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Sophie Mounsey
Ethnocentrism and Attitudes to Cultural Diversity and Immigration: A Review

Abstract

Increasing trends in immigration in the contemporary world have reaffirmed the importance of understanding intercultural relations within multifarious, plural societies. A research-based understanding of these societies is essential for their successful management. This review focuses upon how the construct of ethnocentrism and its composites are related to attitudes to immigration and diversity. Theoretical explanations of ethnocentrism and intergroup processes are provided, and ethnocentrism is discussed in relation to several precipitators and moderators of ethnocentric attitudes to immigration and diversity, including authoritarianism, social dominance, security, ethnic hierarchies, cultural distance, and social conditions. It is recommended that future research focuses on the reciprocal views of ethnic groups in multiethnic societies to gain a more accurate understanding of attitudes to immigration and diversity.
Ethnocentrism and Attitudes to Cultural Diversity and Immigration: A Review

Global changes to society such as increases in immigration have created an interest in intercultural relations. There is considerable literature on the social and cross-cultural psychology of intercultural relations focusing on challenges to the well being of the global society (e.g., Bachman, Stephan & Ybarra, 1999; Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993; Hagendoorn, 1993; Jun & Gentry, 2005; LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Lynskey, Ward & Fletcher, 1991; Tajfel, 1981). However, a large amount of this research has examined the views of dominant groups and their beliefs, expectations, attitudes and behaviours. This trend has resulted in researchers who often focus on challenges to the well being of ingroup. In an increasingly diverse and plural society, it is essential to examine both the needs of ingroups and outgroups in order to provide a comprehensive, mutual and reciprocal understanding of ethnic relations that will promote and improve intercultural attitudes.

Ho (1990) asserted that cultural diversity defined by a variety of languages, religions and cultural practises being observed within what is termed a culturally plural society. Cultural pluralism is a widely used concept describing a diverse range of ethnocultural (religious or ethnic) groups who make up a society (Simon & Lynch, 1999; Ward & Deuba, 1999). In a culturally plural society such as Australia, the need to manage increasing cultural diversity led to a policy of multiculturalism (Ho, Niles, Penney, & Thomas, 1994). Within this context, the policy ‘multiculturalism’ advocates an inclusive tolerance whereby all ethnic groups residing in a country have a moral right to economic efficiency, to express and share their cultural identity and are entitled to social justice and equality whilst preserving national interests (Jones, 2000). This ‘unity within diversity’ promotes solidarity and enables all people to participate fully within society (Gallop, 2004).
Verkuyten and Kinket (2000) stated that many countries around the world are considered multiethnic societies. A multiethnic society is defined as a number of ethnic groups with varying status and differing characteristics such as race, language, and religion co-existing within one society. In addition, Reber and Reber (2001) depicted the term ethnic group as referring to any group of individuals with common cultural traditions and a sense of identity. They asserted that ethnic groups are bound together by characteristics such as history, language, religion, geography, and tradition.

Moscovici and Paicheler (1978) described the criteria for membership within a dominant group as a reflection of status and deviation from the norms of a society within which they exist. For example, to be a member of a dominant group automatically places the individual member inside the group (ingroup member) and places those who are not members outside this group (outgroup member). Those categorised within the group are held with higher status than nondominant outgroup members. Alternatively, researchers have shown nondominant outgroups are oppressed and differentiated by placement at the lower end of any hierarchy based on status or norms. This oppression often is characterised by prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice and discrimination are defined as negative attitudes and behaviours toward a specific group based on traits that one believes to be uniformly displayed by all members of that group. This negative reaction is characteristic of dominant group's attitudes to nondominant groups (Reber & Reber, 2001). However, this can be an endemic attitude in both dominant and nondominant group members.

Ethnocentrism is defined as an attitude derived of values from one's own cultural background that are applied to a particular cultural context (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). For example, an ethnocentric individual assumes that all unfamiliar
cultural characteristics are inferior and immoral when compared to ingroup (to which one belongs) values. Symbols defining one’s own cultural, ethnic or national ingroup become objects of pride and veneration whereas cultural or historical symbols of outgroups (all other groups) become objects arousing hatred and negativity. The term ethnocentrism has become commonly used to depict an individual’s attitude and emotional reaction to collective symbols of the cultural ‘other’ (e.g., an ethnic group; Sumner, 1906 in H. Tajfel). Although ethnocentrism is associated with a negative affect toward outgroups, it can have positive effects on an ingroup identity. For example, if ethnocentrism includes a positive idealist component by which the ingroup seeks positive distinctiveness, it is possible that an increase in the ingroup’s perceived level of self esteem may occur (Tajfel, 1978). This ethnocentric tendency for ingroup favouritism has been identified in many societies, leading LeVine and Campbell to claim that it is a universal feature of intergroup relations. For the purposes of this review, ethnocentrism serves as a measure of intolerance for those who are different to the ingroup as well as a measure of one’s rejection of diversity. It is acknowledged that groups may express respect for other groups (noted in immigration policies) and individuals can vary in the degree to which they tolerate outgroups and favour the ingroup.

Theoretical Frameworks

Social Identity Theory

Social Identity Theory (SIT) offers a pertinent perspective on the intergroup processes of immigrants and host societies. SIT posits that individuals are motivated to categorise and evaluate themselves and members of the ingroup favourably (Tajfel, 1978). Through the process of social comparisons, where ingroup members compare their group status with other groups, a positive distinction emerges. In order
to achieve a positive distinctiveness from outgroups, ingroup members are motivated to perceive themselves as superior, with higher status and prestige (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Upward, favourable comparisons of the ingroup are salient to the formation of positive self esteem (Schmitt, Branscombe, Silvia, Garcia, & Spears, 2006).

Consequently, positive ingroup-and negative outgroup differentiations (such as categorising outgroups as inferior) are reinforced by the need for a positive self concept (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). This need for positive distinctiveness can result in the ethnocentric view that all groups are subordinate and inferior to the ingroup (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Ethnocentrism can be assumed as an inevitable consequence of social identification manifested through ingroup favouritism or outgroup derogation. It is in part, this differentiation from outgroups through the formulation of stereotypes and attributions that leads to discrimination and prejudice, which, increases an ingroup members positive social identity.

The application of SIT is useful in predicting how the social categorisation of the self and others results in the formulation of stereotypes that are used to justify an ingroup’s ethnocentric attitude. Tajfel (1981; Brigham, 1971) postulated that stereotypes allow individuals to implicitly evaluate the characteristics of outgroups and so confirm the values and identity of the ingroup member. Furthermore, stereotypes serve to differentiate the ingroup from other groups on positive dimensions and often place the ingroup in a position of superiority (Tajfel). For example, as a result of ingroup-outgroup differentiation, features of outgroups are likely to be categorised as similar to other outgroups rather than similar to the ingroup (Campbell, 1967). Furthermore, traits shared by an ingroup and outgroups are perceived more positively as traits of the ingroup. The perception of these traits as superior when attributed to the ingroup yet inferior when attributed to outgroups is
a demonstration of ethnocentrism and the intensification of ingroup preference, with one group thinking of themselves in more positive terms in comparison to other groups (Campbell; LeVine & Campbell, 1972).

SIT presumes that positive ingroup differentiation is an outcome of the process of self-categorisation with the ingroup by its members resulting in the perceptual creation of ‘us and them’ (Griffiths & Nesdale, 2006). This social categorisation is the motivational factor behind negative and hostile attitudes to ethnic and immigrant groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Leve, Pratkanis, Probasco, &. 1992). Group members are motivated to make favourable comparisons that protect or enhance the ingroup’s social identity. Researchers have linked the need to maintain a positive self-concept to intergroup discrimination and prejudice. Consistent with this approach, ingroup preference has been demonstrated with ingroup members rating the ingroup more highly and indicating a preference for ingroup members on ethnic hierarchies (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Hogg & Abrams, 1988). Moreover, Houston and Andreopoulou (2003) identified high self esteem to be correlated with ingroup favouritism, and stated that in some cases low self esteem could facilitate outgroup favouritism. SIT emphasises the importance of group level social structures, self-evaluation and factors associated with self-esteem such as perceived (insecure) social status. It is within these broad social categories that factors associated with SIT precipitate ethnocentric attitudes and enhanced levels of intergroup discrimination (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Turner et al., 1992).

**Self-Categorisation Theory**

A more individual level explanation of intergroup discrimination and outgroup evaluation can be found in SCT (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). SCT is a general theory of group processes, which stresses the
Ethnocentrism

importance of cognitive aspects of social categorisation. Individuals engage in the process of self-categorisation using contextually relevant cues to define membership to an in or outgroup. Ingroup attributes become internalised as part of the 'personal identity' of the self. Individuals are said to self-categorise in accordance with the norms and characteristics of the ingroup which then leads to biases in their perception of the ingroup as superior to all outgroups. Rather than being unique, ingroup members depersonalise themselves and act in accordance with the stereotypical social and collective identity they perceive they to belong to (Hogg & Turner, 1987; Turner et al., 1987).

Integrated Threat Theory

The theory of integrated threat (ITT) posits that perceptions of threat are significant when considering prejudice and discrimination toward nondominant groups (Bachman, Stephan & Ybarra, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Central to this theory is the proposition that under competitive conditions, these processes may intensify. In particular, Stephan and Stephan asserted there are four fundamental threats that lead to unfavourable attitudes to immigrant groups: realistic threat, symbolic threat, negative stereotypes and intergroup anxiety. Realistic threats refer to valid threats arising due to scarce assets, particularly economic resources and employment opportunities. Symbolic threats concern differences in norms, beliefs and values that constitute a threat to the ingroups' worldview. Though Bachman et al. (1999) have recognised that stereotypes are not usually conceptualised as threats per se, they assert that they serve as a basis for expectations about outgroups and often lead to prejudicial attitudes (Bachman et al. 1999). Lastly, Stephan and colleagues have mooted that if individuals feel threatened during an intercultural interaction, including fear of being rejected, embarrassed, ridiculed or exploited by
outgroup members, unfavourable attitudes toward outgroups are likely to occur (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). This perceived or tangible external threat to the identity of an ingroup member underlies the function and cause of ethnocentrism. According to LeVine and Campbell (1972), a threat to the ingroup leads to fear and distrust of outgroup(s) and a general dislike of outgroups occurs. Homogeneity and solidarity within the ingroup will increase with threat to the ingroup’s ideology, values, morals and beliefs. Consequently, the rejection of outgroups formed by an expression of hostility termed ethnocentrism will often be evidenced by a negative stereotypical perception of outgroup characteristics.

Both SIT and ITT need not be mutually exclusive explanations of ethnocentrism; each provides evidence of valid concerns for personal and economic well-being as well as explaining underlying reactions to immigrants, minorities and immigration. Theoretically, there is an overlap between SIT and ITT and many studies could be explained using both SIT and ITT (LeVine & Campbell, 1972; for a review see Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). Therefore, rather than be in competition these theories should be considered to complement one another.

Predictors of Ethnocentrism

**Authoritarian Personality**

Scheepers, Felling and Peters (1990) sought a theoretical explanation for ethnocentrism. They asserted the theory of the Authoritarian personality (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson & Sanford, 1950) was central to ethnocentrism. According to this theory, ethnocentrism was considered an aspect of ideology, which is posited as based upon an organisation of one’s attitudes, opinions, values and beliefs. Adorno et al mooted that aspects of personality (e.g., authoritarianism) were derived from one’s outlook, or ideology (their ethnocentrism). Adorno et al. argued
that those who were attracted to ethnocentrism often had a high respect for the
ingroup, its norms and values and habitually displayed a general rejection of
outgroups, and intergroup hostility. This rejection was not necessarily based on
knowledge or actual contact with outgroups, and was instead likely to be based on
stereotypical negative characteristics of outgroups. As suggested earlier, the need to
derogate outgroups is based upon the ingroup’s striving for a positive social identity.

Social Dominance Orientation

Like ethnocentrism, social dominance is a demonstration of an individual’s
attitude of differentiation and denigration of outgroups (Capozza, Bonaldo, &
Di’Maggio, 1982, chap. 11). Social dominance orientation (SDO) has been proposed
as a general approach to relationships amongst social groups, reflecting whether
groups indicate a preference for intergroup relations to be equal or hierarchical
(Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). This individual difference variable
predicts the attitudinal outcome of intercultural relations, and often reflects a general
negative attitude to social groups. In particular, SDO determines whether an
individual is supportive of inequality and group hierarchies ranked based on
superiority (high SDO) or whether they support equality and a reduction in
hierarchical relations between social groups (low SDO) (Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, &
Armstrong, 2001).

According to Sidanius and Pratto (1999), social dominance entails the strength
of an individual’s desire for the ingroup to dominate and subordinate inferior
outgroups and the individual’s willingness to discriminate against other groups in
order to attain or maintain group dominance. Because of their support for a group
hierarchy, highly SDO individuals may also be particularly sensitive to group
boundaries, and thus to differences between groups. In support of these propositions,
higher social dominance oriented individuals have been shown to demonstrate prejudice toward a variety of groups, and to display heightened evidence of proingroup biases (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This derogation of outgroups and ingroup bias based on a desire and belief in the superiority of the ingroup correlates with the nature of ethnocentrism and allows one to argue that ethnocentrism is the underlying mechanism behind such dogmatism.

In the context of immigration attitudes, egalitarian or aggressive-intolerant natures are explained by SDO. It has been shown that individuals who are higher in SDO are likely to believe in zero-sum competition between immigrants and nonimmigrants, including competition over economic resources as well as competition over cultural dominance or national identity (Armstrong, Dovidio, Esses, & Jackson, 2001; Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998). As a result, higher social dominance oriented individuals often hold the belief that immigrants and nonimmigrants are fundamentally different and so generally have more negative attitudes toward immigrants and immigration (Armstrong et al., 2001). This perceived or tangible threat to economic and symbolic security and their belief in inequality leads individuals higher in SDO to manifest intolerant attitudes toward all outgroups.

In addition, Danso, Sedlovskaya and Suanda (2007) hypothesised that when there was a focus on an ingroup national identity, prejudicial attitudes to social groups would be associated with unfavourable attitudes to immigration. Danso et al. conducted an experiment aimed at reducing this prejudicial attitude. They recruited 56 university psychology students who were asked to complete a questionnaire measuring social dominance and attitudes to immigration. Prior to responding to the questionnaires, participants were assigned to one of two conditions. Over a four-
week period, respondents were required to take part in conditions designed to either increase ethnic salience or focus their attention away from the ingroup. During these tasks, respondents were instructed to state which American values they identified with as being similar and as important to themselves as Americans (group focused condition) or, participants were asked to write down values that were least important to Americans and why that value may be important to other cultural groups (other focused condition).

Danso et al. (2007) found that in the group focused condition, focusing an individuals attention away from the ingroups national identity decreased prejudicial attitudes to ethnic groups. In the other-focus condition, focusing attention onto others in a non-competitive sense increased the likelihood of positive attitudes toward immigrants and ethnic groups. However, because this study did not have a baseline measure of attitudes it is difficult to know whether social dominance was lower in the other focused condition because of priming during the experiment or if this occurred due to extraneous variables. In a replication of this study, Danso et al. sought to measure respondent's initial attitudes to immigration and ethnic groups. Respondents reported more favourable attitudes at follow up when compared with initial negative attitudes in the other focus condition. However, the lack of causal direction and experimental nature of this research may have led to a lack of generalisability of the results to real life situations. Nevertheless, we can conjecture that it is likely that having a cultural understanding of outgroups could lower SDO. Consequently, this would reduce negative attitudes to ethnic groups and would serve to improve intercultural relations (Danso et al.).
Perceived or Symbolic Threats

LeVine and Campbell asserted the greater the perceived symbolic threat an outgroup pose to the ingroups values; the more ethnocentric the ingroup is likely to be. Bachman, Stephan and Ybarra (1999) stated that symbolic threats include threats to the ingroup’s welfare values, beliefs, and traditions. These symbolic threats can be perceived as undermining the ingroup’s worldview (e.g., that the ingroup is morally superior) and have been associated with the development of ethnocentric outgroup hostility (Bachman et al. 1999). In support of this finding, Esses, Haddock and Zanna (1993) found evidence that symbolic threat underlies ethnocentrism. Esses et al found a relationship between perceived threat to the maintenance of ingroup values, norms and traditions and negative attitudes to outgroups. Esses, Martin, Stephan, Stephan and Renfro (2005) also found evidence to suggest that perceived, symbolic or realistic threats to the ingroup were directly related to ingroup favouritism, and negative attitudes to outgroups.

Moderators of Ethnocentrism: Ingroup Favouritism, Ethnic Hierarchies and Social Distance

The phenomenon of ingroup favouritism is well researched in social psychology (Berry & Kalin, 1996). Sumner (1906 cited in H. Tajfel) coined the term ethnocentrism to refer to the general tendency to view the world from the perspective of one’s own group. This has typically been associated with an omnipresent positive evaluation of the in-group relative to outgroups. In addition, LeVine and Campbell (1972) affirmed ingroup favouritism as a key aspect of ethnocentrism in that, favouring the ingroup was indicative of outgroup derogation. Moreover, SIT (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) referred to ingroup favouritism as a ‘generic norm’, applicable even to minimal groups (Tajfel, 1970). The social psychological study of the tendency to
evaluate the ingroup more positively than outgroups has led to a considerable body of evidence regarding the ingroup bias effect. In particular, this ethnocentric, ingroup preference has been linked to evidence of ethnic hierarchies and concepts of social distance.

People's beliefs in their ingroup's cultural superiority, their ethnocentrism, may lead to a ranking of outgroups closer or further away from the ingroup depending on how socially desirable the outgroup is perceived by the ingroup (Hagendoorn, Drogendijk, Hraba & Tumanov, 1998). Verkuyten and Kinket (2000) posited that ethnic hierarchies are founded on socio-cultural, political and religious differences between ethnic groups. In addition, Hagendoorn et al. (1998) also identified cultural differences such as ethnic background, place of birth, language, race, religion and belief systems as providing the ingroup with a standard to evaluate outgroups. Kogut and Singh (1988) theorised that cultural similarity is a reflection of national cultural distance. They define national cultural distance as the degree to which cultural norms in one country are different from those in another country. Kogut and Singh posit that cultural distance is based on cultural differences in social skills, language and cultural traditions. They asserted that a high level of cultural distance could create barriers between host and home countries and hinder relations between cultural groups.

Furthermore, Hagendoorn (1993) asserted that for outgroups to be ranked against the ingroup, outgroup's values must be measured against the values of the ingroup. Hagendoorn argued that the ingroup must create a value system that leads to stereotypical and acceptable behaviours of the ingroup. Therefore, outgroups are ranked closer to, or further away from the ingroup according to what is morally acceptable to the ingroup. Arguably, the ranking of outgroups according to the
similarity of ingroup and outgroup values is derived from the ingroup's need to maintain a positive social identity. Hagendoorn posits that one collective ingroup and outgroup belief systems offers justification for positioning of outgroups based on inferiority, status and wealth.

Callan, Gallois, and Parslow (1982) investigated the relationship between ethnocentrism and Australian respondent's attitudes to familiar national groups (Australian Aboriginal, Russian, Greek, Anglo-Australian). Callan et al. surveyed 224 Anglo-Australian undergraduate university students, measuring their favourability toward ethnic groups and preferred social distances with such groups. Participants were classified with low, medium or high ethnocentrism based on their performance on the surveys. Overall, participants expressed a preference for contact with Anglo-Australians (their ingroup) and those who were identified as highly ethnocentric expressed a hierarchical preference for the ethnic groups referred to in the survey. These findings are indicative that ethnocentrism is characterised by ingroup favouritism and negative attitudes to ethnic outgroups. Also, Callan et al. found that Anglo-Australians were more willing to interact with ethnic groups they perceived to be similar based on social, racial, national, ethnic, and political characteristics. According to LeVine and Campbell (1972) the more similar the values of the ingroup are to the values of outgroups, the less outgroups will be perceived as a threat to the positive identity of the ingroup. Moreover, the relationship between preferred social distances, cultural similarity and negative attitudes to ethnic groups suggests ethnocentrism is a predictor of negative attitudes toward immigrant groups, cultural diversity and immigration.

Berry and Kalin (1979) found evidence for ingroup favouritism, a consensual hierarchy of preference and a general ethnocentric attitude, in a national survey.
Ethnocentrism assessing attitudes to immigration and immigrant groups. In a similar and more recent adaptation of this study, these authors extracted data from a 1991 Canadian national telephone survey and measured the acceptability of migrants based on personal and stereotypical characteristics and their country of origin (Berry & Kalin, 1995; 1996). Responses were taken from 3325 adult French Canadian and English Canadian participants situated in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. The sample was highly representative of the general Canadian population. Respondents were asked to state their comfort ratings toward various ethnic and immigrant groups. First, thinking of group members as immigrants to Canada, and second thinking of them as having been born and raised in Canada. These comfort ratings were taken as indicative of attitudes towards immigrant and ethnic groups. Respondent’s comfort ratings toward British, French, Italian, Ukrainian, German, Jewish, Portuguese, Chinese, Native Canadian Indians, West Indian Blacks, Arabs, Muslims, Indo-Pakistanis, and Sikhs were also measured. Overall, the findings of the survey indicated that both groups were supportive of cultural diversity and multiculturalism. However, French Canadian respondents indicated they were less tolerant of ethnic groups than English Canadian respondents. The results of the survey also indicated that each group had an overall preference for the ingroup. Both French and English Canadians placed their groups highest on an ethnic hierarchy and both dominant groups shared a mutual preference for other ethnic groups. Berry and Kalin argued that this demonstrated the existence of a consensual ethnic hierarchy. However, Berry and Kalin were unable to ascertain whether the placement of these dominant groups highest on the ethnic hierarchy would be reciprocated by other ethnic groups. However, because the research did not identify the reciprocal views of ethnic groups
toward French and English Canadians, the general validity of this ethnic hierarchy was limited to the opinions of two dominant groups in Canada.

**Demographic Variables**

Researchers elucidate that social conditions such as social class, age, education level, religious orientation, and gender may be factors predictive of ethnocentric attitudes to ethnic groups, immigrant groups and immigration (Beswick & Hill, 1969; 1972; Card, Dustman & Preston, 2003; Goot & Watson, 2001; Ho, Niles, Penney & Thomas, 1994). In Europe, data derived from the European Social Survey indicated a relationship between anti immigration attitudes and demographic variables, including age, education, employment status, and religious orientation (Card et al). In addition, Beswick and Hill (1969, 1972) conducted a large-scale attitudinal survey in Australia and found similar results. These authors measured attitudes to ethnic groups and immigration using an ethnocentrism scale, as well as obtaining demographic information from 1066 adult respondents. Age, years spent in education and areas of residence (rural or urban) were found to be indicative of ethnocentrism scores and were identified as predictive of a relationship between demographics and immigration attitudes. Moreover, in several studies a correlation was found between employment status, full time education and political views. Those with liberal views on immigration and cultural diversity were more likely to be younger, highly education individuals (Card et al; Goot & Watson, 2001; Ho et al. 1994).

**Summary of the Literature**

This literature review demonstrates a number of composites of ethnocentrism influencing attitudes to immigration and diversity. Throughout this review, factors that precipitate and moderate ethnocentrism such as ingroup favouritism, threats,
social dominance, and ethnic hierarchies are addressed. In the area of intergroup relations, a number of theoretical models, including SIT and ITT provide underlying explanations for reactions to immigration, and attitudes to social groups. Although, researchers often utilise these models separately they are considered to overlap and complement one another (Tajfel, 1981). In particular, these theories both elucidate ethnocentrism. For example, group members are motivated to achieve positive distinctiveness for the ingroup by maintaining group boundaries and upholding the values of the ingroup (SIT; Tajfel, 1981). Threats to the ingroup identity serve to motivate and encourage group solidarity and lead to the rejection of outgroups (ITT, Stephan & Stephan, 1999). This rejection of outgroups in the form of outgroup hostility underlies the basis of ethnocentrism and with that, the motivation behind negative attitudes to immigration and diversity (LeVine & Campbell, 1972).

What is more, a large amount of research in this review has demonstrated that those who hold prejudicial views of ethnic groups and have negative views on immigration often indicate their preference for ethnic groups on a hierarchical scale (Hagendoorn, 1993). Research has also identified that ethnic hierarchies are related to comfort levels expressed during intergroup relations (Berry & Kalin, 1995). These comfort levels were identified as relating to the degree of social contact, and perceived cultural similarity to the ingroup (Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2005). Furthermore, social conditions were identified as explanatory variables pertaining to unfavourable attitude towards outgroups and favourable attitudes for the ingroup. Although, the predictive power of these variables is modest, they do lend support to the fruitfulness of the theory that ethnocentrism underlies unfavourable attitudes to ethnic groups and immigration.
Several weaknesses in past research demonstrate a need for future investigation in the domain of intercultural relations. For example, it has been proposed that the construct of ethnocentrism is a social and psychological universal where all groups view their group as superior and in more positive terms than outgroups (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Although, the majority of this research is indicative that ingroup favouritism and outgroup derogation are universal phenomenon, this research has largely examined the views and attitudes of dominant populations rather than the reciprocal views of all groups in multiethnic societies (Berry, 2006; Berry & Kalin, 1996). Thus, whilst it may be that ethnocentrism is salient to attitudes to immigration and diversity in dominant populations, it is difficult to generalise these findings to nondominant populations.

Research has identified a clear hierarchy of preference for the ingroup, and a consensual ranking of outgroups (Hagendoorn, 1993; 1995). Tajfel and Turner (1979) posited evaluations of outgroups are based on the values of the ingroup. Outgroups are ranked according to the similarity between their values and those of the ingroup. This theoretical explanation for the ethnic hierarchies does indicate that group members differentiate in ways that favour the ingroup. However, a large degree of research on ethnic hierarchies has focused upon the attitudes of dominant populations who share culturally similar characteristics and ideologies (e.g., ethnocentrism) rather than focusing upon the mutual attitudes of multiethnic populations (Berry & Kalin, 1979; 1996). Furthermore, there is little explanation as to why nondominant groups position culturally dissimilar, dominant groups higher on the ethnic hierarchy. In an effort to explain this trend, Tajfel posited low placed groups attempt to gain positive distinctiveness through status and power associations with highly placed groups. Yet, this theoretical implication has not been widely
researched. In particular, contemporary research is needed to examine whether ethnocentric attitudes of ingroup favouritism and a hierarchy of preference for outgroups is demonstrated and reciprocated by nondominant, groups in our multiethnic society.

There has been a unidirectional approach to examining attitudes to immigration and diversity over recent decades. With the exception of Berry and Kalin’s (1979; 1996) representative studies, much of the research has been drawn from dominant and specific samples, including students and the Armed Forces (Callan, Gallois, & Parslow, 1982). It is likely these groups share consistent values and social attitudes. For example, it may be that university students share common ingroup values such as ethnocentrism and therefore, have similar opinions about the positioning of ethnic outgroups. As these samples are limited, conclusions drawn may not be indicative of the larger societies’ attitudes to immigration and diversity. Future research should focus on measuring ethnocentric attitudes of ingroup favouritism and unfavourable attitudes to immigration and diversity in multiethnic societies.

Lastly, there has been a general lack of research in Australia on interethnic relations. In particular, the majority of research conducted in Australia has utilised aged survey data derived from dominant Anglo-Australian populations (Beswick & Hill, 1969, 1972; Ho, 1990; Jones, 2000; Phillips & Holton, 2005). This monocultural view of intercultural relations has grown to be outdated and does not reflect the diversity and dynamics of contemporary Australian society. Therefore, there is a need for future research to measure the attitudes of culturally and linguistically diverse populations residing in Australia in terms of whether their views reciprocate the views of dominant populations.
In summary, increasing trends in immigration have resulted in a focus on intercultural relations and intergroup attitudes. In particular, there has been some focus on interethnic relations, acculturation strategies and ethnic attitudes. For example, in his research on acculturation and ethnic attitudes, Berry (2006) identified four fundamental structures to examine the views of all ethnic groups in plural societies for a comprehensive understanding of interethnic relations. These constructs included ethnocentrism, security, hierarchies, and reciprocity. Specifically, this review considered one of these key mechanisms ‘ethnocentrism’. This review sought to educate the reader the lack of recent empirical research focusing on the reciprocal attitudes of all groups in society on issues relating to attitudes to immigration and diversity. In a multicultural, democratic and plural culture it is important that the needs and views of multiethnic groups are accounted for in public policies and therefore, in research focusing on this elemental area.
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Abstract

International immigration creates culturally and ethnically diverse societies. In order to form a cohesive and inclusive society, societies must have an understanding of the aggregates of positive and negative attitudes towards immigrants and cultural diversity. This study focused upon how the construct of ethnocentrism is related to UK migrants’ attitudes to immigration and diversity. Specifically, the study focused on the research question; does a relationship exist between ethnocentrism (ingroup favouratism and outgroup tolerance) and attitudes to cultural diversity and immigration? A total of 107 (59 female, 47 male) UK migrants were surveyed. The results indicate the majority of migrants viewed the ingroup most favourably, had neutral or indifferent attitudes towards diversity and were moderately tolerant of outgroups. Respondents who indicated they had a positive attitude towards multiculturalism demonstrated lower ethnocentrism scores. Those who were moderately tolerant of outgroups also had low ethnocentrism scores. Moreover, a simultaneous regression analysis showed that education was also an important predictor of attitudes to multiculturalism. In addition, a hierarchical preference for outgroups was also found in the study. These findings implicate the necessity for Australian research focusing on mutual and reciprocal attitudes of all migrants focusing on cultural diversity and immigration attitudes.
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Ethnocentrism: Attitudes to Cultural Diversity and Immigration in Western Australia

With immigration increasing on a worldwide basis, the management of cultural diversity has become an important issue debated in most western countries. Presently, over 175 million people reside outside their country of origin (United Nations, 2002). In particular, Australia, America, Canada, and New Zealand have similar net migration with almost one quarter of their populations born overseas (ABS, 2007a). In 2006, the Australian Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs stated that over 131,593 individuals emigrated to Australia that year (ABS, 2007a). Of those, the largest proportion of entrants to Australia was UK born migrants (17.1%, ABS, 2007b). During 2005-2006 Western Australia saw a 12.4 % increase in migrants who nominated the state as their intended place of residence (ABS, 2007b). Many of these new residents have settled in Perth, a multicultural city consisting of over 236 nationalities (Pemble, 2007). With 142, 430 English-born people now living in Perth, UK migrants are the largest migrant population residing in the state (ABS, 2007c). They make up 10 percent of Perth’s general population and account for over 30 percent of the population of Perth’s northern cities, Joondalup and Wanneroo (Pemble, 2007).

Attitudes towards Multiculturalism

As a result of immigration trends, the Australian population consists of many diverse ethnic and cultural groups, or ‘ethnocultural groups’. Ho (1990) asserted the term diversity to reflect the degree of variation in language, cultural traditions, and religions between groups. Australia is therefore defined as a culturally plural society where many ethnocultural groups reside within a social and political structure (Simon & Lynch, 1999). In response to increasing cultural diversity, policies of multiculturalism have been implemented in Australia and other western countries.
Multiculturalism encourages diversity and integration, whilst also promoting the rights of all residents to live as culturally different beings in one plural society (Berry, 2001). Multiculturalism is also recognised as part of a framework that addresses equal opportunities and creates social equality for all members of society such that all members of society are treated equally and fairly. That is, individuals who support (are tolerant of ethnic groups) and encourage such variation within a society are said to be supportive of the concepts of multiculturalism and social equality, and are therefore, likely to hold positive attitudes towards diversity and immigration (Berry, 2006).

The relationship between attitudes to diversity and multiculturalism has scarcely been explored from a nondominant group’s perspective. Instead, much research has been conducted among members of the dominant group within a society, (e.g., Australians within Australia). It is mooted that this approach to promoting social cohesion in culturally plural societies is no longer acceptable (Berry, 2006). Moreover, if a policy of multiculturalism is to be effective, then it is essential to examine the attitudes of all groups in society. Berry (2006) stresses that it is only through a mutual approach to intercultural relations that complex intergroup relations can be understood and effectively managed. The present study has adopted this mutual approach to examining diversity, by investigating attitudes towards such diversity with the largest nondominant group in Australia; migrants from the United Kingdom.

With regard to factors influencing attitudes to diversity and multiculturalism, Ho (1990) indicated ethnocentrism was a significant predictor of attitudes, such that high levels of ethnocentrism were related to a rejection of the policy of multiculturalism and its underlying dimensions. Ethnocentrism is defined as an
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attitude derived of values from one’s own cultural background, which, are applied to a particular cultural context (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Symbols defining one’s own cultural, ethnic or national ingroup become objects of pride and veneration whereas cultural or historical symbols of outgroups (all other groups) may become objects arousing indifference or hatred and negativity. The term ethnocentrism has become commonly used to depict an individual’s attitude and emotional reaction to collective symbols of the cultural ‘other’ (e.g., an ethnic group; Sumner, 1906 in H. Tajfel). Although, ethnocentrism is associated with a negative affect toward outgroups, it can have positive effects on an ingroup identity. For example, if ethnocentrism is contrived of a positive idealist component by which the ingroup seeks positive distinctiveness, it is possible that an increase in the ingroups perceived level of self esteem may occur (Tajfel, 1978). This ethnocentric tendency for ingroup favouritism has been identified in many societies, leading LeVine and Campbell to claim that it is a universal feature of intergroup relations. For the purposes of this research, ethnocentrism serves as a measure of intolerance for those who are different to the ingroup as well as a measure of one’s rejection of diversity. It is acknowledged that groups may express respect for other groups (noted in immigration policies) and individuals can vary in the degree to which they tolerate outgroups and favour the ingroup.

There have been few empirical studies that have examined attitudes to immigrants and cultural diversity in Australia. One source of information is derived from data produced by the 1988/89 survey of Australian attitudes conducted by the Office of Multicultural Affairs (OMA, 1989). The survey collected data from 4,502 respondents who were Australian born and from non-English speaking backgrounds. The survey focused on a multitude of issues, including attitudes to immigration and
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multiculturalism. Several researchers (Betts, 1991; 2005; Goot, 1993; McAllister, 1993) have examined the data and have produced conflicting interpretations of the findings. Betts (1991) argued that the 1988/89 OMA survey data reflected minimal support for the maintenance of cultural pluralism in Australia. On the contrary, McAllister (1993) argued the data indicated a high level of support for multiculturalism in Australia. Finally, Goot (1993) claimed that previous researchers had misinterpreted the data that he argued indicated the majority of respondents were neutral or indifferent in their attitudes to multiculturalism. In his analysis, Goot found those who were supportive of multiculturalism were born in Asia or Europe, whilst those who lacked support for the policy were of Australian or UK heritage. As Goot suggests perhaps these findings do reflect the notion that Australians may well be neutral or indifferent in their attitudes towards multiculturalism. These conflicting and unresolved findings emphasise the importance of the present research examining attitudes towards diversity and immigration and accentuate the need for more research in the area.

In addition, Ho (1990) found evidence to suggest the policy of multiculturalism was not supported by Australians, and that Australians did not have positive attitudes towards immigrants. Ho (1990) surveyed 159 Anglo-Australian respondents' attitudes to multiculturalism in Darwin, Australia. He focused on the level of support for the policy of multiculturalism, and the level of support for its underlying dimensions. These dimensions included whether the policy would benefit society by creating social cohesion, upholding social justice and ensuring equality for all members of Australian society. The findings indicated a discrepancy between support for the policy and its underlying dimensions. More specifically, the overall strong level of support for the underlying dimension of multiculturalism did not
convert to an overall support for the policy, which was moderately supported by respondents. Ho’s findings emphasised that ethnocentrism, rather than one’s ethnocentric tendency to favour the ingroup, was a significant predictor of attitudes to diversity and towards the policy of multiculturalism.

In a more recent study of attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration, Betts (2005) examined data from the Australian Election Studies (seven post election surveys taken from 1990-2004) and the 2003 Australian Survey of Social Attitudes. Betts found that both multiculturalism and immigration attitudes have become more positive in recent years in Australian, English speaking (England, Ireland, and New Zealand) and non-English speaking groups within Australia. In the most recent election survey (2004), these attitudes have remained positive with respondents indicating they would support an increase in immigration to Australia. Importantly, the survey data indicated the majority of migrants were more supportive of the migration of ingroup members to Australia than ethnic outgroups. Interestingly, more than any other group, UK born Australians were significantly more likely to encourage the immigration of their UK compatriots than non-English speaking groups surveyed. This finding was indicative of the importance of examining UK migrant’s attitudes within a culturally plural society such as Australia.

*Theoretical Perspective of Attitudes to Immigrant Groups and Immigration*

Pertinent to the analysis of intergroup relations is the application of social psychological theories. The current research utilised the social identity theory (SIT) perspective, which states that individuals are motivated to categorise and evaluate themselves and members of the ingroup positively (Tajfel, 1978). It is through the process of social comparisons, where ingroup members compare their group status with other groups that this positive distinction emerges. Upward, favourable
comparisons of the ingroup are salient to the formation of positive self esteem (Schmitt, Branscombe, Silvia, Garcia, & Spears, 2006). Consequently, positive ingroup and negative outgroup evaluations (such as categorising outgroups as inferior) are reinforced by the need for a positive self concept (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990).

The phenomenon of ingroup favouritism is well researched in social psychology (Berry & Kalin, 1996). Ethnocentrism can be assumed to be one consequence of social identification manifested through ingroup favouritism and outgroup derogation where the more ethnocentric individual is less tolerant of ethnic groups (Sumner, 1906 cited in H. Tajfel.). LeVine and Campbell (1972) affirmed ingroup favouritism and outgroup derogation as key aspects of ethnocentrism. The social psychological study of the tendency to evaluate the ingroup more positively than outgroups has led to a considerable body of evidence demonstrating this ingroup bias effect (Berry, 2006). In particular, this ingroup preference has been linked to evidence of ethnic hierarchies and concepts of social distance (Hagendoorn, Drogendijk, Hraba & Tumanov, 1998; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2006; Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000).

There is evidence to suggest a preference hierarchy based on shared cultural values and beliefs within and between groups. Hagendoorn (1993) suggested that groups are ranked closer to, or further away from the ingroup based on the degree of similarity between ingroup and outgroups values. International researchers have found evidence of such ingroup favouritism and preference hierarchies (Berry & Kalin, 1979; 1996, Hagendoorn, 1993; 1995; Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior, 2004; Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). These studies showed dominant groups (Canadian, French-Canadian, Dutch) evaluated ethnic groups of Western and Northern European
The present research recognises that ethnocentrism is one predictor of attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration. Research conducted in the area of intercultural relations has determined that when an individual identifies with a group, they often demonstrate ingroup favouritism and evaluate outgroups less positively than the ingroup. Unlike multicultural ideology, ethnocentrism is the degree of ingroup favouritism expressed and pertains to the general rejection of ethnic groups under the proposition that equality between groups would decrease positive distinctiveness for the ingroup and therefore, may decrease the level of ingroup favouritism. Berry (2006) asserts that these two ideologies (ingroup favouritism and social equality or tolerance for outgroups) are aspects of ethnocentrism. These models of ethnocentrism are hypothesised to relate to attitudes to multicultural ideology and the perceived consequences of immigration in that, when an individual demonstrates ethnocentrism they are less tolerant of outgroups and are likely to be less supportive of cultural diversity.

This research focused upon the attitudes of the largest migrant group in Australia: UK migrants. This research aimed to examine whether UK migrants’ attitudes are similar or different to those found in previous research, to provide a clearer understanding of one of the many social groups who have been largely ignored within the domain of intercultural relations. Historically, researchers have posited that UK and Australian cultures are similar and as a result, these groups are mooted to share beliefs and values. For this reason, UK migrants have received little attention in Australian research focusing on ethnic relations (Stratton, 2000; Beswick & Hill, 1972). This study examined whether there was a relationship between
ethnocentrism and attitudes to diversity and immigration amongst a UK migrant population. This study investigated whether ethnocentrism is demonstrated through ingroup favouritism and tolerance for outgroups and whether these forms of ethnocentrism would be indicative of attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration. Specifically, this study examined whether there is negative relationship between ethnocentrism and attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration such that the more ethnocentric person would have less favourable attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration.

Method

Research Design

The research utilises a correlation design. Attitudes towards diversity and immigration were measured using existing scales from the International Study of Attitudes to Immigration and Settlement instrument (ISATIS; Berry, Bourhis & Kalin, 1999 adapted to Australia by Pe-Pua, 2001) with a sample of UK migrants. The relationships among variables analysed using correlation and regression analysis.

Note. The study was conducted in conjunction with a companion research project conducted by Nikki Isaacson such that there is a single questionnaire package for all participants.

Participants

There were 107 participants ranging in ages from 20 to 83 years with a mean age of 50 years (SD = 12.89). Two participants did not indicate their age. Of the total sample, 59 (55.1%) were female and 47 (43.9%) were male (one participant did not respond to this question). The majority of participants (74.8%) were born in England. In addition, 6.5 percent indicated they were born in Scotland, 4.7 percent
stated they were born in Northern Ireland, and 2.8 percent specified they were born in Wales. Eleven participants indicated they were UK born. The majority of participants (77.6 %) indicated they were Australian citizens and 20.6 percent were permanent residents of Australia. Two did not provide this information. Participants indicated they had been residing in Perth, Western Australia for a maximum of 47 years as citizens \( (M = 12 \text{ years}, SD = 11.18) \) and had been as permanent residents for 6 months to 60 years \( (M = 22.5, SD = 14.7) \). The majority of participants described themselves as Protestant (50.5 %), 29.9 percent classified themselves as having no religion, and 17.8 percent stated they were Roman Catholic. With respect to level of education, 4.7 percent had completed primary school, 30.8 percent completed secondary school, 32.7 percent had technical or college credentials, 22.4 percent had a complete university degree or partially completed a university degree, and 8.4 percent indicated they had obtained a post graduate degree as their highest completed qualification. A small number of participants (6.5 %) were studying at post secondary level. Two participants did not provide any education-based information.

Measures

The questionnaire was completed by the participants, and measured factors relating to social diversity and immigration (see Appendix A). It incorporates the ISATIS questionnaire (Berry, Bourhis, & Kalin, 1999; adapted to Australia by Pe-Pua, 2001). The ISATIS questionnaire package contained core variables. These were background variables or demographic information including age, gender, birthplace, and length of residence in Australia and ethnicity variables including information such as ethnic identity, and strength of identity. The questionnaire also included a measure of attitudes towards diversity (Multicultural Ideology Scale). Attitudes toward immigration were also assessed (Perceived Consequences of Immigration and
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Diversity Scale and Immigration and Population Level Scale). These core scales were shared by the companion research project. A second predictor variable, specific to this research was attitudes towards social equality, which compromised of two components; outgroup tolerance (Ethnocentrism measure; formerly Social Equality Scale) and Social Dominance Orientation. An additional measure of attitudes to ethnic/immigrant groups or rather ethnocentrism (Ethnic Attitudes Scale) also specific to this research project was included in the questionnaire package.

The Multicultural Ideology scale consisted of ten items designed to assess attitudes toward cultural diversity. An example item is ‘Australians should recognise that cultural and racial diversity is a fundamental characteristic of Australian society’. A total score was computed for participants, by summing their responses (possible range = 10 to 70). High scores indicated more positive attitudes towards multiculturalism and diversity. Internal consistency for the Multicultural Ideology Scale was found to be high in the Australian pilot study, with Cronbach’s alpha = .83 (Pe-Pua & Dandy, 2006). Furthermore, Berry and Kalin (1995) indicated high consistency (alpha = .80) for this scale.

The Perceived Consequences of Immigration and Diversity scale included 11 items designed to assess cultural, economic, and personal consequences of immigration. These items reflect the negative consequences ‘With more immigration Australians would lose their identity’ (reverse-scored cultural consequences example) and positive consequences ‘The presence of immigrants will not make wages lower’ of immigration (economic consequences example). An example of personal consequence items is ‘Immigration increases the level of crime in Australia’ (reverse-scored). Responses were summed for each participant to give a total score, ranging from 11 to 77. High scores indicate a positive attitude to immigration.
Internal consistency for the Perceived Consequences of Immigration Scale was also high .85.

The Immigration and Population Level scale is made up of three items: One statement was ‘Overall, there is too much immigration to Australia’, to which participants respond using a seven-point Like scale that ranged from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’. Participants were also asked to indicate their views of the current Australian population level, on a response scale of 1 (too small) to 7 (too large), with a midpoint of 4 (about right); and to indicate a desirable future Australian population level, from 1 (much smaller population) to 7 (much larger population).

The Outgroup Tolerance scale (formerly the social equality scale), which is specific to this research project, consisted of 7 items designed to measure social equality beliefs (i.e., outgroup tolerance). An example item is ‘We should promote equality among all Australians, regardless of race or ethnic origin’. A total score was computed for participants by summing their responses (possible range = 11 to 77). High scores on the outgroup tolerance variable indicated a higher level of tolerance for outgroups and predicted the level of ethnocentrism experienced (i.e., the higher the score, the more tolerant of outgroups and the lower level of ethnocentrism).

The Social Dominance scale (a second measure of tolerance), also specific to this project, consisted of 4 items designed to measure beliefs of ingroup superiority and status. An example is ‘Some people are just inferior to others’. A total score was computed for participants by summing their responses on a possible range from 11-44. High scores on the social dominance orientation scale indicate low levels of social dominance and are predictive of a lower level of ethnocentrism (i.e., the higher the score, the less socially dominant and the less likely one is to be supportive of
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inequality towards outgroups). Internal consistency for the Tolerance scales (Outgroup Tolerance and Social Dominance) was also relatively high at .74 (Pe-Pua & Dandy, 2006).

The Ethnic Attitudes Scale or ‘feeling thermometer’ (Judd, Park, Brauer, Ryan, & Kraus, 1995) was specific to this research project. The scale was an estimated assessment of ethnocentric attitudes towards 23 specific target groups. It consisted of one question stem that required participants to rate their attitudes toward many social groups on a scale of 0° (extremely unfavourable) to 100° (extremely favourable). Included in these scales were the UK born target groups (e.g., English, Irish, Scottish, Welsh, and Australian) as well as outgroups of interest (e.g., Muslim, Jewish, Croatian, and Australian). These target groups were required to rate their own group along with all 22 other target social groups on the 100-point scale.

All other scales in the questionnaire package, not described in detail are related to the companion research project. These scales measured perceptions of security (Cultural, Economic and Personal Security Scales) and intergroup competition, which was measured using the Intergroup Incompatible Goal Scale (Jackson & Smith, 1999).

Procedure

Participants were recruited through several strategies. Firstly, questionnaires were distributed to family and friends using the snowballing technique (Lindloff, 1995). Snowball sampling involved the researcher approaching acquaintances and asking if they could suggest any people who may be interested in participating in the study and then contacting those people formally to ask them if they would like to participate. Those who expressed interest in participating in the study were then asked if they knew of anyone who may also be interested in taking part. In addition,
an article was placed in a community newspaper, which are circulated around the Joondalup and Wanneroo catchments areas (see Appendix B). This area is highly populated by UK migrants (Pemble, 2007). Interested persons were invited to phone or email the researchers for further information. They were then posted or hand delivered a questionnaire, information letter and self addressed postage paid envelope. Moreover, flyers (see Appendix C) were printed and the researchers conducted a letterbox drop in the northern suburbs of Perth. In addition, posters (see Appendix D) were placed on notice boards in shopping centres and libraries in several Northern suburbs of Perth.

All prospective participants were provided with an information letter (see Appendix E) and were given a verbal description of the study by the researcher. Participants were provided with the opportunity to telephone the researcher to ask questions prior to completion of the questionnaire. Once participants were recruited they were asked to complete the questionnaire that took approximately 20 minutes and were asked to return it to the researcher. In addition, participants were given the option to complete a raffle ticket to enter a draw to win a $50 voucher for a department store. Participants were required to submit their telephone number and initials. To maintain confidentiality, this was removed immediately upon the researcher having receipt of the questionnaire.

Results

*Attitudes to Diversity and Immigration: Reliability and Descriptive Statistics*

Results of the Multicultural Ideology scale showed that a large majority of UK migrants fell within the neutral range of attitudes towards the policy of multiculturalism. In general, participants \((n = 107)\) had a total mean score of 43.88 \((SD = 11.54)\) on a possible range of 11-77. Internal reliability was high with
Cronbach’s alpha = .89. In general, responses to the Perceived Consequences of Immigration scale were in the negative to neutral range with a total mean score of 53.16 (SD = 12.29) on a possible range of 11-111. This may indicate participants (n = 107) perceived immigration to negatively affect Australian culture. Internal reliability was high, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .90. In general, responses to the outgroup tolerance scale indicated participants (n = 107) were less tolerant of immigrant and ethnic groups, with a total mean score of 35.57 (SD = 8.24) on a possible range of 11-77. Internal consistency was high, with a Cronbach’s alpha = .86.

The Ethnic Attitudes Scale was utilised to determine participants’ overall attitude to their ingroup and twenty-two specified target groups, as well as to calculate an average ethnocentrism score. Ingroup identification was calculated for each ingroup (English, Northern Irish, Scottish, Welsh and Australian-English). Respondents were required to state their ingroup membership and the strength to which they felt a part of this group. For example, those who strongly identified as English were classified as English whereas respondents who stated they were born in England but more strongly identified as Australian were recoded as Australian for the purposes of these calculations. Overall, the mean attitude towards all twenty-two target groups was positive (n = 107, M = 61.72, SD = 16.53). Nonetheless, participants rated the ingroup more favourably than all target groups (see Table 1) such that they tended to be ethnocentric. The second measure of Ethnocentrism (derived from the ethnic attitudes scale) (n = 107) was computed by calculating the average ingroup and average outgroup rating and then subtracting the social distance of the ingroup rating from the average outgroup distance rating. Positive social distance ratings indicate the degree to which the ingroup value their group on an
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acceptance hierarchy. For example, the higher the positive score the more ethnocentric the ingroup. Negative social distance ratings indicate that the ingroup places their group lower on a hierarchy than other target groups. For example, the lower the negative score the less ethnocentric the ingroup. In general, the majority of participants indicated a low level of ethnocentrism (ingroup favouritism) with a mean ethnocentrism score of 23.08 ($SD = 18.80$).

Table 1.

*Means and standard deviation scores of UK migrants' overall attitudes towards each outgroup on the Ethnic Attitudes scale.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>81.64 (19.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>80.54 (18.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>76.95 (19.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>75.78 (19.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>75.54 (19.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>74.36 (19.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>72.07 (18.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>69.57 (18.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>65.87 (20.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>62.68 (22.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>62.43 (22.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal-Australian</td>
<td>61.43 (27.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>61.42 (23.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>60.64 (23.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>58.17 (22.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>57.15 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>55.77 (24.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>55.51 (25.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>54.51 (23.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>47.43 (25.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>44.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>43.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>43.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Controlling for Background Variables

Bivariate correlations were conducted on age and its relationship to the several variables (attitudes to multiculturalism, perceived consequences of immigration and outgroup tolerance). A significant relationship was found between age and outgroup tolerance. This negative correlation between age and outgroup tolerance indicated that older participants were less tolerant of outgroups ($n = 105$, $r = -.23, p < .05$). There was no relationship between age and attitudes to multiculturalism ($n = 107$, $r = -.18, p = .06$), perceived consequences of immigration ($n = 105$, $r = -.11, p = .281$) or average ethnic attitude ($n = 105$, $r = -.01, p = .91$).

Independent samples t-tests were computed to examine the effect of gender on attitudes to multiculturalism, perceived consequences of immigration, outgroup tolerance and the second measure of ethnocentrism (derived from the Ethnic Attitudes scale). In general, females had more positive attitudes to multiculturalism ($n = 59$, $M = 45.44$, $SD = 10.55$) than males ($n = 47$, $M = 41.8$, $SD = 12.59$). However, t-tests indicated there were no significant differences in attitudes between men and women on these measures.

One-Way ANOVAS were conducted to examine the relationship between education and attitudes to multiculturalism, perceived consequences of immigration, outgroup tolerance and ethnocentrism. There was a significant main effect of education on attitudes to multiculturalism $F(5, 106) = 4.51, p < .05$. Post hoc comparisons indicated that as educational level increased, attitudes to multiculturalism became more positive. In particular, participants who completed primary school ($n = 5$, $M = 33.2$, $SD = 2.28$), completed high school ($n = 33$, $M = 39.97$, $SD = 11.2$) or had Technical college qualifications ($n = 35$, $M = 43.61$, $SD = 10.51$) had less positive attitudes to immigration than those who had completed or
partially completed university \((n = 24, M = 49.21, SD = 11.98)\) and those who had obtained postgraduate qualifications \((n = 9, M = 50.33, SD = 10.43)\). Significant differences in attitudes to multiculturalism were found between those who completed primary school and those who completed or partially completed university \((p < .05)\) or postgraduate level education \((p < .05)\); and between those who completed high school and those who completed or had partially completed university \((p < .05)\).

A second One-Way ANOVA was conducted to examine whether educational attainment was associated with the perceived consequences of immigration. This effect was significant \(F(4,101) = 2.57, p < .05\). However, post hoc comparisons did not reveal any differences between the levels of education attained by participants and the perceived consequences of immigration. A One-Way ANOVA was conducted to explore the relationship between education and outgroup tolerance. This analysis did not reveal any differences in attitudes between groups \(F (4, 101) = 1.73, p = .15\). In general, tolerance for immigrant and ethnic groups increased with level of education attained. A further One-Way ANOVA was conducted on education and Ethnocentrism which found no significant differences between groups in attitudes to target groups \(F(4, 101) = 1.77, p = .14\).

To examine whether there were differences between citizens and permanent residents’ attitudes towards multiculturalism and toward the consequences of immigration, levels of ethnocentrism and outgroup tolerance; several independent samples t-tests were computed. No significant differences were found between citizens and permanent residents.

The Relationship between Ethnocentrism and Attitudes to Diversity and Immigration

Bivariate correlations for the criterion variables attitudes to multiculturalism, and perceived consequences of immigration and predictor variables outgroup
tolerance and ethnocentrism are provided in Table 2. As is evident from the table, correlations were high and significant for all variables. A positive relationship between attitudes to multiculturalism and perceived consequences of immigration was identified, such that those who had positive attitudes to multiculturalism were more positive of immigration. Moreover, the relationship between the attitudes to multiculturalism and outgroup tolerance was positive, such that those who had positive views towards multiculturalism were also more tolerant of immigrant and ethnic groups. Negative relationships were evident between attitudes to multiculturalism, perceived consequences of immigration, ethnocentrism and outgroup tolerance, indicating that positive attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration were associated with lower ethnocentrism scores. In line with this, outgroup tolerance was negatively correlated with ethnocentrism such that those who were more tolerant of immigrant and ethnic groups were less ethnocentric.

Table 2.
Correlations Between the Multicultural Ideology Scale, Perceived Consequences of Immigration, Outgroup Tolerance and Ethnocentrism Scales (n = 107).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multicultural Ideology</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>-.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived Consequences of Immigration</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outgroup Tolerance</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** p < .01.

Based on the pattern of relationships described above, two multiple regression analyses were conducted. A stepwise regression was conducted to examine the respective influences of the predictor variables ethnocentrism and
outgroup tolerance on the criterion variable attitudes to multiculturalism, whilst controlling for the background variable education. Both predictors; ethnocentrism and outgroup tolerance are assumed to be related to the concept of ethnocentrism and are therefore included together in the analysis, according to the simultaneous procedure. The results are summarised in Table 3. The resulting model for attitudes to multiculturalism was significant when all predictors were included in the analyses which accounted for 63% of variance in attitudes (adjusted R squared change .04) $F(1, 102) = 57.87, p < .05$. All predictors; Ethnocentrism $t(102) = -2.83, p < .05$ (standardised $\beta = -.21$), Education $t(102) = 3.15, p < .05$ (standardised $\beta = .20$), Outgroup tolerance $t(102) = 7.97, p < .05$ (standardised $\beta = .58$) made significant and unique contributions to predicting attitudes to multiculturalism. These findings are consistent with the above analyses and indicate that those who are less tolerant of immigrants and ethnic groups and are more ethnocentric and are less likely to have positive attitudes to multiculturalism. Furthermore, the regression indicated that individuals who were more educated were less ethnocentric, more tolerant, and were therefore likely to be more positive to multiculturalism.

The second simultaneous model examined the relationship between the predictor variables ethnocentrism and outgroup tolerance on the criterion variable perceived consequences of immigration. This was significant when both predictors were included in the procedure (see Table 4). Outgroup tolerance and ethnocentrism accounted for 58.5% (adjusted R squared change .24) of variance in the perceived consequences of immigration $F(1, 104) = 73.38, p < .05$. These predictors; Ethnocentrism $t(104) = -3.55, p < .05$ (standardised $\beta = -.27$) and Outgroup tolerance $t(104) = 7.75, p < .05$ (standardised $\beta = .59$) These findings are consistent with the above analyses that those who are more tolerant of outgroups will be less
ethnocentric and therefore, be more likely to view the perceived consequences of immigration positively.

Table 3.

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitudes to Multiculturalism (n = 107).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Tolerance</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Tolerance</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R² = .59 for step 1; ΔR² = .04 for step 2 (ps < .05*).

Table 4.

Summary of Stepwise Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Perceived Consequences of Immigration (n = 107).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Tolerance</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.59*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R² = .35 for Step 1; ΔR² = .24 for step 2 (ps < .05*).
Discussion

It was found that the majority of respondents were neutral or indifferent in their attitudes towards multiculturalism and in line with this, the majority of respondents were moderately tolerant of outgroups. Moreover, ethnocentrism was found to be negatively related to attitudes to multiculturalism such that, respondents who had positive attitudes to multiculturalism scored lower on a measure of ethnocentrism. In addition, ethnocentrism was negatively related to tolerance for outgroups such that respondents who were more tolerant of outgroups scored lower on a measure of ethnocentrism. There was a positive relationship between attitudes to multiculturalism and the perceived consequences of immigration such that respondents who had positive attitudes to multiculturalism believed that immigration would benefit Australian society. In line with this, respondents who indicated they were tolerant of outgroups and supported equal opportunities for all members of society, believed immigration to be valuable for society. In support of this, ethnocentrism was negatively related to the perceived consequences of immigration such that respondents who scored lower on a measure of ethnocentrism had more positive views of immigration. In particular, outgroup tolerance and ethnocentrism significantly contributed to the prediction of attitudes to multiculturalism and immigration. These results are consistent with Canadian findings by Berry (2001; 2006) and serve to resolve the discrepancy between Betts (1991), Goot (1993) and McAllister (1993). One inconsistency with the present research was that Ho (1990) found Australians did not have positive views towards multiculturalism and the majority of his participants had higher levels of ethnocentrism than the level found in this study.
In addition, this research found significant differences between levels of education and attitudes to multiculturalism also found by previous researchers (Ho, Niles Penney & Thomas, 1994; Reufle, Ross, & Mandell, 1992). Three clusters of differences in attitudes to multiculturalism were found. Respondents who completed primary school or some high school had less favourable attitudes than those who completed (partially) a university degree. Furthermore, respondents who completed high school were less positive in their attitudes than those who completed (partially) completed a university degree. Finally, those who completed some high school had less favourable attitudes than respondents who had obtained a postgraduate level education. This difference is consistent with the findings of previous research and lends support to the conclusion that those with limited education are less supportive of cultural diversity in general. For example, Ho et al. (1994) found education to be the only significant and consistent demographic predictor of attitudes towards multiculturalism. Their findings indicated respondents with higher levels of educational attainment were more supportive of multiculturalism. However, a limitation of Ho et al. (1994) research is that education was measured with a single item. Future studies should include an increased number of items to examine the generalisability of these findings and whether they can be replicated in alternate local contexts, using a larger sample.

One difference between the current findings and previous research was that no differences in gender, or age were noted. This was unexpected, as a number of researchers have found females to have more positive attitudes than males and younger participants to be more positive than older participants. Further, it was anticipated that there could be differences between permanent residents and citizens due to the notion that residents may view themselves as a migrant group and thus,
have different views on immigration than citizens. It is recommended that future research investigate whether these non-significant findings would be replicated in a larger population or if the findings were specific to the population examined.

A further important finding of the research is that the sample indicated an ingroup preference. This ingroup preference demonstrated the expression of ethnocentrism, rather there was clear evidence the ingroup had more positive evaluations of their own group than other groups (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Whilst preliminary examinations of the data indicated that there were differences in the degree of ingroup preference, small sample sizes prevented the measurement of between group effects. Future research could examine whether this demonstration of ethnocentrism is universal and is reciprocated by mutual groups in society.

It should also be noted that the sample ranked Australians more favourably on a preference hierarchy than their ingroup. One explanation for this result may be that a large percentage of the sample identified as Australian rather than as their ethnic identity. Moreover, there may have been an underlying assumption that the ingroup values are the same as Australian values and therefore respondents were unable to transcend the frame of their own value system (Hagendoorn, 1993). This form of status thinking may have emerged from UK migrants’ acceptance of the dominant group’s lifestyle and values. Whilst this difference in rankings was minimal and it may be that UK migrants do not perceive themselves to be different from Australians, the findings are ambiguous and raise questions on the strength of ingroup identification and the need to maintain a positive social identity. Future research should explore this finding using qualitative techniques such as focus group interviews, or in-depth interviews.
In this research, the analyses of ethnocentrism also involved examining the degree of ingroup preference and outgroup tolerance. Based on previous Western research, there was an assumption that UK migrants would rank target groups in accordance with other preference hierarchies previously discovered (Berry, 2001, 2006; Berry & Kalin, 1996; Hagendoorn, 1995; Hagendoorn, Drogendijk, Hraba, & Tumanov, 1998; Ho et al. 1994; Verkuyten & Kinket, 2000). First, the findings are indicative of a consensual cumulative preference hierarchy, that is there is an implicit agreement as to which groups are placed high and low on the hierarchy. Second, this ranking is consistent with a social psychological perspective that group positions are based on the need to maintain a positive social identity. Therefore, ingroup members differentiate between in-and-out groups in ways that favour the ingroup on the basis of positive or negative differentiation. Therefore, groups who share similar values are ranked more highly and closer to the ingroup than groups perceived to be culturally different. The present research findings extend on previous research by suggesting that nondominant and migrant groups in Australia also share in the consensual hierarchy found globally in dominant groups (Berry & Kalin, 1996).

This research focused upon respondents’ attitudes to 22-target groups. This number may have led to greater variation in distances perceived from each target group and have affected the overall ethnocentrism value calculated. Given that there were large variations in scores for low placed groups, it would be beneficial to examine whether respondent’s ethnocentrism level would be different with a smaller number of target groups. Moreover, some participants indicated they were frustrated when completing the ethnic attitudes scale. It is unlikely that respondents from the northern suburbs of Perth have had sufficient contact with all 22-target groups to make decisions on which groups are favourable and this may have caused some
irritation. This issue raises the question of whether contact and forms of contact (e.g., media contact or contact with friends, neighbours, work colleagues) with each group would have altered respondents' favourability ratings. For example, the negative impact of world events such as September 11/2001 and the Cronulla Riots in Sydney in 2006 may have led to the rating of Muslim, Arab and Lebanese at the lower end of the hierarchy rather than this effect being a personal and psychological rejection of these outgroups.

As far as causality is concerned, the present study is predicated on the assumption that when group members are more tolerant of outgroups and perceive immigration as a positive they are more favourable in their attitudes to multiculturalism. Causal effects can only be implied due to the correlational nature of the research. Although, we do not know the cause of negative attitudes to multiculturalism or immigration, the consensus found in this sample and in previous research suggests socially shared knowledge about status and group characteristics may be guiding evaluations of ethnic groups.

The present research explored the attitudes of one group of migrants residing in a multicultural society who face the task of living with cultural diversity. This research precludes to the importance of understanding attitudes to multiculturalism, cultural diversity and immigration from the perspectives of both dominant and nondominant, majority and minority social group members. The overarching aim of the present research was to make a significant contribution to international academic research considering the antecedents and correlates of attitudes to immigration and to achieve wider recognition for Australian based research in this area. It further aimed to integrate past and present research to generate findings that will be relevant to the development of future research, policy making and program development in areas
pertaining to immigration and ethnic relations, in particular, for the benefit of UK migrants in Australia. Whist past research has largely focused upon alternate demographics and has sparsely considered the impact of UK migrants on the host culture and vice versa; the area remains vital to the field of ethnic relations and is by no means exhaustive. This study and its significant findings represents a need not only for more focus upon UK migrants as an important demographic residing in Australia but the research also embodies the necessity for more Australian research on the reciprocity of the views of all groups in society.

Moreover, investigating preference hierarchies could be an important guide for communities facing the migration of a new immigrant population. Knowledge of negative attitudes to low placed groups could help prevent potential conflicts and allow for a more positive transition for immigrants and the host community whilst also help maintain existing intergroup relations. The plurality of intercultural relations involves a need for recognition that multiethnic groups views on the effects of immigration must be exhaustively examined so that we as a society understand can build, strengthen and maintain intergroup relationships within and exceeding our global borders.
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DIVERSITY ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.

About this survey:

In this survey we are asking questions about the variety of people who live in Australia. Many of the questions are in the form of opinion; there are no right or wrong answers. We believe that everyone is entitled to their own opinion.

Confidentiality:

Your answers will be kept confidential, which means your name will not appear anywhere. We will remove the raffle ticket as soon as the survey is returned, and store it separately from the survey. We will use the survey information for research purposes only. You can withdraw from this study at any time. However, it is very important for us to know your opinions, whatever they are.

Please turn over and begin the questionnaire
SECTION A: CULTURAL BACKGROUND

1. What is your cultural (ethnic) background?

[ ] Irish
[ ] English
[ ] British
[ ] Scottish
[ ] Welsh
[ ] Australian
[ ] Other (please write in) ________________________________

2. Cultural Identity:

People can think of themselves in various ways. For example, they may feel that they are members of various ethnic groups, such as Vietnamese (etc.), and that they are part of the larger society, Australia. These questions are about how you think of yourself in this respect.

a. How do you think of yourself?

*Please tick.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think of myself as ....................................
(e.g., Scottish, British, Irish, English or Welsh)

I think of myself as Australian

I think of myself as part of another ethnic group

What group? ...........................................
Now please complete the following questions relating to the cultural groups from
the previous question, that is, think of ‘Scottish’ (or British, Irish, English, Welsh)
where the blank spaces ‘..............’ are.

| b. | I feel that I am part of .............. culture. |
| c. | I am proud of being ................. |
| d. | I am happy to be ......................... |
| e. | I feel I am part of Australian culture. |
| f. | I am proud of being Australian. |
| g. | I am happy to be Australian. |
| h. | Being part of ......................... culture is embarrassing to me. |
| i. | Being ......................... is uncomfortable for me. |
| j. | Being part of ......................... makes me feel happy. |
| k. | Being ......................... makes me feel good. |

**SECTION B: SECURITY**

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following
statements, using a 7-point scale, where 1 means ‘totally disagree’ and 7 means
‘totally agree’. You are free to use all numbers between 1 and 7 to indicate varying
degrees of disagreement or agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There is room for a variety of languages and cultures in this country.  
2. We have to take steps to protect our cultural traditions from outside influences.  
3. Learning other languages makes us forget our own cultural traditions.
[SECURITY cont’d]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am rarely concerned about losing my cultural identity.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I feel culturally secure as ................. (British, English, Scottish, Welsh or Irish)  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
6. The high level of unemployment presents a grave cause for concern.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
7. This country is prosperous and wealthy enough for everyone to feel secure.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
8. High taxes make it difficult to have enough money for essentials.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
9. People spend too much time fretting about economic matters.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
10. A person's chances of living a safe, untroubled life are better today than ever before.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Our society is degenerating and likely to collapse into chaos.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
12. The reports of immoral and degenerate people in our society are grossly exaggerated.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
13. People's chances of being robbed, assaulted, and even murdered are getting higher and higher.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6

[Intergroup Goal Compatibility Scale]

14. The everyday concerns of my ethnic (cultural) group are not in line with the everyday interests of people from other ethnic groups.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
15. There is a basic conflict of interest between my ethnic (cultural) group and other ethnic groups.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
16. When other ethnic groups obtain their goals, it is harder for my ethnic (cultural) group to obtain its goals.  
    1 2 3 4 5 6
SECTION C: CULTURAL DIVERSITY [MULTICULTURAL IDEOLOGY SCALE]

For each statement below, please circle the number that best corresponds to your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strong Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Australians should recognize that cultural and racial diversity is a fundamental characteristic of Australian society.
2. We should help ethnic and cultural groups preserve their cultural heritages in Australia.
3. It is best for Australia if all people forget their different ethnic and cultural backgrounds as soon as possible.
4. A society that has a variety of ethnic and cultural groups is more able to tackle new problems as they occur.
5. The unity of this country is weakened by Australians of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds sticking to their old ways.
6. If Australians of different ethnic and cultural origins want to keep their own culture, they should keep it to themselves.
7. A society that has a variety of ethnic or cultural groups has more problems with national unity than societies with one or two basic cultural groups.
8. Australians should do more to learn about the customs and heritage of different ethnic and cultural groups in this country.
9. Immigrant parents must encourage their children to retain the culture and traditions of their homeland.
10. People who come to Australia should change their behaviour to be more like Australians.
### Tolerance Scale Items 1-7; Social Dominance Orientation Items 8 to 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is a bad idea for people of different races/ethnicities to marry one another.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-whites living here should not push themselves where they are not wanted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If employers only want to hire certain groups or people, that's their business.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It makes me angry when I see recent immigrants on television demanding the same rights as Australian citizens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recent immigrants should have as much say about the future of Australia as people who were born and raised here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is good to have people from different ethnic and racial groups living in the same country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We should promote equality among all Australians, regardless of racial or ethnic origin.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Some people are just inferior to others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: CONSEQUENCES OF IMMIGRATION AND DIVERSITY

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the 7 point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strong Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Australian children growing up surrounded by people of different ethnic backgrounds will be left without a solid cultural base.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel secure when I am with people from different ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Immigration tends to threaten Australian culture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. With more immigration Australians would lose their identity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If more immigrants come to Australia, there would be more unemployment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We will all benefit from the increased economic activity created by immigrants.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Immigrants take jobs away from other Australians.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The presence of immigrants will not make wages lower.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is no reason to think that our country is falling apart because of having a variety of ethnocultural groups.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Immigration increases the level of crime in Australia.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Immigration increases social unrest.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: POPULATION LEVEL

To give your answer to the following question, use a 7-point scale, where 1 means “too small”, 7 means “too large” and 4 means “just about right”. Feel free to use any number between 1 and 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too Small</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>Too Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>im1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that the Australian population is: too small, too large, or just about right. Reply by choosing the number that corresponds best with your opinion.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following question, the 7-point response scale means, 1 “much smaller population”, 7 “much larger population. Use any number from 1 to 7 to express your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Smaller Population</th>
<th>Much Larger Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>im2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the future, would you like to see Australia have a population that is much smaller, or much larger</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the next question, 1 means Strongly disagree, and 7 means Strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>im3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there is too much immigration to Australia.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION F: SOCIAL ATTITUDES [ETHNIC ATTITUDES SCALE]

Now I would like to find out about your attitudes toward several social groups living in Australia. I am going to ask you to use a scale like a thermometer to express your attitude. This attitude thermometer has numbers from 0 degrees to 100 degrees.

Here's how it works. If you have a favourable attitude toward members of a group, you would give the group a score somewhere between 50° and 100°, depending on how favourable your evaluation is of that group. On the other hand, if you have an unfavourable attitude toward members of a group, you would give them a score somewhere between 0° and 50°, depending on how unfavourable your evaluation is of that group.

Feel free to use any number between 0° and 100°.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unfavourable</th>
<th>Neither favourable nor unfavourable</th>
<th>Extremely favourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0°</td>
<td>10°</td>
<td>20°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30°</td>
<td>40°</td>
<td>50°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60°</td>
<td>70°</td>
<td>80°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90°</td>
<td>100°</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th></th>
<th>Aborigines</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th></th>
<th>Arabs</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Portuguese</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th></th>
<th>South American</th>
<th>Canadian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lebanese</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th></th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Polish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African</th>
<th></th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th></th>
<th>Croatian</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American</th>
<th></th>
<th>Serbian</th>
<th>Zealander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Islander</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION G: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Age: How old are you? _____ years

2. Sex: What is your gender?
   [ ] Female
   [ ] Male

3. Place of birth: In which country were you born? ____________________________

4. Education:
   a. What is the highest level of schooling that you have obtained?
      [ ] Primary school, or some high school
      [ ] Completed high school
      [ ] Technical, Community College (e.g., TAFE)
      [ ] Some University
      [ ] Complete University degree
      [ ] Post graduate degree

   b. Are you currently studying in post-secondary education?
      [ ] Yes
      [ ] No

   c. What is the highest level of schooling that your mother has obtained?
      [ ] Primary school, or some high school
      [ ] Completed high school
      [ ] Technical, Community College (e.g., TAFE)
      [ ] Some University
      [ ] Complete University degree
      [ ] Post graduate degree

5. Religion:

What is your religion?
   [ ] No religion
   [ ] Protestant
   [ ] Roman Catholic
   [ ] Greek Orthodox
   [ ] Other (please write in) ____________________________
   [ ] Jewish
   [ ] Muslim
   [ ] Buddhist
   [ ] Hindu
6. Employment
What work do you do? What is your occupation?

7. Length of residence:
How long have you lived in Australia? ____________ years

8. Citizenship and Residency:
a. Are you an Australian citizen?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
   If yes, for how long? ________ years

b. Are you a British citizen?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

c. Are you a Permanent Resident of Australia?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
6. Employment

What work do you do? What is your occupation?

7. Length of residence:
How long have you lived in Australia? ___________ years

8. Citizenship and Residency:

a. Are you an Australian citizen?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
   If yes, for how long? _______ years

b. Are you a British citizen?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

c. Are you a Permanent Resident of Australia?
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No
Britons sought for immigration study

Researchers from Duke
University in Durham,
North Carolina, are asking
for help from
1,000 British
students to form
an opinion
panel on
migration.

The students will be
asked to answer
questions about
their attitudes toward
immigration and the
impact it has on the
United Kingdom.

This study is part of a larger
project funded by the
British government.

The researchers are
hoping to use this data
to better understand
the Irish-American
community and its
views on immigration.

If you are interested in
participating, please
contact the researchers
at Duke University.

Ethnocentrism 78
Were you born in the United Kingdom?  
Would you like to share your thoughts about diversity and immigration?  
Then please contact us!  
We are students at Edith Cowan University completing our Honours degree in Psychology and we are interested in your views!  
If you are over 18 and a Permanent Resident or Citizen of Australia ...  
Please contact Nikki or Sophie on 0409104777
Were you....

Born in the United Kingdom?
Would you....
Like to share your thoughts about diversity and immigration?
Then....
Please contact us!
We are students at Edith Cowan University completing our Honours degree in Psychology and we are interested in your views!
If you are over 18 and a Permanent Resident or Citizen of Australia ...
Then
Please contact Nikki or Sophie on the phone number or email below
0409104777
nikkii@ecu.edu.au
smounsey@student.ecu.edu.au
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION LETTER

"Attitudes of UK-Born Individuals Towards Cultural Diversity and Immigration in Australia".

Dear Potential Participant,

We are Psychology students completing our Honours degree at Edith Cowan University. As part of our course, we are conducting research regarding attitudes towards diversity and immigration in Australia. It is part of a larger study of social attitudes that is being conducted by Dr Justine Dandy (contact details below).

You have been invited to participate because you were born in the United Kingdom and moved to Australia when you were at least 18 years of age and are permanent residents or citizens living in Perth, Western Australia.

The purpose of the project is to examine the relationships between UK born residents/citizens in Australia and attitudes to cultural diversity and immigration. In particular, we are investigating the factors that are associated with social identity and views about multiculturalism.

If you choose to participate in the study, you will be required to complete a survey. The survey contains questions about how you feel about diversity and immigration policy in Australia. Participants will also be asked to provide some background information, such as age and gender, and educational history. The survey will take approximately 45 minutes to an hour to complete.

If you are willing to participate, please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us at the university in the pre-paid envelope provided (no stamp required). Be sure to complete your details on the raffle ticket attached to the questionnaire. This ticket puts you in competition for a prize of a $50 voucher for a music store. The winner will be notified by mail or telephone. The raffle ticket with your details will be removed from the questionnaire once received by the researchers, and stored separately from your completed questionnaire.

Participation in this research is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time. You can also decline to answer questions if you wish. It is unlikely that you will experience any discomfort or stress but in the event that you do experience discomfort in completing the questions, and would like to discuss this further with a professional counsellor, please feel free to contact the ECU Psychological Services Centre (Tel. 9301 0011).

All data collected will be treated as confidential and no identifying information will be stored with the surveys. No names will be used in any reports written about the study and only group data will be examined. We shall assume that if we receive your completed survey, then you have consented to participate in this research.

Once the survey is completed, a copy of the report can be made available to you at your request. The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Community Studies, Education, and Social Sciences at Edith Cowan University.

If you have any questions or require any further information about this study, please feel free to contact us on the numbers below. If you have any additional questions concerning the rights of research participants, you may contact our supervisor on the number indicated below. Please keep this letter for your own reference.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and for your interest in our research.

Yours Sincerely,

Nikki Isaacson & Sophie Mounsey

Researchers
Nikki Isaacson  Sophie Mounsey
School of Psychology  School of Psychology
Edith Cowan University  Edith Cowan University
0409104777

Supervisor
Dr Justine Dandy
School of Psychology
Edith Cowan University
(08) 6304 5105
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