

Running Head: PREJUDICE EXPRESSION

“How European am I?": Prejudice Expression and the Presentation of Social
Identity

Olivier Klein¹

Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research and Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Belgium

Laurent Licata, Assaad E. Azzi and Ioanna Durala
Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Published in 2003 in Self and Identity, 2, 251-264

Key words : self-presentation, social identity, Greece, Europe, prejudice

¹ Service de Psychologie Sociale CP 122. Université Libre de Bruxelles. 50 av. F. Roosevelt;
1050 Bruxelles. Belgium. E-mail: oklein@ulb.ac.be.

Abstract

We propose that the expression of prejudice may be used for publicly validating a social identity. This assumption was investigated in a Greek political context. Prejudice towards the Turks is strongly associated to Greek but is contrary to the norms of tolerance associated with European identity. Hence, expressing this attitude in front of a European audience may conflict with many Greeks' desire to be viewed as fully European by other members of the European Union. It was therefore predicted that Greeks who strongly identified with Europe would refrain from publicly expressing negative attitudes towards the Turks when they addressed prototypical Europeans, but not when their answers were private or when they addressed other Greeks. In order to test this hypothesis, the impact of personal identifiability, identification with Europe and the audience's group membership (Western European, Greek) on the expression of prejudice towards the Turks was examined among Greek students ($n = 118$). Results were generally consistent with predictions. Unexpectedly, however, identification with Europe was positively related to the expression of prejudice when participants expected to be identifiable to a Greek audience.

“How European am I?": Prejudice Expression and the Presentation of Social
Identity

“There are no identities, but only processes of identification. The identities to which we pompously refer, as if they existed independently of speakers, become (and disappear) only through such acts of identification, in short through their utterance.”

Jean-François Bayart (1996, p. 98, our translation)

What makes people express their attitudes towards out-groups? According to a widespread conception, in contemporary democratic societies where norms of tolerance and political correctness prevail, people communicate their “true” attitudes regarding out-groups when they don’t risk damaging their public image by appearing prejudiced (Crosby, Bromley, and Saxe, 1980; Dovidio and Fazio, 1992; Dovidio and Gaertner, 1986; Dunton and Fazio, 1997; Jones and Sigall, 1971). In this view, prejudice expression depends on motivations involving the presentation of personal identity as a “tolerant” person. According to this perspective, people should express less prejudiced attitudes and in-group bias when identifiable than not. Results compatible with this prediction have been observed (Blanchard, Crandall, Brigham, and Vaughn, 1994; Postmes, Spears, & Lea, 1999; Waldzus, Schubert, and Frindte, as cited by Postmes, Spears, and Lea, 1999) but it is far from being a general trend (Lambert, Cronen, Chasteen, and Lickel, 1998; Klein, Snyder, and Livingston, in press; Monteith, Deenen,

and Tooman, 1996). In contrast with this view, we shall argue that a variety of social identities may be at stake when people express their attitudes towards out-groups. Identifiability affects the interplay between these identities and this behavior in multiple ways, that cannot be reduced to the simple suppression of prejudiced attitudes.

Attitudes towards out-groups are not only idiosyncratic individual beliefs and evaluations, they are embedded in specific social identities and, as such, constitute group norms (Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Wetherell, 1987). These identities, however, are not fixed: depending on the social context, people may define themselves and act in terms of different identities (Reicher, 1996; Turner et al., 1987). Hence, the likelihood that they will express group attitudes consistent with a particular identity varies as a function of the salience of this identity. By expressing group attitudes, people not only generate an impression of themselves as “tolerant” or “intolerant” but they present a specific social identity. These identities are not privately chosen but are negotiated in the context of interpersonal interactions. Reactions from others contribute to defining whether a specific identity may be legitimately applied to the self or not (Deaux and Ethier, 1998; Mead, 1934; Swann, 1987).

According to the Social Identity Model of Deindividuation Effects (SIDE; Reicher, Spears, and Postmes, 1995; Spears and Lea, 1994), identifiability plays a dual role in this regard. The “cognitive SIDE” concerns the

the influence of indentifiability on the salience of a particular social identity, and hence “the self to be presented”. When a particular social identity is salient, conditions of anonymity tend to blur differences between group members and may further increase the salience of social as opposed to personal identity (Reicher, 1984; Spears, Lee, and Lea, 1990; Postmes, Spears, and Lea, 1999).

Second, the “strategic SIDE” concerns the way personal identifiability affects the expression of group norms by empowering the audience with respect to the communicator. An identifiable communicator can be personally sanctioned for the expression of norms that are not consistent with those of a powerful audience (Reicher and Levine, 1994a; Reicher et al., 1995). Although sanctions can be material, they may also concern the relationship to the audience, and the way the communicator will be treated by this audience. Sometimes, this relationship is irrelevant to the communicator’s concerns and severing this relationship cannot be expected to have any negative consequences. In such cases, the audience has little power of sanction. By contrast, if the communicator wishes to make a particular impression in order to pursue a specific agenda, any behavior on the part of this audience that could harm the realization of this agenda can be considered as a form of sanction.

Strategic concerns can be related to the presentation of different identities. Assuming that a particular social identity is salient, the communicator should view him- or herself as an interchangeable member of his group (Turner et al., 1987). When the personal self is not identifiable, strategic concerns should

therefore mainly involve the presentation of the group (e.g., “We are tolerant”) to which the individual belongs. When identifiable, communicators do not only present their group but themselves as members of a group (e.g., “As a tolerant person, I am a typical member of this group”). To the extent that the desired image of the group and the desired self-image are consonant, identifiability should strengthen the impact of audiences on the expression of attitudes relevant to these images.

In the present case, we will concentrate on a specific agenda: being acknowledged as a group member. Expressing group norms can be viewed as fulfilling one of the main functions of self-presentation: constructing a public identity consistent with one’s self-view (Baumeister, 1982; Swann, 1987; Swann and Read, 1981a, 1981b). By expressing norms that are consistent with those of the group, people can precisely verify their identity publicly. This is of course particularly important when addressing other in-group members: membership in a group does not only involve defining oneself as a group member, it also involves being accepted by other group members as such (Breakwell, 1979). In this regard, lack of ingroup acceptance is a source of identity threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, and Doosje, 1999). As a consequence, people should tend to adopt, through expressive behavior, the position that is prototypical for the group they want to be part of.

In line with this view, Noel, Wann, and Branscombe (1995) have shown that individuals were particularly motivated to be perceived by other in-group

members as espousing the in-group's norms. In order to achieve this goal, they expressed more in-group bias when identifiable to other group members than when their responses were anonymous. Note that this was only true if group members were "peripheral" i.e., if they had not gained full membership status in the group yet.

The natural groups Noel et al. studied (exp. 2) had an important characteristic: their subjects had chosen to be members. In such situations, individuals can be generally expected to identify de facto to the group. However, identities are not always freely chosen: often, they are assigned by others (Breakwell, 1979). In such situations, individuals have no reason to publicly acknowledge such a group membership if they do not identify with the group i.e., if this membership is not part of their self-definition. In an interpersonal context, Swann and Read (1981b) have shown that people chose to verify identities that were consistent with their self-concept. This suggests that in the case of ascribed categories, the relation between group identification and public adhesion to group norms should be highest when the communicator is identifiable and addressing members of the in-group.

In the present study, we tried to assess the validity of this argument in the case of European identification. Although our goal was not to examine the role of "peripherality" on the expression of group norms per se, we chose a group whose status within the European Union (EU) was peripheral on several dimensions: the Greeks. Contrary to Noel et al. (1995), we selected a situation

in which group membership was peripheral in the context of a superordinate identity rather than a situation in which “peripherality” was defined at a purely individual level. Note that this situation is extremely common (consider e.g., ethnic minorities or immigrant groups in the context of nation states).

Greece is on the very Eastern borders of Europe and geographically isolated from other members of the EU; it is the only stable parliamentary democracy in the region, the only Balkan member of the Union. Greece is the poorest member of the EU (the only one who could not catch the “first train” of the European Monetary Union) and the only member in which Eastern Orthodoxy is the main religion. Moreover, Greece is regularly in conflict with Western European countries regarding EU's policy in the Balkans. Among other European countries, Greece is perceived as the most “problematic” member (Pettifer, 1996). The sentiment of being an “underdog” within the EU is widespread in Greece (Diamantouros, 1993). In view of these factors, no member of the EU seems to qualify more as a peripheral member than Greece does.

Simultaneously, however, Greeks generally aspire to being viewed as fully Europeans because of their contribution to Western Civilization (Chrysochoou, 1996; Triandafyllidou, in press). Chrysochoou (1996) showed that the typical European is perceived by Greeks as coming from Northwestern Europe. European Identity is viewed in “Western ” terms, and in opposition to

Turkey and the Orient. Contrary to Britain, for example, peripheral status coexists with an aspiration to being viewed and treated as Europeans.

In this study, we examined the endorsement of a group attitude characteristic of Greece, but in contradiction with those of the superordinate group, Europe. The norm we chose is prejudice towards the Turks. The relations between Turkey and Greece have been contentious since the Independence of Greece (1827), which followed a prolonged period of Ottoman domination. Conflicts have recently occurred concerning the borders of the two countries' territorial waters, the status of Cyprus, and the Kurdish Leader's Abudllah Oçalan's capture². Not only has Greece had a long story of animosity towards Turkey, but the Greek identity has been defined in opposition to the "threatening other" Turkey is perceived to be (Triandafyllidou and Paraskevopoulou, 2001; Triandafyllidou, 1998): subjectively, "Greekness" is, to some degree, the antithesis of "Turkishness"³. A recent analysis of the Greek Press (Triandafyllidou, in press) even reveals that other countries' attitudes towards Turkey can serve as a criterion for categorizing "friends" and "foes". We therefore expect Greek students to regard the expression of negative attitudes towards the Turks as acceptable in a Greek context.

² The Greek government was suspected of having protected Oçalan as he tried to escape the Turkish authorities (although the responsibility of the Greek authorities was never proven). A Turkish commando captured him in February 1999 in Kenya.

³ Although Greeks do acknowledge Ottoman and Turkish influences in several domains.

On the other hand, other prescriptive norms condemn the expression of prejudice. For example, several studies show that regardless of their level of prejudice, people know that prejudice is viewed as socially undesirable in many social contexts (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink, and Elliot, 1991; Plant and Devine, 1998). Empirical evidence suggests that these conclusions apply to Greeks as well: Mikrakis and Triandafyllidou (1994) have found that such norms were present in the Greek press, especially in relation to ethnic minorities.

Although these norms may affect the expression of prejudice in most public contexts, they may be more influential when an interaction with individuals categorized as “Europeans” is anticipated. Not only is tolerance one of the founding values of the EU⁴ (Burgess, 2000; Licata and Klein, 2001; Pinder, 1998; Tapia, 1997), but other members are generally perceived as having a more benevolent attitude towards Turkey than Greece does (Pettifer, 1996). Thus, when the audience is perceived as European, the power of the norms proscribing the expression of prejudice should be higher than when the audience is Greek (in which case, hostility towards the Turks is more acceptable).

To sum up, our central assumption is that strategic considerations regarding the expression of group norms depend on the agenda pursued by the

⁴ One of the chief purposes of the European Economic Community, which was created just after WWII, was to contribute to peace between European nations.

communicator with respect to the audience's group. In this view, we suggest that identification with Europe is associated with the agenda of being acknowledged by other Europeans as fully European. In line with this assumption, we assume that identification with Europe predicts negatively the endorsement of negative attitudes towards the Turks when Greeks address an audience belonging to the superordinate group, Europe, but not to an audience belonging to the subordinate in-group, Greece. Besides, if our analysis is correct, expressing prejudice to an European audience involves a presentation of Greeks in general as well as a presentation of the self. We assume that highly identified Greeks want to be accepted as a group (group acceptance) and as individuals by a European audience (personal acceptance). This second motive can only express itself in situations of identifiability. Hence, to the extent that these two motives operate jointly in these situations, the impact of the audience's group membership on the expression of prejudice should be greater than when the communicator is not identifiable.

Method

Participants and Design

118 undergraduate students (111 women and 17 men) aged between 18 and 45 ($M = 20.82$), enrolled in two Greek Universities (Volo and Rethymon⁵), participated during pedagogy classes. The design was a 2 (Group Membership of the Audience: Greek, non-Greek European⁶) \times 2 (Identifiability to the audience: Not identifiable, Identifiable) \times (Identification: continuous).

Procedure

The two experiment sessions took place in March 1999⁷ during two classes (one in Volo, one in Rethymon). In each case, the lecturer introduced the last author as a researcher requesting the students' participation for the study she was conducting. Participants were randomly assigned to conditions. Once all questionnaires were answered, debriefing took place.

⁵ As no reliable effect of participants' university was observed on our dependent variables, this factor was ignored in subsequent analyses.

⁶ In the remainder of this article, the term "European" is generally used to refer to non-Greek Europeans.

⁷ That is during the Kosovo Crisis, an event that may have heightened animosity towards the European Union. The use of force towards a traditional ally of Greece was met with much resentment in Greece.

The Questionnaire

Introduction and cover story

The first page of the questionnaire (which was written in Greek) contained the experimental manipulations. Researchers conducting a social psychological study usually constitute an audience for participants and are treated as such (Schwarz, 1998, 1999). Moreover, researchers are usually categorized as members of a social groups (Billig, 1976; Klein and Azzi, 2001; Reicher and Levine, 1994; Reicher, Levine, and Gordijn, 1998; Spears and Smith, 2001). This feature of the experimental context was used to manipulate the group membership of the audience. In the Greek audience condition, the authors of the study were presented as “working at the Aristotle University in Thessaloniki” (an institution famed for its attachment to Hellenic values). In the “European Audience” condition, they were presented as working in several Western European Countries, all founding members of the EU (Belgium, France, and Germany). For example, in the European audience condition the introductory text was the following:

“Dear student, in the following questionnaire, we will ask you some questions on Greek identity. This questionnaire will be analyzed by a team of social sciences students from different Belgian, German and French universities. After the analysis of the questionnaire you will discuss on several occasions with these students. ”

To reinforce the manipulation of audience, the introductory text was signed by people having characteristically Greek (e.g. “Dimitra Antoniou”, “Ioannis Dourala”, etc.) or Western European Names (“Dominique Willems”, “Peter Wunderli ”, etc.).

Identifiability was manipulated by asking participants to either report their name (“identifiable” condition) or only a confidential code (“not identifiable” condition). They were informed that, following the study, the researchers would ask them individual questions regarding their answers to the questionnaires. In the “identifiable” condition, they would answer via a two-way videoconferencing system :

“Depending on the answers that you will provide, the researchers conducting this study will ask you individual questions through a television screen connected to the internet. You will see them from Rethymon [Volo] and they will see you from Thessaloniki [“their respective countries”]. Besides these students, nobody will be aware of your answers.”

Remember that the anticipated effect of identifiability are viewed here as dependent upon the existence of a continuing relationship between communicator and audience. If participants in the identifiable condition could expect no further contact with the researchers, responses may not have appeared as more relevant to identity negotiation than if they were anonymous. In the “not identifiable” condition, a similar interview would take place but

participants would remain anonymous and no mention was made of a videoconferencing system:

“After having answered this questionnaire, you will discuss on several occasions with the researchers conducting this study. Depending on the answers you will provide, the authors of this questionnaire will ask you individual questions through the Internet. Your answers will remain completely anonymous. During this whole process you will not have to report your identity.”

We induced the anticipation of this second step in this condition as well in order to ensure that accountability (Tetlock, 1999) was controlled across levels of identifiability.

The European Identification measure

To measure cognitive, emotional and evaluative aspects of European identification, the following items were inserted in the questionnaire: “I consider myself a European”, “Generally, I feel strong ties to Europeans”, “Generally, I agree with other Europeans on most important questions”, “I feel involved in the questions that concern the interests of Europeans”, “I feel affected by the well-being of Europeans”, “I am proud of being European”, “Being European contributes to the way I define myself”. Participants were asked to express on a 9 point scale the extent to which these statements applied to themselves: “not at all” (1) to “extremely” (9) .

We did not measure identification before the manipulation took place as it might have made European identity salient, potentially interfering with the manipulations. The measure of identification was therefore inserted in the main questionnaire and more precisely between the two measures of prejudice. Thus, if the impact of identification was similar on both measures, it would be reasonable to assume that the order in which identification and prejudice were measured did not account for the observed effects.

Dependent Measures

Attitude Towards the Turks

A 5-items bipolar scale measuring the attitude towards the Turks was elaborated (min = 1, max = 9) by averaging the following bipolar items : “ I feel sympathy towards the Turks ” vs. “ I feel antipathy towards the Turks ” ; “ I trust the Turks ” vs. “ I distrust the Turks ” ; “ I feel close to the Turks ” vs. “ I do not understand the Turks’ mentality ” ; “ I think that the Turks will enrich the European Union ” vs. “ I think that the Turks are a threat for the European Union. ” ; “ If one of my close relatives married a Turk, it would please me. ” vs. “ If one of my close relatives married a Turk, it would bother me. ”.

Besides this scale, we used a more direct measure of prejudice, the “ thermometer ” (adapted from Esses, Haddock, and Zanna, 1993) : participants had to express on a scale ranging from 0 (very unfavorable) to 100 (very favorable) their attitudes towards the Turks. Attitude attribution

Participants were asked to report the attitude they respectively attributed to the Greeks and to the Europeans in general concerning the Turks on a 9-point bipolar scale (Min = 1, Max = 9). The poles were “I believe that the Greeks (Europeans) have generally a very positive view of the Turks” and “I believe that the Greeks (Europeans) have generally a very negative view of the Turks”.

Demographic measures

Participants had to report their age, gender and nationality.

Results

Method of Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS 9.0 for Windows. Unless explicitly mentioned, we performed ANCOVAs with audience and identifiability as factors and identification as a covariate. All interactions between these variables were entered in the model as well.

Identification with Europe

The seven items formed a reliable scale with a Cronbach's alpha of .89. As identification was measured after the manipulations, the latter may have, albeit unexpectedly, affected its distribution. To examine this possibility, the European identification scale was submitted to an Identifiability \times Audience ANOVA. No effect reached significance, omnibus $F(3,112) = 0.49$, ns; $\eta^2 =$

.013, which suggests that it could be considered as truly independent of the two other factors.

Norms regarding the Turks.

Greeks were perceived as having a more negative view of the Turks ($M = 8.9$) than Europeans in general ($M = 6.02$, $t(113) = 10.38$, $p < .001$). The difference between the two variables was entered in the regression model. The only reliable predictor of this difference was identification with Europe. The more students identified with Europe, the smaller this difference was perceived to be, $F(107) = 6.84$, $p = .010$. However, it remained present across all levels of identification; for example, in the higher quartile, the mean difference between the two items was 1.7, and differed significantly from 0, $t(25) = 4.41$, $p < .01$. These results indirectly support our assumption that it is more acceptable to express negative views of the Turks to a Greek than to a European audience.

Expression of Prejudice Towards the Turks

In order to make the pattern of results easily understandable, we performed a median split on the identification measure and tabulated the resulting means (see Table 1). Keep in mind, however, that identification was treated as a continuous variables in the analyses.

Analyses on the prejudice scale (Cronbach's alpha = .82) and on the thermometer will be reported simultaneously. Altogether, these analyses

revealed that, in general, Greeks were not reluctant to express negative views of the Turks. They expressed higher levels of prejudice when not identifiable than when identifiable. However, in the case of the prejudice scale, but not the thermometer, this effect was qualified by an identification \times audience interaction, $F(1,110) = 5.55, p = .02$ ($F(1,110) = 1.68, p = .19$ for the thermometer). High identifiers expressed higher levels of prejudice than low identifiers but only when addressing a Greek audience.

This interaction was itself moderated by identifiability, as testified by a 3-way interaction ($F(1,110) = 15.01, p < .001$ for the prejudice scale, $F(1,110) = 4.36, p = .039$ for the thermometer). When identifiable, high identifiers expressed lower levels of prejudice to a European audience than low identifiers whereas the reverse occurred when the audience was Greek. Importantly, simple effects of identification were observed when the audience was European ($F(1,110) = 4.82, p = .030$ and $F(1,110) = 3.33, p = .07$ on the prejudice scale and the thermometer respectively). When the audience was Greek, the simple effect of identification reached significance on the prejudice scale ($F(1,110) = 12.39, p < .01$) but not on the thermometer ($F(1,110) = 2.03, p = .15$). In the unidentifiable condition, no main or interaction effect reached significance, as testified by an identification \times audience ANCOVA in these conditions only, omnibus $F(3,56) < 1, ns$.

These results suggest that the 3-way interactions observed on both measures of prejudice is not only driven by the unexpected effect of

identifiability in the Greek audience condition. Note also that, although tests of significance do not always allow to reach the same conclusions on the thermometer and the prejudice scale, the overall patterns of results observed on both measures of prejudice is consistent (see Table 1), which suggests that the order in which identification and prejudice were measured is not responsible for the presence of this pattern.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Globally, the more participants identified with Europe, the less likely they were to express prejudice towards the Turks when anticipating to encounter a European audience, and the more they did so when anticipating to meet a Greek audience. These effects, however, were limited to situations when participants were identifiable to their audience.

Discussion

The present study was carried out in order to test the hypothesis that the effect of identifiability on the expression of prejudice would depend on the relation participants wished to establish with the audience. We assumed that the motivation to be accepted as fully European by a prototypically European audience would depend on the level of identification with Europe. Therefore, we expected that participants would be more likely to refrain from expressing

prejudiced thoughts towards a relevant out-group the more they identified with Europe, as Europe is associated with norms of tolerance. Results support this assumption: European identification was more negatively related to the expression of prejudice towards the Turks when participants addressed a European Audience than in any of the three other conditions.

Interestingly, participants' level of identification with Europe was positively associated to prejudice towards the Turks, but only when participants were identifiable to a Greek audience: they expressed higher levels of prejudice when they were strongly identified with Europe. This finding was unexpected. It might be understood in the framework of the conflictual relationship between the rest of the EU and Greece. As we mentioned, many Greeks have resented EU policies regarding Turkey. Many have also felt that other European countries systematically ignored their point of view in the Balkan context (Ioakimidis, 1996). For example, support for Turkey, EU policies in regard to the new Macedonian Republic, and the use of military force in Kosovo (at the time when this study was conducted) have led to much resentment within the Greek population. In relation to the EU, Triandafyllidou (1997) reported that many Greeks tended to define themselves as anadelphon⁸, literally as having no allies or brothers. In this regard, the unexpected simple effect of identification may reflect different presentations of the compatibility

⁸ A neologism invented by the former President of the Hellenic Republic, Mr. Sartzekakis.

between European and Greek identity. Thus, people who identified with Europe may have wanted to show their fellow nationals that, despite their attachment to Europe, they still endorsed traditionally Greek norms, such as negative attitudes towards the Turk.

Interestingly, the audience's group membership did not influence participants' endorsement of prejudiced attitudes when they were not identifiable. Earlier studies (Klein, 2000; Klein and Azzi, 2001; Klein, Azzi, Brito, and Berckmans, 2000; Postmes, Branscombe, Spears, and Young, 1999) have shown that group members may strategically manipulate the expression of group attitudes as a function of their audience's group membership even when they were not identifiable. This may suggest that motives underlying self-presentation were not parallel to those underlying group presentation. While the acceptance of Greece within the EU may have been important to our participants, other concerns may have been influential, such as displaying the attachment of Greece to traditional Hellenic values in the face of threatening European intervention, or mobilizing the superordinate group against the Turks (see Klein and Licata, 2001 for example of similar strategies). The achievement of these rhetorical goals do not require identifiability. In conditions of identifiability, however, the representation of the self, and hence the question of personal acceptance become relevant and may have influenced responses over and above these concerns.

Although we explicitly chose a peripheral group within the EU, Greece, the present study does not enable us to assess the role played by membership threat (Branscombe et al., 1999) in the results presented here, as we did not directly vary peripherality of group membership (like e.g., Noel et al., 1995). In this respect, a promising avenue for further research involves examining whether individuals belonging to more central subgroups in a superordinate collectivity, such as Germany or France in the context of the EU, would be less sensitive to manipulations of identifiability.

Recent theoretical work on the SIDE model has argued against a conceptualization of the impact of visibility relations on action as a set of fixed effects (Reicher, 2000; see also Spears et al., 2000). In line with this work, the present results indicate that identifiability does not have a unilateral impact on the expression of prejudice. Audiences may sometimes trigger an “external” motivation to control prejudiced responses (Dunton and Fazio, 1997; Fazio and Dunton, 1997; Plant and Devine, 1998) but this is just part of the picture. Group attitudes, and prejudice, are not only expressions of personal beliefs, they are also manifestations of group memberships. By advertising them or not, individuals affirm how they want to be seen by others. Identifiability to an audience, far from always making individuals passively hide their true self behind the mantle of political correctness, offers them an opportunity to constructively negotiate their identity. Just as prejudice towards the Turks may be an expression of “Greekness”, publicly moderating such attitudes may be

used to claim “Europeanness” or one’s identity as a “tolerant person”. Thus, the expression of prejudice may sometimes demand considerable rhetorical skills. Not only must one choose an identity to present but also, depending on the audience, the signs of this identity must be selected meticulously to ensure they be diagnosed correctly.

References

Baumeister, R. F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 3-26.

Bayart, J.-F. (1996). L'illusion identitaire [The illusion of identity]. Paris: Fayard.

Billig, M. (1976). Social Psychology & Intergroup Relations. London: Academic Press.

Blanchard, F. A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. A. (1994). Condemning and condoning racism: A social context approach to interracial settings. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 993-997.

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context & content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers & R. Spears (Eds.), Social identity: Context, commitment, content. (pp. 35-58). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science Ltd.

Breakwell, G. M. (1979). Illegitimate group membership & inter-group differentiation. British Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 18, 141-149.

Burgess, M. (2000). Federalism & European union : the building of Europe, 1950-2000. London: Routledge.

Chrysochoou, X. (1996). How group membership is formed: Self categorisation or group beliefs? The construction of a European identity in France & Greece. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), Changing European identities: Social psychological analyses of social change. International series in social psychology. (pp. 297-313). Oxford, England UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Deaux, K., & Ethier, K. A. (1998). Negotiating social identity. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), Prejudice: The target's perspective. (pp. 301-323). San Diego, CA, USA: Academic Press, Inc.

Devine, P. G., Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Elliot, A. J. (1991). Prejudice with & without compunction. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *60*, 817-830.

Diamantouros, N. (1993). Politics & Culture in Greece, 1974-91 : An Interpretation. In R. Clogg (Ed.), Greece 1981-89, The Populist Decade. London: St Martin's Press.

Dovidio, J. F. & Fazio, R. H. (1992). New technologies for direct & indirect assessment of attitudes. In J. M. Tanur (Ed.), Questions about questions: Inquiries into the cognitive bases of surveys. (pp. 203-237). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dovidio, J. F. & Gaertner, S. L. (1986). Prejudice, discrimination & racism: Historical trends & contemporary approaches. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination & racism (pp. 1-34). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Dunton, B. C., & Fazio, R. H. (1997). An individual difference measure of motivation to control prejudiced reactions. Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, *23*, 316-326.

Ellemers, N., Barreto, M., & Spears, R. (1999). Commitment & strategic responses to social context. In N. Ellemers & R. Spears (Eds.), Social identity: Context, commitment, content. (pp. 127-146). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science Ltd.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, & emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), Affect, cognition, & stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception. (pp. 137-166). San Diego, CA, USA: Academic Press, Inc.

Fazio, R. H., & Dunton, B. C. (1997). Categorization by race: The impact of automatic & controlled components of racial prejudice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *33*, 451-470.

Ioakimidis, P. (1996). Contradictions in the Europeanisation process. In N. Featherstone & K. Infantis (Eds.), Greece in a changing Europe : Between

European integration & Balkan disintegration ? Manchester, G.-B.: Manchester University Press.

Jones, E.E. & Sigall, H. (1971). The bogus pipeline: A new paradigm for measuring affect & attitude. Psychological Bulletin, 76, 349-364.

Klein, O. (2000). Une approche pragmatique de l'expression des stereotypes [a pragmatic perspective on the expression of stereotypes]. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Universite Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium.

Klein, O., & Azzi, A. (2001). How group members attempt to tailor an out-group's representation of themselves. British Journal of Social Psychology, 40, 279-293.

Klein, O., Azzi, A. E., Brito, R., & Berckmans, S. (2000). Nationalism & the strategic expression of identity. In T. Postmes, R. Spears, M. Lea & S. Reicher (Eds.), SIDE issues centre stage: Recent developments in studies of de-individuation in groups (pp. 131-141). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts & Sciences.

Klein, O. & Licata, L. (in press). When group representations serve social change: the speeches of Patrice Lumumba during the Congolese decolonization. British Journal of Social Psychology.

Klein, O., Snyder, M., & Livingston, R. (in press). Prejudice on the stage: self-monitoring and the expression of group attitudes. British Journal of Social Psychology.

Lambert, A. J., Cronen, S., Chasteen, A. L., & Lickel, B. (1996). Private vs public expressions of racial prejudice. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *32*, 437-459.

Licata, L. & Klein, O. (2001). When inter-group attitudes contradict group norms: The relation between European identification & attitudes towards immigrants. Unpublished Manuscript, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium.

Mead, G. (1934). Mind, Self, Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mikrakis, A., & Triandafyllidou, A. (1994). Greece: The "Others" Within. Social Science Information/Information sur les Sciences Sociales, *33*, 787-805.

Monteith, M. J., Deenen, N. E., & Tooman, G. D. (1996). The effect of social norm activation on the expression of opinions concerning gay men and Blacks. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, *18*, 267-288.

Noel, J. G., Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1995). Peripheral ingroup membership status & public negativity toward outgroups. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *68*, 127-137.

Pettifer, J. (1996). Greek political culture & foreign policy. In N. Featherstone & K. Infantis (Eds.), Greece in a changing Europe : Between European integration & Balkan disintegration ? Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press.

Pinder, J. (1998). The building of the European Union. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Plant, E. A., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Internal & external motivation to respond without prejudice. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *75*, 811-832.

Postmes, T., Branscombe, N. R., & Young, H. (1999). Comparative processes in personal & group judgments: Resolving the discrepancy. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *76*, 320-338.

Postmes, T., Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1999). Social identity, normative content & 'deindividuation' in computer mediated groups. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.). Social identity: Context, commitment, content (pp. 164-183). Oxford: Blackwell.

Reicher, S. D. (1984). Social influence in the crowd: Attitudinal & behavioural effects of de-individuation in conditions of high & low group salience. British Journal of Social Psychology, *23*, 341-350.

Reicher, S. D. (1996). "The Battle of Westminster: Developing the social identity model of crowd behaviour in order to explain the initiation & development of collective conflict. European Journal of Social Psychology, *26*, 115-134.

Reicher, S. D. (2000). Social Identity Definition and Enactment: A Broad SIDE against Irrationalism and Relativism. In T. Postmes, R. Spears, M. Lea & S. Reicher (Eds.), SIDE issues centre stage: Recent developments in

studies of de-individuation in groups (pp. 175-190). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts & Sciences.

Reicher, S.D. & Levine, M. (1994a). Deindividuation, power relations between groups & the expression of social identity: The effects of visibility to the out-group. British Journal of Social Psychology, *33*, 145-163.

Reicher, S., & Levine, M. (1994b). On the consequences of deindividuation manipulations for the strategic communication of self: Identifiability & the presentation of social identity. European Journal of Social Psychology, *24*, 511-524.

Reicher, S., Levine, R. M., & Gordijn, E. (1998). More on deindividuation, power relations between groups & the expression of social identity: Three studies on the effects of visibility to the in-group. British Journal of Social Psychology, *37*, 15-40.

Reicher, S. D., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (1995). A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena. European Review of Social Psychology, *6*, 161-198.

Schwarz, N. (1998). Communication in standardized research situations: A Gricean perspective. In S. R. Fussell & R. J. Kreuz (Eds.), Social & cognitive approaches to interpersonal communication. (pp. 39-66). Mahwah, NJ, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schwarz, N. (1999). Self-reports: How the questions shape the answers. American Psychologist, *54*, 93-105.

Sigall, H., & Page, R. (1972). Reducing attenuation in the expression of interpersonal affect via the bogus pipeline. Sociometry, *35*, 629-642.

Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1994). Panacea or panopticon? The hidden power in computer-mediated communication. Communication Research, *21*, 427-459.

Spears, R., Lea, M. & Lee, S. (1990). De-individuation & group polarization in computer-mediated communication. British Journal of Psychology, *32*, 1492-1512.

Spears, R., Lea, M., and Postmes, T. (2000). One side: Purview, problems and prospects. In T. Postmes, R. Spears, M. Lea & S. Reicher (Eds.), SIDE issues centre stage: Recent developments in studies of de-individuation in groups (pp. 1-16). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts & Sciences.

Spears, R. & Smith, H. J. (2001). Experiments as politics. Political Psychology, *22*, 309-330.

Swann, W. B. (1987). Identity negotiation: Where two roads meet. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *53*, 1038-1051.

Swann, W. B., & Read, S. J. (1981a). Acquiring self-knowledge: The search for feedback that fits. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, *41*, 1119-1128.

Swann, W. B., & Read, S. J. (1981b). Self-verification processes: How we sustain our self-conceptions. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, *17*, 351-372.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), The psychology of intergroup relations (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tapia, C. (1997). Les jeunes face à l'Europe. [Young people's attitudes towards Europe]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Tetlock, P. E. (1999). Accountability theory: Mixing properties of human agents with properties of social systems. In L. L. Thompson & J. M. Levine (Eds.), Shared cognition in organizations: The management of knowledge. LEA's organization & management series. (pp. 117-137). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Triandafyllidou, A. (1998). National Identity & the 'Other'. Ethnic & Racial Studies, *21*, 593-612.

Triandafyllidou, A. (in press). "We Belong to the West"? Representations of Eastern & Western Europe in the Greek Press & the Positioning of the "We". In V. Roudometof & G. Kourvetaris & A. Kourvetaris & K. Koutsoukis (Eds.), The New Balkans. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.

Triandafyllidou, A., Calloni, M., & Mikrakis, A. (1997). New Greek Nationalism. Sociological Research
Online, <http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/socresonline>, 2.

Triandafyllidou, A. & Paraskevopoulou, A. (2001). When is the Greek Nation? The Role of Enemies & Minorities. Manuscript submitted for publication.

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, NY, USA: Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Waldzus, S., Schubert, T., & Frindte, W. (as cited by Postmes, Spears, and Lea, 1999). Ingroup-favouritism and ingroup-salience under computer mediated conditions: An extended replication of minimal group results.

Authors note

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Olivier Klein, Service de Psychologie Sociale, Université Libre de Bruxelles CP. 122, 50 av. F.

Roosevelt, 1050 Bruxelles, Belgium. E-mail: oklein@ulb.ac.be.

We wish to express our gratitude to Xenia Chrysochoou, Russell Spears, Anna Triandafyllidou, Jennifer Yanowitz and three anonymous reviewers for having provided valuable comments on an earlier version of this article and to

Professors Vamvoukas and Vlachos for having made their classes accessible.

This paper was written when the first author was pursuing a postdoctoral training at the University of Minnesota as a fellow of the Belgian American Educational Foundation.

Table 1 : Mean attitudes towards the Turks as a function of Identification, Audience's group membership and identification with Europe.

	Not Identifiable		Identifiable		Total	
Audience	High Id.	Low Id.	High Id.	Low Id.	High Id.	Low Id.
	Scale					
Greek Audience	2.73	2.50	2.38	4.60	2.58	3.52
European Audience	2.33	2.47	3.70	2.96	3.00	2.75
	Thermometer					
Greek Audience	16.67	14.37	14.54	38.00	15.76	25.80
European Audience	14.71	13.33	27.50	16.25	20.91	15.00

Note: For the scale, min = 1 (least prejudiced), max = 9 (most prejudiced). For the thermometer, min = 0 (most negative), max = 100 (most positive)