PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION, IDENTITY AND OUTGROUP ATTITUDES AMONG RUSSIAN-SPEAKING IMMIGRANTS LIVING IN FINLAND
Abstract

The present study focused on the relationship between perceived discrimination, identity and outgroups attitudes of immigrants towards nationals of mainstream societies. It started with the introduction of theoretical models describing the aforementioned relationships. First Berry’s (1997) acculturation strategies model was presented in the core of which are the identification preferences of minority group members with respect to ethnic identification. In addition, based on the Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM) (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009), perceived discrimination was discussed in terms of its consequence for immigrants’ perception of ethnic superiority and their attitudes towards members of the mainstream society.

The measures of the study (self – rating questionnaires) were adopted and or modified from existing scales for the purpose of a larger MIRIPS-FI project (Mutual Intercultural Relations in Plural Societies) conducted at the Department of Social Sciences, Unit of Social Psychology (University of Helsinki) under the leadership of Professor Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti between 2012-2014. The sample used in this study were Russian speaking immigrants living in Finland (N = 317).

The study found complex and dynamic relationships between perceived discrimination, identity and outgroups attitudes. The results showed that perceived discrimination enhanced hostile outgroup attitudes and also reduced national identification among the immigrants. The results also showed that ethnic identification did not affect the relationship between perceived discrimination and the outgroup attitudes of the immigrants towards members of the mainstream society. However, it rather showed that national identification and perceived ethnic superiority predicted the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes towards nationals of mainstream societies.

The results showed that the presence of actual or perceived discrimination restricts the achievement of a superordinate identity and also promotes hostile attitudes among immigrants towards natives of mainstream societies. The theoretical relevance and practicality of this study are discussed in order to understand identity preferences and its accompanying outgroup attitudes of immigrants in the development of an inclusive society.
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1. Introduction

Cultural diversity has been on a steady rise in Finland as the country opened its borders to nationals of different countries wishing to migrate. Particularly to individuals of Finnish descent from Russia, Estonia and other parts of the former Soviet Union. Immigration leads to the creation of multicultural societies as people from different cultural backgrounds cohabit in the same diverse society (Berry, 1997). As a result of this, cultural groups may be formed with different characteristics such as unequal distribution of power numerically, economically or even politically and this has resulted in “popular and social science terminology such as ‘mainstream’, ‘minority’, ‘ethnic groups’ etc” (Berry, 1997, p. 8).

The ultimate goal of a multicultural society is to attain a unit society which is comprised of different cultural groups sharing a superordinate national identity. However, intergroup attitudes, identification patterns and interaction between dominant and non-dominant groups are prerequisites of the participation of non-dominant groups in the mainstream society.

A lot of research in multiculturalism has raised interesting issues surrounding the need for individuals to make sense of their environment, and the roles they play in it (Phinney, 1999). As a result of this, the individuals form an identity with particular community, ethnic, national or cultural groups in which its members share similar identity traits, values and norms. This is in agreement with Phinney (1990) description of what group identity entails. Phinney (1990) described group identities as being more than categorical designations and that; they include attitudes, feelings and behavior surrounding any membership in that group. This also explains our human innate nature for the need to belong as well as the need to be accepted. In this thesis, I am studying ways in which non-dominant groups use identities in order to adapt to and or manage intergroup encounters in the mainstream society.

Ethnic discrimination is often seen as posing barriers that prevent non-dominant groups, specifically ethnic groups from developing a sense of belonging in a mainstream society. And in several countries, immigrant policies still dictate what is expected of the immigrants in respect to adaptation in the mainstream society. This however is avoidant of the fact that, in order to attain a multicultural society, the dominant group has to create opportunities and eliminate obstacles that restrict the achievement of this goal (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009). This, in turn has consequences on the identity choices that the non-dominant group may select and also their
Attitude towards the perpetuators of discrimination which in most cases, are the nationals of the mainstream society. Therefore, in this thesis, I will shift my focus to the non-dominant groups who are discriminated against. I will focus on how they cope or deal with the discrimination. Furthermore, I will direct my attention to how they identify amidst the vile consequences of discrimination, and look into the attitudes they project towards the nationals of the mainstream society.

Attitudes as conceptualized in different models consist of three components: affective (feelings and emotions), cognitive (beliefs) and behavior (action tendencies). Studies have shown that the affective component is useful in indicating individual’s reactions to outgroups in intergroup relations (Kosic & Caudek, 2005). Support for one’s in-group results in positive attitudes towards the group. This drives the desire to have a positive social identity. The degree to which one favors their in-group may develop into in-group favoritism (Kosic & Caudek, 2005). With respect to ethnic groups, in-group favoritism may take on the form of perceived ethnic superiority and result in negative attitudes towards outgroups. In this thesis, I will investigate why immigrants’ perceived ethnic superiority increases hostile attitudes towards nationals of the mainstream society in the presence of perceived or actual discrimination.

In Finland, there has been a significant rise in the immigration population since the start of the 1990’s because, individuals who were of Finnish descent from Russia, Estonia and other parts of the former Soviet Union, were given the “returnee” status “(or returning immigrant, or reimmigrant)” and were allowed back into the country. Also, Russian speaking immigrants from Russia and the former Soviet Union constitute the largest immigrant group (non-citizen group) in Finland according to Statistics Finland, Population statistics, 2013. Hence, I have specifically chosen to focus on Russian speaking immigrants as the non-dominant group because, they are most confronted with harsh realities of discrimination due to the general stereotypes held about them by nationals of the mainstream Finnish society (i.e. the dominant group). The stereotypes generally held about them surround the dwindling economic and political situations coupled with conflictual history of intergroup relations between these two neighboring countries.

In previous research, it was shown that, in support of the Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM), national identification mediated the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes of immigrants towards nationals of mainstream societies. The studies also
showed that ethnic identification did not moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and immigrants’ psychological well-being. This did not support the Rejection Identification Model (RIM) (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009)

In this thesis however, the moderating effect of ethnic identification would be tested as well as the mediating effect of national identification and perceived ethnic superiority on the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes towards national of the mainstream society.

The research question for my thesis is: What is the relationship between perceived discrimination, ethnic and national identity and out-group attitudes towards nationals of mainstream societies?
2. Theoretical background and definition of key concepts.

Chapter two serves to provide the theoretical and empirical evidence that clarifies the topic of my research. It also contains operationalized definitions of the key concepts used throughout this thesis. Despite the large amount of literature on perceived discrimination, identity and the accompanying attitudes which are outcomes of the relationship, I will focus on three themes. The first theme I will discuss is acculturation where I will elaborate on the acculturative outcomes. I will also discuss the identification preferences of national vs. ethnic identity.

The second theme is about perceived discrimination and in-group identification. Under this theme I will also discussed the Rejection Identification Model (RIM) to support this subject.

The third subject is on attitudes towards the mainstream society. I will also support this theme with elaborated discussions of attitudes towards members of the mainstream society, discrimination and attitudes towards members of mainstream societies, the Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM) and discrimination and in-group superiority.

2.1. Acculturation

Multicultural societies exist all over the world as a result of immigration. People of different cultural backgrounds move across international borders to settle in diverse societies thereby, making it multicultural. They may form cultural groups that are unequal in power numerically, politically and economically (Berry, 1997). As a result of this, terms such as mainstream, minority, majority, ethnic groups etc arise to demarcate the different levels of power held by these groups (Berry, 1997).

Immigrants and ethnic minority group members are often biculturals as they are exposed to two cultures namely; their culture of origin and the culture of the mainstream society in which they are domiciled. They often have to identify with either of the cultural groups and endorse a level of participation with either of the groups. It should however be noted that it is impossible to say that, one is fully or partially culturally competent because it is within a multilevel continuous entity of social skill and personality development (LaFromboise et al., 1993). They also cited an example of a bicultural individual being able to perform socially accepted behaviors within the
two cultures but unable to negotiate diverse institutional structures. It should also be noted that biculturals do find a great difficulty in achieving cultural competence as they were not brought up within such society with different cultural values than theirs. However, LaFromboise et al., (1993) do speculate that, the more levels in which biculturals gain competence, the less obstacles they would encounter in their roles within the two cultures.

Integration is also a strategy whereby multiculturalism is promoted and immigrants may adapt to both their original culture and that of the mainstream society without any conflict. It is much enhanced when societies make it a point to support the continuation of cultural diversity at the same time viewing it as a shared communal resource (Berry, 2005). Mainstream societies that support positive multiculturalism through the strategy of integration tend to provide social support from the larger institutions in the form of culturally sensitive healthcare and a multicultural curricula in schools to mention a few. They also provide social support from continuing and evolving ethnocultural communities which make up the exclusive integrated society (Berry, 2005). It can also be implied that, in integrated societies, immigrants are less likely to be forced into adapting to the culture and norms of mainstream societies. Thus, the chances of immigrants adapting acculturational strategies of assimilation, marginalization and separation are quite slim.

Although integration is the best acculturative strategy in any multicultural society, the actual fact is that it is hardly enforced due to factors like cultural, racial and religious discrimination (Berry, 2005). The affected groups which are often the minority groups experience hostility, rejection and discrimination from the members of the mainstream societies who do not endorse or accept the idea of a pluralistic society.

In the past, sociologists and psychologists believed that acculturation of European immigrants always presents a state of conflict in these immigrants regarding their ethnic culture and that of the mainstream society. They had to choose to either maintain their own culture hence rejecting the culture of the dominant or mainstream society. On the other hand, they would have to assimilate into the culture of the mainstream society and reject their ethnic culture (Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997; Child, 1943; Stonequist, 1935). The two cultures were assumed to be on the either end of a single continuum thus it was represented by the linear or bipolar model. The model proposed that, if non dominant group members become more mainstream or acculturated,
the less they could retain their ethnic culture and if they were less acculturated, the more they would retain their ethnic culture (Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997). Biculturals however, are most likely to be seen in the mid-way of this linear model because they are found between their ethnic culture and the culture of the mainstream society (Montgomery, 1992; Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997).

Contrary to this description, more recent studies have proposed acculturation to be rather multidimensional where it describes two independent dimensions of ethnic minorities position which are; “cultural maintenance (to what extent are cultural identity and characteristics considered to be important, and their maintenance strived for); and contact and participation (to what extent should they become involved in other cultural groups, or remain primarily among themselves).” (Berry, 1997, p. 9). These two independent dimensions can be classified as high and low when discussing the strategies of acculturation.

The term acculturation refers to alterations in a group’s original culture pattern which is usually influenced by the presence of another culture pattern. I use this concept in order to explain how non-dominant groups specify which identity they belong to and also, how they come about making these choices either being coerced by the dominant group or on their own accord. The strategies involved also give an idea of the level of participation of non-dominant groups in the mainstream society. Acculturative group is used to describe groups that undergo such changes under the influence of another group. The strategy of integration is often the best choice for the achievement of a multicultural society but in many instances, it is far from the reality where dominant groups seem to dictate quite a number of affairs affecting the non-dominant groups.

There are four strategies of acculturation namely integration, assimilation, marginalization and separation which can be measured along attitudinal dimensions (Berry, 1997). The names for the different strategies are also variant depending on the groups either dominant or non-dominant being examined. Non-dominant or minority groups who wish to maintain their original cultural values as well as engage in contact with the mainstream society are said to be integrated (Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997). Here, culture maintenance is of utmost importance to both groups. This also means that, there is a balance in the retention and maintenance of one’s own ethnic culture and also contact and participation with the larger society. The acculturative outcome of assimilation is defined from the perspective of the non-dominant group. The group
members decide to discard and not maintain their original cultural identity. They adopt and participate in the culture of the mainstream society. In this case, there is low retention of one’s cultural maintenance and a high identification in terms of contact and participation with the mainstream society. The third acculturative outcome is marginalization. With marginalization, members of the non-dominant group tend to disassociate themselves from the in-group probably due to cultural breakdown from enforced cultural loss. These members may show little or no interest in participating with the cultural norms of the mainstream society due to factors weighing against them such as exclusion and discrimination (Berry, 1997). The dimensions of this acculturative outcome would be low cultural maintenance of one’s original culture and also low participation with the mainstream society. The last acculturative outcome is separation whose outcome is in contrast to the outcome of assimilation. Unlike the assimilation outcome whereby the members of the non-dominant group reject their own ethnic culture and rather take on the culture of the mainstream society, the non-dominant group members in the separation outcome of acculturation reject and also, do not participate with the culture of the mainstream society. They rather hold on to and maintain their original culture. With this outcome, the dimensions are high for one’s own cultural maintenance and low for the participation in the mainstream society.

The presentations of these acculturative outcomes were based on the assumption that the non-dominant groups and their members have a choice as to which outcome to apply and would best suit their identity needs. This, may sometimes be an exception, as most of the time, the reality is that, the dominant group may enforce some form of acculturation that may deviate from the choices made by the non-dominant groups and alike individuals limiting their opportunities (Berry, 1997). Different terms are used to classify this deviation. As opposed to separation which is often a choice objected freely by individuals or members of non-dominant group, segregation occurs when it is imposed by the dominant group. With segregation, the dominant group dictates the exclusion of the non-dominant group and denies its member’s participation in the mainstream society. The acculturative outcome of assimilation has been likened to the notion of a “melting pot” when members of the non-dominant group on their own accord decide to undertake this strategy. On the contrary, when the non-dominant group is forced or pressured into accepting this outcome of acculturation, it is then likened to the notion of a “pressure cooker”. Marginalization is rarely a preferred option for individuals and members of non-dominant groups. Individuals and
groups opt for marginalization when the assimilation strategy is imposed onto them (pressure cooker) coupled with forced exclusion (segregation) from the mainstream society by the dominant group. When these two strategies are combined, non-dominant group members and individuals often withdraw the need to identify culturally and participate as well in the mainstream society as a whole (Berry, 1997)

Integration by far is the best acculturative outcome where both dominant and non-dominant groups living in a multicultural society are at an advantage. However, some psychological pre-conditions have to be met in order for this acculturative outcome to gain stronghold (Kalin and Berry, in press; Berry, 1997). These pre-conditions include “the widespread acceptance of the value to a society of cultural diversity (i.e. the presence of a positive “multicultural ideology”); relatively low levels of prejudice (i.e. minimal ethnocentrism, racism, and discrimination); positive mutual attitudes among cultural groups (i.e. no specific intergroup hatreds); and a sense of attachment to, or identification with, the larger society by all groups” (Berry, 1997, p. 11.; Kalin and Berry, in press).

Acculturation strategies can be operationalized in different ways (Snauwaert et al., 2003). Identity operationalization of acculturation strategies emphasized the importance of the simultaneous development of two identities for immigrants in mainstream societies, national identity and ethnic identity. As already stated above, the preferences of identification amongst immigrants in mainstream societies also depend on the surrounding circumstances such as discrimination and support for multiculturalism, etc. Moreover, as discussed later the immigrants’ preference for national or ethnic identity would also contribute to the understanding of the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes.

2.2. National and ethnic identification

It is quite typical to find biculturals or multiple cultural identities coexisting in naturally existing ethnic groups which includes both identification with one’s own original culture (ethnic identity) and identification with the mainstream society (national identification) (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009). Ethnic identity can be defined as “one’s sense of belonging to an ethnic group and the part of one’s thinking, perceptions, feelings, and behavior that is due to ethnic group membership”
National identity can also be described as a sense of belonging to a population that claim to share a common ancestry, and either share one or more of the elements that include culture, kinship, language, religion and place of origin (Phinney et al., 2001). The salience of either of the identities is dependent on the sense of belongingness attained from each identity categorization. For example, ethnic identity is more salient when immigrants have the desire to retain their original culture and identities and also when pluralism is promoted and accepted. National identity on the other hand is more salient when immigrants are forced to assimilate into the mainstream culture. The non-dominant group members would also need to feel a sense of acceptance by the nationals of the mainstream society in order for them to accept the national identity (Phinney et al., 2001). In the presence of actual or perceived discrimination towards immigrants for example, national identity may be opted for in order to escape the harsh consequences of the discrimination. Here, immigrants are seen to downplay or out-rightly reject their ethnic identity as was discussed in the acculturative strategy of assimilation in the paragraphs above. On the other hand, some immigrants would hold on to their ethnic identity in spite of actual or perceived discrimination as a way of showing solidarity to their ethnicity and also as a defensive mechanism to the threats on their ethnic identity (Phinney et al., 2001).

Affiliation to either national identity or ethnic identity is also dependent on whether positive outcomes are predictable and accompanied with membership. These outcomes however will be influenced by the perceptions and interpretations of circumstances by individuals or the non-dominant groups (Phinney et al., 2001). Labels are often used to refer national identity for example, American although an additional label is attached based on the origin of the immigrant assuming the national identity, for instance: “African American”, “Chinese American”, “Indian American” etc. It should be emphasized however that, just as ethnic identity encompasses feelings of belongingness, behavior to one’s in-group, national identity on the other hand, also involves feelings of belonging to and attitudes towards the mainstream society (Phinney et al., 2001; Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997).

According to the linear dimensional model, ethnic and national identities are statistically independent of each other and may vary across immigrating groups and national settings but they are negatively correlated in the sense that when ethnic identity is high, national identity is low and vice versa. In the case of immigrants pertaining to these two identity categories, they are only limited to two of the four acculturational outcomes of assimilation and separation (Phinney
et al., 2001). In a recent large study of immigrant adolescents, the international Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY)\(^1\), Phinney et al., (2001) examined the strength and interrelationship of both ethnic and national identity in four immigrant receiving countries: the United States, Finland, Israel and the Netherlands. The population sample was among adolescents from recent immigrant groups. From the United States, the sample included those of Mexican, Vietnamese and Armenian backgrounds. Those from Finland had Vietnamese and Turkish backgrounds. From Israel, samples include Russian and Ethiopian backgrounds and from the Netherlands, the samples included Turks, Surinamese of Indian descent and Antilleans (Afro-Caribbean’s with Dutch citizenship). It should be emphasized that since each group had diverse experiences, inconsistencies with their identification to their own original group and that of the mainstream society would be expected. Ethnic identity was measured with four items evaluating ethnic affirmation (e.g., sense of belonging, positive feelings) with reference to the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992). National identification was measured with four comparative items which was based on Phinney and Devich-Navarro (1997). The individual scores were combined and also four identity variables were computed to correspond with the four acculturational outcomes. The combined variables were assimilated identity, separated identity, integrated identity and marginalized identity. From the results, ethnic identity scored higher than national identity in all the countries although the absolute levels varied. The scores were much higher in the United States and the Netherlands than in Israel and Finland where Finland scored the lowest. For national identity however, the United States recorded the highest scores followed by Finland. Netherlands scored the lowest on National identity.

Situational factors are also posited to influence immigrants’ identification with either their ethnic group or the mainstream society. From the ICSEY study, it found out that Mexican adolescent samples from the United States, South California to be precise, correlations were positive and significant than those of other ethnic backgrounds which suggested that integration was quite

---

1 The study was part of a larger study, the International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (ICSEY). The ICSEY project was carried out in a number of immigrant-receiving countries. Current members of the project, in alphabetical order by country, are C. Fan, R. Pe-Pua, R. Rooney, D. Sang (Australia), J. Berry and K. Kwak (Canada), K. Liebkind (Finland), C. Sabatier (France), P. Schmitz (Germany), G. Horenczyk (Israel), P. Vedder & F. van de Vijver (Netherlands), C. Ward (New Zealand), D. Sam (Norway), F. Neto (Portugal), E. Virta and C. Westin (Sweden), and J. Phinney (United States).
favorable. The fact that Southern California is widely populated by Mexicans who have infiltrated their culture into that society may be the reason for this.

Context also plays a significant role in the identification preference of immigrants. For instance, the correlation between ethnic identity and national identity for Antilleans in the Netherlands was negative and significant. This suggested that, they either had a separated identity or an assimilated identity. Although they are Dutch citizens, the Dutch government tends to treat them as though they were aliens and due to the unjust treatment, the Antilleans take up a separated identity (Phinney et al., 2001; Kromhout and Vedder, 1996). Israel also recorded a significant negative correlation between the two identities amongst the Russian immigrants. The reason for this was attributed to perceptions of conflict or incongruity between the Russian ethnic culture and the Israeli national culture (Phinney et al., 2001; Kozulin and Venger, 1995).

From the study discussed above, it shows that ethnic and national identity are theoretically independent of each other but situational or contextual factors does influence the identity preference the immigrant might choose (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009; Phinney et al., 2001; Phinney et al., 2006; Verkuyten, 2005).

Studies have shown that biculturals can switch between different cultural frameworks or between different cultural meaning systems when primed with situational cues (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). Biculturalism can also be referred to as multiculturalism. It can be described as the presence of two different cultures in a country or society, (Dictionary reference). Individuals who internalize two different cultures are termed as biculturals (Benet-Martinez et al., 2002). In relation to this thesis, the Russian speaking immigrants fit this category as they internalize both Finnish identity and Russian identity.

For instance, research has shown that Chinese and Hong Kong American biculturals are able to portray characteristics of western cultural behavior when primed with western cues as well as East Asian behaviors when primed with East Asian cultural cues (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). However, Benet-Martínez and Haritatos, (2005), criticized earlier conceptions of bicultural identity. They criticized Berry’s concept of integration which involves identification with both the culture of the mainstream society as well as their own ethnic culture. They point out that the concept fails to offer a description of how biculturals manage the dual identities of which they have acquired and how they either adapt of are in a state of conflict or confusion possessing
these two identities. For example, “variations in socio-cultural (e.g., generational status, cultural makeup of the community), socio-cognitive (e.g., personality, attitudes) and socio-emotional factors (stress due to discrimination or in-group pressures)” gives rise to different meanings and management of bicultural identity in mainstream societies (Benet-Martínez and Haritatos, 2005, p.1019).

In the above paragraphs, it was discussed that discrimination plays an active role in the identification preferences of immigrants in mainstream societies. This thesis also serves to investigate the predicting roles of these identification preferences on attitudes towards the members of mainstream societies in the presence of discrimination using two (2) theoretical models. The models are the Rejection Identification Model (RIM) and the Rejection Dis-identification Model (RDIM). In the following paragraphs, I will discuss how perceived or actual discrimination enhances in-group or ethnic identification.

2.2.1. Perceived discrimination and in-group identification.

Actual or perceived discrimination is a common phenomenon in the lives of ethnic minority group members. This refers to all negative and unfair treatment meted out to non-dominant groups. It may be actual or perceived in the form of negative stereotypes, prejudice etc. Discrimination is often carried out by a more powerful group who often dictate what is acceptable or not and it is mostly directed at a less powerful group which in this study happens to be the non-dominant group. Research has shown that perceived discrimination can have adverse effects on the well-being of the affected group, however, in this thesis; I will discuss how group identification can protect the well-being in the presence of perceived or actual discrimination. I will also discuss how perceived discrimination causes a negative reaction of hostile attitudes towards nationals of the mainstream society by using the Rejection Disidentification Model (RDIM).

Discrimination exhibited by members of the mainstream society towards non-dominant groups represents a threat to one’s group identity. This also means that the members of the mainstream society devalue the non-dominant group membership (Jetten et al., 2001). There may also be different levels of discriminations of ethnic minority groups although little research has been
done to study the comparison between the groups. In comparison, group level characteristics, “such as cultural and ethnic distinctiveness (i.e. visibility) of the immigrant group, the cultural `fit' (i.e. compatibility of cultural norms, values and behavior) between the immigrant and the host populations, and the average time of residence in the host country, may be important predictors of group differences in the prevalence of discrimination experiences” (Liebkind and Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000; Crocker et al., 1989).

Prejudice and discrimination have adverse consequences on the economic, political and psychological states of non-dominant or stigmatized group members (Crocker et al., 1989). Economic hardships affecting non-dominant groups such as immigrants in terms of inadequate job opportunities for example, is one of the consequences of discrimination. For instance, in New York city, Blacks were less likely to receive positive feedback on job offers as opposed to their White counterparts after submitting entry-level job applications (Pager and Karafin, 2009). From recent longitudinal studies, there was also found to be an association between perceived discrimination and well-being as well as perceived discrimination and self-esteem (Schmitt et al., 2014; Pascoe and Smart Richman, 2009). Perceived discrimination prognosticates depression, anxiety, distress and acculturative stress symptoms among non-dominant groups (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009).

Acculturative stress have been linked to psychological consequences as immigrants who perceive themselves to be targets or victims of discrimination by the members of the mainstream society often develop psychological symptoms detrimental to their well-being (Jasinskaja-Lahti and Liebkind, 2001). People who are targets or victims of discrimination fall under social categories of which others project negative attitudes towards and also hold stereotypes and beliefs. They are also often at the receiving end of lower economic and interpersonal outcomes due to the discrimination against them as compared to members of the mainstream society (Jasinskaja-Lahti and Liebkind, 2001). In this thesis, however, I have chosen to use Russian speaking immigrants and assess their experiences of discrimination because they constitute the largest population of immigrants in Finland. They are also subjected to lower economic hardships as they also form the largest unemployed immigrant population in Finland. They also face interpersonal difficulties and discrimination as negative stereotypes and beliefs are held against them by members of the mainstream society about the dwindling economic situations and
the political breakdown in Russia. Hence they are subjected to negative attitudes from dominant members of the Finnish society (i.e. Native Finns). Although, perceived discrimination has negative impact on the psychological well being of immigrants and targeted victims, these disadvantaged individuals adapt to some coping mechanism that help them buffer the effects of perceived discrimination as well as protect their well-being.

Over the years, social psychologists have written much literature about coping mechanisms that help to buffer the psychological effects of discrimination against the well fare of disadvantaged groups. One of the coping mechanisms that has been used to protect the well-being of discriminated group members has been found in attributional research. Research has shown that when people are challenged with prejudice or negative treatment from others, they often disregard such negative feedback in order to protect their well-being (Branscombe, et al., 1999). They are able to protect their well-being by diverting the focus or the reason of the negative feedback from an internal point to view to an external point of view (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Synder and Higgins, 1985). The affective consequences of being stigmatized or being the target of prejudice and discrimination, is dependent on the attribution laid on the negative outcomes (Crocker, et al., 1993; Crocker et al., 1991). This means that the discriminated person or group usually disregards or discount the negative outcome by attributing it to the prejudice against the individual or the group rather than to their level of deservingness. For example, in one study, when the information of the prejudiced nature of a male evaluator was manipulated, women attributed the negative outcomes to a prejudiced evaluator when they received negative feedback. They actually showed lower depressed affect than women who were evaluated by a non-prejudiced evaluator (Crocker, et al., 1993; Crocker et al., 1991). A similar extension was replicated in a second study where, both White and Black students were evaluated and received either positive or negative interpersonal feedback by a White same sex evaluator of whom they perceived could see them depending on whether the blinds were up on a one-way mirror or down on a two-way mirror. The Black students attributed the negative outcomes or feedback to prejudice when they perceived that they were not seen by the evaluator (i.e. Blinds were up). However, the measure of self-esteem in the Black students who received negative feedback from the evaluator when the blinds were up was much lower than those who received the negative feedback when the blinds were down. The effects were not significant for the White students (Crocker et al., 1993; Crocker et al., 1991; Branscombe, et al., 1999). From this
supporting example, it is very evident that when the negative outcome of prejudice or discrimination is projected from a more central or important view to a lesser one, self esteem is protected and hence well-being protected as well. The Rejection Identification Model (RIM) also builds up an argument in the protection of well-being and also increased in-group identification.

2.2.2. The Rejection Identification Model (RIM)

The Rejection Identification Model (RIM) predicts that discrimination against a non-dominant group would affect the psychological well-being of its members adversely however, in response to the discrimination, when non dominant group members increase their identification with their group; it buffers the harmful consequences of the discrimination to their psychological well-being (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Schmitt and Branscombe, 2002).

The need to be included rather than excluded could also explain the reason for strong in-group identification in the presence of perceived discrimination. Targets prone to discrimination based on stigmatized categories of race, age or gender are often aware that they may be subjected to discrimination across different circumstances and under different occurrences. The dominant or majority group carrying out the acts of discrimination, project “perceived systematic and unaltering exclusion and rejection” unto the minority or non-dominant group (Branscombe, et al., 1999, p. 136). Being excluded would mean that the exiled group would not have access to resources that would help maintain their well-being in terms of satisfaction and happiness. There has been a lot of literature that supports the notion that individuals seek inclusion rather than exclusion (Branscombe, et al., 1999). There has also been found to be a correlation between feelings of rejection or being a cultural misfit and psychological well-being (Branscombe, et al., 1999). The risk of being excluded by being given the silent treatment includes: lowered self-esteem, a reduced sense of control and belongingness, and also, a reduced perception of a meaningful existence (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Williams et al., 1998). However, group discrimination may protect the well-being of the discriminated group members by allow them to perceive that they share in each other’s plight (Jasinskaja-Lahti, et al., 2009; Bourguignon, et al., 2006). This means that having members of a discriminated group, believing that they share similar discriminatory plights with each other buffers the effect of the discrimination on their well-being. It is however in my opinion that members sharing a common fate may form strong
identification with the group so as not to be feel excluded and at the same time gain a sense of belonging. The need for inclusion in one’s own low-status group increases the likelihood for increased in-group identification as the probability of gaining acceptance into the dominant group may be slim. The dominant group which carries much of the society’s prestige and power may not offer the same opportunities to the members of the non-dominant group who are constantly bombarded with unfair treatment. Due to this, the members of the non-dominant groups tend to channel their investments into their own in-groups where acceptance is more than guaranteed (Branscombe, et al., 1999). Thus, inclusion and identifying with one’s group of which in this case is referring to the non-dominant group may protect its members well-being from perceived discrimination. This is what is referred to as the Rejection Identification Model (RIM; Branscombe, et al., 1999; Schmitt and Branscombe, 2002) (see Figure 1).

![Fig 1. The Rejection-Identification Model (RIM) of attributions to prejudice among disadvantaged groups. (Branscombe et al., 1999)](image)

Social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1986), proposes that when a dominant or powerful majority group discriminates against a non-dominant or minority group, it results an increase in identification in that disadvantaged group. And also, preconceived expectations of discrimination or adversity towards a group’s status by the dominant group can also enhance in-group cohesion and identification of non-dominant group (Branscombe, et al., 1999; Tajfel and
Turner, 1986). Branscombe et al., (1999) cited a research by Ellemers, (1993) which showed that, threat to social mobility of group members enhanced group identification among low-status groups than when individuals moving up to higher statuses on their own (Branscombe, et al., 1999). Social mobility is based on the belief that an individual can improve his or her social status in a society by moving from one social position to another (Simon et al., 1998; Tajfel, 1981). Individual strategies would be, to leave the devalued or discriminated group physically or psychologically, however, collective strategies may present a form of improvement to the group and its members. Collective strategies may include severe forms of group behavior such as; militant action, strikes and rebellion as well as less severe forms of group behavior such as signing petitions or attending group meetings (Simon et al., 1998). Thus, acknowledging the impediments surrounding the rise in social status as well as the expectation of actual or perceived discrimination does increase the tendency for stronger in-group identification among low-status minority or non-dominant groups. For example, Branscombe et al., (1999) cited a study done by Jetten et al., (1999) whereby, manipulations of anticipated discrimination of devalued groups which in the case of their experiment was people with body piercings caused an increase in identification of the in-group members of that cultural group. Another example involving collective action or strategy was by a study conducted by Simon et al., (1998). They manipulated collective identification by varying the salience of the common fate of gay people as being a threatened minority. They found out that when the gay men were reminded of their minority group status, they formed stronger identification with the group than when the group was less salient (Simon et al., 1998; Branscombe, et al., 1999).

Being that the well-being of members of a stigmatized group might be at stake, one might reason that the best option to take when individuals are faced with discrimination because of one’s membership or affiliation to the disadvantaged group would be to leave or avoid the group. On the contrary, forming stronger in-group bonds, meaning, when members of the disadvantaged groups have close affinity and strong identification within their group, they may be shielded and buffered from the harsh effect of discrimination. Having a more group based approach enables members of a devalued group or non-dominant to place more value on themselves and rather reject the values proposed or dictated to them by the dominant group (Jetten et al., 2001). In other words, stronger identification amongst members of a devalued or non-dominant group also results in the group being distinct from the norm of groups proposed or dictated by the dominant
group. The realization of a group being a target of prejudice and discrimination causes its members to form strong identification with their in-group (Branscombe, et al., 1999). The optimal distinctiveness theory of Social identity was proposed by Brewer (1991) in order to explain the need for in-group identification and differentiation. The theory proposed that group identification is the result of opposing needs of inclusion (assimilation) as well as the drive for distinction (differentiation) from others (Brewer, 1999).

Because the need for inclusion and the need for differentiation are opposing, a balance needs to be struck out. For instance, when an individual feels isolated or detached from the mainstream society through perceived discrimination, the need for inclusion is activated. However, being a member of an undefined mainstream society also activates the need for differentiation (being distinct). A balance is reached through the identification with a distinctive social group which satisfies both the need of inclusion and differentiation at the same time (Brewer, 1999). This means that, an individual satisfies the need for inclusion (assimilation) and also the drive for distinction (separation) by identifying with a group which is different from the norm group of the mainstream society. This in turn fosters intergroup distinctions (Brewer, 1999).

An implication of the optimal distinctiveness theory is that, it affects the distinct group’s level of participation with the mainstream society. This is often characterized by in-group loyalty, depersonalized trust and co-operation (Brewer, 1999). This also presents a platform for in-group love in terms of ethnocentrism and or out-group hate (i.e. hostile attitudes towards members of the mainstream society). It should however be noted that, perceived discrimination does not always result in hostile or negative attitudes towards members of the mainstream society.

In this study, I will be focusing on how perceived discrimination contributes to ethnocentrism (in-group superiority) among non-dominant groups and its product of negative attitudes toward the nationals of the mainstream society. In this thesis, I propose that immigrants’ perception of ethnic superiority influence their attitudes towards members of mainstream societies in the presence of perceived or actual discrimination.
2.3. Attitudes towards members of mainstream society

Many theoretical perspectives have proposed that recognizing stable prejudice against one’s group would increase hostility against the dominant group discriminating against them (Branscombe et al., 1999). According to the Social Identity theory, being aware of prejudice or discrimination against one’s in-group enhances the salience of intergroup differences which in turn makes room for in-group favoritism (ethnocentrism) (Branscombe et al., 1999). Discrimination occurring between in-groups and out-groups can be explained as having a relative favoritism towards an in-group and the lack of equal favoritism toward an out-group (Brewer, 1999). This structure suggests that an in-group can consider the out-group, whereby the in-group is sympathetic towards them, indifferent with them and sometimes even have admiration for them on the condition that there is an element of distinction between the two groups (Brewer, 1999). For instance, in a research on subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe, Pettigrew and Meertens (1995) found that some members of dominant groups were unusually open about intimacy with members of the non-dominant groups and also more readily reported feeling sympathy and admiration for the non-dominant group members. This means that, conflict does not always have to exist within intergroup relation especially when there is mutual respect of each group’s distinctive properties.

2.3.1. Discrimination and attitudes towards members of the mainstream society

The Rejection Identification Model (RIM) does not only suggest the relationship between perceived discrimination and in-group identification, and well-being. It also poses that perceived discrimination also promotes negative hostile attitudes toward nationals of the mainstream society (Jasinskala-Lahti, et al., 2009; Schmitt and Branscombe, 2002). It should also be noted that in the area of RIM, there is a lack of substantial research surrounding the relationship between perceived discrimination and attitudes towards nationals of the mainstream society and also the relationship between the effect of perceived discrimination (i.e. negative hostile attitudes towards the nationals of the mainstream society and decreased well-being) (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009). Studies have shown that increased identification with non-dominant groups does not always imply the groups having negative hostile attitudes towards members of the mainstream society. It may even be associated with positive attitudes towards the out-group (i.e. member of
the mainstream society) (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009). For example, studies by Verkuyten, (1992) provided experimental evidence that showed that although ethnic minority subjects identified more strongly with their own ethnic in-group, thus showing greater in-group preference, they did not show any out-group dislike towards the national majority which in this case was Dutch adolescents. From the developmental perspective, ethnic identity maturity is associated to more open and positive intergroup attitudes (Phinney et al., 2007). Gaining a mature sense of ethnic identity is the product of contextual factors and a developmental process which occurs between adolescent and young adult ages where one becomes open minded to other groups as well as gains a more secure sense of confidence in his or her own groups’ membership. “In a study with adolescents from minority backgrounds, they showed that ethnic identity increased with age and predicted positive in-group attitudes which in turn contributed to more positive out-group attitudes” (Phinney et al., 2007, p.479). this means that the development process needed to gain a mature sense of ethnic maturity is dependent on cognitive capacities, egocentrism, psychopathology, peers, religion, family, groups and the society at large (Newman, 1995; Markstrom-Adams, 1992). Despite the fact that negative attitudes towards nationals of the mainstream society may develop from ethnocentrism, it may also be related to other factors than mere in-group identification (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009).

Prior research done by Operario & Fiske (2001) revealed that ethnic identification served as a moderator in immigrants’ perception of discrimination with respect to high identifiers and low identifiers within the group. The studies revealed that high identifiers of ethnicity were more susceptible to discrimination than low identifiers. It is in my opinion that, being vulnerable to discrimination may result in harboring negative feelings and attitudes towards the perpetuators of the discrimination.

Although increased ethnic identification which also serves to protect the psychological well-being of non-dominant group members as posited by the Rejection Identification Model (RIM) which I elaborated on much earlier, Jasinskala-Lahti et al., (2009) suggested that “decreased national identification may also mediate the effect of perceived discrimination on attitudes towards the national out-group”(p. 109). This pattern of relationship is referred to as Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM).
2.4. The Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM)

The Rejection Disidentification Model was based on the fact that perceived discrimination prevented non-dominant group members from gaining a sense of belonging to the mainstream society. The group engagement model which was developed by Tyler and Blader (2003) within a social justice system supported this model. Tyler and Blader (2003) used Thibaut & Walker’s (1975) studies on procedural justice to expound on this. In this study, they hypothesized that, people demand fair treatment in the prospect of achieving equitable outcomes from decision makers who they trust to give equitable judgments. However, the focus of the procedures in decision making has shifted to interpersonal aspects of procedures. This is due to the social interaction setting which also includes overt behavior when these procedures are being meted out. For example; respectfully, aggressively, etc. These aspects of interpersonal experiences of procedure may also have an influence on the people involved (Tyler and Blader, 2003).

In other studies, it has been found that interpersonal treatment had an influence on the people involved despite “their interest in the fairness of decision making judgments” (Tyler and Balder, 2003 p. 351). Justice has been strongly associated to treatment issues in social interaction and its emphasis to generate commitment and cooperation other than reducing hostile attitudes and behavior (Tyler and Blader, 2003). Thus the evaluations of procedural fairness experienced in a group may or may not motivate members of the non-dominant group to maintain favorable group identities (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009).

National disidentification had mediated the effect of discrimination perceived in 1997 on attitudes towards the national out-group in 2004. The more immigrants disidentify with the national out-group (i.e. the mainstream society) within those years, the more their hostile attitudes towards the national out-group escalated in 2004. These results come in support of Tyler and Bladers’, (2003) Group Engagement Model. “The level of perceived negative treatment stemming from the national out-group influenced the degree to which the immigrants wanted to identify with the superordinate national in-group and as a consequence, also the degree to which they developed supportive attitudes towards the national out-group” (Jasinska-Lahti et al., 2009, p. 121; Tyler and Blader, 2003). This implies that if the immigrants perceive unfair treatment in the form of ethnic discrimination from the nationals of the mainstream society, the likelihood of identifying with the mainstream society would be dissuasive. This would result in
the tendency to disengage from the mainstream society (i.e. national Disidentification). The product of this Disidentification may be an increase in negative and hostile attitudes towards the nationals of the mainstream society (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009).

Jasinskala-Lahti et al., (2009) cited a recent study by Berry et al., (2006), of the relationship between perceived discrimination and national identification among immigrants from 13 countries. Immigrant adolescents who perceived discrimination against them were more likely to disidentify with the mainstream society by rejecting a national identity. On the other hand, those who did not perceive discrimination tended to identify with the mainstream society thus; perceived discrimination was distinctly linked to the hindrance of attaining a superordinate national identity which is mediated by “distancing” (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009). This goes on to show that, group identification can either be resisted or rejected. In Verkuyten’s (2007) study of Religious Group Identification and Inter-Religious Relationships among Turkish-Dutch Muslims, the differences between de-identification and low national identification were established. De-identification, on the one hand, involves a rejection and an act of distancing from the main group and everything it stands for. On the other hand, low identification still involves a sense of belonging and commitment to the mainstream society. “The consequences of both processes can be different, such as indifference towards the ‘other’ in the former case and an oppositional identity and counterculture in the latter” (Verkuyten, 2007, p. 354; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009, p. 110).

Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., (2009), go on to differentiate between the terms dis-identification and de-identification. They suggested that, while de-identification involved the rejection and the resistance to any possible or actual commitment to a common superordinate group due to perceptions of obstacles preventing a sense of belonging with the national society, disidentification refers to the process of detachment from the national in-group (i.e, mainstream society). This thus means that there was some form of commitment and identification with the mainstream before the process of disidentification.

The Rejection Disidentification Model (RDIM) as well as the Rejection Identification Model (RIM) was also tested in an 8 year longitudinal study by Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., (2009). The population sample includes 293 Russians, Estonians and Ingrian Finns who had migrated from the former Soviet Union to Finland. The measures were; ethnic and national identification,
perceived ethnic discrimination, attitudes towards the national out-group and psychological well-being which were recorded at two different times. According to the results, National disidentification was enhanced when the immigrants experienced perceived ethnic discrimination and this also resulted in negative attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society. However, perceived discrimination at time1 had no significant direct influence on attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society at time2. Neither did the relationship between perceived discrimination and ethnic identity have any significant effect on immigrants’ well-being between the two time frames of time1 and time2 (See Figure 2).

They also found out from the study that, immigrants who elicited high levels of psychological stress, were more likely to perceive or experience discrimination of which they express more negative hostile attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society (i.e. the national out-group), this also resulted in a decrease in national identification. Another finding from the study was that, when the immigrants perceived less discrimination, their psychological well-being was affected positively and it resulted in more positive attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society. It should however be emphasized here that psychological stress levels may have played a role in the immigrants’ experience of perceived discrimination at the two different times which would also result in the different attitudinal patterns (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009). Thus in summary, the study supported the Rejection Disidentification Model (RDIM) but not the Rejection Identification Model (RIM).

From the literature discussed above about perceived discrimination, identity and its effects on well-being and out-group attitudes, two assumptions can be made. (1) Perceived discrimination affects well-being and out-group attitudes, (2) Ethnic identification serves as a moderator whereas and national identity serves as a mediator between perceived discrimination and out-group attitudes. It is also evident that the two dimensions of bicultural individuals (i.e. national and ethnic identification) have different functions. Ethnic identity does not account for the out-group attitudes among discriminated non-dominant group members. It would however depend on the way ethnic identification is approached and measured.

In previous studies, the typical way to assess ethnic identity was via cognitive (I’m a member of this group) and emotional (I’m happy to be a member of this group) dimensions of ethnic identification. There are however also other dimensions such as ethnic pride or perceived ethnic
superiority that might be related to negative out-group attitudes more than other dimensions and might also additionally account for the relationship between perceived discrimination and out-group attitudes.

Figure 2. Theoretical model of the relationships between perceived discrimination, ethnic and national identification, perceived ethnic superiority and attitudes towards the national out-group. (i.e. members of the mainstream society) (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009).

In this thesis, ethnic identification will serve as a moderator in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. This means that immigrants’ degree of ethnic identification in the presence of discrimination would predict the attitudes they express towards members of mainstream societies. National identification would also serve as a mediator in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. This comes in relation to the Rejection-Disidentification Model, I propose that perceived discrimination would cause an decrease in immigrants’ preference for national identification which will result in more hostile attitudes towards members of mainstream societies. I also propose that ethnocentrism in the form
of perceived ethnic superiority will be a mediating factor in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes.

This implies that immigrants’ degree of national identification in the presence of discrimination would explain the attitudes they express towards members of mainstream societies.

2.5. Discrimination and in-group superiority.

Discrimination and perceptions of in-group superiority associated with out-group inferiority has been the notion of ethnocentrism for a very long time whereby the main focus was on in-group superiority whereas, out-group inferiority was often neglected (Raden, 2003). Ethnocentrism was initially viewed within the paradigm of in-groups of unitary societies and its equivalent external out-group. Taking into consideration the present existence of multicultural societies around the world, the in-group typically consists of the dominant ethnic or racial group (nationals of the mainstream society) whereas the internal minority or the non-dominant ethnic groups (immigrants) serve as the out-groups (Raden, 2003). Here, I will define ethnocentrism on the basis of groups alienating themselves from other groups or, out-groups having little or no contact with other external group members. It can also be characterized by aggressive attitudes towards the out-group. Harboring negative perceptions and attributions about the out-group whiles perceiving one’s own group with positive attribute would also constitute ethnocentrism.

In this thesis, three types of ethnocentrism will be discussed which are: mere in-group preference, general in-group bias and classical ethnocentrism. I also propose that ethnocentrism in the form of perceived ethnic superiority would mediate the effect of perceived discrimination on attitudes towards members of mainstream societies.

Mere in-group preference is a type of ethnocentrism that focuses on the positivity towards the in-group intrinsically (Raden, 2003). Here, evaluations of both in-group and out-group are on the same traits instead of the usual association between favoritism ratings and measures of prejudice and discrimination as is defined by ethnocentrism. Researchers test what is usually a weaker form of ethnocentrism as there is an absence of derogation to the out-group despite the negativity measured from the in-group (Raden, 2003). For example, in a research conducted by Bobo & Zubrinsky (1996), in-group measures on a feelings thermometer had weak associations or
relations to racial residential integration attitudes. It showed that mere in-group preference lack substantial evidence to be the cause of dominant group (White) members reaction to the non-dominant group members (Blacks, Asians, Hispanics) in terms of racial intergroup residence. This goes to say that, despite one’s strong attachment or preference to an in-group, it does not determine whether he or she is prejudiced or discriminates against members of an out-group. One may just prefer to associate with “their kind” or members of similar ethnic background or race.

Classic ethnocentrism is the form of ethnocentrism where basically, an in-group rates itself with positive attributes or favorable evaluations and the negative evaluations are used to rate the out-group. It should be noted however that, both groups are rated on the same traits. This is a strict form of ethnocentrism because “attitudes toward the in-group and out-group are viewed in absolute rather than relative terms” (Raden, 2003, p. 804). Unlike the classic form of ethnocentrism, general in-group bias is a form of ethnocentrism that gives higher ratings to one’s own group than the ratings given to other groups. With this form of ethnocentrism, the out-group is not rated in negative terms like in the case of the classic version of ethnocentrism. The in-group is only rated in more favorable terms than the out-group (Raden, 2003). There is an obvious trend of loyalty and cooperation to one’s in-group in the different types of ethnocentrism which I have discussed above. In the next section, I will discuss how the lack of trust and cooperation brings forth hostile attitudes towards the members of the dominant group and also inhabits the achievement of a superordinate society.

Moral superiority is listed as one of the conditions for out-group hate and hostility. Brewer (1999) explains that from observations at the basic level, in-group preference develops from expectations of favorable treatments by in-group members. Thus in-group members perceive themselves and interact with each other more positively than they would towards the out-group. In-group members would also attribute positive social behaviors to themselves and negative social behaviors to the out-group. For example; “‘we’ are more peaceful, trustworthy, friendly and honest than ‘they’” (Brewer et al., 1999, p.435). This is often because one can predict the behavior of their in-group better than the behavior of the out-group (Brewer, 1999). Moral superiority comes into play when moral order within large in-groups becomes questionable (i.e. when out-groups do not support the same moral rules as the in-group). This is characterized by
denigration and contempt but it should be stated however that, this devaluation of the out-group does not always lead to hostility or conflict (Brewer, 1999). For example, immigrants have been able to live in some countries for so many years without engaging in wars against their countries of settlements. Brewer (1999) explains that, such “emotions of contempt and disgust are associated with avoidance rather than attack” (p. 435) and she further explains that, segregation and mutual avoidance could be ingredients to the maintenance of intergroup peace. Also, in agreement with Brewer (1999) cited by Staerklé et al., 2005, moral superiority may predict a positive relationship between ingroup identification and outgroup hostile attitudes when the ingroup endorses the notion of tolerance for difference. According to Sidanius (1993), cited by Brewer, 1999, moral superiority provides a platform for the “justification or legitimization of domination or active subjugation of out-groups.” (p. 435).

Perceived threat is another condition for out-group hate and hostility. When an in-group receives threat to their in-group interest or survival by an out-group, it lays the foundation for the basis of negative attitudes towards the out-group (Brewer, 1999). According to the Realistic conflict theory of intergroup relations, there is a correlational relationship between in-group identification and out-group hostility which may be mediated by competition for physical resources or political power (Brewer, 1999; LeVine and Campbell, 1972; Sherif and Sherif, 1953). It is hypothesized that there is a strong correlation between in-group identification of members of non-dominant groups and prejudice against the dominant out-group. For evidence of this correlation, Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) did a longitudinal research in South Africa on group identification and intergroup attitudes. They found out that, Black Africans showed high in-group identification and negative attitudes towards the White Afrikaans as well as held negative evaluations about them. They however had a more positive evaluation of English Whites and Whites in general and also showed positive attitudes towards them. “These findings led Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) to conclude that there are two different types of prejudice involved in anti-White attitudes among Black Africans. One type is rooted in perceived conflict and entails a reciprocal relationship between in-group identification and out-group hostility. When intergroup attitudes are not conflict-based, attitudes toward the in-group and prejudice toward the out-group are essentially independent” (Brewer, 1999, p.436)
The pursuit of common goals could serve as another reason for non-dominant groups hostile attitudes towards dominant groups. It is a general notion that solidarity increases in a group when the group is faced with shared threats or a common challenge (Brewer, 1999). Brewer (1999), also pointed out that in-groups that are not bonded strongly may also gain strong cohesion when they aim to achieve a common goal. Trust is a necessary tool when dealing with cooperation between highly differentiated groups. When dealing with members of an in-group in terms of cooperative collective action, trust does not pose much of a problem but when dealing with groups that are highly differentiated (in an intergroup context), perceived interdependence and the need for cooperation or participation in the achievement of common goals makes obvious the absence of mutual trust (Brewer, 1999). “Without the mechanism of depersonalized trust based on common identity”, (p.436) the chances that non-dominant groups would be exploited in terms of cooperation are quite high and trust becomes “a thing of a question” as non-dominant groups may not be given the same fair advantage as the dominant group would have. Brewer (in press), also espoused the reason for intergroup hostility and conflict to the in-group’s anticipation of positive interdependence with an out-group mediated by common goal or common threats (Brewer, 1999). In the presence of perceived positive interdependence with the out-group, social differentiation becomes at risk. The need for in-group boundaries and intergroup distinctions in regards to the of loyalty of in-group members, feelings of secure inclusion in the in-group, coupled with shared experiences and cooperation with the out-group poses a threat for the basis of social identification. Especially in a situation when one’s membership belongs to a single group. A resistance to cooperate with the out-group may be moderated by the perception of loss of distinctiveness even when the in-groups interest is at stake (Brewer, 1999).

An in-group’s strive for positive distinctiveness in a much as differentiation from an out-group is one of the basis of the social Identity Theory (Turner, 1975; Brewer, 1999). However, within the boundaries of group differentiation and the strive for positive distinctiveness, in-group and out-group comparison whereby the in-group is favored more than the out-group also forms the platform for ethnocentrism. Shared goals coupled with shared values can be a contributing factor for conflicts between groups as well as in-group’s negative hostile attitudes towards members of an out-group. The possibility for competition is intensified when an in-group and an out-group quest after the same goals or outcome either non-material resources and positive values like world peace (Brewer, 1999). Positive distinctiveness can be reached if the different groups value
different things. When there is an absence of differentiation between groups it stirs up the need for positive distinctiveness through differentiation whereby one’s in-group is perceived to be treated more favorably than the out-group. The strive for positive distinctiveness for an in-group may also develop another discriminating tendency mediated through legitimization of hostile attitudes towards the out-group. When group members perceive threat to the validity, superiority and internal validity of their norms and values, they try to defend and at the same time, maintain their identity by devaluing the out-groups and also directing hostility towards them (Mummendey and Wenzel, 1999). When the dominant group members are rejected by the members of the non-dominant group, it causes no consequence of exclusion from the mainstream society (Schmitt and Branscombe, 2002), but on the other hand, in the face of discrimination, members of the non-dominant groups may end up taking decisions to disidentify with the with the members of the mainstream society and may or may not hold any negative and hostile attitudes towards members of the mainstream society.

Research on perceived superiority and other related topics, for example, research on nationalism by Mummendey et al., 2001; research on collective narcissism by Golec de Zavala et al., 2013 have been restricted to only national majority samples. But this should not be interpreted that, ethnocentrism is only restricted to dominant groups. (Mahonen et al., in press).

When the image of a non-dominant group is threatened, it may develop collective narcissism which yields out-group hostility. (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013). For example; a study done on an American sample in 2005 showed that, collective narcissism predicted support for the war on terrorism in Iraq more than it did for social dominance orientation, authoritarianism, blind patriotism, nationalism and in-group glorification. (Golec de Zavala et al., 2013)

Most research done on intergroup attitudes usually focus on negative attitudes that stem out of prejudice and discrimination directed at one’s in-group. New situations usually arouse interest and approach as well as anxiety or withdrawal, however, the contrasting side of human character which is curious to investigate and explore new phenomenon has been ignored (Phinney et al., 2007). Thus the propensity to be curious about the phenomenon surrounding intergroup relations may give room for positive attitudes instead of the assumption that ethnocentrism arises where in-groups are favored and rated more positively than the out-group and inevitably directing hostile attitudes are directed towards the out-group.
In this thesis, I seek to investigate the mediating role of perceived ethnic superiority in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. This implies that in the presence of discrimination, immigrants’ perception of ethnic superiority would explain their attitudes towards members of mainstream societies.

2.6. Aims and Hypotheses.

The main aim of the study is to study the relationship between perceived discrimination among Russian speaking immigrants, their identity reactions and attitudes towards native Finns in Finland. The hypotheses tested in my thesis are based on the theories and previous empirical studies presented and discussed above.

H1: Perceived discrimination will be negatively related to national identification outgroup attitudes and positively to perceived ethnic superiority.

H2: The negative impact of perceived discrimination on attitudes towards members of the mainstream society will be mediated by decreased national identification and increased ethnic superiority.

H3: Ethnic identification (i.e., Russian) will moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and attitudes towards majority Finns. High ethnic identifiers will express more hostile attitudes towards majority Finns than low ethnic identifiers in the presence of discrimination.
Figure 3: Proposed theoretical model of the relationships between perceived discrimination, ethnic and national identification, perceived ethnic superiority and attitudes towards the national out-group. (i.e. members of the mainstream society).
3. Methods

Data collected involved the completion of a structured questionnaire. All participants were informed that participation was voluntary, and that responses were anonymous. The measures covered a wide range of variables which were taken directly and modified to fit this study from other existing scales.

3.1. Outline of the present study

This study is an independent project in which data and sample were collected from the MIRIPS-FI project conducted in the Unit of Social Psychology between 2012-2014 under the leadership of Professor Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti. MIRIPS-FI project is part of the international Mutual Intercultural Relations In Plural Societies (MIRIPS) network.

The main aim of the MIRIPS-FI project is to address problems related to the demographic and social changes resulting from the increasing ethno-cultural diversity in Finland and to produce scientific knowledge to support the development of positive intergroup relations and social cohesion in the country. It studied intergroup relations between nationals of the mainstream Finnish society and the largest immigrant group in Finland i.e. Russian Speaking immigrants. The MIRIPS-FI project examined the relationships between individual level, group level and societal level determinants of the inclusiveness of the integration context.

3.2. Participants

A total of 317 Russian-speaking immigrants aged between 18 and 65 years were studied. The participant sample consisted of 74 males and 243 females living in all the 19 provinces of Finland. 24.6% identified their ethnicity as Finn/Ingrian Finn, 56.5% identified as Russian, 8.2% identified as other while 10.1% identified with both Finn and other identity. 6% did not answer this category.
3.2.1. Measures

National (civic) identification

This was assessed by a (5) item scale ($\alpha = 0.89$) which was originally adapted from Mlickli & Ellemers (1996; sample item which tapped both the cognitive and affective aspects of identification: “I feel myself a part of Finnish society”). The ethnic group was replaced with Finnish society. The participants responded to the questions by choosing answers on Likert scales ranging from 1 (No) to 5 (Yes).

Ethnic identity

These measures were used in INPRES (Intervening at the pre-migration stage. It was Originally Adapted from Mlickli & Ellemers (1996). It consisted of (15) fifteen questions which measured different dimensions of belonging to Russian culture and also tapped the cognitive and affective aspects of identification.. Items 1-5 consisted of ethnic (Russian) identification variables where item 5 was reversed. Items 6-7 consisted of centrality of Russian identity variables ($\alpha = 0.90$), comprised of self perception by Sellers et al, 1997; sample item: “(My) belonging to Russian culture is an important part of my identity”). Items 8-11 consisted Perceived Superiority of Russian identity variables by Roccas et al (2008; sample item: “Russians are better than other groups in all other aspects”). Items 12-15 consisted of variables of identification with the Russian-speaking community in Finland. The ethnic group was replaced with Russian society. Being proud from Phinney & Devich-Navarron American identity measure (1997; sample item: “I feel proud that I am Russian”) was used as the measure for ethnic identification. The participants responded to the questions by choosing answers on Likert scales ranging from 1 (No) to 5 (Yes).

Perceived ethnic superiority

It was measured with a (4) four-item scale ($\alpha = 0.81$) adapted from Roccas et al. (2008; sample item: “Russians are better than other groups in all respects”). The participants responded to the questions by choosing answers on Likert scales ranging from 1 (No) to 5 (Yes).
Attitudes towards nationals of the mainstream society

(Native Finns) which is the dependent variable was assessed by an (8) eight item scale (α = 0.70) which was adapted from INPRES articles by Jasinskaja-Lahti et al (2009; sample item: “I have positive attitude towards native Finnish people”). The participants responded to the questions by choosing answers on Likert scales ranging from 1 (Disagree) to 5 (Agree)

Perceived discrimination

The variables were measured on a (6) six-item scale (α = 0.87). The measures were adapted from MIRIPS project (Mutual Intercultural Relations In Plural Societies)and ICSEY project (International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth) which covered both personal and group discrimination by Berry et al (2006; sample item: “In my opinion native Finns have treated Russian immigrants unfairly or otherwise negatively”). The participants marked answers on a Likert scale ranging between 1(No) to 5(Yes)
4. RESULTS.

4.1. Preliminary analysis.

The hot deck imputation method was used to manage the missing data. This method replaces missing item values of a participant with similar values of the closest participants within the same dataset (Myer, 2011). The first hypothesis was tested using a correlational analysis and the second and third hypothesis were tested using a hierarchical regression with outgroup attitudes as the dependent variable. As recommended by Hayes (2013), all the continuous predictors: national identification, ethnic identification, perceived ethnic superiority and perceived discrimination were centered around their respective means.

A principal component analysis using direct oblimin rotation was conducted on the 15 items measuring ethnic (Russian) identification and perceived ethnic (Russian) superiority in order to ensure that these two scales load in separate factors. The indicators of factorability were good. (KMO= 0.85, Bartlett’s Test $p < .001$). The results revealed a 2 factor solution to explain a total of 54.42% of the variance with factor 1 contributing 39.89% and factor 2 contributing 14.53%

The first component was labeled ethnic identification because the items weighing heavily on this component related to Russian ethnic identity. The second component was labeled Perceived ethnic superiority because the items in this component leaned heavily on this component which relates to Russian superiority.

An independent samples T-test was used to compare gender differences in the means of the variables studied. The results indicated that there was no significant difference between men ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.60$) and women ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.63$) in their attitudes towards members of the Finnish mainstream society. $t(315) = -1.01$, $p < 0.05$ and the effect was small, $\eta^2 = 0.00$.

The results also indicated a significant difference between Russian speaking immigrants in ethnic identification ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.24$) and perceived ethnic superiority of Russian speaking immigrants ($M = 1.86$, $SD = 0.10$) in the immigrants attitudes towards Native Finns. $t(316) = 24.87$, $p < 0.05$. The effect was high $\eta^2 = 0.66$

There was no significant correlation between age ($r(315) = 0.06, p < 0.05$) and attitudes towards Native Finns.
The study also showed a significant correlation between the years of education ($r(315) = 0.11, p \leq 0.05$) and attitudes towards Native Finns.

Descriptive statistics are presented in table 1.

As seen from the correlation matrix (see Table 1), there was a strong negative correlation between perceived discrimination, national identification and outgroup attitudes and positive correlation between perceived discrimination and ethnic superiority. This comes in support of my first hypothesis (H1). However, there was found to be a negative correlation also between ethnic identification and outgroup attitudes.

The correlation analysis also showed a strong positive correlation between perceived ethnic superiority and ethnic identification and a weak positive correlation between perceived discrimination and ethnic identification.

4.2. Main analysis

Table 3 presents the results from the hierarchical linear regression for outgroup attitudes towards native Finns. The first model showed the relationship between the social background variables (sex, age and years of education), and outgroup attitudes towards native Finns. It showed that the more educated the Russian immigrants were, the more they accorded positive attitudes towards the native Finns. It also showed that age did not have an influence on the attitude accorded towards native Finns by the Russian immigrants. Finally, the results showed that the sex of the Russian immigrants had no influence on their attitudes towards native Finns.

The second model comprised of the effects of perceived discrimination and national identification on outgroup attitudes. It reported a very strong negative relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. This means that the more Russian immigrants perceived discrimination the more they expressed negative attitudes towards the native Finns. The model also indicated that the higher was the national identification of Russian immigrants; they more positive attitudes they expressed towards the native Finns. These results gave support for hypotheses H1 (on the direct effect of perceived discrimination on outgroup attitudes).
The third model explained the relationship between Russian ethnic identification and perceived ethnic superiority and outgroup attitudes. It showed that the higher was the Russian identification of immigrants, the more negative were their attitudes towards the native Finns. It also showed that the more Russian immigrants perceived their ethnic identity as being superior, the more negative were their attitudes towards the native Finns supporting hypothesis H2.

4.2.1. **Test for mediation of perceived ethnic superiority.**

Multiple regression analysis were conducted to assess each component of the proposed mediation model- first, it was found that perceived discrimination was positively associated with perceived ethnic superiority ($\beta = 0.17$, $t(315) = 3.28$, $p = 0.001$). It was also found that perceived discrimination was negatively associated with outgroup attitudes ($\beta = -0.14$, $t(315) = -4.42$, $p < 0.01$). Lastly, the results showed that the mediator perceived ethnic superiority was negatively associated with outgroup attitudes ($\beta = -0.10$, $t(315) = -2.91$, $p = 0.004$. Because both the a path and b path were significant mediation analysis were tested using the bootstrapping method with bias corrected estimates (Hayes, 2013). In the present study the 95% confidence interval of the indirect was obtained with 10,000 bootstrap samples (Hayes, 2013). Results of the mediation analysis confirmed the mediating role of perceived ethnic superiority in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. ($\beta = -0.02$, CI = -0.0464 to -0.0024). In addition, results indicated that the direct effect of perceived discrimination on outgroup attitudes was significant ($\beta = -0.16$, $t(315) = -4.97$, $p < 0.01$) when controlling for perceived ethnic superiority interaction, thus suggesting partial mediation. The result partly supports hypothesis H2. Figure 1 displays the results.

4.2.2. **Test for mediation of national identification**

Multiple regression analysis were again conducted to assess each component of the proposed mediation model- first, it was found that perceived discrimination was negatively associated with national identification($\beta = -0.29$, $t(315) = -5.24$, $p < 0.01$). It was also found that perceived discrimination was negatively associated with outgroup attitudes ($\beta = -0.13$, $t(315) = -4.01$, $p < 0.01$). Lastly, the results showed that the mediator national identification was positively
associated with outgroup attitudes ($\beta = 0.09$, $t(315) = 2.85$, $p = 0.005$). Because both the a path and b path were significant mediation analysis were tested using the bootstrapping method with bias corrected estimates (Hayes, 2013). In the present study the 95% confidence interval of the indirect was obtained with 10,000 bootstrap samples. (Hayes, 2013). Results of the mediation analysis confirmed the mediating role of national identification in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. ($\beta = 0.01$, CI = -0.0567 to -0.0073). In addition, results indicated the direct effect of perceived discrimination on outgroup attitude was significant. ($\beta = -0.16$, $t(315) = -4.97$, $p < 0.01$) when controlling for national identification interactions, thus indicating partial mediation. The result thus partly supports hypothesis H2.

4.2.3. **Test for moderation of ethnic identification.**

Table 4 presents the results from the hierarchical linear regression for outgroup attitudes towards native Finns with ethnic identification being examined as a moderator of the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. Social backgrounds were entered in the first step of the regression. Perceived discrimination and ethnic identification were entered in the second step of the regression, and in the third step of the regression analysis, the interaction term between perceived discrimination and ethnic identification was entered. The model was significant and explained 90% in the variance of outgroup attitudes, $R^2 = 0.90$, $F(6, 310) = 5.1$, $p < 0.01$. The results showed that the direct effect of perceived discrimination on outgroup attitudes was significant ($B = -0.15$, $p < 0.01$). The results also found out that, the direct effect of ethnic identification on outgroup attitudes was not significant. ($B = -0.01$, $p = 0.64$). The interaction term was also not significant ($B = 0.02$, $p = 0.33$). Hence, ethnic identification is not a significant moderator of the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes and thus H3 is not supported.
4.3. Table of results.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of variables used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>46.90</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Years of education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. National identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ethnic Identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perceived ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superiority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Outgroup attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01.
### Table 2: Results for Principal Component Analysis with oblimin rotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>Russian ethnic identity</th>
<th>Perceived ethnic superiority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am Russian</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud that I am Russian</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad that I am Russian</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is Important for me that I am Russian</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not perceive myself as Russian</td>
<td>-0.553</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging to the Russian culture is an important part of my self-perception</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging to the Russian culture reflects very well the way I am</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of different nationalities can learn a lot from Russians</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing to other nationalities Russians are particularly good</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing to other nationalities Russians have a very high morality</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians are better than other groups in all respects</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I belong to Russian speaking population of Finland</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud that I belong to Russian speaking population of Finland</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am glad that I belong to Russian speaking population of Finland</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me that I belong to Russian speaking population of Finland</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Hierarchical linear regression analysis for outgroup attitudes (N = 317).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.54* (5.62)</td>
<td>10.4* (5.43)</td>
<td>13.48* (5.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.06 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.8)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>0.02+ (0.01)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived discrimination</td>
<td>-0.13** (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.11** (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National identification</td>
<td>0.09** (0.03)</td>
<td>0.09** (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic identification</td>
<td>0.01 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic superiority</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11** (0.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F change for R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.41**</td>
<td>6.79**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: +p = .06, *p < .05, **p < .01

Table 4. Hierarchical linear regression analysis for the predictors outgroup attitudes (N = 317).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
<td>B (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.54* (5.62)</td>
<td>8.54 (5.47)</td>
<td>8.15 (5.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.06 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.08)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>0.02+ (0.01)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identification (EI)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Discrimination (PD)</td>
<td>-0.15** (0.03)</td>
<td>-0.15** (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD X EI</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F change for R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.97**</td>
<td>5.13**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: +p = .06, *p < .05, **p < .01
Figure 4. Unstandardized regression coefficient for the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes as mediated by perceived ethnic superiority. The unstandardized coefficient between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes controlling for perceived ethnic superiority is in parenthesis.

***$p < 0.005$

Figure 5. Unstandardized regression coefficient for the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes as mediated by national identification. The unstandardized coefficient between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes controlling for national identification is in parenthesis.

***$p < 0.005$
5. Discussion.

The aim of this study was to study the relationship between perceived discrimination, identities and outgroup attitudes towards nationals of mainstream Finnish society. The theoretical model of the study was based on the assumptions of the Rejection Identification Model and the Rejection-Disidentification Model. In addition, acculturational strategies model, the concept of ethnocentrism and the theory of optimal distinctiveness were presented to support the hypotheses of the study.

The study showed the mean levels for national identification, ethnic identification and perceived ethnic superiority. The results indicated that the mean difference between national identification and ethnic was quite small. The reasons why the mean levels for national identification were high could be that the immigrants feel the need to attain a sense of belonging to the mainstream society and to be accepted by members of the mainstream society. also, when the immigrants are forced or willingly choose to assimilate into the mainstream society, they would have no choice than to reject their ethnic identity and take up the identity of the national society (Phinney et al., 2001). Another reason why immigrants may choose to identify with the national society is that, it may offer an escape from the harsh consequences of discrimination (Phinney et al., 2001).

The reasons why the mean levels for ethnic identification was similarly as high as that of national identity could be supported by the Rejection-Identification Model (RIM) (Branscombe et al., 1999). The model suggested that the immigrants identified more with their ethnic group when they believed that they shared the same plights of discrimination. This buffers them against the consequences of perceived or actual discrimination and also protects their psychological wellbeing. Also, showing solidarity to one’s ethnic group could be a reason in the presence of perceived or actual discrimination may be another reason for the high mean levels for ethnic identification.

The results of this study also indicated a low mean level for perceived ethnic superiority. The mean level for perceived ethnic superiority was found to be more than half of the mean level for ethnic identification. Based on the concept of ethnocentrism (Brewer, 1999), it was expected that the mean level for perceived ethnic superiority would be high. It was also expected that the immigrants perception of their in-group superiority would be associated with high mean levels of ethnic identification According to Brewer (1999), the immigrants strive for distinctiveness and
differentiation should “wield” the group members together hence increase ethnic identification. Although the mean results for ethnic identification and perceived ethnic superiority were quite contrasting, it would be interesting to find out the reasons for the vast difference in mean levels of the two variables in future studies.

5.1. **The relationship between perceived discrimination, national identification and outgroup attitudes.**

The results of this study showed that perceived discrimination was negatively related to outgroup attitudes and national identification. This supports the first hypothesis (H1) of this thesis. This can also be explained as; the more discrimination that is perceived by the Russian speaking immigrants from members of the mainstream Finnish society, the more hostile attitudes is projected by the immigrants towards the Native Finns. The attributional theory which was elaborated on the theoretical background may support this theory. Attributional research explains that once an individual or a group is confronted with prejudice, they tend to divert the reason of the negative treatment from themselves and attribute it to the source of the prejudice (Branscombe et al., 1999; Synder and Higgins, 1985). This is however also a coping mechanism used to protect the well-being of individual or groups who are being discriminated against. In my opinion, some of the consequences of attributing the negative feedback to the source of the prejudice would be; the expression of negative attitudes towards the source of the feedback which in this case are the members of the Finnish mainstream society.

Prior research done by Branscombe et al (1999), Schmitt and Branscombe (2002) and Jasinskaja-Lahti et al (2009) have shown support for the Rejection-Identification Model (RIM). The model postulates that perceived discrimination affects the psychological well-being and at the same time increasing ingroup identification of immigrants. It also poses that perceived discrimination also promotes negative hostile attitudes toward nationals of the mainstream society (Jasinskala-Lahti et al., 2009; Schmitt and Branscombe, 2002). The Rejection-Identification Model (RIM) also posits that the immigrants form increased identification with their ethnic in-group in the face of discrimination because they believe that they suffer the same plight. This in turn buffers them from the adverse effect of discrimination and hence protects their well-being. It should however be noted that the increase in the identification of immigrant groups in the presence of
discrimination does not always result in the immigrants harboring negative attitudes towards the members of mainstream societies (Verkuyten, 1992).

Phinney et al (2001) explained that affiliation to either ethnic or national identity is dependent on predictable positive outcomes with its associated membership. Thus the more immigrants perceive discrimination from the members of the mainstream society, the less they would want to affiliate of identify with the national community. It should be noted that perceived discrimination affects immigrants feeling of belongingness and identity preference which also has consequences in their attitudes towards nationals of the mainstream society (Phinney et al., 2001; Phinney and Devich-Navarro, 1997).

5.2. The mediating role of national identification and perceived ethnic superiority in the relationship between perceived discrimination and out-group attitudes.

In this research, I tested the mediation role of national identification and perceived ethnic superiority in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitude. The results showed that both national identification and perceived ethnic superiority mediated the relationship between perceived discrimination and out-group attitudes towards members of the mainstream society. The results supported my second hypothesis (H2).

The results of this research were in agreement with the Rejection-Disidentification Model (RDIM). The model proposes that perceived discrimination prevents immigrants from gaining a sense of belonging to the mainstream society hence resulting in decreased national identification. This was also seen in the case of the Russian speaking immigrants in my research. Procedural justice also plays a role in the immigrants’ decreased national identification. When they are treated unfairly by decision makers in their search for equitable outcomes, it takes a toll on their commitment to the mainstream society. This also has an impact on their attitudes towards members of the mainstream society (Tyler and Blader, 2003).

The results of this research also revealed that the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes was mediated by increased perceived ethnic superiority. Factors that encourage ethnocentrism in the form of ethnic superiority could explain this finding. When immigrants perceive threats to their identity, they may perceive their ethnic group as being
superior to the outgroup. As a result of this, they may express negative attitudes towards the threatening group which is the mainstream society.

Another reason why the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes is mediated by increased perceptions of ethnic superiority could be explained in the immigrants’ quest for common goals (Brewer, 1999). When immigrants are refused equal opportunities by members of the mainstream society in their quest and achievement for common goals, they perceive threats to their existence. They then perceive their ethnic group as being superior and in the fight for their existence; they express negative attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society. The strive for an ethnic group to be recognized as being positively distinct also explains the mediated role of increased perceptions of ethnic superiority. This is often characterized by ingroup loyalty of members, feelings of inclusion in the group, shared experience and cooperation with the outgroup (Brewer, 1999). The end result of this involves the ethnic group seeking to be favored over other groups. In relation to this thesis, the Russian speaking immigrants would want to be seen more positively in comparison to the members of the mainstream Finnish society.

5.3. The moderating role of ethnic identification in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes.

This research also sought to investigate the moderating role of ethnic identification in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. The results of this research indicated that ethnic identification was not associated in the relationship between perceived discrimination and out-group attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society. From the results, it explained that; as immigrants identified more strongly with their ethnic group (high identifiers), they showed more negative attitudes towards members of the mainstream society than when they did not identify strongly (low identifiers). This supported the third hypothesis (H3) of my thesis.

This study however showed that ethnic identification did not moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. An explanation for this could be found in the research conducted by Verkuyten (1992). The study revealed that, adolescents who identified
strongly with their ethnic minority groups did not show any hostile attitudes towards the national majority which were Dutch adolescents. Also, when immigrants who strongly identify with their ethnic groups endorse a tolerance for difference in the superordinate society, their attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society tend to be more positive than hostile or negative. (Staerklé et al., 2005). It is my suggestion that more research should be conducted to understand the moderating role of ethnic identification in predicting outgroups attitudes in the presence of discrimination.

5.4. **Strength and limitations.**

The limitation of this study is that it does not explain the causal relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. It only explained the correlational relationship between perceived discrimination and out-group attitudes. Longitudinal research should be encouraged in this area. More research should also be conducted in other mainstream societies as well in order to generalize the results across different immigrant populations.

Another limitation of this study is that it comprised of samples used in this research were ethnically heterogeneous. It would be interesting to find out the how the predictors would work in the same models using samples that are more ethnically homogeneous.

The strength of the study was in the analysis of the predictors which used bootstrapping in SPSS. Bootstrapping enabled greater accuracy of the analysis of the predictors. This assured validity of the analysis and enabled the generalization of the results.

5.5. **Conclusion.**

The present study indicates that, immigrants’ perception of discrimination may have effects on their attitudes towards members of mainstream societies depending on the immigrants’ identity preferences. This was approached by measuring the level of discrimination, preference of identification and the attitudes Russian speaking immigrants had towards natives of the Finnish society. Some of them declared preference for the national Finnish identity and some for the
Russian ethnic Identity. Some Russian speaking immigrants assumed that their ethnic identity was superior to all other identities.

The results of the study indicate that, when immigrants perceive discrimination, they are more likely to have negative attitudes towards members of mainstream societies. They are also less likely to show support for national identification. This indicates that, the presence of actual or achieved discrimination prevents the achievement of an exclusive society and may result in minority groups expressing negative hostile attitudes towards majority groups.

This study also showed evidence that, ethnic identification does not predict hostile attitudes towards members of mainstream societies in the presence of perceived discrimination. The implication of this result is that, in the presence of perceived or actual discrimination, immigrants ethnic identity preference does not influence hostile attitudes towards the nationals of mainstream societies. However, the results revealed that immigrants as immigrants identified strongly with their ethnic group, they became more vulnerable to perceived or actual discrimination. And this had an impact on their attitudes towards the members of the mainstream society.

The study also revealed that national identification and perceived ethnic superiority were predictors of outgroup attitudes in the presence of perceived of actual discrimination. The results showed complete mediation of the predictors in the relationship between perceived discrimination and outgroup attitudes. There are some implications for the mediation results in this study. Firstly, immigrants gain a decreased sense of belonging to the national outgroups in the presence of discrimination and this may result in negative attitudes towards members of the mainstream society.

And secondly, the mediating role of perceived ethnic superiority implies that, immigrants would have negative attitudes towards members of mainstream societies when they perceive their ethnic minority groups to be superior to all other groups in the presence of discrimination.

A general implication of this study is that, it provides conditions in terms of immigrants’ identification preferences for the prediction of their attitudes towards nationals of mainstream societies in the presence of perceived or actual discrimination.
The findings of this study can in future; help policy makers as well as nationals of mainstream societies understand the circumstances surrounding attitudes projected by immigrants towards them. This study may help policy makers to suggest some strategies and policies in order to alleviate the consequences of discrimination. Some proposed strategies could be: to offer equal opportunities to immigrants in their quest for resources and improvement of their quality of life. Support for the acculturational outcome of integration is another way to reduce discrimination and its attitudinal consequences. Integration would provide a platform for tolerance and also result in support for multiculturalism which is the main goal for achieving an exclusive society.
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