



## Who wants to know? The effect of audience on identity expression among minority group members

Manuela Barreto<sup>1\*</sup>, Russell Spears<sup>2</sup>, Naomi Ellemers<sup>1</sup> and Khosrow Shahinper<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Leiden University, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Statements of social identification among ethnic minority members were examined as a function of group membership of the participants, group membership of the audience, and personal identifiability. In Study 1, Turkish migrants and Iranian refugees in the Netherlands expressed their identification with native and host groups as a function of the audience implicit in the language of the questionnaire (native, host). Turks stressed identification both with native and with the host group more to the host audience, whereas Iranians did not. Both groups, but particularly the Turks, emphasized the adaptation problems and associated stress, to the host culture and to the host audience. In Study 2, identification with native and host group was examined among Portuguese migrants in the Netherlands, as a function of audience (native, host) and personal identifiability (anonymous, identifiable). Degree of identification with native and host groups depended both on the audience and on personal identifiability. Results from both studies are explained primarily in terms of strategic self-presentation of identities, determined by the relation between the group and the audience. In general, participants address identity claims to audiences that might question these claims (or are in a position to redress grievances), although because of reality constraints, this is easier when anonymous.

The degree to which people express identification with a given social group has been shown to depend on a variety of factors (e.g. Deaux, 1996; Ellemers, 1993, for reviews). Generally, statements of identification with a group are seen as diagnostic of how people see themselves in a particular context. Yet, statements of identification may be seen to reflect not only how people see themselves, but also how they wish to be seen by others. So far this communicative aspect of identities has been given little attention. In this paper, we examine how people tailor their claims of group identification to the audiences they address. Specifically, we investigate how migrant group members strategically adapt their statements of identification with native and host groups, as well as other responses, to the audiences with whom they communicate.

\*Requests for reprints should be addressed to Manuela Barreto, Department of Social Psychology, Leiden University, PO Box 9555, 2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands (e-mail: [Barreto@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:Barreto@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)).

Theory and research on impression management suggest that people may monitor the image that they provide of themselves to the audiences they address (e.g. Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, 1980). Although these approaches have more traditionally focused on the presentation of individual identities, recent research indicates that people may also be motivated to influence how others view their social identities (e.g. Ellemers, Van Dyck, Hinkle, & Jacobs, 2000; Klein & Azzi, 2001; Reicher & Levine, 1994a, 1994b; see Ellemers, Barreto, & Spears, 1999, for a review). A recently developed model specifies how self-presentation processes may be involved in the expression of identities at various levels of self-definition. The social identity model of de-individuation effects (SIDE model; Reicher, Spears, & Postmes, 1995; Spears & Lea, 1994) postulates that identity expression involves two components: a cognitive component and a strategic component. The cognitive component refers to the level of self-definition that is salient in a given context, for instance whether or not a given social identity is cognitively salient. The strategic component refers to the concern that identity expression be contextually appropriate, and implies sensitivity to the nature of the audience addressed and its power of sanction. For instance, travelling abroad may render our national identity highly salient. However, the specific way in which this identity is acted out often reflects a concern to avoid being offensive to those hosting us ('when in Rome, do as the Romans do'). According to this model, public behaviour cannot be understood solely by reference to cognitive or to strategic processes: we need to consider *both* what is salient inside people's minds (the cognitive component), as well as the contextual constraints and opportunities in relation to which identities are acted out (the strategic component). It is therefore important to make explicit that the strategic component is not separate from or secondary to the cognitive component but inherently bound up with it (and in this sense we reject a dualistic notion of identification as *either* cognitive *or* strategic). Moreover, strategic self-presentation is not just used to 'flatter to deceive' but can also be used to assert and affirm important identities for audiences we deem need to be reminded of them, even where this might come at a cost. Indeed the central theme of this paper concerns how people *affirm* rather than hide identity for strategic reasons.

Prior research has indeed shown that people portray their social selves differently to different audiences. For instance, people express greater agreement with a group's norms when their responses are public to this group than when they are anonymous (e.g. Barreto & Ellemers, 2000; Douglas & McGarty, 2001; Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995). However, the opposite effect has also been found: rather than trying to please or accommodate to an audience, people may instead choose to affirm publicly their difference from the audience (e.g. Reicher & Levine 1994a, 1994b). This variety of responses is also well represented in the literature on the effect of linguistic audiences on the endorsement of collectivist values among ethnic groups. This research has revealed both affirmation and accommodation to the audience's values, not only across different studies (e.g. contrast Kosmitzi, 1996; Yang & Bond, 1980, with Ralston, Cunniff, & Gustafson, 1995; Trafimow, Silverman, Fan, & Law, 1997), but also on different measures within the same study (e.g. Bond & Cheung, 1984; Marin, Triandis, Betancourt, & Kashima, 1983). In this paper we examine two possible moderators of the effect of audiences on identity expression: (a) the extent to which an audience is likely to question the respondents' identity and (b) personal identifiability to the audience.

With regard to the first of these factors, it is indeed likely that the way people describe themselves to an audience that accepts their own self-view is likely to differ from how they describe themselves to an audience that questions their identity. Indeed, it has been argued that the discrepancy between self-identities and external ascription is likely to constitute an important identity threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Breakwell, 1983; see also Higgins, 1987). One way of addressing this threat may be to assert one's self-view when communicating with the audience that questions one's identity. In this paper, we examine this process by investigating how migrant group members express their identity to a native and to a host audience. Prior research indeed suggests that migrant group members often experience a discrepancy between their self-perception and external ascription by members of the host society. In particular, while the great majority of migrants express identification with both native and host groups (e.g. Berry, 1990; Deaux & Ethier, 1998; Hutnik, 1991; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Phinney, 1990; Verkuyten, 1997), they are generally categorized by others on the basis of their native identity (Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998; see also McGuire, McGuire, Child, & Fujioka, 1978; Nelson & Miller, 1995). In other words, while they may have a 'dual identity', they are perceived by the host culture primarily in terms of one, their native identity.

We define dual identity here simply as the situation in which two identities have some degree of importance for the individual, both of which therefore represent an important part of the self (we make no assumptions about *how* these are represented, whether as two separate identities or as part of a compound identity; such assumptions are unnecessary for our argument). For migrant groups, such dual identification often goes hand in hand with an 'integrationist' ideology. This is to be distinguished from an 'assimilationist' ideology in which the immigrant group tries to give up its native identity (or is persuaded to do so) in order to better assimilate to the host culture. In the integrationist ideology, associated with multiculturalism, the migrant group will take on the identity of the host while *maintaining* their own native identity (Berry, 1990; Hornsey & Hogg, 2000).

This discrepancy in how migrants with a dual identity perceive themselves and are perceived by the host culture is also often accompanied by discrimination, which is likely to accentuate further the identity threat experienced. Given these conditions, when provided with the opportunity to address a host audience, we propose that migrants will be motivated to assert their dual identity (that is, *both* their native and host identities), in order to communicate to the host society their belief that it is possible to be a full citizen of the host society *without* relinquishing their native identity (consistent with the integrationist ideology of multiculturalism). Since their relation to the native group is likely to be less problematic, statements of identification are likely to be less emphatic when addressing the native audience. We investigate this possibility in the first study described in this paper, by examining statements of native and host identification among migrants, and varying whether they addressed a native or a host audience.

Another possible moderator of audience effects on identity expression examined in this paper is personal identifiability to the audience. The predictions described so far are based on the idea that the presence of an audience provides the opportunity to express valued identities to an audience that might question these. However, one of the problems for those with a dual identity is that the gatekeepers of either identity (i.e. representatives of the native and host cultures) may have some legitimacy in judging the criteria for identity or group membership in their culture (greater affinity

with the culture, no divided loyalties). This may render those with the dual identity vulnerable to tests of loyalty to (or affinity with) the identity in question when accountable to this audience. This may then constrain attempts to affirm identity, especially if respondents are personally identifiable, and therefore accountable, to this audience. Indeed, personal identifiability provides the audience with the opportunity to judge the validity of one's claims (according to its membership criteria). In line with the SIDE model, an important aspect of the strategic component of identity expression concerns a sensitivity about making claims that might be punishable, or that may lack credibility to the audience (Reicher & Levine, 1994a, 1994b; Reicher, Levine, & Gordijn, 1998; see also Barreto & Ellemers, 2000; Douglas & McGarty, 2001; Ellemers *et al.*, 2000; Spears, Jetten, & Doosje, 2001; Spears & Lea, 1994). Since migrants typically do not satisfy all of the criteria for membership in native and host groups (e.g. place of residence and of birth, respectively), we may expect personal identifiability to moderate the expression of the identity that the audience represents. This possibility was examined in the second study reported in this paper, where we varied whether or not respondents were personally identifiable.

In sum, the research reported in this paper has two major goals: in Study 1, we concentrated on examining how members of ethnic minorities adapt their statements of identification with native and host groups to the audience they address; in Study 2, we focused on the analysis of how personal identifiability may moderate identity expressions among migrant group members. In this way, we examine two of the aspects that are likely to be involved in strategic identity expression: the sensitivity to the opportunities for voicing that an audience may present, as well as the sensitivity to the constraints brought about by personal identifiability.

## STUDY 1

The main purpose of the first study was to investigate whether or not people assert their identity or identities when communicating with an audience that questions one or both of these identities, compared to when they address an audience that presents less of an identity threat. Audiences were manipulated by varying the language in which the questionnaire was written (i.e. native or host language). This procedure capitalizes on the consistent finding that research participants take into account the group membership of the researchers when responding to questionnaires (Klein & Azzi, 2001; Norenzayan & Schwarz, 1999; Reicher *et al.*, 1998).

Based on prior research, we had reason to believe that Turkish migrants in the Netherlands experience a discrepancy between their self-view and external ascription by the host society. Indeed, in a prior study conducted in the Netherlands, Turkish migrants defined themselves as both Turkish and Dutch, but were nevertheless seen by members of the host society as Turkish only (Van Oudenhoven *et al.*, 1998). In other words this group possesses a dual identity, and the dual identity preferred by these migrants also differs from the identity that host group members wish them to adopt: Dutch respondents showed a preference for migrants to relinquish their native culture and fully assimilate into the host society (Van Oudenhoven & Eisses, 1998). In other words, whereas the Turks possess an integrationist ideology in which they want to be accepted as Dutch without losing their Turkish identity, they perceive the Dutch, with some justification, as preferring them to assimilate, and to become Dutch by rejecting their Turkish roots. Given these conditions, we expected Turkish migrants to take the opportunity of asserting their dual identity (that is both Turkish and Dutch) to the host

audience perceived to question this possibility, but that they would be more moderate when addressing a Turkish audience (Hypothesis 1a). The Turkish audience is after all already familiar with the issue and does not need to be persuaded.

The degree to which a discrepancy between (dual) identity and external ascription is experienced is not only likely to vary across audiences (with the native audience holding less discrepant self-views than the host audience), but is also likely to depend on aspects of the group. As we have argued in the case of the Turks in the Netherlands, a dual identity and an integrationist ideology, coupled with the perceived pressure from the Dutch for them to assimilate, are predicted to result in the motivation to assert both identities to this audience. It follows that other groups lacking these properties, and perceptions by the Dutch, may be less likely to display this response. In order to investigate whether these effects would generalize to a different minority group in the Netherlands, we also examined statements of identification among a sample of Iranian migrants. Turks and Iranians in the Netherlands are similar in certain respects: compared to the more individualistic host society, they may both be characterized as culturally collectivist; both groups have themselves moved to a host society, as opposed to being colonized, and have done so relatively recently. However, there are important differences between these groups. Turkish migrants generally came to the Netherlands for economic reasons, whereas Iranians in the Netherlands have the status of political refugees, and for this reason also have a more ambivalent relation to the host culture. Moreover, Turkish migrants are a significantly more visible minority group in Dutch society than are the Iranians, and are thus likely to be more easily categorized as separate, and as a distinct group (Crocker & Major, 1989; Dijker, 1987). This difference in visibility is due not only to numbers (whereas the number of Turks in the Netherlands currently approaches 300,000, there are no more than 22,000 Iranians: Central Statistics Bureau, 2000), but also to differences in appearance, clothing and development of the migrant community (Lucassen & Penninx, 1997). Given these conditions, we expect that the host audience is likely to present less of an identity threat to the Iranians than to the Turks. In sum, we expect the Iranians to rate less highly on the factors predicted to motivate identity affirmation for the Turks (dual identity, integrationist ideology, treatment as an ethnic minority rather than Dutch). As a consequence, we expected Iranians to assert their dual identity to the host audience compared to the native audience much less than the Turks, if at all (Hypothesis 1b).

In order to offer further evidence for the strategic enhancement of identity-related claims, we also examined how participants tailored their ratings of adaptation problems and stress to the audience addressed. Migrants are known to experience difficulties in adapting to a new culture, which often include experiences of discrimination directed against them (see Berry, 1990). The absence of personal identifiability in this study should provide participants with the opportunity to voice their complaints without fear of sanction (Reicher & Levine, 1994a, 1994b). Compared to the native group, the host group is likely to be seen more as a source of distress, as well as more able to do something about these problems. As a consequence, respondents may be expected to emphasize the problems and stress that they have experienced when addressing the *host* audience, compared to when addressing the native audience (Hypothesis 2a). Note here that these measures relate more to problems experienced by the minority groups from the *Dutch host*, and specifically (effects of) racist or ethnocentric treatment. Despite the differences between the minority groups described above, it is likely the members of *both* of these groups have had some such negative experiences (e.g. Leach, Peng, & Volckens, 2000; Pettigrew & Meertens,

1995). For this reason, issues of dual identity or ideology important to identification, and predicted to differentiate Turkish and Iranian responses on that measure, may be less relevant to the present measures. However, given the more problematic position of the Turkish minority in Dutch society, we might expect this effect to be somewhat stronger for the Turkish than for the Iranian group (Hypothesis 2b).

Note that these hypotheses, which take into consideration cognitive *and* strategic aspects of identity expression, may be contrasted to predictions drawn *only* on the basis of cognitive processes. For example, following McGuire *et al.* (1978), minority identification should be more distinctive and therefore enhanced in the majority environment (i.e. to the Dutch audience), whereas identification with the host group would be enhanced to the native audience (see also Nelson & Miller, 1995; Schwarz & Bless, 1992; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). In addition, this pattern of results should be the same for Turks and Iranians.

To summarize, we expected Turkish migrants to be more motivated to express identification with both native *and* host groups when the language implies that responses are directed at the Dutch audience than when responses are directed at the Turkish audience (Hypothesis 1a). We expected a weaker or no comparable effect for the Iranians (Hypothesis 1b). This results in a predicted two-way interaction between ethnic group and audience, unqualified by type of identification (for native or host). However, it is important to check that the predicted effect of asserting identification to the host among the Turkish sample is reliable for both identification with the host and the native group. In terms of reported problems and stress, we predicted that both minority groups would tend to voice these more to the host audience than to the native audience (Hypothesis 2a), and this was also expected to be stronger for the Turks, who ostensibly have more to complain about to this particular audience (Hypothesis 2b). This would result in a predicted main effect of audience qualified by an interaction between ethnic group and audience.

## **Method**

### ***Design and participants***

This study consisted of a postal questionnaire survey with two independent variables: ethnic background of the participants (Turkish or Iranian), and audience implicit in the language of the questionnaire (native or host), resulting in a 2×2 static group comparison design (Kidder & Judd, 1986). Audience was manipulated by varying the language in which the questionnaire was written. The questionnaire was developed in the Dutch language, and translated into Turkish and Farsi. A cover letter introduced the study as an investigation into the adaptation of immigrants (for Turks) or refugees (for Iranians) into Dutch society. All participants were told that while mean responses of the overall sample were to be made public, they would remain personally anonymous. Participants were requested to return the questionnaire in the stamped and addressed envelope provided.

All participants were randomly assigned to the audience conditions. A total of 28 Turkish participants (13 in the Turkish and 15 in the Dutch audience conditions) were recruited via a Turkish student association by means of a postal questionnaire. The Iranian participants were recruited via an Iranian refugee student organization, and were 35 in total (16 in the Farsi and 19 the Dutch audience conditions). The average age of the participants was 25 (28 for Iranians, 23 for Turkish). The 25 females (15 Turkish, 10 Iranian), and 38 males (13 Turkish, 25 Iranians) were evenly distributed

across conditions. The mean length of stay in the Netherlands was higher for the Turkish group (12.73 years) than for the Iranian group (5.48 years). Duration of stay in the Netherlands was entered as a covariate in the analyses revealing the same results as reported here. The subsamples within each ethnic group were roughly equivalent regarding age, gender, and duration of stay.

### **Dependent measures**

All questions were answered on 7-point Likert scales, ranging from (1) 'not at all' to (7) 'very much'. The five items used to assess *degree of identification with native and host groups* were adapted from Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, and Williams (1986) ('I identify with Turkish/Iranian/Dutch people', 'I am a worthy Turk/Iranian/member of Dutch society', 'In general, being a Turk/Iranian/member of Dutch society has little to do with the way I see myself (inverted)', 'The fact that I am Turkish/Iranian/member of Dutch society is an important part of who I am', and 'In general, I am pleased that I am a Turk/Iranian/member of Dutch society',  $\alpha=.75$  for identification with native group and  $\alpha=.68$  for identification with Dutch group). *Adaptation problems and stress* were tapped by seven items, concerning problems with language, accommodation, meeting daily needs, culture conflict, unfriendliness and discrimination, social ease among Dutch people, and separation from friends (see Nicassio, 1985). Participants were asked to first state to what extent they experienced each of the problems listed (e.g. 'To what extent did you have problems with learning the Dutch language?',  $\alpha=.76$ ), and subsequently to indicate the amount of stress associated with each problem (e.g. 'To what extent did you experience stress as a result of this problem?',  $\alpha=.77$ ). After answering these questions, participants were asked to indicate their gender, age and length of stay in the Netherlands.

## **Results**

### **Degree of identification with native and host groups**

Hypotheses 1a and 1b were analysed with a 2 (Ethnic group: Turkish, Iranian)  $\times$  2 (Audience language: native, host)  $\times$  2 (Target group for identification: native, host) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the last factor. This analysis revealed a main effect of target,  $F(1, 54)=10.02, p<.005$ , unqualified by interactions with the other factors, indicating that in all conditions native identification was stronger than host identification. A between-participants effect of audience,  $F(1, 54)=10.28, p<.005$ , was qualified by the predicted interaction between ethnic group and audience,  $F(1, 54)=25.53, p<.001$ . Inspection of the means presented in Table 1 indicate that Turkish respondents did indeed report stronger levels of identification with both host and native cultures in the host audience condition, whereas this pattern was (non-significantly) reversed for the Iranians. The absence of a three-way interaction suggests that this pattern is equally strong for host and native identification. However to provide a more focused test of this we performed additional simple effects analyses comparing native vs. host audience conditions for each ethnic group on both types of identification. These analyses confirmed that, consistent with our hypothesis, Turkish respondents expressed stronger identification with the native group,  $F(1, 54)=11.86, p<.001$ , as well as with the host group,  $F(1, 56)=15.36, p<.001$ , to the Dutch audience than to the native audience (see Table 1). By contrast, statements of identification

**Table 1.** Identification with native and host groups as a function of ethnic group and audience (Study 1)

	Ethnic group			
	Iranian		Turkish	
	Audience			
	Native	Host	Native	Host
Identification with native group	4.44 <sup>a</sup> (1.36)	4.13 <sup>a</sup> (1.15)	3.63 <sup>b</sup> (1.49)	5.27 <sup>a</sup> (0.82)
Identification with host group	3.9 <sup>a</sup> (1.22)	3.45 <sup>a</sup> (0.99)	2.73 <sup>b</sup> (0.91)	4.37 <sup>a</sup> (1.07)

Note. Scores range from 1 to 7. Comparisons are made within rows. Only differences between means with different superscripts are reliable ( $p < .05$ ). Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

among Iranians did not differ reliably across audience, with regard to identification with the native group,  $F(1, 54) < 1$ , *ns*, nor with regard to identification with the host group,  $F(1, 56) = 1.53$ , *ns*.

### **Adaptation problems and stress**

Reports of adaptation problems and related stress were analysed with a 2 (Ethnic group: Turkish, Iranian)  $\times$  2 (Audience language: native, host) ANOVA. These analyses revealed main effects of ethnic group membership on both measures: Turkish respondents reported more problems ( $F(1, 52) = 3.90$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and related stress ( $F(1, 52) = 3.97$ ,  $p < .05$ ) than did Iranian respondents (see Table 2). Main effects of audience showed that more problems ( $F(1, 52) = 22.70$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and related stress ( $F(1, 52) = 5.58$ ,  $p < .05$ ) were reported to the Dutch audience than to the native audience (supporting Hypothesis 2a). These effects were qualified by an interaction between ethnic group and audience, which was only reliable for reports of adaptation problems ( $F(1, 52) = 6.50$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and not for related stress ( $F(1, 52) < 1$ , *ns*). This interaction shows that the effect of audience on reports of adaptation problems was only reliable for the Turkish respondents.

In sum, both ethnic groups reported greater adaptation stress to the host group, while only Turks reported more adaptation problems to the host group. Overall, Turks reported both more adaptation problems and more adaptation stress than the Iranians, a finding that is consistent with our analysis of the position of the two groups in Dutch host society.

### **Discussion**

The results of this first study show that participants' ratings of degree of group identification vary depending on the audience implicit in the language of the questionnaire. Moreover, this variation was related to the nature of the audience in predicted ways. Specifically, Turkish participants expressed stronger identification with both native



**Table 2.** Reported adaptation problems and stress as a function of ethnic group and audience (Study 1)

	Ethnic group			
	Iranian		Turkish	
	Audience			
	Native	Host	Native	Host
Reported problems	4.11 <sup>b</sup> (0.65)	4.55 <sup>b</sup> (0.63)	4.00 <sup>b</sup> (0.71)	5.45 <sup>a</sup> (0.98)
Reported stress	4.26 <sup>b</sup> (1.17)	4.89 <sup>a</sup> (0.99)	4.78 <sup>b</sup> (0.97)	5.56 <sup>a</sup> (1.29)

Note. Scores range from 1 to 7. Comparisons are made within rows. Only differences between means with different superscripts are reliable ( $p < .05$ ). Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

and host groups when addressing the Dutch audience, which, in line with a more assimilationist ideology, is seen to question this dual identity (Van Oudenhoven *et al.*, 1998). In addition, the results revealed an asymmetry between the Turkish and Iranian sample, which can be related to the extent to which each of these groups is likely to experience an identity threat when faced with the host group. The audience effect on statements of identification among the Iranians was in the opposite direction to the Turks but not reliable. One possibility is that besides experiencing less threat from the host society than the Turks, as political refugees, the Iranians may also experience *more* threat from the *native* audience than the Turks. This would mean that both audiences are equally threatening for this group, albeit for different reasons, rendering the contrast between the two audiences of no significance for the Iranians. That being said, the asymmetry between the two groups is consistent with our core argument that audience effects depend on what particular audiences represent for the groups under study, and which identity needs they render relevant. Indeed, the two groups may be seen to differ in the extent to which they are seen as separate by the host society. As a result, the two groups are also likely to differ in the need to persuade the host audience of their dual identity. In this way, statements of identification may be seen as strategic responses that help immigrants to cope with an identity threat presented by a particular audience.

In all conditions and for both groups, identification with the native group was higher than identification with the host group. It is unclear whether this finding may have been due to the greater cognitive fit of the native identity and its emotional significance (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner *et al.*, 1987), or to the likelihood that identity claims would otherwise not be taken seriously by the audience, or even to both processes. It is also possible that claims of host identification may have been dependent (i.e. anchored) on reported native identification, given that native identification was always stated first.

A second set of measures provides further support to our argument based on the SIDE model: the degree of stress experienced in the process of adaptation to the host society was emphasized by all participants when addressing a Dutch audience, rather

than a native audience. This finding also makes good strategic sense: participants voice their complaints to the audience whom they presumably hold responsible for this experience, as well as those who could presumably do something to ameliorate it (they may even have thought that the researchers or the research would have some influence in this regard). A similar pattern was revealed for reports of adaptation problems, but here the audience effect was only reliable for the Turks.

Note that these results are difficult to explain in terms of cognitive salience effects alone (see also Reicher *et al.*, 1995). For instance, unless we acknowledge that people have an active role to play in how they portray their identity, it is difficult to account for the enhancement of both identities in the same context, which we found among the Turks (see e.g. McGuire *et al.*, 1978; Turner *et al.*, 1987). It is possible to reformulate a cognitive approach to contemplate the possibility that these two identities may be so well integrated into a new minority identity that they become simultaneously salient as soon as the minority identity is contextually distinctive (e.g. Gonzalez & Brown, 1999; Haslam, 2001; Huo, Smith, Tyler, & Lind, 1996). However, since this integrated identity would be distinctive both in relation to the native audience and to the host audience, no difference in identification across audiences should be obtained. Also, this would not easily account for the asymmetry between the two samples. It thus seems more fruitful to regard our findings as the result of a strategic process, through which people select which view of themselves they wish to express, as a function of how they are categorized by a particular audience. To do so, the conditions under which participants expressed themselves in this study are likely to have been ideal, in the sense that participants were given the opportunity to address the audience that constrained their self-view, while they remained personally anonymous. We examine the influence that personal identifiability to the audience may have on this process of identity expression in Study 2.

## STUDY 2

The central aim of the second study was to examine whether or not personal identifiability modifies the effect of an audience on identity expression. To examine this, orthogonal to the manipulation of audience (native or host), we manipulated whether or not respondents were personally identifiable to that audience (anonymous or identifiable). In addition, we wished to investigate the effect of audiences on expressions of native and host identification among members of a minority group that is seen by the host society as relatively assimilated, but nevertheless still has a dual identity (i.e. in which native and host identities are both important). Choosing a group that is more accepted by the host culture in some ways provides a more stringent test of the hypothesis that people will adjust identity claims to the specific audience. We argue that people with dual identities experience concerns about how or whether they measure up to identity criteria for host and native audiences, which motivate them to affirm their identities to these audiences *even when* their identities are not explicitly questioned or threatened. Our central rationale is that it may be easier to make the identity claims of high identification when anonymous rather than identifiable to the group or culture in question.

For this purpose we chose to study Portuguese immigrants in the Netherlands. Portuguese migrants are not particularly visible or numerous in the Netherlands (approximately 13,000; Central Statistics Bureau, 2000), and are seen as generally well-integrated in this society. That is, from a Dutch perspective (and compared to the

Turks in our first study) they are relatively assimilated, whereas from the Portuguese migrant perspective there is little obvious pressure to assimilate more. Official statistics show that these migrants are more similar to the native Dutch than to most other minorities in several socio-economic indicators, such as education level and unemployment rate (Lindo & De Vries, 1998; Tesser, Merens, & Van Praag, 1999). Their command of the Dutch language is also generally better than that of other minority groups, such as the Turkish (Lindo & De Vries, 1998). Perhaps as a consequence, they tend to be relatively positively evaluated by the host group (Dijker, 1987). Their relation to the native country is also not especially problematic. Indeed, although some Portuguese originally arrived in the Netherlands as political refugees during the late 1960s, their current status is that of economic migrants, and their relation to the native community is no longer characterized by rejection. Thus, unlike the minority groups in the previous study, these migrants do not have a problematic relation with either native or host societies. They can be both of Portuguese origin and Dutch citizens, in the Netherlands and in Portugal, without undergoing particularly negative treatment by either community.

Given these conditions, and specifically the fact that the Portuguese feel relatively accepted by host and native cultures, when personally anonymous these migrants may be expected to emphasize the contextually relevant identity, reflecting the current audience: emphasizing Portuguese identification when addressing a Portuguese audience, and emphasizing Dutch identification when communicating with a Dutch audience.

Critically, however, we expected that this pattern would be modified by personal identifiability to the audience in question. In line with prior research, we expected identifiable participants to downplay claims that may seem illegitimate to the audience (Reicher & Levine, 1994a, 1994b; Reicher *et al.*, 1995). Since migrants do not satisfy all the criteria that contribute to defining membership in native and host groups (e.g. residence and place of birth, respectively), they may be concerned that their claims be regarded as invalid or less credible (see also Spears *et al.*, 2001). To ensure that they make valid claims, identifiable participants are likely to downplay identification with the group that the audience has the knowledge to question. That is, participants identifiable to the Dutch audience are likely to feel compromised by the fact that they are not Dutch by birth, and express weaker identification with the Dutch than when they are anonymous to this audience. In a similar vein, participants identifiable to the Portuguese audience are likely to feel compromised by the fact that they reside in the Netherlands, and express weaker identification with the Portuguese than when they are anonymous to this audience. These constraints should not operate when the respondents are anonymous (as in Study 1), because then their claims cannot be scrutinized. These constraints should also not operate when participants are identifiable to the audience that is irrelevant to the identity in question, since that audience is neither knowledgeable about that identity, nor likely to care about the precise fulfilment of its criteria.

In sum, in common with Study 1, we predict that people will take into account aspects of the context in making identity claims addressing the concerns of important (dual) identities. However in this case the relation to the audience is slightly different from that of Study 1. Because the Portuguese have a more positive relation to the host than the Turks the factor limiting their claim to the host identity now is not so much commitment or loyalty, but their credibility to this host as prototypical group members (given that they fall short on important criteria). The same applies to the Portuguese

audience. Importantly (and unlike Study 1 where all respondents were anonymous), credibility concerns constrain full-blown identity claims in the identifiable compared to anonymous conditions.

We therefore predicted that in *anonymous* conditions, identification with the Portuguese would be enhanced to a Portuguese compared with a Dutch audience (Hypothesis 1a), while identification with the Dutch would be stressed to a Dutch audience compared with a Portuguese (Hypothesis 1b). By contrast we predicted that *personally identifiable* participants would moderate their statements of identification with the group represented by the audience, resulting in weaker identification with the Portuguese when identifiable to a Portuguese audience rather than anonymous, with less or no difference in the host language audience conditions (Hypothesis 2a). Analogously, we predicted weaker identification with the Dutch when identifiable to a Dutch audience than when anonymous, with less or no difference in the native language audience conditions (Hypothesis 2b).

In order to examine whether or not the predicted effects are also obtained on measures tapping somewhat different forms of identity expression, we investigated reports of behavioural involvement with the native group. The predictions were similar to those advanced for the measure of native identification: we expected *anonymous* participants to indicate greater involvement with the native group when addressing a native audience compared to when addressing a host audience (Hypothesis 3a). Moreover, we expected participants to moderate their ratings of involvement with the native group when *identifiable* to the native audience, whereas no such tendency should be evident for the host audience (Hypothesis 3b).

## Method

### *Design, participants and procedure*

This study was a postal questionnaire survey and had a 2 (Audience: native, host) × 2 (Personal identifiability: anonymous, identifiable) between-participants factorial design. Audience was manipulated by varying both the language in which the questionnaire was written, and the identity of the research team. The questionnaire was developed in the English language and translated into Portuguese and Dutch. A covering letter introduced the study as an investigation into the way Portuguese migrants see Dutch society. In the Portuguese conditions, this covering letter identified the research team as Portuguese (i.e. the first author of this paper was mentioned), while in the Dutch conditions the covering letter identified the research team as Dutch (i.e. the third author of this paper was mentioned). Identifiability was manipulated by including in half of the questionnaires the request for the participant's name and address, allegedly to enable researchers to contact participants later on, to request further elaboration of their answers. The other half of the questionnaires assured participants of complete anonymity. Participants were requested to return the questionnaire in the stamped and addressed envelope provided.

A total of 123 participants were recruited via three Portuguese cultural associations and were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions (35 anonymous Portuguese, 34 identifiable Portuguese, 26 anonymous Dutch, 28 identifiable Dutch). Of these, 21 were of participants born in countries other than Portugal, and 27 questionnaires were either sent as anonymous and received identifiable (2), or sent as identifiable and received as anonymous (25). Data from these questionnaires that did not correspond to the assigned condition was not included in our analysis, leaving a total of 75

participants. The mean age of the 13 females and 62 males (proportionally distributed across conditions,  $\chi^2 < 1$ , *ns*) was 47, while the average length of stay in the Netherlands was 24 years. Respondents did not differ reliably across conditions in terms of gender, age, or duration of stay in the Netherlands.

### **Dependent measures**

All questions were answered on 7-point Likert scales, ranging from (1) 'not at all' to (7) 'very much'. *Degree of identification with native and host groups* was measured with six items similar to those used in the first study ('I see myself as Portuguese/Dutch', 'I am pleased to be Portuguese/Dutch', 'I feel strong ties with the Portuguese/Dutch', 'I identify with the Portuguese/Dutch', 'the Portuguese/Dutch are an important group for me', 'being Portuguese/Dutch is an important part of how I see myself',  $\alpha = .89$  for identification with the native group, and  $\alpha = .87$  for identification with the host group). *Involvement with native culture* was measured with five items ('I find it important that children of Portuguese people living in Holland are educated according to Portuguese traditions', 'I enjoy going to Portuguese festivities', 'I like to frequent at least one Portuguese association or club', 'I like to eat Portuguese meals', 'I enjoy visiting Portugal',  $\alpha = .65$ ). Finally, participants were asked to indicate their age, gender and length of stay in the Netherlands.

## **Results**

### **Degree of identification with native and host groups**

Degree of identification with native and host groups was analysed with a 2 (Audience: native, host)  $\times$  2 (Personal identifiability: anonymous, identifiable)  $\times$  2 (Target group for identification: native, host) mixed design ANOVA, with repeated measures on the last factor. This analysis revealed a main effect of target of identification,  $F(1, 62) = 59.23$ ,  $p < .001$ , showing that in all conditions native identification was stronger than host identification (all  $t > 1$ ,  $p < .05$ ). An interaction between target of identification, audience and identifiability  $F(1, 62) = 7.65$ ,  $p < .01$  was also obtained. In order to specify this complex interaction and test our hypotheses; we conducted separate ANOVAs for each identity target group.

For identification with the *native group*, we found an interaction between audience and identifiability,  $F(1, 69) = 5.71$ ,  $p < .05$ . Consistent with Hypothesis 1a, anonymous participants expressed stronger identification with the Portuguese to a native Portuguese audience than to a Dutch audience,  $F(1, 69) = 7.89$ ,  $p < .01$  (Table 3 top panel). In line with Hypothesis 2a, participants also reported stronger identification with the native group when anonymous to the native audience than when identifiable to this audience (Table 3 top panel),  $F(1, 69) = 6.69$ ,  $p = .01$ . The difference between the two audiences in identifiable conditions was not reliable  $F(1, 69) < 1$ , *ns*.

Analysis of ratings of identification with the *host group* also revealed a reliable interaction between audience and identifiability,  $F(1, 63) = 6.63$ ,  $p < .05$  (see Table 3 middle panel). In line with Hypothesis 1b, identification with the (host) Dutch group in the anonymous host audience condition was reliably greater than in the anonymous native audience condition,  $F(1, 63) = 7.16$ ,  $p < .01$ . Moreover, participants also claimed stronger identification with the host group when responses were anonymous to a host audience than when identifiable to this audience,  $F(1, 63) = 4.95$ ,  $p < .05$ , in line with Hypothesis 2b. The difference between the two audiences in identifiable conditions was not reliable,  $F(1, 63) < 1$ , *ns*.

**Table 3.** Identification with native and host groups, and reported involvement with the native culture as a function of audience and identifiability (Study 2)

	Identifiability			
	Anonymous		Identifiable	
	Audience			
	Native	Host	Native	Host
Identification with native group	6.29 <sup>a</sup> (0.97)	5.22 <sup>b</sup> (1.54)	5.38 <sup>b</sup> (1.29)	5.90 <sup>b</sup> (1.14)
Identification with host group	2.80 <sup>c</sup> (1.39)	3.88 <sup>a</sup> (1.41)	3.53 <sup>b</sup> (1.38)	2.64 <sup>b</sup> (1.23)
Involvement with native culture	6.38 <sup>a</sup> (0.74)	5.65 <sup>b</sup> (1.00)	5.69 <sup>b</sup> (0.99)	6.33 <sup>a</sup> (0.66)

Note. Scores range from 1 to 7. Comparisons are made within rows. Only differences between means with different superscripts are reliable ( $p < .05$ ). Standard deviations are presented in parentheses.

In short, anonymous participants stressed identification with the group represented by the audience (as predicted in Hypotheses 1a and 1b). Moreover, personal anonymity increased statements of identification with the group represented by the language of the questionnaire relative to the equivalent identifiable condition (as predicted in Hypotheses 2a and 2b).

### ***Involvement with native culture***

A 2 (Audience) × 2 (Personal identifiability) ANOVA on reported involvement with *native culture* revealed a reliable interaction between language and identifiability,  $F(1, 71) = 9.81, p < .01$  (see Table 3). Consistent with Hypothesis 3a, anonymous participants stressed involvement with the native group more in the anonymous native audience condition than in the anonymous host audience condition,  $F(1, 71) = 8.16, p < .01$ . Moreover, participants reported greater involvement with native culture when anonymous to a Portuguese audience, than when identifiable to that audience,  $F(1, 71) = 7.29, p < .01$  (in line with Hypothesis 3b). There was also a reliable but unpredicted reversal in the host condition, showing that more involvement with the native culture was reported when participants were identifiable rather than anonymous to the Dutch,  $F(1, 71) = 4.31, p < .05$ .

## **Discussion**

The results of this study show that anonymous participants addressed identity claims relevant to their dual identities by enhancing identification with the group cued by the language of the questionnaire. In addition, the results show that personal identifiability may indeed moderate how identities are publicly expressed. Concretely, Portuguese migrants expressed stronger identification with the Portuguese if anonymous than

when they were identifiable to the Portuguese audience. Analogously, respondents reported stronger identification with the Dutch host culture when addressing this audience anonymously, rather than when personally identifiable. That is, respondents moderated expression of identification with a culture when identifiable to the audience that was in a position to scrutinize the credibility of such claims. This discrepancy between anonymous and identifiable conditions suggests that these people are expressing identities that are important to them and where they are motivated to stake a claim to the identity, perhaps because of the credibility concerns inherent in a dual identity (otherwise why should they enhance identification in the anonymous conditions?).

This pattern was also obtained on the additional measure concerning behavioural involvement with the native culture. It is interesting to note that besides downplaying involvement with the group represented by the audience, identifiable participants also seem to have enhanced involvement with the other group. Closer inspection of the pattern of responses reveals that a similar pattern was obtained for the identification measures (see Table 3), but it was not reliable for these measures. Although not predicted beforehand, this result parallels the findings reported by Reicher and Levine (1994a, 1994b). These authors found that although participants moderated expression of behaviour punishable by the out-group when identifiable, they actually enhanced expression of non-punishable behaviour under identifiable conditions, thereby affirming their group identity to the out-group. However, it must be noted that whereas Reicher and Levine's work focused on the power of sanction entailed by conditions of identifiability, we are dealing here more specifically with the 'power of knowledge', namely the constraints implied by the awareness that the audience knows the limits of one's identity claims. Our results therefore suggest that audiences may hold various forms of power, which may have similar effects on identity expression.

This pattern of results also tends to undermine a general salience-based interpretation of our findings. For example, one possible explanation for the fact that people moderate expressed identification with the matching audience under conditions of personal identifiability, is that giving their name actually rendered personal identity more salient, undermining group salience and thus group identification. However, if this were generally true of the personally identifiable conditions, this pattern should also occur on the 'non-matching' identification measures. This did not occur, and if anything the pattern was reversed, rendering a simple salience explanation less plausible. That participants expressed stronger identification with each group in different contexts also seems to rule out the possibility that the dual identities of migrant group members are necessarily tied to each other, which could have been at the basis of a salience explanation for the results of Study 1. Instead, migrant group members seem to be able to stress their native and host identities in separate contexts, indicating that they are relatively independent and open to strategic presentation. In short, strategic concerns do indeed seem to guide expressions of identification and behavioural involvement: these are affected by constraints of social reality, or at least social credibility, that take the audience's perspective into account (see also Spears *et al.*, 2001).

More generally, the findings of the present study are consistent with the SIDE model insofar as they suggest that while anonymity seems to facilitate the expression of social identity, identifiability appears to undermine identity expressions that are seen to conflict with the audience's norms, and enhance expressions of identity that the audience does not constrain (Reicher *et al.*, 1995; Reicher & Levine, 1994a, 1994b;

Spears & Lea, 1994). Our study went one step further than previous research by showing that this may be so even when the audiences concerned are not clearly defined as in-groups or as out-groups (since the definition of self-boundaries is in fact what is under negotiation). That this pattern seems to be stronger for behavioural reports than for statements of identification may be taken to support Gordon's (1978) view that migrants first learn how to adapt their behaviour and only later come to learn how that could be reflected in their self-definition.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

In this paper we set out to examine some of the factors that influence how people express their identities to particular audiences. Specifically, we have shown that statements of identification vary depending on whether or not the audience is seen to question the respondents' identity, or is in a position to scrutinize the credibility of claims to such an identity (as when identifiable to the audience). We provide evidence to support the idea that public statements of identification should not be understood solely as a reflection of how people see themselves in a particular context; such statements also take into account perceptions of (and reactions to) how context affects perceivers' perceptions of how they are perceived by others (audiences).

The results of Study 1 suggest that when personally *anonymous*, people feel free to challenge external self-views, and attempt to communicate to others how they wish to be regarded. In that study, Turkish migrants, who are seen as separate by the host society and who are pressured to assimilate, chose to assert their dual identity (i.e. *both* Turkish *and* Dutch identities) when addressing the host group. By contrast, our results also show that if migrants are seen as more accepted and less separate by the host society (Study 2), and are therefore less pressured to assimilate, they are more likely to use this opportunity to express membership in the group that the audience represents. Moreover, the results of Study 2 go one step further to show that the presence of audiences does not always facilitate identity expression. In fact, this study showed that personal *identifiability* is likely to constrain identity claims when the audience has the knowledge to judge their veracity.

Taken together, the results of these studies are consistent with the SIDE model in suggesting that people may strive for positive self-presentation at the group level taking the audience into account (Reicher *et al.*, 1995; Spears & Lea, 1994). This analysis is both different from a purely cognitive perspective, and from a purely self-presentation perspective. Indeed, this model postulates that *both* cognitive and self-presentation processes are likely to be involved in public identity expression and that strategic processes do not exclude identity processes. Self-presentation is viewed as premised on the existence of valued identities. In turn, strategic processes are viewed as necessary for the understanding of how identities are publicly expressed. That audiences may affect the cognitive salience of particular group memberships is not under dispute in this approach, but the cognitive salience of particular identities alone is not considered sufficient to understand what people make public about themselves.

Our results suggest that the language used in a questionnaire, the identity of the research team, and the identifiability of participants' responses to the researchers convey a social context that is not neutral. For instance, it seems possible that contradictory evidence supporting both the dependence as well as the independence of native and host identification (Phinney, 1990) may be understood by reference to the communicative context in which they were voiced. As a consequence, researchers



must be sensitive to the fact that their own identity will have an impact on how people respond to their questionnaires, especially when that is significant for the issue being researched (see also Emler & Reicher, 1995; Klein & Azzi, 2001).

Although the analysis of the characteristics of each group and of their position in the host society provides some insights into the psychological processes underlying our results, further research should attempt to establish these mediators more directly (see e.g. Barreto & Ellemers, 2002). We echo Emler and Reicher (1995) in their concern that this may constitute a difficult endeavour because the assessment of mediating variables is likely to be subject to the same presentational concerns as the dependent variables here. However, the closer examination of these processes is likely to constitute an important step in the investigation of social identity phenomena. In the meantime, we believe we have contributed to a more complete understanding of identity processes by showing that identity expression is not a passive reflection of some underlying essence but half of a dynamic dialogue with a particular audience. This research therefore emphasizes the situated, relational, and communicative nature of social identity.

## Acknowledgements

This research was in part funded by a European community training programme (Marie Curie Fellowship) awarded to the first author. We wish to thank Annette Linden for her assistance in the preparation of research material, Alex Haslam, Steve Reicher, Olivier Klein, Boris Snauwaert, and three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments to previous versions of this manuscript. We also thank five cultural associations (Turkse Studenten Vereniging, Stichting voor Vluchtelingen Studenten (UAF), 'Os Lusitanos', Grupo Desportivo da Casa dos Portugueses em Haia, and Centro Português de Roterdão) for their assistance in data collection. The first two authors contributed equally to this paper.

## References

- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2000). You can't always do what you want: Social identity and self-presentational determinants of the choice to work for a low status group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 891-906.
- Barreto, M., & Ellemers, N. (2002). The impact of respect vs. neglect of self-identities on identification and group loyalty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 493-503.
- Baumeister, R. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin*, *91*(1), 3-26.
- Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation: Understanding individuals moving between cultures. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), *Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 232-254). Sage.
- Bond, M. H., & Cheung, M.-K. (1984). Experimenter language choice and ethnic affirmation by Chinese bilinguals in Hong-Kong. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *8*, 347-356.
- Branscombe, N., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35-58). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Breakwell, M. (1983). *Coping with threatened identities*. New York: Methuen.
- Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup differentiation in an industrial organisation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *59*, 273-286.

- Central Statistics Bureau [Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, CBS, Statline] (2000). Voorburg/Heerlen (<http://www.cbs.nl>).
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, *96*, 608-630.
- Deaux, K. (1996). Social identification. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 777-779). New York: Guilford.
- Deaux, K., & Ethier, K. A. (1998). Negotiating social identity. In J. K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The target's perspective* (pp. 301-323). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Dijker, A. J. M. (1987). Emotional reactions to ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *17*, 305-325.
- Douglas, K., & McGarty, C. (2001). Identifiability and self-presentation: Computer mediated communication and intergroup interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 399-416.
- Ellemers, N. (1993). The influence of socio-structural variables on identity management strategies. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *4*, 27-57.
- Ellemers, N., Barreto, M., & Spears, R. (1999). Commitment and strategic responses to social context. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 157-146). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ellemers, N., Van Dyck, C., Hinkle, S., & Jacobs, A. (2000). Intergroup differentiation in social context: Identity needs versus audience constraints. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*, 60-74.
- Emler, N., & Reicher, S. (1995). *Adolescence and delinquency: The collective management of reputation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gonzalez, R., & Brown, R. (1999). *Maintaining dual identity as strategy for reducing intergroup bias*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Kent.
- Gordon, M. M. (1978). *Human nature, class, and ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organisations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage.
- Higgins, T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*, 319-340.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *4*, 143-156.
- Hutnik, N. (1991). *Ethnic minority identity: A social psychological perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separatism the problem, is assimilation the answer? *Psychological Science*, *7*, 40-45.
- Kidder, L., & Judd, C. M. (1986). *Research methods in social relations*. New York: CBS.
- Klein, O., & Azzi, A. (2001). The selective confirmation of meta-stereotypes: How group members attempt to tailor an outgroup's representation of themselves. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 279-293.
- Kosmitzki, C. (1996). The reaffirmation of cultural identity in cross-cultural encounters. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 238-248.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, L. K. H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 395-412.
- Leach, C. W., Peng, T. R., & Volckens, J. (2000). Is racism dead? Comparing (expressive) means and (structural equation) models. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 449-465.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*, 34-47.
- Lindo, F., & De Vries, M. (1998). Allochtone jongeren [Migrant youth]. In R. Penninx, H. Munstermann, & H. Entzinger (Eds.), *Etnische minderheden en de multiculturele samenleving* [Ethnic minorities and the multicultural society] (pp. 501-538). Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

- Lucassen, J., & Penninx, R. (1997). *Newcomers: Immigrants and their descendants in the Netherlands 1550-1995*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Marin, G., Triandis, H. C., Betancourt, H., & Kashima, Y. (1983). Ethnic affirmation versus social desirability: Explaining discrepancies in bilinguals' responses to a questionnaire. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *14*, 173-186.
- McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. (1978). Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinctiveness in the social environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36*, 511-520.
- Nelson, L. J., & Miller, D. T. (1995). The distinctiveness effect in social categorisation: You are what makes you unusual. *Psychological Science*, *6*, 246-249.
- Nicassio, P. M. (1985). The psychological adjustment of the Southeast Asian refugee. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *16*, 153-173.
- Noel, J. G., Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1995). Peripheral ingroup membership status and public negativity toward outgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*(1), 127-137.
- Norenzayan, A., & Schwarz, N. (1999). Telling what they want to know: Participants tailored causal attributions to researchers' interests. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 1011-1020.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *25*, 57-75.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescence and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 499-514.
- Ralston, D. A., Cunniff, M. K., & Gustafson, D. J. (1995). Cultural accommodation: The effect of language on the responses of bilingual Hong-Kong Chinese managers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *26*(6), 714-727.
- Reicher, S., & Levine, M. (1994a). Deindividuation, power relations between groups and the expression of social identity: The effects of visibility to the out-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*, 145-163.
- Reicher, S., & Levine, M. (1994b). On the consequences of deindividuation manipulations for the strategic considerations of self: Identifiability and the presentation of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *24*, 511-524.
- Reicher, S., Levine, M., & Gordijn, E. (1998). More on deindividuation, power relations between groups and the expression of social identity: Three studies on the effects of visibility to the in-group. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*(1), 15-40.
- Reicher, S. D., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (1995). A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *6*, 161-198.
- Schlenker, B. (1980). *Impression management: The self-concept, social identity and interpersonal relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Schwarz, N., & Bless, H. (1992). Constructing reality and its alternatives: An inclusion/exclusion model of assimilation and contrast effects in social judgement. In L. L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), *The construction of social judgement* (pp. 217-249). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spears, R., Jetten, J., & Doosje, B. (2001). The (il)legitimacy of ingroup bias: From social reality to social resistance. In J. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 332-362). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1994). Panacea or panopticon? The hidden power of computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*, *21*, 427-459.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-48). Monterey, C.A.: Brooks Cole.
- Tesser, P. T. M., Merens, J. G. F., & Van Praag, C. S. (1999). Rapportage minderheden 1999 [Report on minorities 1999]. Den Haag: Social en Cultureel Planbureau.

- Trafimow, D., Silverman, E. S., Fan, R. M.-T., & Law, J. S. F. (1997). The effects of language and priming on the relative accessibility of the private self and the collective self. *Journal of Cross-Cultural psychology*, *28*(1), 107-123.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J. , Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Oudenhoven, J.-P., & Eisses, A.-M. (1998). Integration and assimilation of Moroccan immigrants in Israel and the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *22*, 293-307.
- Van Oudenhoven, J.-P., Prins, K., & Buunk, B. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *28*, 995-1013.
- Verkuyten, M. (1997). Discourses of ethnic minority identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*, 565-586.
- Yang, K.-S., & Bond, M. H. (1980). Ethnic affirmation by Chinese bilinguals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *11*(4), 411-425.

Received 20 August 1999; revised version received 18 January 2002