-group evaluation	Out-group derogation	Internal minorities
Study 1	5 items .80	13 items .86	16 items .70	1 item
Study 2	4 items .77	7 items .86	11 items .78	10 items .72
Study 3	6 items .81	6 items .79	10 items .79	—
Study 4	13 items .92	6 items .74	9 items .84	9 items .86

Note. Depicted are the number of items administered to assess each concept and scale reliabilities.

procedure, participants were first asked to generate reasons why they preferred to live in their home country rather than in a different country, in their home country today rather than in the past, or in their home country without any specific comparison reference. Following this, respondents were provided with further items that reinforced the positive in-group evaluation orientation (e.g. by pointing to advantages in health system, social security, democracy, etc.). Depending on the experimental condition, these were worded using an appropriate comparative framework (e.g. compared to other countries, to former times, or with no comparative reference).

After completing the priming procedure, a questionnaire including a series of items measuring in-group (national) identification, in-group pride (e.g. with national history, culture, etc.), derogation of foreigners was administered. In each of the studies a slightly different but to a large extent overlapping inventory of items was used. Table 2 gives an overview and presents scale reliabilities.

Measures

In-group identification. In Study 1, in-group identification was assessed using five items (e.g. 'I identify with the Germans', 'It is important to me to be a German'). In Study 2, the same item pool was used, but for reliability reasons one of the identification items had to be excluded ('I regard myself as a typical German'). In Study 3, the identification measure consisted of six items with three of them already applied in the first two studies. Finally, in Study 4, an elaborated identification scale by Klink, Mummendey, and Mielke (1998) was administered. From the original item pool, three items were excluded because of reliability issues; thus for Study 4, a total of 13 identification items remained. In all four studies, 5-point scales, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, were used. Scale reliabilities were more than satisfactory (Cronbach's α s = .77–.92).

In-group evaluation. In three of the four studies, a subset of seven identical items was used to assess in-group evaluation, each of them asking how proud respondents were of a particular national aspect (e.g. 'How proud are you of the German/British history?'). Items covered pride in history, the political system and democratic institutions, political influence in the world, economic success, welfare state achievements, technical and scientific success and culture. In Study 3, the welfare state achievements were excluded, because they were not meaningful to the pupils involved in that study. In Study 1, five additional aspects were included: tolerance towards minorities, citizens' action groups, the readiness to contribute to various charitable organizations, tolerance within society, and political participation. Those aspects formed additional heterogeneous factors and thus were not used in subsequent studies. In all four studies, 5-point scales ranging from not proud at all to very proud were used. Scale reliabilities were satisfactory (α = .73–.86).

Out-group derogation. In Study 1, out-group derogation was measured by a set of 16 items stemming from scales by Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) and Blank and Schmidt (1993) (e.g. 'If there are not many jobs, the foreigners living in Germany should be sent back to their own countries'). The remaining three studies each used a subset of 11 items from the Pettigrew and Meertens scale that were carefully selected to cover blatant (e.g. 'I don't want a foreigner to join my family through marriage') and subtle (e.g. 'Foreigners living here should not push themselves where they are not wanted') aspects of out-group derogation. In Study 2, the derogation score was composed of all 11 items, while in Studies 3 and 4, some items had to be excluded because of reliability issues. Again, in all four studies, 5-point scales, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree were used. Scale reliabilities were satisfactory ($\alpha = .70-.84$).

Results

To examine H_1 and H_2 correlations between in-group evaluation, in-group identification and out-group derogation were computed. Table 3 presents those correlations for each of the studies separately and also averaged across the four studies.

In H_1 , we expected a positive correlation between in-group evaluation and identification regardless of comparison condition. Consistent with expectations, across all four studies, the correlations between in-group evaluation and identification were, with only one exception ($r = .17$ in Study 2 under control conditions), both significant and positive, ranging from $r = .37$ to $r = .67$ (all $p < .04$). Including all four studies into a small meta-analysis using Fisher's z transformation and the Schmidt-Hunter Method offers additional support for H_1 . Here, all three average correlations were significant (r s ranging from .46 to .58; $p < .001$), and they did not differ between conditions (all $p > .10$). Tests on the homogeneity of effect sizes reveal overall homogenous population effect sizes (i.e. correlations).

H_2 predicted a positive relation between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation and between in-group identification and out-group derogation in the intergroup comparison condition. Both parts of the hypothesis were at least partially confirmed. In Studies 1 and 2, positive correlations of $r = .41$ ($p < .02$) and $r = .31$ ($p = .11$) between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation were observed in the intergroup comparison condition, while the correlations in Studies 3 and 4 are rather weak (both $p > .30$). In contrast, the corresponding relationships in the temporal comparison and control condition were, with one exception ($r = .52$ in Study 2 under control conditions), all not significantly different from zero (r s ranging from $-.24$ to $.26$). Additionally, three of the four studies led to the predicted significant positive correlation between in-group identification and out-group derogation under intergroup comparison orientation (r s ranging from .49 to .53, all three p s $< .008$). Here, the corresponding relationships in the temporal comparison and control condition were all not significantly different from zero (r s ranging from $-.23$ to $.29$).

Including all four studies into a small meta-analysis using Fisher's z transformation and the Schmidt-Hunter Method offers additional support for H_2 . Here, average correlations of $r = .24$ ($p < .01$) between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation and $r = .44$ ($p < .001$) between in-group identification and out-group derogation were observed in the intergroup comparison condition. In contrast, the corresponding relationships in the temporal comparison and control condition

were all not significantly different from zero ($r_s = .13$ and $.05$, $.09$ and $.11$). The differences between the correlations in the intergroup comparison condition and the other two conditions were significant in the case of identification–derogation (both $p < .05$), but not for the in-group evaluation–derogation relationships. None of the correlations in the temporal and control conditions differed reliably. Tests on the homogeneity of effect sizes reveal overall homogenous population correlations with one notable exception: correlations between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation in the control condition show a certain amount of effect size variance (all other $p < .10$).

The pattern of correlations involving out-group derogation suggests that in-group identification plays a special role in mediating the significant relationship between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation observed under intergroup comparison orientation. To test this hypothesis, multiple regression analyses including identification and in-group evaluation as predictors were computed. It can be shown that the strong positive correlations between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation observed under induced intergroup comparison orientation in Studies 1 and 2 diminish as soon as in-group identification is considered as a second predictor ($\beta = .13$ in Study 1; $\beta = .05$ in Study 2; both $p > .50$). At the same time, the effect of in-group identification on out-group derogation remains significant ($\beta = .45$ in Study 1; $\beta = .46$ in Study 2; both $p < .04$). As Studies 3 and 4 did not produce comparable strong positive correlations between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation, we did not compute regression analyses for those studies. However, to evaluate the overall picture of all four studies, we calculated an additional regression analysis using the average correlations obtained in our meta-analyses. The result confirms the pattern observed in Studies 1 and 2: the significant positive correlation between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation diminishes as soon as in-group identification is considered as a second predictor ($\beta = -.01$, $p > .93$), while the effect of in-group identification on out-group derogation remains significant ($\beta = .45$; $p < .001$).

To rule out possible alternative explanations that rely on the fact that the comparison conditions may have induced different levels of positive in-group evaluation, in-group identification and out-group rejection, we computed additional 3×4 ANOVAs on each measure with Experimental Condition and Study as factors. Table 4 displays means and standard deviations for all variables. For none of the measures was any significant main or interaction effect of priming manipulations observed (all $p > .33$). Thus, manipulating comparison orientations did not lead to differential levels of positive in-group evaluation, in-group identification or out-group derogation. The only reliable effects in these analyses were highly significant main effects owing to Study: for in-group evaluation ($F(3,368) = 47.96$, $p < .001$), for in-group identification ($F(3,369) = 98.35$, $p < .001$) and for out-group derogation ($F(3,369) = 35.99$, $p < .001$). Not surprisingly, given the substantial age and potential cultural differences among the four studies, there were some sizeable differences in absolute levels on our four measures. The most obvious among those involved nationality, with the British respondents showing higher levels of in-group evaluation, in-group identification and out-group derogation than their German counterparts.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations for all dependent variables

	Study:	Inter-group comparison				Temporal comparison				Control condition			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
IG evaluation	<i>M</i>	2.89	2.38	3.82	3.30	2.80	2.81	3.99	3.29	3.01	2.63	3.77	3.38
	<i>SD</i>	.68	1.03	.74	.79	.77	.93	.65	.64	.49	.94	.70	.54
Identification	<i>M</i>	2.62	2.22	3.73	3.70	2.48	2.09	3.76	3.70	2.54	1.99	3.69	3.82
	<i>SD</i>	1.02	.92	.88	.88	.84	.83	.64	.77	.68	.52	.70	.71
OG derogation	<i>M</i>	2.36	1.71	2.72	2.13	2.21	1.63	2.66	2.07	2.25	1.65	2.44	2.16
	<i>SD</i>	.47	.61	.78	.71	.31	.57	.63	.60	.32	.46	.67	.82

Note. Depicted are means and standard deviations and information on significant effects of comparison orientation and study number. *F* values for manipulation conditions (intergroup, temporal, control) are 1.02 for IG evaluation, .23 for identification and 1.16 for OG derogation (all $p > .32$). *F* values for the comparison between studies are 47.96 for IG evaluation, 96.94 for identification and 36.03 for OG derogation (all $p < .001$). *F* values for the interaction effect are 1.02 for IG evaluation, .32 for identification and .60 for OG derogation (all $p > .41$). All variables were measured on 5-point scale.

Discussion

The present study examined the hypothesis that national identification and in-group evaluation only show a reliable relationship with out-group rejection if the judgments are based upon an intergroup comparison but not so if based on temporal comparisons or in control conditions. Before evaluating our results in detail, we should acknowledge that the pattern of correlations obtained across all four studies shows some variation. However, as indicated by the tests of effect size homogeneity computed within the meta-analysis, population correlations are still homogenous overall. Thus, while not denying but neglecting for a moment certain peculiarities between studies, the following integrative view can be taken.

The present results are in line with the fundamental SIT assumption that identification with one's in-group is associated with a positive in-group evaluation: the correlation between identification and in-group evaluation remained stable across comparisons conditions. Thus, regardless of whether participants are induced to compare their own nation with other nations, with the situation in the past or without a prime of any comparison, their positive in-group evaluation always covaried with a strong national identification.

Beyond that, the overall pattern of results provided support for the hypothesis that the particular type of comparison on which the in-group evaluation is based is an important moderator of the correlation between positive in-group evaluation and out-group derogation. In distinguishing among intergroup, temporal and abstract standard comparisons, the findings revealed that a positive in-group evaluation is only linked to out-group derogation if that in-group evaluation is based upon a positive outcome of a comparison between own and other group. No relation between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation was observed when participants were asked to base their in-group evaluation on temporal comparisons or when no comparison prime was induced. What seems crucial here is that the very nature of intergroup comparisons implies a negative interdependence between positive evaluation of own group and devaluation of the other group. In contrast, temporal comparisons (or the control condition) do not explicitly imply such a negative interdependence: thus, own group's positive evaluation can be achieved independently of out-group derogation.

The results also supported Hinkle and Brown's (1990) model according to which identification with one's in-group is associated with a negative out-group evaluation only if groups or individuals hold a relational as compared to an autonomous orientation. Again, it was only in the intergroup comparison conditions (i.e. where a relational orientation was induced) that respondents' in-group identification was correlated with out-group derogation. No such relation between both variables emerged when participants were asked to compare their own nation with former times or with an abstract standard.

Our results contribute to current debates on nationalism and patriotism. Here, some researchers have argued for a distinction among both (e.g. Bar-Tal, 1993; Blank & Schmidt, 1993; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989), whereas Billig (1995) has questioned whether nationalism and patriotism are indeed associated with distinct psychological states of mind or motivations. Our approach connects nationalism

and patriotism with processes linked to different types of comparisons. We had assumed that inducing an intergroup comparison leads to intergroup behaviour that corresponds to nationalism or 'blind' patriotism. We had also expected that temporal comparisons (or the absence of explicit intergroup comparisons) should go along with intergroup behaviour that more closely matches the pattern of 'constructive' patriotism. Both propositions are mostly supported by our data. Thus, one way to avoid the negative consequences of out-group exclusion and rejection might be to base a positive evaluation of one's own nation not on intergroup comparisons, but on temporal comparisons (i.e. self-referential comparisons).

Linking the differential correlation pattern of types of comparisons to the reduction of negative consequences of nationalism such as out-group exclusion and rejection should not be misunderstood as offering a new pathway to prejudice reduction. What is important to note here is that those differences between comparison orientations observed in our study are *process* differences (i.e. differences in strength of relationships between variables). They do not correspond to mean differences in the levels of out-group derogation. Thus, respondents were equally xenophobic regardless of the type of comparison on which their in-group evaluation was based: whether they had been induced to compare their own nation with other nations, with the past or with some abstract standard.

More important, the absence of mean differences in absolute terms between comparison conditions can be considered as a strength of our findings, since possible alternative explanations can be ruled out: if comparison conditions would have had an impact on the level of positive in-group evaluation, then in-group identification and out-group rejection in turn could have contributed to the differential correlation pattern. Moreover, the absence of mean differences in in-group identification seems to be a strong reply to alternative explanations that see differential category salience at the heart of our findings. The absence of mean differences in in-group identification, in-group evaluation or out-group derogation can also be taken as a counter-argument to an interpretation that holds the specific content of the relevant identities rather than different processes responsible for our findings. Of course, that does not preclude that different levels of in-group identification, in-group evaluation and out-group derogation between the German and the British samples may point to specific content effects of German and British identities.³ However, our analysis suggest that those effects play no role with regard to differences between comparison conditions, but offers strong support for our differential process explanation.

The important aspect of our findings that clarifies these process differences seems to be the mediating role of in-group identification. The effect of in-group evaluation on out-group derogation that was observed under induced intergroup comparison disappeared when we computed multiple regression analyses including in-group identification as a second predictor. Here, a word of clarification on the intention of this analysis seems necessary. One may argue that SIT and SCT see in-group identification as the point of departure that leads to positive in-group

³We are grateful to two reviewers who discussed both alternative explanations.

evaluation and out-group derogation rather than mediating the relationship among the latter two. In the present case, it is our intention to show that the correlation between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation observed under intergroup comparison orientation is not simply because of the particular nature of the intergroup comparison manipulation. One may critically argue that asking participants to come to a positive evaluation of the in-group through a comparison with an out-group either includes a purely semantic relation among both judgments or simply provides a specific content that is responsible for the significant correlation between both variables.⁴ However, showing that the relation between both vanishes as soon as in-group identification is included as a second predictor allows us to conclude that the association between in-group evaluation and out-group derogation observed under intergroup comparison orientation is owing to the relation our respondents have with their in-group (e.g. their in-group identification). The particular influence of in-group identification observed in our data confirms similar results obtained in the context of the German unification where, especially for East Germans, intergroup comparisons with West Germans are highly salient. Mummendey, Klink, Mielke, Wenzel, & Blanz (1999) were able to show that in-group identification with East Germany is a powerful mediator between the perceived structure of intergroup relations (e.g. stability and legitimacy of status relations and permeability of group boundaries) and identity management strategies like individual mobility and social competition.

In conclusion, the findings reported underline the importance of an SIT analysis for understanding xenophobic attitudes. Although social identity concepts have been used before for understanding attitudes towards other countries (e.g. Brown & Haeger, 1999; Ros, Huici, & Gomez, 2000; Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999), we have shown here that a direct link between national identification and the derogation of foreigners depends upon the prior establishment of a socially comparative perspective. Although this is not inconsistent with the original formulation of SIT that stressed the importance of relevant out-group comparisons for the maintenance of identity (e.g. Tajfel & Turner, 1986), it reinforces Hinkle and Brown's (1990) contention that these are not the sole means of sustaining a positive identity. Given this, three further questions seem particularly worth pursuing. One concerns the origin of autonomous and relational (or patriotic and nationalistic) orientations. We have shown that it is possible to influence these through a simple priming procedure; presumably, there are other naturally occurring circumstances which raise the possibility of one or the other outlook being adopted. It would be instructive to know more about these. A further interesting question, prompted by the provocative findings of Gilbert, Giesler, and Morris (1995), is the extent to which intergroup comparisons are under our conscious control. Gilbert *et al.* suggest that inappropriate or non-diagnostic social comparisons—in their case in the interpersonal domain—can sometimes arise spontaneously or automatically, only to be corrected later by conscious reflection. Is the same true in the case of comparisons involving an in-group like one's country? Finally, much still remains to be understood about effective

⁴We are grateful to one of the reviewers who drew our attention to those alternative explanations.

educational, social or political interventions to try to prevent the more pernicious forms of nationalism. It is clear from our data that merely changing the type of comparisons made will not, by itself, reduce people's antipathy towards foreigners. To achieve that, doubtless other strategies—for example, those stemming from the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954; Brewer & Miller, 1984; Hewstone & Brown, 1986)—will be necessary. Nevertheless, coupling those strategies with interventions that highlight temporal rather than their more intergroup counterparts may well be beneficial. Our findings clearly imply that by these means, it is at least possible to disconnect in-group favouritism and/or in-group identification from out-group devaluation. This might be the way to achieve a positive regard for, and identification with, one's own country that is not dependent upon the *disregard* of other countries. Nevertheless, we still do not know whether everyday judgments of one's own group are mostly based on intergroup comparisons, whether these be explicitly chosen or simply highly accessible (Gilbert *et al.*, 1995). However, we do know that according to our findings, a positive national identification is associated with out-group devaluation as soon as the basis for in-group evaluation changes to comparisons with other national groups.

Acknowledgements

Parts of this article have been presented at the Conference of the British Psychological Society, Social Psychology Section, University of Kent, September 1998. Among those numerous students who were involved in the research presented herein we would like to express our special thanks to Anne-Katrin Grewe for her assistance and her suggestions on an earlier version of the article.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1993). Patriotism as fundamental beliefs of group members. *Politics and the Individual*, 3, 45–62.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Blank, T., & Schmidt, P. (1993). Verletzte oder vertletzende Nation? Empirische Befunde zum Stolz auf Deutschland (Harmed or harmful nation? Empirical evidence on national pride in Germany). *Journal für Sozialforschung*, 33(4), 391–415.
- Blank, T., & Schmidt, P. (1997). Konstruktiver Patriotismus im vereinigten Deutschland? Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Studie (Constructive patriotism in the unified Germany? Results of a representative study). In A. Mummendey & B. Simon (Eds.), *Identität und Verschiedenheit* (S. 127–148). Bern: Huber.
- Brewer, M. G., & Miller, N. E. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives in desegregation. In N. E. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in conflict: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 123–146). New York: Academic Press.
- Brown, R., Capozza, D., Paladino, M. P., & Volpato, C. (1996). Identificazione e favoritismo per il proprio gruppo: verifica del modello di Hinkle e Brown. [Identification and ingroup favouritism: test of the Hinkle & Brown Model]. In P. Boscolo, R. Cristaake, A. Dellantino, e S. Soresi (Eds.), *Aspetti qualitativi e quantitative nella ricerca psicologica*. Qualitative and quantitative aspects of psychological research. (pp. 307–318). Padova: Il Poligrafo.
- Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59, 273–386.
- Brown, R., & Haeger, G. (1999). 'Compared to what?': Comparison choice in an international context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 31–42.

- Brown, R. J., Hinkle, S., Ely, P. G., Fox-Cardamone, D. L., Maras, P., & Taylor, L. A. (1992). Recognizing group diversity: Individualist-collectivist and autonomous-relational social orientations and their implications for intergroup processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 327-342.
- Brown, R. J., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (1999). Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 741-764.
- Gilbert, D. T., Giesler, R. B., & Morris, K. A. (1995). When comparisons arise. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 227-236.
- Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (Eds.) (1986). *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hinkle, S., & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparisons and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D. Abrams & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 48-70). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Klink, A., Mummendey, A., & Mielke, R. (1998). *A multicomponent approach to group identification: Differential prediction of intergroup behavior by cognitive and affective components of identification*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10, 257-274.
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., Mielke, R., Wenzel, M., & Blanz, M. (1999). Socio-structural characteristics of intergroup relations and identity management strategies: Results from a field study in East Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 259-285.
- Mummendey, A., & Simon, B. (1997). Nationale Identifikation und die Abwertung von Fremdgruppen (National identification and devaluation of groups of foreigners). In A. Mummendey & B. Simon (Eds.), *Identität und Verschiedenheit* (S. 175-193). Bern: Huber.
- Noelle-Neumann, E., & Köcher, R. (1987). *Die verletzte Nation. Über den Versuch der Deutschen, ihren Charakter zu ändern*. [The injured nation. About the attempt of the Germans to change their character]. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 57-75.
- Ros, M., Huici, C., & Gomez, A. (2000). Comparative identity, category salience and intergroup relations. In D. Capozza & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research*. (pp. 81-95). London: Sage.
- Schatz, R. T., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism: Personality correlates and individual-group relations. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations. Nelson-Hall series in psychology* (pp. 229-245). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: in the lives of individuals and nations. Nelson-Hall series in psychology* (pp. 213-228). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tajfel, H. (1969). The formation of national attitudes: A social psychological perspective. In M. Sherif & C. W. Sherif (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary relations in the social sciences* (pp. 137-176). Chicago: Aldine.
- 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.
- Topf, R., Mohler, P. Ph., Health, A., & Trompeter, R. (1990). Nationalstolz in Großbritannien und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (National pride in Britain and Germany). In W. Müller, P. Ph. Mohler, B. Erbslöh, & M. Wasmer (Eds.), *Blickpunkt Gesellschaft. Einstellungen und Verhalten der Bundesbürger*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-338.

Received 4 January 1999; revised version received 27 April 2000