

The benefits of studying immigration for social psychology

Maykel Verkuyten 

Ercomer, Utrecht University

Correspondence

Maykel Verkuyten, Ercomer, Utrecht University.

E-mail: m.verkuyten@uu.nl

Received: 5 November 2017

Accepted: 13 November 2017

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2354>

Abstract

This Agenda article argues that studying the continuing world-wide migration and the resulting cultural diversity has specific benefits for social psychology: it raises new questions for the field, introduces new topics of research, and challenges conventional ways of thinking. The argument is developed in relation to four issues. The first one relates to the literature on ethnic and civic nationhood and the importance for social psychology to study citizenship and lay understandings of genetics. The second issue relates to the social psychological literature on threat and prejudice and the relative lack of interest in prosocial behavior and intergroup toleration. Third, the limiting implications of the majority–minority schematic framework that dominates in social psychology are discussed. Finally, the relevance of studying immigration for the evidentiary value movement that has developed in response to the current ‘crisis’ in (social) psychology is discussed.

Social psychological assumptions are at the core of the immigration debate, but compared to, for example, sociology, the policy community and the public does not consider social psychology very relevant for this debate and the proposed policies. The discipline is often seen as dealing with individual problems rather than societal issues and as focusing on very specific and ‘small’ psychological processes that are investigated in artificial experiments that have unclear or doubtful implications for the real world. Moreover, topics such as outgroup threat, intergroup contact, discrimination, ethnic and national identity, cultural diversity and attitudes toward immigrants are also examined by sociologists and political scientists, often with large representative, cross-national samples (e.g., Bansack, Hainmueller, & Hangartner, 2016; Ceobanu & Escandell, 2010; Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014). And topics such as citizenship and transnationalism, which are central to the immigration debate, are mostly ignored by social psychologists (Condor, 2011).

My aim with this EJSP Agenda article is not to convince the policy community or stakeholders of the relevance of social psychology for the immigration debate (Verkuyten, 2014), but rather to argue that studying questions of immigration has benefits for social psychology. Migration and the resulting diversity raise new questions for the field, introduce new topics of research, and challenge conventional ways of thinking. The growing social psychological research on dual (multiple) identities, acculturation processes, and (minority) religion (e.g., Muslim immigrants) are good examples of the impact that immigration questions have on social psychology. For each of these topics a substantial and

important literature has been developed and there are comprehensive overviews (e.g., Brown & Zagefka, 2011; Schwartz, Vignoles, Brown, & Zagefka, 2014; Settles & Buchanan, 2014; Voas & Fleischmann, 2012). Therefore, I will focus on some additional issues that have received relatively less attention from social psychologists and that may have implications for a range of settings and social psychological questions beyond immigration, and in relation to minority groups and cultural diversity in particular.

The article is structured in four parts related to four key questions: (1) who belongs, (2) how to get along, (3) what is the relevant context, and (4) how to achieve a better social psychology. The first question relates to the literature on ethnic and civic nationhood and I will discuss the importance of studying citizenship and the return of biology. The second relates to the extensive social psychological literature on threat and prejudice and the relative lack of interest in prosocial behavior and intergroup toleration. As a third point, I discuss the limiting implications of the majority–minority framework that is predominantly used in social psychology. In the fourth part I briefly discuss the relevance of studying immigration for the so-called evidentiary value movement (Finkel, Eastwick, & Reis, 2015) that has developed in response to the current ‘crisis’ in (social) psychology.

The field of migration studies is extensive, and various forms of migration and important legal and social categories are distinguished, such as short-term and long-term migration, back-and-forth migration, internal and international migration, forced migration, return migration, chain migration, cross-border workers, first and later generation immigrants, and undocumented

migrants, illegals, asylum seekers and refugees. These important distinctions are not always understood and appreciated by the public and also not considered much by social psychologists. Despite their importance, I do not have the space here to go into these many forms of migration and types of migrants. Rather, I will use the terms 'immigrants' and 'immigrant-origin' (recent history of immigration and children of immigrants) in a general sense, and I will also consider issues of cultural diversity that result from immigration.

Who Belongs

The term 'immigrant' denotes someone who is from elsewhere and who is an outsider both legally and socially. Legally, a (non-naturalized) immigrant is an outsider because he or she has no citizenship, and socially he/she is an outsider because of not being recognized as belonging to the same imagined national community. The former aspect refers to membership in the state that grants the legal status of citizen with the related rights and duties, and the latter refers to the status of national as one's place in an affective community. In practice these two elements of the term 'nation-state' are often conflated, but the implied equivalence is challenged by international migration. Naturalization policies turn immigrants and their children into citizens, but that does not have to make them nationals in the eyes of themselves and others, and dual citizenship can raise public doubts about national commitment and loyalty. Even advocates of dual citizenship for American citizens have argued for a modified citizenship oath in which new citizens must pledge their core political loyalty to the United States (Schuck, 1998).

Citizenship

Citizenship is a major topic of study in political science, political philosophy, legal studies, and to a lesser degree in sociology and anthropology. In its most basic form, citizenship refers to a status of legal and political membership of a state. Citizenship is considered a force of justice, equality and national cohesion, and an essential basis of democratic governance: the unitary status of citizen means that everybody enjoys the same rights. From a legal and political perspective, citizenship would counteract social inequalities and social exclusion and would contribute to the commitment and solidarity necessary for a functioning democratic welfare state. A few social psychologists have addressed the issue of citizenship and its importance for progressive social reform already in the first half of the 20th century (see Stevenson, Dixon, Hopkins, & Luyt, 2015), and there are recent papers (e.g., Andreouli, Kadianaki, & Xenitidou, 2017; Barnes, Auburn, & Lea, 2004), special issues (e.g., Condor, 2011; Stevenson et al., 2015) and edited volumes (Borgida, Federico, & Sullivan, 2009). Yet, compared to the large body of work in other disciplines, there is in social psychology very little attention

to the study of democratic citizenship. This is surprising and unfortunate, considering the field's interests in identity and equality.

Together with ethnicity, race, class, and gender, citizenship status is a central axis of stratification in many democratic societies (Massey, 2007). The egalitarian and inclusive dynamic of citizenship goes together with social exclusion of non-citizens, documented temporary residents, and those that are considered second class citizens (Joppke, 2010). Whereas inequality and discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity and gender is strongly rejected in most societies, inequality and discrimination on the basis of citizenship is largely unchallenged but rather taken for granted and considered morally and politically legitimate ('what does a nation owe non-citizens?'). For example, many migrants in Europe and in the United States do not have the legal right to reside in the countries in which they live (undocumented residents, illegals). And there are substantial numbers of stateless individuals and children in particular (United Nations estimates around 700 000 in Europe). These migrants face many challenges, including feelings of insecurity and fear of deportation, and inability to participate fully in social and political life and to negotiate over housing and working conditions. Their situation illustrates the profound importance of citizenship status for leading a normal life.

Citizenship implies that one holds certain rights and obligations and can fully participate in politics. The relationship between status, rights, and participation is not self-evident (e.g., non-citizens can have local voting rights, and female citizens can have no right to vote, as in Saudi Arabia), but these aspects are considered key dimensions of citizenship (Bloemraad, Korteweg, & Yurdakul, 2008). Citizenship involves the right to participate fully in the political system and without political voice it is difficult for immigrants to advance projects that address inequalities and disadvantages. However, in social psychology and in acculturation research the question of political participation and acculturation is mostly ignored (Hindriks, Verkuyten, & Coenders, 2015). There seems to be the assumption that immigrants' challenges and concerns are about culture, identity and the hassles of everyday life rather than about the 'loftier goals of political participation' (Joppke, 2010, p. 147).

Citizenship is a legal status that defines a specific social identity that differs in important ways from ethnic, racial and gender identities that are studied by social psychologists. The processes of self-categorization and categorization by others are intertwined in social identities (Jenkins, 1996). However, the relative weight of the two differs considerably for different social identities. The categorization by others tends to be dominant in citizenship and citizenship-like immigration statuses (e.g., documented residents). Access to the territory and citizenship rights and benefits does not depend on self-identification but on the legal status bestowed by the state and certified by official documents. The legal

aspect of citizenship leaves little room for ambiguity¹ but rather draws sharp and consistent social boundaries. The categorization by others is decisive and being a citizen is for most citizens, most of the time, self-evident, at least for those who have an established position in society. It does not require strong self-identification for its working but rather is practiced routinely (Isin, 2009). But the taken-for-granted state of affairs can become disrupted by globalization and immigration making citizens (re-)consider and (re-)negotiate the meanings and boundaries of citizenship. This raises important questions for social psychology.

Citizenship is contestable and practised (Shotter, 1993), which means that in everyday life there can be different ways in which people orient to their citizenship and attribute citizen status to themselves and others. For instance, citizenship can be considered as something that should be “earned” by immigrants (i.e., adopt the dominant culture, demonstrate national loyalty and pride, pass a citizenship test) rather than legally granted (Conover, Searing, & Crewe, 2004). Immigrants should be ‘good’ citizens rather than simply be citizens: without legal status there is no citizenship, but without psychological membership citizenship is second class. Research has found that acquiring citizenship has positive implications for migrants’ wellbeing (e.g., Brown & Tip, 2017). But naturalized immigrants who have formal legal citizenship might come to feel like second-class citizens, because they are treated with ‘double standards’ and are monitored, patronized, ignored or misrecognized. The social psychological consequences of feeling like a second-class citizen for people’s well-being and participation in society’s civic and political life are not fully clear and deserve more attention.

Nationhood

Nationhood is not so much about formal rights but rather about community belonging. The distinction between ethnic and civic representations of nationhood is used in the social psychological literature for understanding differences in psychological representations of national belonging (see Yogeewaran & Dasgupta, 2014).

Ethnic citizenship defines the nation as a community of people of shared descent. The implication is that immigrants who do not have native ancestry cannot fulfill the ascribed, fixed citizenship criteria and therefore do not (fully) belong. Research has consistently found that an ethnic understanding of nationhood is associated with more negative attitudes toward immigrants, immigration policies, and multiculturalism (e.g., Pehrson, Vignoles, & Brown, 2009; Reijerse, Van Acker, Vanbeselaere, Phalet, & Duriez, 2013; Wakefield et al.,

2011). In contrast, a civic representation emphasizes that national belonging depends on fulfilling one’s citizenship obligations and respecting the basic civic principles of society. This makes it relatively easy for immigrants to be included. Although there are some exceptions (e.g., Kunovich, 2009; Schildkraut, 2007), research in the European and the US context has found that a civic understanding is related to positive attitudes toward immigrants, immigration policies, and multiculturalism (e.g., Meeus, Duriez, Vanbeselaere, & Boon, 2010; Reijerse et al., 2013; Wakefield et al., 2011).

However, the precise underlying reasons for why ethnic and civic representations differently affect attitudes toward immigrants remain rather general in current theoretical discussions. Social psychologists have not examined systematically whether, for example, category salience, perceived group permeability, notions of group essentialism, a sense of common national belonging, or specific ideological beliefs underlie the differential implications of ethnic and civic nationhood for the acceptance of immigrants (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2015).

For instance, it is not fully clear how people understand ethnicity and how genetics play a role in people’s thinking about national belonging. According to Brubaker (2015), an ethnic understanding of nationhood gets a new impetus by the ‘return of biology’ in contemporary discussions of migration and minority groups. The increase in relatively inexpensive genomic data has influenced understandings and practices of ethnicity in biomedical research and stimulated the search for between-group and within-group genetic differences. For example, genetic testing has emerged in family reunification contexts to establish family relationships that confer immigration and citizenship benefits. Individual-level genetic tests (tests of ancestry) are also on offer in the United States for individuals to validate their Native American ancestry claim and for tribes to screen new applicants and existing members. Thus, some college applicants have been seeking DNA ancestry testing in order to justify identifying as Native American, or black, on applications for financial aid and admission (Brubaker, 2015).

At the group level, genetic testing and data are also proposed for establishing ethnic origin and making political claims. The UK Border Agency proposed in 2009 a program to use DNA tests to identify the country of origin of asylum seekers. And the British National Party has used population genetic research to strengthen its discourse against immigration that would undermine “the clearly definable indigenous population in Britain and that they qualify fully for protected status under the United Nations Charter on the rights of Indigenous Peoples” (Kemp, 2010). But the assertion of a distinctive genetic profile is also used by indigenous groups such as the Uros in Peru for getting control over land and resources (Brubaker, 2015). The Uros have enlisted genetic data and collaborated with the Genographic Project to support their claim of being descendants of the ancient Urus, who were considered the first ethnic group that settled in the Andes. Group essentialism

¹In practice there are various distinctions. For example, immigrants can sometimes obtain special residence status, the right to work, employment, social security benefits, and protection from deportation. These ‘denizens’ or ‘quasi citizens’ (Hammar, 1990) are foreign citizens with legal and permanent resident status.

has strategic advantages for minority groups in countering the denial of their identity and claiming group rights (Morton & Postmes, 2009; Verkuyten, 2003).

These examples indicate that the 'return of biology' has important and ambivalent implications for people's understanding of ethnicity and the instrumental use of group claims. On the one hand, genetic data can reinforce and naturalize common sense ethnic and racial categories, which can be used for racist ends but also for claiming indigenous rights (Brodwin, 2002). On the other hand, population genetics can undermine notions of ethnic purity by highlighting the genetic heterogeneity within any community and the inescapable mixedness of all populations, which can be used to challenge hostilities and racist politics (Kimmel, Huesmann, Kunst, & Halperin, 2016; see also Keller, 2005) but also to question the distinctive status and related rights of indigenous groups. The political indeterminacy of genetics raises an important social psychological question about the nature of essentialist group understandings (cultural, biological or otherwise) and how and when claims based on these understandings have similar or different oppressive or rather progressive political implications.

How to Get along

The second set of issues that I want to address relates to the ways in which the host society responds to immigration and the related cultural diversity. Commentators in many Western countries have identified polarization in public opinion about immigration issues. Some sections of the population, and some politicians and mass media, emphasize the difficult fate of immigrants, the need to be tolerant and to offer support and help to these newcomers, and they stress the benefits of cultural diversity for society. Other sections of the public, and other politicians and media, claim that the majority of newcomers are 'fortune seekers', that they are a burden on the country, and that diversity undermines the unity and cohesion necessary for a well-functioning society. Social psychologists tend to focus on the feelings of symbolic and realistic threats of the latter group of people. The former group of people, which demonstrates prosocial behaviors toward immigrants or tolerates these newcomers without necessarily being favorably disposed to them, tends to be ignored. However, both outgroup helping and intergroup toleration are important themes to study, and there are other forms of threat for social psychologists to consider.

Offering Help and Support

There are many examples of individuals showing solidarity and offering help and support to refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants more generally. Many volunteers are involved in making migrants feel welcome and assisting them in settling in and finding their place. This has become especially visible during the so-called refugee crisis in 2015. As a result an increasing number of research projects are trying to understand people's

support for and helping of refugees (Wagner, 2017). However, despite this social psychological interest in support for refugees, and in prosocial behavior (Stürmer & Snyder, 2010) and intergroup helping (Van Leeuwen & Zagefka, 2017) more generally, to date there is little systematic work on understanding why and when people act prosocially toward refugees and immigrants.

So we do not know how far existing theoretical propositions for explaining prosocial behavior are adequate for understanding the various forms of solidarity, help and support offered to refugees and immigrants more generally. A sense of shared humanity and solidarity ("brothers rather than others"), a common ingroup identity (Kunst, Thomsen, Sam, & Berry, 2015), and feelings of sympathy and empathy are likely to be important predictors of people's intention to help refugees and asylum seekers (e.g., Nickerson & Louis, 2008). Yet these kinds of explanations tend not to take the strongly polarized and politicized context into account. It is one thing to help outgroup members in need when almost everyone sees them as victims (e.g., in natural disasters), but it probably is something else when many people around you, and in society more generally, consider them as not deserving support (e.g., as 'bogus refugees', 'fortune seekers').

Furthermore, these explanations focus predominantly on individual perceptions and feelings. Yet, it is important also to examine solidarity-based collective action that can be based on intergroup contact and involve feelings of empathy but also anger about injustices and the dehumanization of refugees (e.g., Saab, Tausch, Spears, & Cheung, 2015; Selvanathan, Techakesari, Tropp, & Barlow, 2017). However, these studies are concerned mainly with what happens when people understand themselves as a member of a group (collective self), and not with actual networks, organizations, and local communities. Different organizations are involved in making migrants feel welcome and assisting them in settling in and finding their place ("*Refugees welcome*"; "*Solidarity with refugees*"; "*Voices for refugees*"). And sometimes whole communities offer help and support, such as in the village of Riace in the southern Italian region of Calabria that has become known for its hospitality toward refugees. The local inhabitants of Riace support the reception program for refugees that has been developed, and they perceive hospitality toward refugees as an integral part of the identity of the town and as something to be proud of (Driel, 2017). The inhabitants strongly identify with their local community, which is demonstrated by the fact that they explicitly express (e.g., on social media) their pride to belong to the "village of hospitality". Conceiving help and support as a matter of collaborative efforts raises interesting social psychological questions about group dynamics.

Intergroup Toleration

In political science there is a large literature on political tolerance. Political scientists have extensively discussed and examined the nature, level, and determinants of

political (in)tolerance in democratic societies (Gibson, 2006). Tolerance (psychological orientation) and toleration (behavior) are considered critical for democratic governance: "Tolerance is one of the few viable solutions to the tensions and conflict brought about by multiculturalism and political heterogeneity: tolerance is an essential endorphin of a democratic body politic" (Gibson, 2006, p. 21). Political tolerance is a way to live with or put up with people who hold views and beliefs one disagrees with. One may strongly oppose the views of others (e.g., racist groups; religious orthodox people) but nevertheless accord them the same rights of political action as other groups, such as the right to demonstrate, run for office, and give political speeches. Political science research indicates that political intolerance and prejudicial attitudes are distinct phenomena (Gibson, 2006; Sullivan, Piereson, & Marcus, 1982). For example, endorsement of democratic norms and principles plays an important role in encouraging political tolerance but almost no role in reducing prejudice. In an intervention study, teaching students about the norms of democracy (e.g., principle of free speech) enhanced their political tolerance, but their initial negative feelings against their disliked groups became even stronger (Avery, Bird, Johnstone, Sullivan, & Thalhammer, 1992). This relative independence of prejudicial attitudes and political tolerance might be part of the reason why there is so little connection between political scientists studying political tolerance and social psychologists studying intergroup relations.

Social psychologists are predominantly concerned with prejudicial attitudes and do not consider situations of intergroup toleration in which people put up with or endure norms and practices that they object to (Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2017). Yet, objection and disagreement about what is good and right are inevitable in our increasingly plural societies. Continuing immigration implies an increase in cultural diversity, and people cannot be expected to accept and value everything. After all, "if everything is of value, nothing is of value: the value loses its content" (Sartori, in Joppke, 2004, p. 242). However, we do not have to like each other's way of living, but we should at least tolerate one another. This conceptualization of intergroup toleration raises various important and interesting questions for social psychology that we have discussed at length elsewhere (Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2017). These questions relate to (1) the psychological processes behind people's disapproval of outgroup norms and practices and how these differ from prejudicial feelings of dislike; (2) the reasons people nevertheless have to accept these disapproved norms and practices and show self-restraint, (3) how people define and justify the boundaries of tolerance whereby particular norms and practices are considered intolerably wrong ('zero-tolerance'), and (4) the social psychological implications for individual well-being and collective action of being the target of toleration with its implied deviance and disapproval.

Threat and Prejudice

In addition to the limited research on helping behavior and tolerance, there also is very little social psychological research that focuses on people's attitudes in relation to the perceived contributions to society that immigrants make. An exception is recent research that focuses on immigrants' perceived indispensability to the functioning of society (functional indispensability; Guerra, Gaertner, António, & Deegan, 2015) and for defining the national category (category or identity indispensability; Verkuyten, Martinovic, & Smeekes, 2014).²

In contrast to research on perceived contributions, there is a relatively large literature on prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants and immigration policies and regulations. Some studies, for example, suggest that negative attitudes toward different groups of migrants are quite similar (e.g., Sniderman, Hagendoorn, & Prior, 2004), whereas others argue and demonstrate that the attitudes are (in part) group-specific and depend, for example, on cultural similarity (Ford, 2011), level of educational and work skills (Helbling & Kriesi, 2014), language and skin tone (Hopkins, 2015), national origin (Hainmueller & Hangartner, 2013), and economic contribution and religion (Bansack et al., 2016).

Central in the explanation of these negative attitudes is the concept of threat. Perceptions of threat can underlie prejudicial attitudes (you dislike immigrants because you see them as a threat) but can also follow from outgroup hostility (immigrants are seen as a threat because you dislike them). In the latter case, the perception of threat also can be used to justify negative outgroup feelings (e.g., Pereira, Vala, & Costa-Lopes, 2010). Politicians, for example, often argue that public hostility toward immigrants is the logical outcome of people's genuine concerns and everyday feelings of threat: it is considered only natural that people have negative feelings when they feel threatened.

Perceived threat, however, is not a very 'deep' explanation (Fiedler, 2014) of prejudice and often the two are very difficult to disentangle (Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Showing, again and again, that feelings of outgroup threat are associated with prejudicial attitudes is not very informative.³ For theoretical and applied reasons it seems more useful to focus on feelings of threat rather than on prejudicial attitudes. The applied reason is that addressing feelings of threat will elicit less resistance among the public than addressing prejudice and racism, which imply moral accusations that trigger strategies of moral self-defense (Ellemers, 2017). Theoretically, such a focus allows us to specify what exactly drives outgroup hostility by distinguishing between different forms of threat that provide quite different

²The social psychological construct of (functional and identity) indispensability is likely to be meaningful and important in a range of other group contexts, such as within organizations and institutions.

³Investigating the conditions under which feelings of threat are less or more strongly related to prejudices is more useful.

understandings of what a conflict between groups is actually about.

Social psychologists and social scientists have proposed the distinction between realistic and symbolic threats (Wagner, Christ, & Heitmeyer, 2010). Although the distinction is not without its problems, there is a relatively large literature on these two forms of threats and how these affect intergroup relations and attitudes toward immigrants and minority groups in particular (see Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). For example, following realistic conflict theory (Sherif, 1966) researchers have argued and demonstrated the importance of threats to the ingroup's material interests (e.g., jobs, houses), safety and political influence.⁴ From the social identity perspective, others have pointed at the importance of threats to the distinctiveness, value, and integrity of the ingroup identity (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). Thus, social psychological research typically examines people's attitude toward immigrants from the perspective of perceived (zero-sum) competition for scarce resources (realistic threat) and perceived (symbolic) threats to the national culture and identity (see Esses, Jackson, & Bennett-AbuAyyash, 2010; Wagner et al., 2010).

The literature on threats and intergroup relations is diverse and there is quite some variation in how threat is defined, operationalized, and which forms of threat are distinguished. One way to understand the nature of threat and its different forms is to consider what is at stake psychologically and how people react to various threats (Vignoles, 2011). Threats to the material interests of one's ingroup (realistic threats) are different from symbolic threats to the value and distinctiveness of the ingroup identity. Different things are at stake that involve different concerns, feelings and beliefs with different intergroup behaviors (e.g., discrimination in resource allocation, and bias in prestige distribution). There is one other form of threat in which other things are at stake that can also be important for understanding

people's attitudes toward immigration and immigrants, and that suggests new directions for social psychological research: ownership threat (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2017). Furthermore, the construct of collective psychological ownership might prove to be very meaningful and useful for understanding intergroup relations in a range of settings such as in institutions, organizational mergers, and in neighborhoods.

Ownership Threat

There is a body of research on personal psychological ownership ("mine") in managerial and organizational sciences (see Pierce & Jussila, 2011), developmental psychology (e.g., Nancekivell, Van de Vondervoort, & Friedman, 2013; Ross, Friedman, & Field, 2015), and social psychology (e.g., De Dreu & Van Knippenberg, 2005; Ye & Gawronski, 2016). However, the concept of collective psychological ownership ("ours") has been largely ignored, although psychological ownership does not only manifest itself at the personal level but also at the collective level (Pierce & Jussila, 2011).

The key slogan of the successful pro-Brexit campaign (2016) was "Take back control" so that "we" again can decide who can and who cannot enter the country, and this rhetoric also was a central theme in Trump's 2016 victorious presidential campaign in the United States. What is at stake here is the right to subject the whole world to our decisions regarding "our" country and the regulation of life within it. In the party manifesto for the general elections of 2012 of the right-wing Dutch Party for Freedom, it is stated in relation to immigration: "We are no longer master in our own house. We are guests in our own country: no longer able to determine our own future. ... But people who are master in their own country decide themselves who enters and who does not". The rhetoric of lost sovereignty and no longer being master in one's own house justifies outgroup exclusion. In this rhetoric, exclusion or 'denial of access' is not unjust or discriminatory, but rather a right that the owner has and that confirms collective ownership. When you own something it is up to you to decide what happens with it and not up to someone else. Critically, ownership implies a 'gatekeeper right': the right to decide whether others are permitted or prohibited to have access (Merrill, 1998). Thus, a sense of collective ownership adds something to who "we" are, namely, a powerful justification for what "we" rightfully can do with what is "ours", including the right to exclude others.

An intrinsic part of the sense of ownership is the possibility of losing control and being dispossessed (Rochat, 2014). Ownership can be challenged, disputed or threatened, which leads to behavior to defend and restore one's ownership claims. Any real or perceived threat of losing control over something that one feels to be "ours" tends to trigger anticipatory and reactionary defenses (Brown, Lawrence, & Robinson, 2005; De Dreu & Van Knippenberg, 2005). The latter are reactions taken after a perceived infringement and serve to

⁴To date, perceived threat related to political competition is not researched much, although it can be expected to become increasingly important. Census projections suggest that due to immigration and childbirths the United States will be more ethnically diverse in the near future with more ethnic minority members than White Americans, and there are similar census projections for countries in the European Union. Since the democratic political power of a group is based on its relative size, this development raises important political and societal questions, illustrated in the title of a report of the American Immigration Council (2010), *The new American electorate*. It also raises important social psychological questions, because negative attitudes in the political domain can have a real impact on the standing of immigrant groups, as well as the democratic process. It might increase political alienation among immigrants and undermine the perceived legitimacy of the political system. Members of immigrant groups constitute a growing share of the national and local electorate and their political incorporation has important symbolic, normative, and empowerment implications. A study in 10 European countries found that growth in the immigrant electorate was one of best predictors of the expansion of rights to immigrants between 1980 and 2006 (Koopmans, Michalowski, & Waibel, 2012).

restore one's claim to ownership with the related bundle of rights (e.g., deportation of illegals; leaving the EU). Anticipatory defense, in contrast, occurs before an infringement and serves to thwart infringement attempts by others, such as the setting up of fences and walls (e.g., to keep immigrants from entering Hungary or the US), use of warning signs and border controls, and the implementation of exclusionary rules and regulations (e.g., voting restrictions for migrants).

Collective psychological ownership involves the psychology of possessions, and ownership threats differ from realistic and symbolic threats (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2017). Competition over scarce material resources in which material wellbeing is at stake, and identity undermining outgroup norms and values in which a positive and distinctive ingroup identity is at stake, do not have to be experienced as an infringement on one's 'gatekeeper right' with the related righteous indignation and anger. Collective psychological ownership based, for example, on primo-occupancy is a strong (legal) justification for territorial and sovereignty claims (e.g. "First nations" in North America), a core issue in 'Sons of Soil' conflicts (Côté & Mitchell, 2017) and of violence and wars around the world (Toft, 2014), and an important justification for rejecting immigrant groups in countries such as the Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, and Denmark (Ceuppens, 2011; Geschiere, 2009; Martinovic & Verkuyten, 2012).

The Majority-Minority Framework

My third general point has to do with the fact that in social psychology many perceptions, experiences, and behaviors are theorized and investigated within a majority-minority social status framework. In addition to research on prejudice and racism, this framework is used to study, for example, mental health and well-being, intergroup contact, social identity, cultural diversity beliefs, as well as neuroscientific correlates of cognitive attention and evaluation (e.g., Destin, Rheinschmidt-Same, & Richeson, 2017; Mattan, Kubota, & Cloutier, 2017). The majority-minority framework is extremely useful and powerful for making predictions and interpreting findings and is central in, for example, social dominance theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), system justification theory (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004), and social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Arguably, the majority-minority distinction has become a self-evident framework for many social psychological questions, topics, and findings. Yet, despite its great usefulness in studying immigrants and immigration, it becomes clear that there are also some drawbacks and limiting implications for social psychology. These have to do with the social psychological issues that are considered, the questions that are asked, and the theories that are developed. One of these limitations is that (1) important intra-group processes within immigrant and minority groups more generally are ignored, and another one is the (2) limited interest in inter-minority relations. Two other implications have to do with the (implicit)

national context of the majority-minority framework which leads to neglecting the importance of (3) the local and the (4) transnational for people's thinking, feeling, and doing.

Intra-Group Processes

The majority-minority framework implies that social psychological research focuses on the highly important processes of societal rejection, exclusion and discrimination that immigrants and minority group members face. One possible result of this is that the dynamics within immigrant and minority (and also majority) communities tend to be ignored.

Tajfel (1978) points out that for minority group members not all situations elicit minority-majority comparisons: "not all 'natural' social contexts include the need or the requirement for intergroup comparisons, and a person's idea about himself or herself is at least as much (and probably much more) dependent upon continuous and daily interaction with individuals from the same social group" (Tajfel, 1978, p. 327). This is especially likely for ethnic minority communities that have strongly integrated norms, traditions, values, and functions. Also for religious minority communities (the Amish, Hasidic Jews, orthodox Muslims), the majority can be considered inherently different and thus partly irrelevant for social comparisons. But as Tajfel (1978, p. 328) notes, "Most minorities fall in between: their identity is simultaneously determined by the socially prevailing views of the majority and by the psychological effects of their own culture and social organization".

Most social psychologists tend to focus on the *minority* aspect of ethnic minorities and the related intergroup comparisons and ignore the *ethnic* aspect and related intra-group comparisons. However, co-ethnics often form the obvious frame of reference and comparison. Research among ethnic minorities has clearly shown that there is a preference for comparisons with co-ethnics over comparisons with outgroups (e.g., Abbey, 2002; Leach & Smith, 2006; Zagefka & Brown, 2005). Differences and similarities within one's own immigrant or cultural minority community get a lot of attention in daily life and are much discussed. People make comparisons between subgroups within their community, such as between 'established' and recent co-ethnic immigrants, first and second generation immigrants, those with a darker and lighter skin color, integrating and assimilating individuals, and in addition they also compare their current position with that of the past (Verkuyten, 1997). Newly immigrated Arabs in the United States are found to be aware of their lower social status compared to other Arab groups, and struggle with the discrimination and derogation they experience from well-established immigrant groups (Kumar, Seay, & Karabenick, 2015). And in a study of daily acculturative hassles among Vietnamese-Canadians, there was evidence that intra-group processes, such as feeling isolated from one's ethnic group, being perceived as too white, and pressures to conform to cultural traditions,

had a significant negative impact on their acculturation process (Lay & Nguyen, 1998; see also Martinovic & Verkuyten, 2012).

The predominant concern in social psychology with status and power leads to the presupposition that for (immigrant) minorities the relationship with the majority group is all that matters. This is a restricted and one-sided view that ignores or underestimates the many different (sub)group comparisons that are made, the importance of a sense of ethnic belonging and continuity, the relevance of ingroup norms, and the importance of imagined history, culture, and homeland of many of these groups. It also underestimates the importance of inter-minority comparisons and the relations that exist between different minority groups.

Inter-Minority Relations

In contrast to the many studies on the causes and correlates of prejudice and discrimination toward minority members, there is relatively little work on relations *between* immigrant groups and ethnic minority groups more generally (e.g., Craig & Richeson, 2011; Hindriks, Coenders, & Verkuyten, 2014). This is unfortunate for two reasons. First, investigating relations between these groups is theoretically interesting because it allows social psychologists to examine the factors that influence if and when members of one minority group perceive other minority groups as potential allies or competitors (Craig & Richeson, 2016). Further, it makes it possible to test existing theoretical propositions in another intergroup context, and to develop new predictions such as an asymmetric pattern of horizontal hostility toward multiple minority groups (White & Langer, 1999). For example, the categories of 'deserving' and 'undeserving' in welfare debates relate to the perception of (lack of) choice – and thereby (lack of) responsibility – of those in need of support. These categories are used to account for health and illness, unemployment and poverty, but are also used by 'involuntary' immigrant-origin groups to claim more rights than 'voluntary' migrants (Verkuyten, 2014).

Second, immigrants tend to relocate to cities where they live together in the same neighborhoods, send their children to the same schools, and buy their groceries in the same streets. There are many cities, neighborhoods, and institutions (e.g., schools) that predominantly consist of various immigrant and minority groups, and in which there are inter-minority tensions and hostilities. Furthermore, strong negative outgroup attitudes can be widely shared within a particular minority community. For example, and similar to research in other countries (Baum, 2009), several studies in the Netherlands among Sunni Muslim minority members, including among preadolescents, have found that around one in two reported to have explicit and strong negative feelings toward Jews and non-believers (Martinovic & Verkuyten, 2016; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2010). Within sections of Muslim communities there exist serious dehumanization and hatred of Jews and

strong bigotry toward non-believers, and these should not be ignored but examined systematically (Kressel, 2012; Schoenfeld, 2004). Inter-minority hostilities can have a strong negative impact on everyday life and on the (local) community in which people live. The disadvantaged are not morally pure, and being disadvantaged does not have to imply a commitment to equality and tolerance.

Local Context

In most countries "migration is essentially an urban affair" (IOM, 2015, p. 26). Immigrants relocate to cities that are increasingly diverse, and the modern-day reality in cities such as London, Brussels, Amsterdam, Rome, Berlin, Stockholm, and Paris is that there are hundreds of different ethnic and language groups, which are also heterogeneous themselves. This super-diversity is often concentrated in specific (old) urban neighborhoods and raises the question of the adequateness of the nation-based minority–majority framework that predominates in social psychology. Although there are various multi-level theories and models (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Doise, 1986; House, 1981), it is not fully clear how exactly the national context influences the local one and how people in local contexts understand themselves and relate to others. Yet it seems safe to assume that the local does not simply reflect the national. For example, groups that in terms of numbers and power are minorities at the national level can be majorities at the local level, and vice versa (Kanas, Scheepers, & Sterkens, 2016). And local status can drive perceptions, feelings, and behaviors more than national status. In various European cities, second-generation immigrant groups are more 'native' (born and raised) to their city of residence than their peers of non-migrant parentage, many of whom come to the city to study or work (Schneider et al., 2012). Additionally, in these cities second-generation immigrants express stronger feelings of local rather than national belonging, while this difference is reversed or less accentuated for non-migrant youth (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2016). And immigrant youth are also relatively more strongly involved in their neighborhood of residence, which they consider their home (Schneider et al., 2012).

Super-diversity limits the usefulness of the nation-based minority–majority framework in social psychology. Today it is not two groups in contact because the number of immigrant and ethnic minority groups is rising in most local and institutional settings. Working in the UK, Modood and colleagues concluded already in Modood, Beishon, and Virdee (1994) that "Our research . . . challenges those who think in terms of simplistic oppositions of British–alien or black–white. A significant population on the ground is living in ways that refute these dualisms. It is time for social analysts and policy-makers to catch up" (p. 218). A dichotomy between the dominant majority and ethnic minorities is of limited value for interpreting and analyzing many local situations. It is necessary to have a more detailed

understanding of how people negotiate and define themselves and their everyday life.

One implication for social psychology relates to the existing research on multiculturalism as a diversity ideology. This research is firmly rooted in differences between national majority and minority populations and examines, for example, the differential endorsement of multiculturalism among both populations and whether multiculturalism has a similar positive impact on outgroup attitudes of majority and minority members (see Deaux & Verkuyten, 2014; Rattan & Ambady, 2013, for reviews). Yet, this research tends to ignore the local reality of super-diversity and the fact that people themselves are increasingly crossing borders, building new (virtual) networks, creating new cultural meanings (creolization), and developing hybrid and multiple identities (Harris, 2013). The emphasis of multiculturalism on separate cultural identities tends to make it an inadequate response to the growing urban diversity, the increasing number of people with plural, hybrid and mixed identities, and the ongoing individualization in society (Boli & Elliott, 2008; Cattle, 2016). There is growing interest in social psychology in identity complexity and multiple and dynamic identities (Settles & Buchanan, 2014), but it is unclear how this relates to the maintenance and recognition of group distinctions that are central to multiculturalism.

It has been argued that, similar to assimilation, multiculturalism has “the same, schematic conception of society set in opposition of majority and minority, differing only in endorsing separation of the minority from the majority rather than assimilation to it” (Council of Europe, 2008, p. 18). The Council of Europe prefers the term ‘interculturalism’ that has been employed in various European countries and by the European Commission, the Council of Europe (2008), and UNESCO (2009), and that features in education programs and in the Intercultural Cities Programme that has been adopted in cities around the world. Although interculturalism is not a radical break from multiculturalism (Meer & Modood, 2012), it places more emphasis on the three interrelated aspects of *dialog*, *identity complexity*, and a *sense of unity* across cultural differences. Compared to multiculturalism, interculturalism emphasizes more the importance of exchange and interactions between people of all origins, acknowledges multiple, complex identities, and focuses more on the unity than the diversity aspect of pluralism. These three aspects of interculturalism overlap, but link to three strands of social psychological research, namely, intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954), the work on identity hybridity and identity complexity (Roccas & Brewer, 2002), and the common ingroup identity model (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000), respectively. However, despite these clear links and the important debate about interculturalism within the social scientific literature and at policy levels, there is no systematic social psychological research on the extent to which multiculturalism and interculturalism represent separate ideological frameworks in laypersons’ eyes, and whether, why,

and when interculturalism has a positive impact on intergroup relations. It is unlikely that the ideological perspective of interculturalism is always preferred. For example, interculturalism might elicit feelings of distinctiveness threat with the increased efforts to differentiate one’s identity from others by processes of outgroup derogation and exclusion (Branscombe et al., 1999). Yet, interculturalism seems to be an additional, complementary strategy to create intergroup harmony in local contexts that are increasingly characterized with super-diversity, mixed-origin individuals, dual identifiers, and processes of individualization and cultural hybridization.

Transnationalism and Dual Citizenship

Globalization challenges state borders, and many immigrants have notions of belonging across national borders and are involved in transnational economic, social, and political activities (Bloemraad et al., 2008). Social science research has documented the importance of transnational relationships among different immigrant groups in different countries of settlement (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004). This importance raises further questions about the limiting implications of social psychology’s nation-based majority-minority framework. Immigrants’ acculturation orientations are not only determined by perceived rejection in the country of settlement but also by perceived rejection by family and friends in the country of origin (Badea, Jetten, Iyer, & Er-Rafiy, 2011). Further, there is not only the movement of people over borders but also the movement of borders over people. For example, the breakup of the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia left many people with having residency and citizenship in one state but feeling ethnically connected to another nation. The concept of transnationalism shifts attention away from a concern with majority–minority relations at the national level, to a focus on affective and instrumental social relationships and identities spanning borders. For example, in so-called long-distance nationalism (Anderson, 1998) immigrants are primarily interested in furthering the political cause of their ethnic group in the country of origin (e.g., Kurds and Tamils in Western Europe).

Transnationalism emphasizes the existence of multiple memberships, and dual citizenship is a manifestation of this. Although rules differ between countries, many states permit dual or multiple citizenship and some emigration countries do not allow nationals to give up their citizenship (e.g., Morocco), not even third generation immigrants. In social psychology there is increasing interest in dual identities (e.g., sense of ethnic and national belonging) and their importance for intergroup relations and the wellbeing of minority members (Settles & Buchanan, 2014). However, in this line of research dual citizenship is ignored, as well as the transnational lives of many dual citizens and the fact that countries can target their own emigrants abroad. For example, politicians and government officials in

sending countries can promote dual citizenship to stimulate remittances, and dual citizens can influence the country's policy toward the sending countries (Itzigsohn, 2000; Østergaard-Nielsen, 2002). Often immigrants do not want to appear disloyal to their country of origin and as a result might feel torn between sending and receiving countries and consequently practise a 'politics of in-between' (Jones-Correa, 1998).

Furthermore, dual citizens can be mobilized for political purposes in the country of origin. Many people of Turkish origin who live in countries such as Germany, Belgium, Sweden, Austria, and the Netherlands have dual citizenship. In March 2017, there was a referendum in Turkey about changing the political system to a presidential one. Turks living in Western Europe could also vote and the Turkish government targeted these emigrants. Many of them talked about "my government" and Erdogan as "my president", and they accused Turkish emigrants who did not support Erdogan of being quislings and threatened them and their families in Turkey with violence. Among Turkish emigrants, there are similar accusations, violent threats, and normative pressures in relation to the Kurdish question in Turkey and toward (alleged) supporters of Fethullah Gülen, who, according to the Turkish government, was behind the *coup d'état* attempt on July 15, 2016. Similar transnational influences, pressures, and tensions were apparent in the first half of 2017 among the Moroccan-origin population in Belgium and the Netherlands in relation to the political demands of Berber movements in the Rif area in Morocco (*Rif Alert*). These transnational processes go beyond the familiar majority-minority framework and raise important social psychological questions about identities, belonging, and intergroup relations.

Dual citizenship is important to study because it might lead to public concerns about conflicting loyalties and rights that can affect political participation, social equality, and cohesion in the country where people live. International tensions between Turkey and West European countries mean that the questions of loyalty and allegiance are strongly debated within the Turkish diaspora but also among the native population. European politicians have stated that the possibility of dual citizenship should perhaps be reconsidered, among other things because children of Turkish emigrants have to fulfill their compulsory military service in Turkey, and dual citizens can be potentially subject to two, possibly conflicting, sets of laws. Dual citizenship would undermine a shared national identity that is considered necessary to motivate citizens in democratic societies to pursue a number of goals, especially social justice. For natives, immigrants' dual citizenship might lead to suspicions of disloyalty and perceived injustices with the related feelings of resentment because immigrants can have the best of both worlds (in terms of dual citizenship rights but without dual obligations) whereas they themselves cannot. Examining why and when natives accept or reject dual citizenship and whether this is similar to or different from the acceptance of dual national identification, seems an important and relevant

topic for social psychological research. Furthermore, the increasing number of social psychological studies on multiple and dual identities have not considered dual citizenship. Depending, for example, on international relations, dual citizenship could facilitate a sense of dual belonging that contributes to immigrants' integration, but it could also lead to feelings of conflicting loyalties and group conflicts.

Studying Immigrants and a Better Social Psychology

The fourth issue that I briefly want to discuss relates to the current methodological debates within social psychology. In response to problematic and dubious research practices and the so-called replication crisis, a lot has changed in the past years in social psychology. The 'evidentiary value movement' (Finkel et al., 2015) has resulted in various solutions, such as systems and policies for full openness, unbiased publication, and pre-registration. These important changes encourage social psychologists to improve their research practices and will, on average, lead to more reliable work. Increasing awareness of our weaknesses and discussions of concrete suggestions for how to improve research practices are vital for the development of our discipline. Research on immigrants and immigration issues can make a contribution to these discussions by drawing attention to the narrow scope of the evidentiary value movement to date (see Finkel et al., 2015, Hamlin, 2017, for a similar argument). I will draw attention to two related issues.

First, the vast majority of the current discussion about improving research practices and replication relates to easily accessible populations like MTurk respondents and undergraduates. For social psychologists studying these populations it is, for example, relatively easy to recruit the recommended minimum sample size, rule out potential confounds, and try to replicate findings (Simmons, Nelson, & Simonsohn, 2011). But these recommendations are not very useful for research on very difficult-to-reach and vulnerable populations such as refugees, asylum seekers, and illegal immigrants, or for research on radicalization among Muslim immigrant youth. Furthermore, 'regular' migrants are also harder to reach than the non-migrant population and they sometimes lack the necessary language skills for participating in survey research. Additionally, there often is no clear sampling frame for knowing how population specific or representative participants are (e.g., how do you draw a representative sample of Muslims in a specific country, let alone across countries?). This means that alternative ways for reducing error are needed, which requires a broader scope of the evidentiary value movement. For example, triangulation with its cross verification from two or more sources can be a useful technique for validating findings and improving scientific quality. And with limited sample sizes the use of adequate comparison groups makes it possible to rule out potential confounds.

A second and related point is that the movement has made suggestions for how to improve practices by considering a limited set of methodologies, mainly experiments and (on-line) surveys. The diversity of methodologies and the unique methodological challenges inherent in some subfields and for some research questions are not considered. Using experiments or (on-line) surveys is not realistic when studying refugees, illegals, or radicalized youth. With these techniques, important issues, concerns, and questions are difficult to examine, such as the meanings that marginalized people themselves give to their surrounding environment and the ways in which they negotiate identity and group belonging in their everyday life. Additionally, these techniques, with their manipulation of variables and standard measures, can be experienced as dehumanizing by the vulnerable people concerned because the researcher is seen as being more interested in minimum sample size than in their personal problems and unique life story. The implication is that the issue of methodological diversity in best practice should be addressed. If not, researchers studying marginalized and vulnerable populations such as refugees and immigrants may feel excluded from the discussions in the evidentiary value movement (Hamlin, 2017). Social psychologists increasingly recognize the importance for the field of having researchers from different nations, ethnicities, and political orientations (Duarte, Crawford, Stern, & Haidt, 2015; Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010), but methodological diversity is often not considered. This is unfortunate because there are valuable discussions about the pros and cons and best practice of multi-methods and mixed-methods research designs (e.g., Creswell & Plano Clark, 2010). It is tempting to view one's own methodological approach as 'sacred', but all research practices have their trade-offs. The evidentiary value movement should not turn into a debate on methodological means while losing sight of the goal of improving the quality of our research.

Conclusion

Studying immigration and the resulting cultural diversity has benefits for the further development of social psychology. Immigration raises new questions and topics of research, challenges predominant ways of thinking, and can make a contribution to discussions about ways for improving the evidentiary value of the discipline. Important social developments such as immigration offer opportunities to advance the discipline and thereby contribute to the continuing development of not only a better social psychology but also one that continues to matter. Social psychology should and can make a relevant contribution to key questions and assumptions in the immigration debate. The human tragedies involved, the often painful process of trying to fit into a new society, the challenges, difficulties, and moral dilemmas that natives face, and the often profound impact that immigration has in all domains of society, should lead social psychologists to ask themselves what

sort of answers and solutions their discipline can offer. I have tried to argue that asking these questions will also be beneficial for the discipline because the new research topics, themes, and broader ways of thinking can have implications beyond the field of immigration.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank the editors for inviting me for this Agenda article and for their useful suggestions on a previous version. I further like to thank Fenella Fleischmann, Borja Martinovic, Anouk Smeekes, and Tobias Stark for their stimulating comments on an earlier version of this article.

References

- Abbey, E. (2002). Ventriloquism: The central role of an immigrant's own group members in negotiating ambiguity in identity. *Culture and Psychology, 8*, 409–415.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Anderson, B. (1998). *The spectre of comparison: Nationalism, South East Asia and the world*. London: Verso.
- American Immigration Council (2010). *The new American electorate*. Washington, DC.: The American Immigration Council.
- Andreouli, E., Kadianaki, I., & Xenitidou, M. (2017). Citizenship and social psychology. In C. Howarth & E. Andreouli (Eds.), *The social psychology of everyday politics* (pp. 87–101). London: Routledge.
- Avery, P., Bird, K., Johnstone, S., Sullivan, J. L., & Thalhammer, K. (1992). Exploring political tolerance with adolescents. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 20*, 386–420.
- Badea, C., Jetten, J., Iyer, A., & Er-Rafiy, A. (2011). Negotiating dual identities: The impact of group-based rejection on identification and acculturation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 586–596.
- Bansack, K., Hainmueller, J., & Hangartner, D. (2016). How economic, humanitarian, and religious concerns shape European attitudes toward asylum seekers. *Science, 354*(6309), 217–222.
- Barnes, R., Auburn, T., & Lea, S. (2004). Citizenship in practice. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 187–206.
- Baum, S. K. (2009). Christian and Muslim anti-semitic beliefs. *Journal of Contemporary Religion, 24*, 137–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537900902816632>
- Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration: Multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34*, 153–179. <https://doi.org/10.1156/annurev.soc.34.040507.134608>
- Boli, J., & Elliott, M. A. (2008). Facade diversity: The individualization of cultural difference. *International Sociology, 23*, 540–560. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580908090727>
- Borgida, E., Federico, C. M., & Sullivan, J. L. (2009). *The political psychology of democratic citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Branscombe, N., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35–58). Oxford: Blackwell.

- Brodwin, P. (2002). Genetics, identity and the anthropology of essentialism. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 75, 323–330.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, G., Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2005). Territoriality in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 577–594.
- Brown, R. & Tip, L. (2017). *Intergroup contact and well-being among refugees in the UK*. Paper presented at the 18th General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, July 5–8. Granada.
- Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2011). The dynamics of acculturation: An intergroup perspective. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 129–184.
- Brubaker, R. (2015). *Grounds for difference*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cantle, T. (2016). The case of interculturalism, plural identities and cohesion. In N. Meer, T. Modood, & R. Zapata-Barrero (Eds.), *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: Debating the dividing lines* (pp. 133–157). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ceobanu, A. M., & Escandell, X. (2010). Comparative analyses of public attitudes toward immigrants and immigration using multinational survey data: A review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 309–328.
- Ceuppens, B. (2011). From “the Europe of the regions” to “the European Champion League”: The electoral appeal of populist autochthony discourses in Flanders. *Social Anthropology*, 19, 159–174.
- Condor, S. (2011). Towards a social psychology of citizenship? Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 193–201. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1089>
- Conover, P. J., Searing, D. D., & Crewe, I. (2004). The elusive ideal of equal citizenship: Political theory and political psychology in the United States and Great Britain. *The Journal of Politics*, 66, 1036–1068.
- Côté, I., & Mitchell, M. I. (2017). Deciphering “Sons of Soil” conflicts: A critical survey of the literature. *Ethnopolitics*, 16, 333–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2015.1089050>
- Council of Europe (2008). *White paper on intercultural dialogue: Living together as equals in dignity*. Strassbourg: Council of Europe.
- Craig, M., & Richeson, J. A. (2011). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences inter-minority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 759–777.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2016). Stigma-based solidarity: Understanding the psychological foundations of conflict & coalition among members of different stigmatized groups. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25, 21–27.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2010). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2005). The possessive self as a barrier to conflict resolution: Effects of mere ownership, process accountability, and self-concept clarity on competitive cognitions and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 345–357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.345>
- Deaux, K., & Verkuyten, M. (2014). The social psychology of multiculturalism: Identity and intergroup relations. In V. Benet-Martínez & Y.-Y. Hong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity: Basic and applied psychological perspectives* (pp. 118–138). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Destin, M., Rheinschmidt-Same, M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Status-based identity: A conceptual approach integrating the social psychological study of socioeconomic status and identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12, 270–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616664424>
- Doise, W. (1986). *Levels of explanation in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Driel, E. (2017). *Riace, a town of hospitality: Community development, local identity, and the welcoming of refugees*. Utrecht: Ercomer.
- Duarte, J. L., Crawford, J. T., Stern, C., & Haidt, J. (2015). Political diversity will improve social psychological science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 38, 1–58. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X14000430>, e130
- Ellemers, N. (2017). *Morality and the regulation of social behavior*. London: Routledge.
- Esses, V., Jackson, L. M., & Bennett-AbuAyyash, C. (2010). Intergroup competition. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 225–240). London: Sage.
- Fiedler, K. (2014). From intrapsychic to ecological theories in social psychology: Outlines of a functional theory approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 657–670. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2069>
- Finkel, E. J., Eastwick, P. W., & Reis, I. T. (2015). Best research practices in psychology: Illustrating epistemological and pragmatic considerations with the case of relationship science. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108, 275–297. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000007>
- Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2016). Identity conflict or compatibility: A comparison of Muslim minorities in five European cities. *Political Psychologist*, 37, 447–463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12278>
- Ford, R. (2011). Acceptable and unacceptable immigrants: How opposition to immigration in Britain is affected by migrants’ region of origin. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37, 1017–1037.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Geschier, P. (2009). *The perils of belonging: Autochthony, citizenship, and exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gibson, J. L. (2006). Enigmas of intolerance: Fifty years after Stouffer’s communism, conformity, and civil liberties. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4, 21–34.
- Guerra, R., Gaertner, S. L., António, R., & Deegan, M. (2015). Do we need them? When immigrant communities are perceived as indispensable to national identity or functioning of the host society. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 868–879. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2153>
- Hainmueller, J., & Hangartner, D. (2013). Who gets a Swiss passport? A natural experiment in immigrant discrimination. *American Political Science Review*, 107, 159–187.
- Hainmueller, J., & Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 17, 225–249.
- Hamlin, J. K. (2017). Is psychology moving in the right direction? An analysis of the evidentiary value movement. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12, 690–693. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616689062>

- Hammar, T. (1990). *Democracy and the nation state: Aliens, denizens, and citizens in a world of international migration*. Aldershot, UK: Avebury Press.
- Harris, A. (2013). *Young people and everyday multiculturalism*. London: Routledge.
- Helbling, M., & Kriesi, H. (2014). Why citizens prefer high-over low-skilled immigrants: Labour market competition, welfare state, and deservingness. *European Sociological Review*, 30, 595–614.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Science*, 33, 61–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hindriks, P., Coenders, M., & Verkuyten, M. (2014). Inter-minority attitudes: The role of ethnic and national identification, contact and multiculturalism. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77, 54–74.
- Hindriks, P., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2015). The evaluation of immigrants' political acculturation strategies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 47, 131–142.
- Hopkins, D. J. (2015). The upside of accents: Language, skin tone, and attitudes toward immigration. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45, 531–557.
- House, J. S. (1981). Social structure and personality. In M. Rosenberg & R. H. Turner (Eds.), *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives* (pp. 525–561). New York: Basic Books.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM, 2015). *World Migration Report 2015: Migrants and Cities, New Partnerships to Manage Mobility*. Geneva, Switzerland. http://publications.iom.int/system/files/wmr2015_en.pdf
- Insin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, 29, 367–388.
- Itzigsohn, J. (2000). Immigration and the boundaries of citizenship: The institutions of immigrants' political transnationalism. *International Migration Review*, 34, 1126–1154.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. London: Routledge.
- Jones-Correa, M. (1998). *Between two nations: The political predicament of Latinos in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Joppke, C. (2004). The retreat of multiculturalism in the liberal state: Theory and policy. *British Journal of Sociology*, 55, 237–257.
- Joppke, C. (2010). *Citizenship and immigration*. London: Polity Press.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881–919.
- Kanas, A., Scheepers, P., & Sterkens, C. (2016). Religious identification and interreligious contact in Indonesia and the Philippines: Testing the mediating roles of perceived group threat and social dominance orientation and the moderating role of context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 700–715. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2212>
- Keller, J. (2005). In genes we trust: The biological component of psychological essentialism and its relationship to mechanisms of motivated social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 686–702.
- Kemp, A. (2010). *Four flags: The indigenous people of Britain*. Deeside, UK: Excalibur Books.
- Kimel, S. Y., Huesmann, R., Kunst, J. R., & Halperin, E. (2016). Living in a genetic world: How learning about interethnic genetic similarities and differences affects peace and conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42, 688–700.
- Koopmans, R., Michalowski, I., & Waibel, S. (2012). Citizenship rights for immigrants: National political processes and cross-national convergence in Western Europe, 1980–2008. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117, 1202–1245.
- Kressel, N. J. (2012). *"The sons of pigs and apes": Muslim anti-Semitism and the conspiracy of silence*. Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books.
- Kumar, R., Seay, N., & Karabenick, S. A. (2015). Immigrant Arab adolescents in ethnic enclaves: Physical and phenomenological contexts of identity negotiation. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 21, 201–212.
- Kunovich, R. (2009). The sources and consequences of national identification. *American Sociological Review*, 74, 573–593.
- Kunst, J. R., Thomsen, L., Sam, D. L., & Berry, J. W. (2015). "We are in this together": Common group identity predicts majority members' active acculturation efforts to integrate immigrants. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41, 1438–1453.
- Lay, C., & Nguyen, T. (1998). Acculturated-related and acculturation non-specific hassles: Vietnamese-Canadian students and psychological distress. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 30, 172–181.
- Leach, C. W., & Smith, H. J. (2006). By whose standard? The affective implications of ethnic minorities' comparison to ethnic minority and majority referents. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 747–760.
- Levitt, P., & Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Transnational perspectives on migration: Conceptualizing simultaneity. *International Migration Review*, 38, 595–629.
- Martinovic, B., & Verkuyten, M. (2012). Host national and religious identification among Turkish Muslims in Western Europe: The role of ingroup norms, perceived discrimination and value incompatibility. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 893–903.
- Martinovic, B., & Verkuyten, M. (2016). Inter-religious attitudes of Sunni and Alevi Muslim minorities: The role of religious commitment and host national identification. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 52, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.02.005>
- Massey, D. S. (2007). *Categorically unequal: The American stratification system*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
- Mattan, B. J., Kubota, J. T., & Cloutier, J. (2017). How social status shapes person perception and evaluation: A social neuroscience perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12, 468–507. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616677828>
- Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2012). How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 33, 175–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.2011.618266>
- Meeus, J., Duriez, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boon, F. (2010). The role of national identity representations in the relation between ingroup identification and outgroup derogation: Ethnic versus civic representations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 305–320.
- Merrill, T. W. (1998). Property and the right to exclude. *Nebraska Law Review*, 77, 730–755.
- Modood, T., Beishon, S., & Virdee, S. (1994). *Changing ethnic identities*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

- Morton, T. A., & Postmes, T. (2009). When differences become essential: Minority essentialism in response to majority treatment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*, 656–668.
- Nancekivell, S. E., Van de Vondervoort, J. W., & Friedman, O. (2013). Young children's understanding of ownership. *Child Development Perspectives*, *7*, 243–247.
- Nickerson, A. M., & Louis, W. R. (2008). Nationality versus humanity? Personality, identity, and norms in relation to attitudes toward asylum seekers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*, 796–817. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00327.x>
- Østergaard-Nielsen, E. (2002). Working for a solution through Europe: Kurdish political lobbying in Germany. In N. Al-Ali & K. Koser (Eds.), *New approaches to migration?: Transnational communities and the transformation of Home* (pp. 186–201). London: Routledge.
- Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V., & Brown, R. (2009). National identification and anti-immigrant prejudice: Individual and contextual effects of national definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *72*, 24–38.
- Pereira, C., Vala, J., & Costa-Lopes, R. (2010). From prejudice to discrimination: The legitimizing role of perceived threat in discrimination against immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*, 1231–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.718>
- Pierce, J. L., & Jussila, I. (2011). *Psychological ownership and the organizational context: Theory, research evidence, and application*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*, 12–21.
- Reijerse, A., Van Acker, K., Vanbeselaere, N., Phalet, K., & Duriez, B. (2013). Beyond the ethnic-civic dichotomy: Cultural citizenship as a new way of excluding immigrants. *Political Psychology*, *34*, 611–630.
- Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 336–353.
- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6*, 88–106.
- Rochat, P. (2014). *Origins of possession: Owning and sharing in development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, H., Friedman, O., & Field, A. (2015). Toddlers assert and acknowledge ownership rights. *Social Development*, *24*, 341–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12101>
- Saab, R., Tausch, N., Spears, R., & Cheung, W. Y. (2015). Acting in solidarity: Testing an extended dual pathway model of collective action by bystander group members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *54*, 539–560. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12095>
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2007). Defining American identity in the 21st century: How much “there” is there? *The Journal of Politics*, *69*, 597–615.
- Schneider, J., Fokkema, T., Matias, R., Stojcic, S., Ugrina, D., & Vera-Larucea, C. (2012). Identities: Urban belonging and intercultural relations. In M. Cruil, J. Schneider, & F. Lelie (Eds.), *The European second generation compared: Does the integration context matter?* (pp. 285–340). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Schoenfeld, G. (2004). *The return of anti-semitism*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.
- Schuck, P. H. (1998). *Citizens, strangers, and in-betweens: Essays on immigration and citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Schwartz, S. J., Vignoles, V. L., Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2014). The identity dynamics of acculturation and multiculturalism: Situating acculturation in context. In V. Benet-Martínez, & Y.-Y. Hong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity: Basic and applied psychological perspectives* (pp. 57–93). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selvanathan, H. P., Techakesari, P., Tropp, L. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2017). Whites for racial justice: How contact with Black Americans predicts support for collective action among White Americans. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217690908>
- Settles, I. H., & Buchanan, N. T. (2014). Multiple groups, multiple identities and intersectionality. In V. Benet-Martínez, & Y.-Y. Hong (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of multicultural identity: Basic and applied psychological perspectives* (pp. 160–180). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Shotter, J. (1993). *Cultural politics of everyday life: Social constructions, rhetoric and knowing of the third kind*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-positive psychology: Undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 1359–1366.
- Sniderman, P., & Hagendoorn, L. (2007). *When ways of life collide: Multiculturalism and its discontent in the Netherlands*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sniderman, P., Hagendoorn, L., & Prior, M. (2004). Predispositional factors and situational triggers: Exclusionary reactions to immigrant minorities. *American Political Science Review*, *98*, 35–50.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory on prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23–45). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Stevenson, C., Dixon, J., Hopkins, N., & Luyt, R. (2015). The social psychology of citizenship, participation and social exclusion: Introduction to the special thematic section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *3*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jpspp.v3i2.579>
- Stürmer, S., & Snyder, M. (Eds) (2010). *The psychology of prosocial behavior*. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sullivan, J. J., Piereson, J. E., & Marcus, G. E. (1982). *Political tolerance and American democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *The social psychology of minorities*. London: Minority Rights Group.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Toft, M. D. (2014). Territory and war. *Journal of Peace Research*, *51*, 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343313515695>

- UNESCO (2009). *Investing in cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue*. Paris: United Nations educational, cultural and scientific organization.
- Van Leeuwen, E., & Zagefka, H. (2017). *Intergroup helping*. London: Springer.
- Verkuyten, M. (1997). Discourses of ethnic minority identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 565–586.
- Verkuyten, M. (2003). Discourses about ethnic group (de-) essentialism: Oppressive and progressive aspects. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 371–391.
- Verkuyten, M. (2014). *Identity and cultural diversity: What social psychology can teach us*. Hove, UK: Routledge.
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2015). Behind the ethnic-civic distinction: Public attitudes toward immigrants' political rights in the Netherlands. *Social Science Research, 53*, 43–44.
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2017). Collective psychological ownership and intergroup relations. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*, 1021–1039.
- Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B., & Smeekes, A. (2014). The multicultural jigsaw puzzle: Category indispensability and acceptance of immigrants' cultural rights. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 40*, 1480–1493.
- Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2010). Religious group relations among Christian, Muslim and non-religious early adolescents in the Netherlands. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 30*, 27–49.
- Verkuyten, M., & Yogeewaran, K. (2017). The social psychology of intergroup toleration: A roadmap for theory and research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 21*, 72–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316640974>
- Vignoles, V. L. (2011). Identity motives. In K. Luycke, S. J. Schwartz, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 403–432). New York: Springer.
- Voas, D., & Fleischmann, F. (2012). Islam moves west: Religious change in the first and second generations. *Annual Review of Sociology, 38*, 525–545. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145455>
- Wagner, U. (2017). European Research on immigration. Paper presented at the 18th General Meeting of the European Association of Social Psychology, July 5–8. Granada.
- Wagner, U., Christ, O., & Heitmeyer, W. (2010). Anti-immigration bias. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination* (pp. 361–375). London: Sage.
- Wakefield, J. R. H., Hopkins, N., Cockburn, C., Shek, K. M., Muirhead, A., Reicher, S., & Van Rijswijk, W. (2011). The impact of adopting ethnic or civic conceptions of national belonging for others' treatment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 1599–1610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211416131>
- White, J. B., & Langer, E. J. (1999). Horizontal hostility: Relations between similar minority groups. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 537–559.
- Ye, Y., & Gawronski, B. (2016). When possessions become part of the self: Ownership and implicit self-object linking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 64*, 72–87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2016.01.012>
- Yogeewaran, K., & Dasgupta, N. (2014). Conceptions of national identity in a globalized world: Antecedents and consequences. *European Review of Social Psychology, 25*, 189–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2014.972081>
- Zagefka, H., & Brown, R. (2005). Comparisons and perceived deprivation in ethnic minority settings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 467–482. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271711>