<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

From Cultural Discordance to Support for Collective Action : The Roles of Anxiety, Trust and Group Status

Brylka, Asteria Anna

2015-08

Brylka , A A , Mähönen , T A E , Schellhaas , F M H & Jasinskaja-Lahti , I 2015 , ' From Cultural Discordance to Support for Collective Action : The Roles of Anxiety, Trust and Group Status ' , Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology , vol. 46 , no. 7 , pp. 897-915 . <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022215589118>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/234339>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022215589118>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

From Cultural Discordance to Support for Collective Action:

The Roles of Intergroup Anxiety, Trust and Group Status

Brylka, A. A., Mähönen, T. A. E., Schellhaas, F. M. H. & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I.

Accepted author manuscript.

Brylka, A., Mähönen, T. A., Schellhaas, F. M., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2015). From cultural discordance to support for collective action: The roles of intergroup anxiety, trust, and group status. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46(7), 897-915.

Abstract

Support for collective action, an initial step in challenging social inequalities, can have important implications for intergroup relations in contemporary plural societies. The present study, conducted among majority Finns ($N=274$) and Russian immigrants in Finland ($N=228$), investigated the relationship between perceived cultural discordance (i.e., disagreement between majority and minority groups about the importance of cultural maintenance for minority members) and support for collective action benefiting the minority. Specifically, it was expected that the association between cultural discordance and collective action would be at least partially mediated by intergroup anxiety and outgroup trust, and that both the direct and indirect effects of cultural discordance would depend on group status (i.e., majority vs. minority). The results showed that among majority group members, the association was negative and mediated by high intergroup anxiety and low outgroup trust, whereas among minority group members the association was positive and mediated by only low outgroup trust.

Keywords: cultural discordance, collective action, intergroup anxiety, outgroup trust, intergroup relations

From Cultural Discordance to Support for Collective Action:
The Roles of Intergroup Anxiety, Trust and Group Status

Introduction

With increasing ethnic and cultural diversity in many European countries, acculturation processes and potential ways of improving conditions for integration of acculturating groups in the receiving societies have attracted increasing attention among researchers (e.g., Huijnk, Verkuyten, & Coenders, 2012; Mähönen, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Liebkind, 2010). According to the classic definition of Redfield, Linton, and Herskovitz (1936), acculturation occurs when two cultural groups continuously interact with each other, resulting in changing cultural patterns of either or both interacting groups. In practice, this reciprocal process typically involves actors of unequal status and power, with the dominant majority group being in a position to impose its preferred acculturation strategies over members of subordinate minorities (see Berry, 2001; Bourhis, Moïse, Perreault, & Senécal, 1997; Navas et al., 2005). This, in turn, may accentuate an intergroup perception of cultural discordance, defined as a disagreement between majority and minority group members on the preferred degree of minority groups' cultural maintenance (Piontkowski, Rohmann, & Florack, 2002). In a majority-minority context, perceived cultural discordance is seen as an identity threat for both groups (Piontkowski et al., 2002), but it leads to different identity and attitudinal reactions among these groups towards each other (e.g., Mähönen et al., 2010; Rohmann, Florack, & Piontkowski, 2006). Thus, it can also be expected to trigger versatile behavioural responses, including support for or resistance to collective action—that is, “any action that

promotes the interests of one's ingroup or is conducted in political solidarity" (Becker, 2012, p. 19; see also Klandermans, 1997).

In order to embrace the reciprocity of acculturation processes and intergroup relations in plural societies, as recently called for by Horenczyk, Jasinskaja-Lahti, Sam, and Vedder (2013), it is crucial to examine their effects on collective action from the perspective of both majority and minority groups. Although in the last decade, social psychologists' interest in collective action has surged (e.g., Barlow, Sibley, & Hornsey, 2012; for a meta-analysis, see van Zomeren, Postmes, & Spears, 2008), research on support for actions empowering immigrants in plural societies is somewhat fragmented. For instance, studies on collective action among immigrants focus predominantly on groups that are culturally distant from the national majority (e.g., Simon & Ruhs, 2008; Tausch et al., 2011), while more culturally similar minorities have largely been left aside (but see Simon & Grabow, 2010). Even less attention has been dedicated to majority members' support for, and resistance to, minorities' collective action (but see Barlow et al., 2012). This has left a gap in our understanding of a key process by which majority group members (do not) support the mutual process of integration. To fill this omission in social psychological research, in this paper we investigate the relationship between perceived cultural discordance and support for minority group's collective action from the perspective of both majority Finns and Russian immigrants in Finland.

Based on previous theorisations showing the importance of group identity and identity-related perceptions for collective action engagement (van Zomeren et al., 2008; van Zomeren, Leach, & Spears, 2012) and empirical research on collective action (Barlow et al., 2012; Rohmann et al., 2006; see also Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009), we argue that perceived cultural discordance is associated with support for collective action because it evokes relevant intergroup emotions. Thus, we suggest that this relationship is likely to be *indirect*. A considerable amount of research suggests a link between group-based emotions, for instance, group-based anger and

collective action (for a summary, see van Zomeren et al., 2012). No previous study, however, has focused on the role of emotional responses that are typically experienced in *intergroup* interactions or those that are particularly targeted towards outgroups. We propose that, for majority-minority interactions in the context of immigration, the relationship between perceived cultural discordance and support for collective action among both majority and minority group members is partly due to the emotions involved in intergroup contact (see Sinisterra, Finell, & Geschke, 2009), specifically intergroup anxiety and outgroup trust. This proposal is in line with previous research supporting separate associations between cultural discordance and intergroup anxiety (Rohmann et al., 2006), as well as intergroup anxiety and support for minority groups' collective action (Barlow et al., 2012), and research linking outgroup trust to behavioural tendencies towards ingroups and outgroups (e.g., Tam et al., 2009).

Cultural Discordance and Collective Action

In the acculturation models of Berry (1997) and Bourhis et al. (1997), the most beneficial situation for intergroup relations in plural societies occurs when the acculturation preferences of both majority and minority groups align, and when the acculturation strategy of the dominant majority group allows minority members to fully participate in mainstream society. In reality, however, majorities and minorities often hold discordant acculturation attitudes, particularly towards maintaining the cultural heritage of minority members, leading to conflictual intergroup relations (e.g., Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, Horenczyk, & Schmitz, 2003). Depending on how majority and minority group attitudes towards minority cultural maintenance match up, one of two types of cultural discordance can develop in a national context. The first type of discordance occurs when minority group members perceive that their cultural maintenance is less supported than they wish. The second type is when minority group members perceive that the majority group allows or expects them to preserve their culture of origin to an even higher degree than they actually wish to. If the first type of cultural discordance reflects a vivid intergroup disagreement on the minority

group's cultural maintenance and most likely is reflective of an assimilationist acculturation orientation of the majority group, the second type, in turn, most likely reflects a segregationist acculturation orientation of the majority group (Berry, 1997; Bourhis et al., 1997). Regardless of the possibility of these two types of cultural discordance, recent research has mostly found evidence of the first form, that is, that minority group members would like to preserve their original culture more than what majority group would prefer them to: This suggests assimilationist ideologies to be somewhat characteristic of contemporary Western societies (see e.g., Brubaker, 2010).

As regards the attitudinal and behavioural ramifications of cultural discordance, building on Berry (1997), Piontkowski et al. (2002) proposed in their Concordance Model of Acculturation (CMA) that a greater discrepancy between immigrants' desire to preserve their culture of origin and the dominant group's support for such maintenance facilitates more negative perceptions of intergroup relations among members of both groups. Specifically, it is discordance in terms of the acculturation dimension of cultural maintenance and not the dimension of contact or cultural adoption that evokes stronger intergroup threats (Piontkowski et al., 2002). To exemplify the relevance of cultural discordance for negative intergroup relations, Sindic and Reicher (2009) showed that majority group members' opposition to the minority group's cultural maintenance resulted in a negative association between ethnic and national identification among minority members. In a similar vein, Mähönen et al. (2010) showed that perceived cultural discordance caused a conflict between young immigrants' ethnic and national identities. Nevertheless, no previous research has focused on the behavioural consequences of cultural discordance among both majority and minority group members. In this paper, therefore, we suggest that cultural discordance that indicates assimilative pressure from the majority group (i.e., when members of a majority group perceive immigrants as demanding more cultural maintenance than the majority group would allow) is related to a desire to support collective action to improve the minority group's position

among minority members and, conversely, a lack of desire to support such action among majority members.

From a social psychological perspective, collective action aimed at improving the conditions of the ingroup or in solidarity with an outgroup (Becker, 2012) refers not only to explicitly politicised collective behaviours such as protests and strikes, but also more everyday behaviours such as signing a petition or attending a group meeting (Simon et al., 1998). This broader understanding of collective action reflects the full array of different forms of collective struggle for social change (Simon et al., 1998; Simon, 2004). Support for collective action may be assessed not only by group members' actual engagement in change behaviours, but also by their intentions to engage in, or support of, actions made towards equality. As outlined in the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) and shown in a meta-analytic review of van Zomeren et al. (2008), individuals' intentions of collective action predict their engagement in actual collective action. Thus, in this paper, immigrants' collective action is understood as majority and minority group members' support for behaviours geared at empowering immigrants in host society, and includes one's readiness to promote immigrants' political participation, support for their civil rights, and opposition to discrimination.

For both majority and majority group members, a disagreement on the cultural maintenance of the minority group poses an identity threat (Piontkowski et al., 2002), and is related to the recognition of unjust treatment of the ingroup by outgroup members. As originally suggested by Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), perceiving identity threat and group injustice are key requirements of mobilising ingroup's collective action. As majority and minority group members take different perspectives during intergroup interactions, the roots of their perceptions of identity threat and group injustice slightly differ. For a majority group, cultural discordance may elicit a perception of identity threat and injustice because majority group members would prefer minority group members to adhere to majority group's cultural values instead of

preserving their culture of origin (Piontkowski et al., 2002). This perceived threat to majority identity may inhibit the majority's support for minority group's collective action that would improve the minority's social standing in relation to the majority (cf., Zebel, Doosje, & Spears, 2009). For a minority group, in contrast, the discordance-driven recognition of social injustice results from a perception that the maintenance of their cultural heritage is not fully accepted by members of the majority group. Considering that maintaining culture is strongly associated with minority group identification (Florack & Piontkowski, 2000), perceived cultural discordance linked to the perception of group injustice should strengthen minority members' support for their ingroup's collective action (see van Zomeren et al., 2008, 2012).

Moreover, we suggest that the pathway from cultural discordance to support for collective action is indirect via specific emotional responses. According to the socio-functional approach (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005), different identity threats evoke specific emotional responses, which in turn are associated with goals relevant to the ingroup. This idea is partly incorporated in the dynamic dual pathway model of collective action by van Zomeren et al. (2012), which proposes that one of the paths from group identity to collective action goes through group-based anger triggered by recognising outgroup members' unjust treatment towards ingroup members. In this model, anger is considered to be an emotional response to perceived injustice towards the ingroup perpetrated by outgroup members; collective action is, thus, seen as a way to overcome this unjust treatment. In this study, therefore, we suggest that collective action is an emotion-driven response to perceived cultural discordance, that is, an everyday intergroup disagreement on a dimension relevant to the ingroup identity of both groups.

Suggested Mediators

Intergroup Anxiety

Emotional responses specific to the majority-minority context of interaction are likely to be differently affected by the strength of perceived cultural discordance. In an intergroup situation, a

perception of high cultural discordance can be expected to not only accentuate unpleasant emotional reactions, but also weaken pleasant ones. *Intergroup anxiety* (Stephan & Stephan, 2000), an unpleasant emotional response, is a feeling of being personally threatened due to a possibility of experiencing embarrassment or rejection during social interactions with outgroup members. To date, intergroup anxiety has been associated with cultural discordance (Rohmann et al., 2006) and collective action (Barlow et al., 2012) only for members of majority groups. Among these groups, perceived cultural discordance is likely to elicit intergroup anxiety because cultural heritage maintenance among minority members may enhance the perception of (excessive) cultural dissimilarities between the groups (see Rohmann, Piontkowski, & van Randenbourgh, 2008). As found by Van Acker and Vanbeseleare (2011), majority group members perceive that it is not possible for immigrants to simultaneously maintain their culture of heritage and adopt the host society's culture; immigrants who are seen as preserving their cultural heritage are seen as less familiar with, and less competent in, the host culture. Thus, when immigrants wish to preserve their culture more than the national majority would like them to, majority group members' perceptions of cultural discordance also include suspicions that immigrants lack competence in the dominant culture, making intergroup interactions less predictable. This, in turn, can elicit higher intergroup anxiety (see also Rohmann et al., 2008) and decrease support for minority groups' collective action among majority group members (Barlow et al., 2012).

Among minority group members, by contrast, intergroup anxiety has not been found to be associated with either perceived cultural discordance or collective action tendencies (Barlow et al., 2012; Rohmann et al., 2006). This is most likely due to the fact that minority group members are accustomed to interacting with members of the national majority and they are familiar enough with majority culture, so that even high cultural discordance does not elicit detectable changes in intergroup anxiety (see Binder et al., 2009). We, therefore, propose intergroup anxiety as a mediator

of the relationship between cultural discordance and support for collective action among majority group members, but not among minority group members.

Outgroup Trust

Another possible mediator of the investigated relationship is a pleasant intergroup emotional response, namely *outgroup trust*. Trust has been defined as a positive psychological bias toward others (Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994), facilitating favourable expectations of the trustee's intentions and actions, especially under conditions of uncertainty (e.g., Molm, Takahashi, & Peterson, 2000). With regard to outgroups, trust is a confident expectation that the outgroup has good intentions and will genuinely act in ways that advance ingroup needs and interests (Kelman, 2005; Tropp, 2008; Tyler, 2001). This expectation has direct implications for intergroup behaviour, in that trusting requires relinquishing control over cherished outcomes and, therefore, the acceptance of vulnerability at the hands of a trusted outgroup (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998; Tanis & Postmes, 2005).

We propose here that while weak cultural discordance promotes outgroup trust and high cultural discordance erodes it. That is, perceiving a strong disagreement between the majority and minority over the issue of minority culture maintenance emphasises cultural dissimilarities and increases the salience of ingroup-outgroup disagreement on the dimension of minority group's cultural maintenance. Intergroup dissimilarities, however, thwart the development of trust (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002) and individuals have been shown to be generally less trusting toward outgroups (Foddy, Platow, & Yamagishi, 2009). Moreover, cultural discordance is typically experienced as an identity threat (e.g., Mähönen et al., 2010; Rohmann et al., 2008) and threats, in turn, have been shown to decrease trust (Schmid, Al Ramiah, & Hewstone, 2014; Tausch Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2007). Thus, based on previous theorisations, cultural discordance should generally be negatively associated with outgroup trust for both majority and minority group members.

Yet, how outgroup trust affects support for collective action in the context of social hierarchy depends on prevailing power relations between groups. Trust generally increases the willingness to relinquish control and accept vulnerability; this willingness is rooted in the belief that the trusted outgroup will not exploit it. Advantaged *majorities* make themselves vulnerable by tolerating the outgroup's collective efforts for egalitarian social change. Trusting that the minority has one's best interests at heart should, thus, *strengthen* majority support for minority group members' collective action. In contrast, disadvantaged *minorities* make themselves vulnerable by abandoning assertive action for egalitarian social change. Trusting in the majority's benevolence should thus *weaken* their resolve for collective action, which is consistent with previous research (e.g., Corcoran, Pettinicchio, & Young, 2011). In short, we posit that outgroup trust is positively associated with support for collective action among the majority, but negatively associated with support among the minority.

Context of the Present Study

Finland has been a destination for immigration only for the last twenty years. The number of foreign-born residents in the country is rising and now there are approximately 289 000 individuals of foreign descent living in Finland (i.e., 5.3% of the total population) (Statistics Finland, 2012, 2014). Of all foreign-born individuals in Finland, Russian-speaking immigrants from Russia and the former Soviet republics are numerically the largest group. Russians are also one of the oldest ethnic minorities in Finland, with a history of settlement going back to the beginning of the 19th century, when the Grand Duchy of Finland was a part of the Tsardom of Russia.

Throughout the 20th century, Finnish-Russian relations were marked by military resistance and political struggle aimed at protecting the cultural heritage of the Finnish people and the territorial integrity of the Finnish state. First, the historical struggle to preserve Finnish cultural heritage during times of Russian influence as well as the difficult adjustment to the increasing Russian immigration to Finland has made cultural discordance between majority Finns and Russian

immigrants salient. Second, due to pervasive prejudice towards Russian immigrants and their low social standing (Jaakkola, 2009), collective action empowering Russians in Finland may not be desired only by Russian immigrants themselves but also by more egalitarian Finns. Thus, studying the relationship between cultural discordance and collective action in this social setting offers a unique opportunity to examine its underlying mechanism from the perspective of two ethno-cultural groups differing in cultural characteristics and status positions.

Aims and Hypotheses

The present study aims to investigate the relationship between perceived cultural discordance and collective action among majority and minority group members. We expect that cultural discordance will be directly associated with support for collective action among members of both groups but negatively for majority Finns and positively for Russian immigrants (H1). Moreover, greater perceived cultural discordance among majority group members should be associated with greater intergroup anxiety, which should diminish their support for collective action of the minority group. We hypothesise that intergroup anxiety will mediate the negative effect of perceived cultural discordance on collective action among majority Finns—but not among immigrants (H2). Further, greater perceived cultural discordance should be linked to reduced levels of outgroup trust for both majority and minority group members. In turn, lowered levels of trust should undermine support for collective action among the majority but strengthen support for such action among the minority. We hypothesise that outgroup trust will mediate the effect of perceived cultural discordance on support for collective action both among majority Finns (i.e., a negative indirect effect) and minority immigrants (i.e., a positive indirect effect) (H3). The hypothesised model is visualised in Figure 1.

Figure 1 about here

In the proposed model, we will adjust for gender, age and years of education (for effects of demographics on collective action, see e.g., Paulsen, 1991). In addition, as positive cross-group contact relates directly to both intergroup anxiety (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) and outgroup trust (Tam et al., 2009), and as recent research suggests that outgroup contact undermines collective action among minority groups (e.g., Becker, Wright, Lubensky, & Zhou, 2013), we also adjusted our model for two forms of intergroup contact: frequency of casual encounters with outgroup members¹ and number of close outgroup friendships.

Method

Participants and Procedure

This study was carried out as part of the international project Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies (MIRIPS), coordinated by John Berry (see Berry, 2012). The postal survey was conducted between June and November 2012 among representative samples of Finnish majority members and Russian immigrants to Finland. Participation in the study was voluntary and confidential. The sampling was conducted by the Finnish National Population Register Centre. All majority members included in the sample were native Finnish speakers, born in Finland and residing in the country at the time of the survey. The Russian immigrants spoke Russian as their mother tongue, were born in the former Soviet Union or the Russian Federation, and had moved to Finland no later than January 1, 2008. The response rate to the survey was 33.5 per cent for the majority and 39.0 per cent for the minority sample. The analysed data comes from the sample of $N=502$ individuals (Finns: $n=274$, 57% female; Russians: $n=228$, 77% female).

Materials

Majority and minority group participants responded to the same set of measures from their respective viewpoints. All items used a scale ranging from one (*completely disagree*) to five

¹ Frequency of casual intergroup contact was measured slightly differently for majority and minority participants: native Finns indicated how many Russian immigrants lived in their residential area, whereas Russian immigrants were asked how often in everyday life they interact with native Finns.

(*completely agree*). Participants were provided questionnaires in their mother tongues, Finnish or Russian. The Russian-language questionnaire was translated by two independent native speakers of the Russian language.

Cultural discordance was operationalised as the discrepancy between (a) one's own attitudes toward the preservation of minority culture and (b) the outgroup's perceived attitudes toward minority cultural maintenance. To this end, we devised a three-item scale to assess attitudes towards the cultural maintenance of Russian immigrants—once from the participant's own perspective, and again from the perspective of an average outgroup member (i.e., a Russian immigrant for native Finnish participants, and vice versa). The items were: "*It is important that immigrants from Russia maintain their own culture in Finland*," "*It is important that immigrants from Russia maintain in Finland their religion, language and traditions*," and "*It is important that immigrants from Russia maintain their way of life in Finland*" (adapted from Rohmann et al., 2006; Zagefka & Brown, 2002). The items formed reliable scales for personal attitudes toward cultural maintenance ($\alpha = .86$ for Finns, $\alpha = .61$ for immigrants), as well as for perceived outgroup attitudes toward cultural maintenance ($\alpha = .84$ for Finns, $\alpha = .70$ for immigrants).

We then computed a single index of cultural discordance by subtracting the individual scores representing perceived *outgroup* attitudes from the individual scores representing *personal* attitudes. Moreover, to facilitate interpretation, the resulting discordance index was reversed for majority group participants (see Rohmann et al., 2006). Participants with negative and zero scores on perceived cultural discordance index were removed from the analysis. As such, positive scores on the cultural discordance index always denote that immigrants are, or are seen as, more strongly in favour of minority culture maintenance, relative to native Finns. Moreover, the magnitude of the index score represents the perceived degree of discordance, in that greater scores indicate greater levels of perceived discordance between one's own and outgroup support for minority culture maintenance.

Intergroup anxiety was measured with a six-item measure adapted from Stephan and Stephan (1985). Participants were asked to indicate how they would feel during an interpersonal interaction with outgroup members (i.e., Russian immigrants for native Finnish participants, and vice versa) using six adjectives: nervous, anxious, good (reverse-coded), awkward, safe (reverse-coded), and relaxed (reverse-coded). The items were aggregated into a reliable scale of intergroup anxiety ($\alpha = .89$ for Finns and $\alpha = .80$ for immigrants), with higher scores representing greater levels of anxiety.

Outgroup trust was measured with three items adapted from Paolini, Hewstone, and Cairns (2007). The items were: *"I think that most Russian immigrants/native Finns would treat me fairly even if they had a chance to take advantage of me,"* *"In my opinion most of Russian immigrants/native Finns are trustworthy,"* and *"I believe that Russian immigrants/native Finns will not take advantage of me if I trust them."* Combining the items resulted in a reliable scale of outgroup trust ($\alpha = .86$ for Finns and $\alpha = .74$ for immigrants), with higher scores denoting greater levels of trust.

Support for collective action was measured with three items developed to suit the social context of this study. The items were adapted from Simon et al. (1998) and tapped individual readiness to promote the maintenance of immigrant culture in the country and actively stand against the discrimination of immigrants. The items were: *"I could vote for a Russian immigrant candidate who would fit to my political views,"* *"I could defend the rights of Russian immigrants in public debate/discussion,"* and *"I could intervene verbally in situations in which I notice discrimination of Russian immigrants"*. A maximum likelihood (ML) factor analysis conducted among both groups showed an acceptable fit of a one-factor model for the majority ($KMO = .67$, $\chi^2_{(3)} = 322.16$, $p < .001$) and for the minority sample ($KMO = .66$, $\chi^2_{(3)} = 135.03$, $p < .001$). The extracted factor explained 63 per cent and 47 per cent of the variance for the majority and minority samples,

respectively. The individual loadings of the items on the common factor were between .70 and .95 for the majority and .63 and .81 for the minority sample.

Data Analysis

A hot deck imputation method (Myers, 2011) was used to deal with missing data by replacing a missing item value of the recipient with a value of the matching donor within the same dataset. All hypotheses were tested with conditional process analysis (Hayes, 2013), using the PROCESS tool for SPSS. As Hayes suggests, in the case of smaller data sets when observed variables are used to estimate the model, this ordinary least squares regression-based path analysis provides more accurate estimations of *p*-values for the regression coefficients than structural equation models with latent variables. The strength and significance of indirect effects were assessed with a non-parametric bootstrapping method using 10,000 resamples, allowing unbiased estimation of these non-normally distributed effects (see Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007; Hayes, 2013). All regression coefficients in the study are reported in an unstandardised form (*B*).

Group status (Majority=0, Minority=1) was entered as a moderator of all direct and indirect paths specified in the model (see Figure 1). The hypotheses of the study were tested by three regression analyses (for more details see Hayes, 2013). First, intergroup anxiety (Me1) and outgroup trust (Me2) were independently regressed on all control variables, cultural discordance (IV), group status (Mo), and the cultural discordance $\times$ group status interaction (IV*Mo). Second, support for collective action was predicted by all control variables, cultural discordance, intergroup anxiety, outgroup trust, group status, the intergroup anxiety $\times$ group status interaction (Me1*Mo), the outgroup trust $\times$ group status interaction (Me2*Mo), and the cultural discordance $\times$ group status interaction (IV*Mo).

Results

Correlations among the variables, their means and standard deviations are shown in Table

Table 1 about here

The results of the regression analysis testing the hypotheses for the proposed model are presented in Table 2. The association between perceived cultural discordance and support for collective action was moderated by group status. As predicted, cultural discordance yielded a negative and significant effect on collective action among majority Finns, $B=-0.33$, $p<.001$. However, among Russian immigrants, the predicted direct positive effect of cultural discordance on collective action did not reach statistical significance, $B=0.05$, $p=.533$. Thus, H1, which stated that cultural discordance will be directly and negatively associated with support for collective action among majority Finns but positively among Russian immigrants, was only supported in the majority sample.

Table 2 about here

As reported in Table 3, the bootstrapped results of the conditional process analysis for the indirect effects were consistent with both H2 and H3. In support of H2, which stated that intergroup anxiety will mediate the negative effect of perceived cultural discordance on collective action among majority Finns but not among Russian immigrants, there was a significant negative indirect effect of perceived cultural discordance on support for collective action. This occurred through intergroup anxiety among majority Finns, whereas no such indirect effect was found for the minority group (see Table 3). Thus, the perception of higher cultural discordance—by virtue of eliciting stronger intergroup anxiety among majority members—was associated with weaker support for immigrants' collective action.

In support of H3, which stated that outgroup trust will mediate the effect of perceived cultural discordance on support for collective action both among majority Finns and immigrants, there was a significant indirect effect of perceived cultural discordance on support for collective action through outgroup trust among members of both groups (see Table 3). However, this indirect

effect was somewhat weaker for the minority group. The indirect negative effect for the Finnish majority suggests that the perception of higher cultural discordance was associated with *lower* support for collective action by virtue of eroding trust toward immigrants. In contrast, those Russian immigrants who wanted to preserve their cultural heritage more than they thought majority Finns would allow tended to show *stronger* support for collective action by virtue of lower trust toward native Finns. The model produced the same results also without controlling for the effects of the socio-demographic variables and the effects of intergroup contact and intergroup friendship.²

Table 3 about here

The direct and indirect effects of cultural discordance on support for collective action for majority and minority members are presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2 about here

Discussion

The present study sheds light on a previously unexplored aspect of intergroup dynamics in plural societies, specifically the relationship of perceived cultural discordance and group support for behaviour aimed at achieving intergroup equality. We integrated the frameworks of cultural discordance (Piontkowski et al., 2002; Rohmann et al., 2006, 2008) and collective action (van Zomeren et al., 2008, 2012), while considering two affective mediating processes, and tested the proposed model in a Finnish sample with members of the national majority group and immigrants from Russia. We found that, for members of the Finnish majority, the relationship between

² Due to the use of correlational data, we also tested for opposite causality assumptions and conducted a post-hoc analysis to investigate whether cultural discordance mediates the relationship between intergroup anxiety, outgroup trust and support for collective action. The analysis gave support for this alternative model among majority but not among minority group members. The indirect effect of intergroup anxiety on support for collective action was $B=-0.18$, CI 95% (-0.256, -0.116) for the majority and $B=0.00$, CI 95% (-0.012, 0.028) for the minority group. Accordingly, the indirect effect of outgroup trust on support for collective action was $B=0.13$, CI 95% (0.078, 0.202) for majority and $B=0.00$, CI 95% (-0.049, 0.009) for minority group members.

perceived cultural discordance and support for collective action was mediated by both intergroup anxiety and outgroup trust. Thus, it seems that when members of the majority group are confronted with minority group desire for cultural maintenance, perceived cultural discordance directly and indirectly evokes reactions directed against empowering members of minority groups. For Russian immigrants, however, the positive association between perceived discordance and collective action was restricted to an indirect path through outgroup trust. Taken together, this indicates that different social psychological processes may operate in the link between cultural discordance and collective action for members of majority and minority groups. These results complement previous research on collective action (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2012), and contribute to the discussions highlighting different perspectives and motivations of majority and minority group members in intergroup contact situations (see e.g., Dovidio et al., 2007).

Corroborate the mediating role of outgroup trust in the association between perceived cultural discordance and support for collective action complements previous research on the link between outgroup trust and intergroup behaviour. In line with the results of Tam et al. (2009), low outgroup trust was associated with weaker majority support for collective action geared at improving immigrants' social standing. As Wirtz and Doosje (2013) demonstrated, it is easier for majority members to accept messages about injustice when minority members giving such comments do not overemphasise cultural maintenance. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that under these conditions, minority members are seen as less of a threat for the majority identity and, thus, more trustworthy. This, in turn, results in more support for immigrants' empowerment. On the contrary, when perceived cultural discordance is high, trust towards immigrants tends to decline (see Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002), as does support for actions benefiting the immigrant group.

For the immigrant minority, the indirect positive association between perceived cultural discordance and support for collective action, which occurred through outgroup trust, seems similar to the negative association operating for majority members. The perception of high cultural

discordance is likely to reflect the high assimilative pressure exerted by majority members over immigrants, which acts as a threat to minority identity. The perception of an identity threat leads to a decline of trust towards the majority group, which subsequently contributes to greater engagement in collective action. These results point to the central role of ethnic identification among minority group members. With no consent given by the majority group for the maintenance of minority cultural heritage, the perception of high cultural discordance can be experienced by members of culturally non-dominant groups as a threat to a crucial part of their self-concept (Mähönen et al., 2010), as well as a threat to ethno-linguistic vitality and continuity (Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Teräsaho, 2007). Perceiving an identity threat translates, through declined outgroup trust, into greater support for actions that reduce the threat, including empowering one's ethnic group. Only with such empowerment can minority groups ensure the preservation of their minority culture in the future.

The proposed causal relationship between perceived cultural discordance and support for collective action via group-relevant emotional responses is consistent with SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), as well as the socio-functional approach to intergroup emotions (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005), which proposes that, in an intergroup situation, different identity threats evoke specific emotional responses associated with goals relevant to one's ingroup. The proposed causal relationship is also in line with van Zomeren and colleagues' (2008, 2012) recent models of collective action engagement which empirically support the causal link between group identity and collective action via group-based emotion of anger. Additional support for our model comes from a study by Rohmann et al. (2008), which demonstrated experimentally that cultural discordance causally precedes intergroup anxiety. Thus, the model tested in this study was based on previous, empirically supported theorisations. However, given the use of correlational data in the current study, we ran additional analyses suggesting a reciprocal relationship between the proposed mediators and perceived cultural discordance. Given that our study was the first to focus on the association

between cultural discordance, intergroup anxiety, outgroup trust and support for collective action, future experimental and longitudinal studies should dig deeper into the causal relationship between cultural discordance and experiences of intergroup anxiety and trust. We acknowledge that due to the characteristics of our minority sample (first-generation immigrants with an average knowledge of Finnish, and predominantly female, middle aged, and well-educated), the generalisability of our results may be limited and should be replicated with different representative samples of immigrants and members of other minorities.

We would like to end with a concluding remark about the role of outgroup trust in support for collective action among minority group members. While high cultural discordance is positively associated with support for ingroup collective action through diminished outgroup trust, the results also show that, when cultural discordance is low, immigrants' support for collective action declines through elevated trust towards the majority group. Thus, while models of acculturation (Berry, 1997; Bourhis et al., 1997) argue for concordant attitudes towards cultural maintenance to be beneficial for majority-minority relations, the perception of low cultural discordance may, in fact, undermine minority members' support for collective action and be harmful to immigrants' interests in the long run. This may be especially true in the European immigration context, as an ethnic representation of national identity based on common ancestry (Smith, 2001) still remains vivid (Reeskens & Hooghe, 2010) in many receiving countries, and is linked to prejudiced attitudes towards those who do not share the same ethnic ancestry as the majority group (e.g., Meeus, Duriez, Vanbeselaere, & Boen, 2010; Pehrson & Green, 2010; Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009). Thus, even immigrants who do not insist on maintaining their cultural heritage and are willing to assimilate may not be guaranteed full inclusion into host society. In light of our results, we propose that diverse societies should not necessarily aim to have low cultural discordance, with its seemingly positive effect on majority-minority intergroup relations as largely suggested so far (e.g., Bourhis et al., 1997). Instead, emphasis should be put on the promotion and actual implementation of real multiculturalism in

everyday life, which would support equality and participation of all groups in society, regardless of cultural roots of their members.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making Process*, 50, 179–211.
- Alesina, A., & La Ferrara, E. (2002). Who trusts others? *Journal of Public Economics*, 85, 207–234.
- Barlow, F. K., Sibley, C. G., & Hornsey, M. J. (2012). Rejection as a call to arms: Inter-racial hostility and support for political action as outcomes of race-based rejection in majority and minority groups. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 51, 167–177.
- Becker, J. (2012). Virtual special issue on theory and research on collective action in the European Journal of Social Psychology. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 19–23.
- Becker, J. C., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. E., & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or ally: Whether cross-group contact undermines collective action depends on what advantaged group members say (or don't say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 442–455.
- Berry, J. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5–68.
- Berry, J. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 615–631.
- Berry, J. (2012). *Mutual intercultural relations in plural societies (MIRIPS)*. Retrieved from <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/cacr/research/mirips>
- Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., & Mummendey, A. Leyens, J. P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of

the contact hypothesis among majority and minority groups in three European countries.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96, 843–856.

Bourhis, R. Y., Moïse, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senécal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: a social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, 32, 369–386.

Brubaker, R. (2010). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24, 531–548.

Corcoran, K., Pettinicchio, D., & Young, J. (2011). The context of control: A cross-national investigation of the link between social structure, fatalism, and collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 576–605.

Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to ‘prejudice.’ *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 770–789.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2007). Another view of “we”: Majority and minority group perspectives on a common ingroup identity. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 296–330.

Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2000). Acculturation attitudes of the Dutch and the Germans towards the European Union: The importance of national and European identification. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21, 1–13.

Foddy, M., Platow, M., & Yamagishi, T. (2009). Group-based trust in strangers: The role of stereotypes and expectations. *Psychological Science*, 20, 419–422.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Horenczyk, G., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Sam, D. L., & Vedder, P. (2013). Mutuality in acculturation: Towards an integration. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 221, 205–231.

- Huijnk, W., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2012). Family life and acculturation attitudes: A study among four immigrant groups in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38, 555–575.
- Jaakkola, M. (2009). *Maahanmuuttajat suomalaisten näkökulmasta. Asennemuutokset 1987–2007 [Immigrants from the perspective of Finns. Change in attitudes 1987 – 2007]*. Helsinki: City of Helsinki Information Centre.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., Horenczyk, G., & Schmitz, P. (2003). The interactive nature of acculturation: perceived discrimination, acculturation attitudes and stress among young ethnic repatriates in Finland, Israel and Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 79–97.
- Kelman, H. C. (2005). Building trust among enemies: The central challenge for international conflict resolution. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 639–650.
- Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Liebkind, K., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Teräsaho, M. (2007). Ingroup vitality and intergroup attitudes in a linguistic minority. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 409–418.
- Meeus, J., Duriez, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, P. (2010). The role of national identity representations in the relationship between in-group identification and out-group derogation: Ethnic versus civic representations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 305–320.
- Molm, L. D., Takahashi, N., & Peterson, G. (2000). Risk and trust in social exchange: An experimental test of a classical proposition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 1396–1427.
- Myers, T. A. (2011). Goodbye, listwise deletion: Presenting hot deck imputation as an easy and effective tool for handling missing data. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 5, 297–310.
- Mähönen, T. A., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Liebkind (2010). Cultural discordance and the polarization of attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14, 505–515.

- Navas, M., García, M., Sánchez, J., Rojas, A. J., Pumares, P., & Fernandez, J. S. (2005). Relative acculturation extended model (RAEM): New contributions with regard to the study of acculturation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 21–37.
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2007). Direct and indirect intergroup friendship effects: Testing the moderating role of the affective and cognitive bases of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 1406–1420.
- Paulsen, R. (1991). Education, social class, and participation in collective action. *Sociology of Education*, 64, 96–110.
- Pehrson, S., & Green, E. G. T. (2010). Who we are and who can join us: National identity content and entry criteria for new immigrants. *Journal of Social Issues*, 66, 695–716.
- Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V. L., & Brown, R. (2009). National identification and anti-immigrant prejudice: Individual and contextual effects of national definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 72, 24–38.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three models. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 922–934.
- Piontkowski, U., Rohmann, A., & Florack, A. (2002). Concordance of acculturation attitudes and perceived threat. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 5, 221–232.
- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42, 185–227.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovitz, M. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149–152.
- Reeskens, T., & Hooghe, M. (2010). Beyond the civic–ethnic dichotomy: investigating the structure of citizenship concepts across thirty-three countries. *Nations and Nationalism*, 16, 579–597.

- Rohmann, A., Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2006). The role of discordant acculturation attitudes in perceived threat: An analysis of host and immigrant attitudes in Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 683–702.
- Rohmann, A., Piontkowski, U., & van Randenbourgh, A. (2008). When attitudes do not fit: Discordance of acculturation attitudes as an antecedent of intergroup threat. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 337–352.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393–404.
- Schmid, K., Al Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2014). Neighborhood diversity and trust: The role of intergroup contact and perceived threat. *Psychological Science*, 25, 665–674.
- Simon, B. (2004). *Identity in modern society: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford : Blackwell.
- Simon, B., & Grabow, O. (2010). The politicization of migrants: Further evidence that politicized collective identity is a dual identity. *Political Psychology*, 31, 717–738.
- Simon, B., Loewy, M., Stürmer, S., Weber, U., Freytag, P., Habig, C.,...Spahlinger, P. (1998). Collective identification and social movement participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 646–658.
- Simon, B., & Ruhs, D. (2008). Identity and politicization among Turkish migrants in Germany: The role of dual identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1354–1366.
- Sindic, D., & Reicher, S. D. (2009). ‘Our way of life is worth defending’: Testing a model of attitudes towards superordinate group membership through a study of Scots’ attitudes towards Britain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 114–129.
- Sinisterra, J., Finell, E., & Geschke, D. (2009). “I can feel we don’t like them.” On the emotional nature of prejudice. In I. Jasinskaja-Lahti & T. A. Mähönen (Eds.), *Identities, intergroup*

relations and acculturation: The cornerstones of intercultural encounters (pp. 125–136).

Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Smith, A. D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, ideology, history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Statistic Finland (2012). *Nationality according to age and sex by region 1990–2012 (table)*.

Retrieved from

http://193.166.171.75/Dialog/varval.asp?ma=020_vaerak_tau_101_en&ti=Nationality+accordin+to+age+and+sex+by+region+1990+%2D+2012&path=../Database/StatFin/vrm/vaerak/&lang=1&multilang=en

Statistics Finland (2014). *Foreign-language speakers account for 90 per cent of the population*

growth in 2013. Retrieved from http://tilastokeskus.fi/til/vaerak/2013/vaerak_2013_2014-03-21_tie_001_en.html

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157–175.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination. The Claremont Symposium on applied social psychology* (pp. 23–45). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Intergroup relations* (pp. 94–109). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 45–59.

Tanis, M., & Postmes, T. (2005). A social identity approach to trust: interpersonal perception, group membership and trusting behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 413–424.

Tausch, N., Becker, J. C., Spears, R., Christ, O., Saab, R., Singh, P., & Siddiqui, R. N. (2011).

Explaining radical group behavior: Developing emotion and efficacy routes to normative and nonnormative collective action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 129–148.

- Tausch, N., Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2007). Individual-level and group-level mediators of contact effects in Northern Ireland: The moderating role of social identification. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 541–556.
- Tropp, L. R. (2008). The role of trust in intergroup contact: Its significance and implications for improving relations between groups. In U. Wagner, L. R. Tropp, G. Finchilescu, & C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew* (pp. 91–106). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tyler, T. R. (2001). Why do people rely on others? Social identity and the social aspects of trust. In K. S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Van Acker, K., & Vanbeselaere, N. (2011). Heritage culture maintenance precludes host culture adoption and vice versa: Flemings' perception of Turks' acculturation behavior. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 15, 133–145.
- van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2008). Towards an integrative social identity model of collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of three socio-psychological perspectives. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 504–535.
- van Zomeren, M., Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2012). Protesters as “passionate economists”: A dynamic dual pathway model of approach coping with collective action. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16, 180–199.
- Wirtz, C., & Doosje, B. J. (2013). Reactions to threatening critical message from minority group members with shared or distinct identities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 50–51.
- Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, 129–166.
- Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2002). The relationship between acculturation strategies, relative fit, and intergroup relations: immigrant-majority relations in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 171–188.

Zebel, S., Doosje, B., & Spears, R. (2009). How perspective-taking helps and hinders group-based guilt as a function of group identification. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 12, 61–78.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Pearson's Correlation Coefficients for the Variables Used in the Study in Majority (n = 274) and Minority (n = 228)

Samples

			Pearson's r								
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Majority											
1. Gender	---	---	1	.08	-.02	-.03	-.04	-.16*	-.07	.04	.10
2. Age	45.45	13.67		1	-.19**	-.17**	-.07	-.02	.08	-.04	-.03
3. Years of education	14.03	3.50			1	.04	.07	-.20**	-.24**	-.14**	.25**
4. Contact	---	---				1	.10	.08	-.24*	.09	.11
5. Friendship	---	---					1	-.10	-.20**	.07	.17**
6. Cultural discordance	1.63	1.01						1	.50**	-.44**	-.57**
7. Intergroup anxiety	2.73	0.90							1	-.51**	-.58**
8. Outgroup trust	3.26	1.01								1	.54**
9. Collective action	2.91	1.11									1
Minority											
1. Gender	---	---	1	.07	.14*	.09	.08	-.12	.08	-.05	.12
2. Age	44.39	12.31		1	-.07	-.17**	.01	-.06	-.07	.05	.01
3. Years of education	15.41	3.15			1	.07	.00	-.06	-.08	.00	-.03

CULTURAL DISCORDANCE AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

31

4. Contact	---	---	1	.00	.05	-.02	-.11	.05
5. Friendship	---	---		1	-.11	-.20**	.19**	-.11
6. Cultural discordance	1.13	0.70			1	.09	-.18**	.07
7. Intergroup anxiety	1.96	0.75				1	-.31**	.24**
8. Outgroup trust	3.90	0.76					1	-.22**
9. Collective action	3.56	0.92						1

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

Table 2

Model Characteristics for the Conditional Process Analysis of the Indirect Effect of Cultural Discordance on Collective Action via Intergroup Anxiety and Outgroup Trust for Majority Finns (n=274) and Russian Immigrants (n=228)

	Intergroup anxiety (Me1)		Outgroup trust (Me2)		Collective action (Y)	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Constant	2.63***	0.24	3.76***	0.27	3.00***	0.44
Gender (0 = male)	0.06	0.07	-0.09	0.08	0.10	0.08
Age	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Years of education	-0.03*	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Contact (0 = no or little)	-0.44***	0.09	0.19	0.10 [†]	0.03	0.11
Friendship (0 = none or few)	-0.25***	0.07	0.14	0.08 [†]	0.19*	0.08
Discordance (X)	0.44***	0.04	-0.44***	0.05	-0.33***	0.06
Group (0 = majority) (Mo)	0.06	0.13	0.08	0.15	0.36	0.53
Discordance x Group (X*Mo)	-0.36***	0.08	0.25**	0.09	0.38***	0.10
Anxiety (Me1)	---	---	---	---	-0.32***	0.07
Anxiety x Group (Me1*Mo)	---	---	---	---	0.57***	0.11
Trust (Me2)	---	---	---	---	0.29***	0.06
Trust x Group (Me2*Mo)	---	---	---	---	-0.50***	0.10
R^2	.38		.25		.41	
F change for R^2	36.98***		20.54***		28.29***	

Note. [†] $p=.10$. * $p<.05$. ** $p<.01$. *** $p<.001$. X=independent variable. Mo=moderating variable.

Me=mediator variable. Y=dependent variable.

Table 3

Bootstrapped Indirect Effects of Cultural Discordance on Collective Action via Intergroup Anxiety and Outgroup Trust for Majority Finns (n=274) and Russian Immigrants (n=228)

Group membership	Intergroup anxiety				Outgroup trust			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>LL CI</i>	<i>UL CI</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>LL CI</i>	<i>UP CI</i>
Finns	-0.14*	0.04	-0.219	-0.075	-0.13*	0.03	-0.202	-0.073
Immigrants	0.02	0.02	-0.011	0.069	0.04*	0.03	0.001	0.112

Note. *At least $p < .05$. LL CI and UP CI=lower and upper level of the bias corrected confidence intervals for $\alpha = .05$.

Figure 1. Hypothesised model of the indirect relationship between cultural discordance and support for collective action moderated by group status (majority vs. minority). MAJ=majority members; MIN=minority members.

Figure 2. Direct and indirect effects of perceived cultural discordance on support for collective action among majority (L) and minority group members (R). Only statistically significant effects are depicted.