University of Groningen

Threat by association

Bouman, Thijs

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Citation for published version (APA):
Bouman, T. (2016). *Threat by association: how distant events can affect local intergroup relations*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.

Copyright
Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment.

Take-down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): http://www.rug.nl/research/portal. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Download date: 26-09-2023

Chapter 1

General introduction

In today's globalized world, local societies host an increasing amount of cultural groups. Although this diversification clearly has its merits (e.g., diversity may contribute to creativity and innovation; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007), cultural minorities also frequently face prejudice and resistance by host-society members (Coenders, Lubbers, Scheepers, & Verkuyten, 2008; McLaren, 2003; Ward & Masgoret, 2006). One prominent explanation for this negativity is that many host-society majority members perceive cultural minorities as local outgroups that threaten their ingroup[1] (e.g., Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Stephan, Renfro, Esses, Stephan, & Martin, 2005; Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009). For instance, local outgroups are frequently seen as competing over jobs with the ingroup, profiting from social security benefits (e.g., Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, & Armstrong, 2001), and to threaten the ingroup's cultural identity (e.g., González, Verkuyten, Weesie, & Poppe, 2008). However, recent observations (e.g., Allen & Nielsen, 2002) suggest that international events in which observers perceive threats from a distant outgroup (e.g., Al Qaeda after the 9/11 terrorist attacks) might also affect prejudice toward local cultural minorities (e.g., Turkish-Dutch citizens). This dissertation will systematically focus on these '*carry-over effects*' by examining whether and how threats from *distant outgroups* facilitate prejudice toward *local outgroups*.

The possible influence of international events on local intergroup relations is particularly relevant in the current 'global village' (McLuhan, 1964), in which the media frequently confront individuals with international events that could induce feelings of *intergroup threat*. For instance, the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the European debt crisis and the Arab uprisings dominated the international media, could be followed almost everywhere through (live) media coverage, and often evoked feelings of threat among observers worldwide (e.g., Allen & Nielsen, 2002; Antoniades, 2012; De Beer,

---

[1] Within this dissertation we focus on host-society majority members' (e.g., native Dutch citizens') perceptions of cultural minorities within this society (e.g., Turkish-Dutch citizens). Therefore, we refer to the majority group as the *ingroup* and to the cultural minority groups as the *local outgroups*.

2011; Tzogopoulos, 2013). As such, one could say that individuals have transformed from 'local observers' that are mainly aware of threatening events within their immediate surroundings into 'global observers' that are aware of threatening events worldwide, which stresses the importance of studying the psychological consequences of these more distant intergroup threats.

Although these developments have increased observers' awareness of international events, most of the outgroups involved in international events remain remote (i.e., observers are unlikely to have direct contact with the far away outgroup). Most frequently, international events concern perceived conflicts between the ingroup (e.g., native Dutch citizens) and a distant outgroup (e.g., Greeks), or between two distant outgroups (e.g., the Egyptian rebels and the Mubarak government)[2], which makes direct contact with the involved outgroups unlikely. For this reason, global observers mainly rely on secondary sources — such as the media — to form impressions of the involved distant outgroups. This lack of direct contact makes it unlikely that prejudice results in prejudiced actions (such as aggression) targeting or influencing the distant outgroup (Allen & Nielsen, 2002). Local cultural minorities, on the other hand, are more likely encountered and are more probable targets of prejudiced actions. This line of reasoning accentuates the specific relevance of studying carry-over effects from distant intergroup threats because their influence on *local* outgroups can be psychologically consequential close to home.

In sum, threats from distant outgroups might carry over into prejudice toward local outgroups. Studying carry-over effects is particularly relevant because the current media frequently inform individuals about threatening international events and thus affects individuals' reactions toward local cultural minorities. Nonetheless, surprisingly little is known about carry-over effects of distant intergroup threat. Therefore, this dissertation will focus on these carry-over effects and, more specifically, investigate

[2] Within this dissertation an international event is defined as an event that receives international media attention. Accordingly, events that originate within a nation (e.g., Egypt) but are globally discussed still belong to what we define as an international event.

when carry-over effects occur, *which different types of intergroup threats* can carry over (i.e., symbolic and realistic intergroup threats; Stephan et al., 2009), and which associative processes underlie these carry-over effects of different distant intergroup threats (i.e., *how* they occur).

Theoretical Background

Carry-over effects are particularly important to consider in the context of a globalized world. Globalization refers to a process that connects and integrates national and cultural groups around the world (Giddens, 1990; Rantanen, 2005; Thompson, 1995; Waters, 2001). Global integration can occur through growing mobility and immigration, which increases direct contact between cultures (e.g., between native host-society members and immigrants; CBS, 2015); as well as through developments within media and communication, which enable mediated exposure to groups far away (e.g., news reports on international events; Rantanen, 2005). Moreover, through these processes, globalization has brought distant situations nearby in such a way that they can shape local happenings (Giddens, 1990). This dissertation brings these underpinnings of globalization together as it focuses on how intercultural relations at the local level are influenced by information about distant events.

Although globalization has brought distant and international events nearby, not all events are equally likely to receive global attention. Because global observers are generally only weakly involved in such events and do not have contact with the outgroups involved, they often rely on what secondary sources, such as the media, present to them. Accordingly, the perceived 'newsworthiness' of an international event is an important indicator of the events' visibility (Robinson & Sparkes, 1976; Segev, 2014). Research has indicated that negative and threatening conflicts are considered particularly newsworthy, are centrally discussed within the media (Galtung & Ruge, 1965; Greenwood & Jenkins, 2015; S. T. Lee & Maslog, 2005; Segev, 2014), and have a high probability to grasp observers' attention (e.g., Rozin & Royzman,

2001; Trussler & Soroka, 2014). Hence, global observers are likely to be confronted with negative international events that evoke feelings of distant intergroup threat.

In the remainder of this introduction we[3] will outline how these feelings of distant intergroup threat could carry over into prejudice toward local outgroups. Because not much is known about such threats' influence on other outgroups than the one perceived as threatening, and thus about carry-over effects, we will start by defining threat and discuss its influence on the outgroup perceived as threatening. From this, we will move to the central theme of this dissertation: carry-over effects of intergroup threats. More specifically, we will discuss how previous research on intergroup threats might relate to *when* and *how* threats from distant outgroups carry over into prejudice toward local outgroups. Thereafter, we close by providing a brief overview of the chapters of this dissertation.

Theories of threat

Threats, defined as a feeling that individuals experience when their well-being or goals are challenged by others' actions, beliefs, or characteristics (Riek et al., 2006), often occur within an intergroup context in which an outgroup is perceived to threaten the ingroup (Semyonov, Raijman, Tov, & Schmidt, 2004; Stephan et al., 2009). For instance, native Dutch citizens might perceive Polish labor immigrants (i.e., outgroup) to threaten their ingroup's job-perspectives. Moreover, even when the threat is too general to be caused by a specific outgroup (e.g., global economic downturn), individuals tend to attribute this threat to an outgroup (e.g., immigrants; Becker, Wagner, & Christ, 2011; Butz & Yogeeswaran, 2011). Accordingly, when individuals experience threat, they often attribute those threats to an outgroup.

[3] Throughout this dissertation "we" is used instead of "I" to reflect that the research described is a product of my collaboration with my advisors—Martijn van Zomeren and Sabine Otten—and others.

Various theories have been proposed that consider such *intergroup threats* as an explanation for prejudice toward the outgroup perceived as threatening (for overviews see Riek et al., 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000); for instance, whether prejudice by native-Dutch citizens toward Polish labor immigrants could be explained by native-Dutch perceiving threats from Polish labor immigrants. We will discuss three classic theories that consider feelings of threat as an explanation of prejudice: realistic group conflict theory, group position model, and symbolic racism theory. Thereafter, we will continue by discussing the intergroup threat theory (Stephan et al., 2009), which integrates these classic approaches and could be considered the main theory underlying our predictions.

Realistic group conflict theory. One of the most prominent theories that considers intergroup threats is *realistic group conflict theory* (Campbell, 1958; LeVine & Campbell, 1972; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961; Sherif, 1966), which focuses on how competition between groups can result in prejudice toward the competitor (e.g., Bobo, 1988; Sherif et al., 1961). More specifically, within a realistic group conflict, an outgroup is perceived to pose a *realistic threat* to the success of the ingroup by competing over tangible, limited resources or power (Bobo, 1988; Sherif et al., 1961; Sherif, 1966). Realistic threats could be illustrated by current debates on immigration, in which host-society members perceive immigrants to compete over jobs with host-society members, using governmental money, and to pose threats to the economic well-being of the host-society members' ingroup (Esses et al., 2001; Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998; McLaren, 2003; Pichler, 2010; Zárate, Garcia, Garza, & Hitlan, 2004). The conflict between Greece and Western-European countries regarding the Greek debts, reforms and repayments could be seen as an example of an international realistic conflict (Antoniades, 2012; Tzogopoulos, 2013) posing a distant realistic threat. Although observers from the involved countries (e.g., Dutch citizens) might perceive and experience threats, they generally do not have contact with the outgroup involved (e.g., Greek citizens).

Group position model. Somewhat related to the realistic group conflict theory is Blumer's (1958) *group position model,* which focuses on the broader sociological position of the ingroup. According to the group position model, dominant groups often exhibit a proprietary claim over rights, statuses and resources, and might perceive subordinate groups to threaten these entitlements (Blumer, 1958; Bobo, 1999; Minescu & Poppe, 2011). Hence, group members might perceive outgroups to threaten certain prerogatives of the ingroup and therefore become prejudiced toward these outgroups. Similar to realistic group conflict theory, these prerogatives might concern relatively tangible resources such as property, jobs, or political decision making. Additionally, these prerogatives might also concern more intangible constructs such as prestige, intimacy, or privacy (e.g., Bobo, 1999). In addition, Blumer (1958) emphasizes that most threats are induced by the remote public arena and not by first-hand information, supporting the earlier notion that mediated information about international events might prompt feelings of threat.

Symbolic racism theory. Lastly, the *symbolic racism theory* (Kinder & Sears, 1981; McConahay & Hough, 1976; Sears, 1988) proposes that individuals become prejudiced because they experience threats from conflicting values, norms and beliefs rather than competition or conflicting goals. Differences in values, beliefs and norms might threaten the identity of the ingroup (De Dreu & Van Knippenberg, 2005; Harinck & Ellemers, 2014) and the group's valued way of living (Stephan et al., 2005, 2009) For instance, immigrants could be perceived as threatening because they might have other cultural values and religious beliefs than citizens of the host-society (e.g., Biernat, Vescio, & Theno, 1996; González et al., 2008; McLaren, 2003). Moreover, individuals might experience threats when they perceive another group to violate important ingroup values (Biernat et al., 1996). For example, observers from Western countries might perceive threats from the Muslim Brotherhood's involvement in the Egyptian uprisings as it might conflict with their democratic (e.g., separation of church and state) and religious (e.g., Christian) ideals (e.g., De Beer, 2011).

In sum, the realistic group conflict theory, group position model and symbolic racism theory describe different types of threat which could be experienced at both the personal and group level (Stephan et al., 2009): Individuals could experience threats to their possessions (e.g., LeVine & Campbell, 1972), group position (e.g., Blumer, 1958), or group values (e.g., Sears, 1988). Although these theories seem to complement each other (e.g., Riek et al., 2006), they were originally seen as conflicting in their claim to predict prejudice and were therefore often studied separately (Bobo, 1983; Kinder & Sears, 1981; Sniderman & Tetlock, 1986). More recently however, Stephan and colleagues (2002; 2000; 2009) provided an integrative framework in which these threats could be studied together: the *intergroup threat theory*.

Intergroup threat theory

Based on the realistic group conflict theory and symbolic racism theory, intergroup threat theory (Stephan & Renfro, 2002; Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2009) differentiates between two basic types of threat: realistic and symbolic threats. According to intergroup threat theory, both types of threat can occur next to each other, and each uniquely predicts prejudice (for a meta-analysis see Riek et al., 2006). Because the conceptualization of the threats slightly differs from the original theories, and because the specific characteristics of each type of threat are associated with specific reactions and consequences, we will discuss both threats in more detail below.

Realistic threats. Similar to realistic group conflict theory, intergroup threat theory defines realistic threats as threats concerning tangible resources of the ingroup, such as its resources, possessions, and power. Additionally, realistic threats include threats to the ingroup's existence, health, and physical well-being. Therefore, intergroup threat theory's definition of realistic threats is slightly broader than the definition of realistic group conflict theory, and focuses on the general welfare of the ingroup (Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1999). Realistic threats can be considered

relatively *concrete* as they generally concern observable and measurable things which could be directly targeted by outgroup actions (e.g., Esses et al., 2001, 1998; McLaren, 2003; Pichler, 2010; Zárate et al., 2004).

These characteristics of realistic threats have important consequences for individuals' reactions to such threats. Because of realistic threats' concreteness, they are typically associated with pragmatic responses aimed at coping with the threat and the outgroup perceived as threatening (Esses et al., 1998; Maddux, Galinsky, Cuddy, & Polifroni, 2008; Stephan et al., 2009). For instance, when host-society members perceive realistic threats from labor immigrants, they might vote for policies that might disadvantage labor immigrants (e.g., high taxes for labor immigrants). Moreover, reactions to realistic threats often involve feelings of fear and anger (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005), and concern behaviors such as negotiation (De Dreu, Harinck, & Van Vianen, 1999; De Dreu & Van Knippenberg, 2005; Harinck, De Dreu, & Van Vianen, 2000; Harinck & Ellemers, 2014) or aggression (Stephan et al., 2009).

Symbolic threats. Symbolic threats are perceived threats to the ingroup's religion, values, belief system or ideology (Stephan et al., 2009). These threats rely on individuals' perception that an outgroup has different values from the ingroup, violates values of the ingroup, or does not support the ingroup's values (Biernat et al., 1996; Stephan et al., 1999). In contrast to realistic threats, symbolic threats are abstract and intangible; they concern valued ideas and ideals instead of possessions. Moreover, they are often considered central and important to the individuals' and ingroup's identity (De Dreu, Vries, Gordijn, & Schuurman, 1999; Harinck & Ellemers, 2014).

Because symbolic values are central to the individual´s and ingroup´s identity, individuals are unlikely to negotiate or compromise on them (Stephan et al., 2009). For that reason, individuals typically respond to symbolic threats by conforming to the ingroup's norms and values (Cameron, Duck, Terry, & Lalonde, 2005; Jetten, Postmes, & McAuliffe, 2002; Kouzakova, Ellemers, Harinck, & Scheepers, 2012; Vaes & Wicklund, 2002) and react toward the outgroup with disgust (e.g., Cottrell &

Neuberg, 2005), lowered sympathy (Kouzakova et al., 2012), dehumanization, and moral exclusion (e.g., Stephan et al., 2009). Moreover, symbolic threats are more likely to result in escalating conflicts (Kouzakova et al., 2012; Kouzakova, Harinck, Ellemers, & Scheepers, 2014) and may sometimes even lead to vicious behavioral responses, such as torture and mutilation (Stephan et al., 2009).

In sum, both realistic and symbolic threats predict prejudice toward the outgroup held responsible for the threat (Riek et al., 2006) and characteristics of each threat are related to specific prejudiced reactions (Stephan et al., 2009). Realistic threats are relatively concrete, which enables reactions directed at removing the threat; symbolic threats are more abstract, which make individuals prone to react by defending the ingroup's worldview and downplaying the outgroup's worldview (e.g., Stephan et al., 2009).

Typically, however, the study of different intergroup threats occurs in a 'local', not distant, setting. Indeed, although individuals can perceive threats from both local (e.g., local immigrant groups) and distant outgroups (e.g., citizens of a distant nation), most studies on intergroup threats have focused on local outgroups and individuals' reactions toward these local outgroups that are perceived as threatening (for a meta-analysis see Riek et al., 2006). Accordingly, it is yet unclear whether intergroup threats from distant outgroups carry over and influence local intergroup relations as well.

Carry-Over Effects of Distant Intergroup Threats

Little research has been done so far on carry-over effects of distant intergroup threats. Nonetheless, observations during and after the 9/11 terrorist attacks might be illustrative for a situation in which an international event influenced more local intergroup attitudes. After that horrible event, individuals worldwide seemed to not only react toward the group behind the attacks (i.e., Al Qaeda) but toward other outgroups as well. More specifically, even though most local Muslim

groups (e.g., within the Netherlands, Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch citizens; within the United States, Arab Americans) actively condemned these attacks, many became targets of prejudice and acts of retaliation (e.g., Allen & Nielsen, 2002; Hitlan, Carrillo, Zárate, & Aikman, 2007; Panagopoulos, 2006; Sheridan, 2006).

Some authors suggested that the violent extremity of the terrorist attacks might have psychologically legitimized (already existing) xenophobic attitudes (e.g., Allen & Nielsen, 2002; Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Das, Bushman, Bezemer, Kerkhof, & Vermeulen, 2009; Sheridan, 2006). Moreover, the observation that reactions were mainly directed at Muslims could suggest that observers attributed the threat to the larger group of Muslims rather than to the specific group Al Qaeda (e.g., Allen & Nielsen, 2002; Sheridan, 2006). These suggestions offer important preliminary insights in *when* and *how* carry-over effects of distant intergroup threats might occur.

Considering the *when* question, these observations suggest that carry-over effects occur when individuals perceive an outgroup (e.g., Al Qaeda) as being part of a broader category (e.g., Muslims). Indeed, research on generalizations of attitudes has revealed that individuals often generalize their attitudes toward a larger collection of associated objects rather than only one object (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew, 2009; Shook, Fazio, & Richard Eiser, 2007; Tausch et al., 2010; Walther, 2002). For instance, Shook and colleagues (2007) found that objects that were perceived as extreme and negative also affected attitudes toward other objects that looked alike. These findings might apply to intergroup threats as well and could imply that, as a function of a distant intergroup threat, negative attitudes are generalized toward outgroups that are *associated* with the outgroup perceived as threatening (e.g., in appearance or ideology; Allen & Nielsen, 2002).

Considering the *how* question, an association between the distant and local outgroups might represent the psychological creation of a more inclusive category consisting of several outgroups — a category to which we refer as a '*superordinate outgroup*' (e.g., for Dutch observers of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Muslims in general). Such superordinate outgroups could be seen as the opposite of superordinate

ingroups (or common ingroups; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2007, 2009; Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman, & Rust, 1993). Whereas the creation of a superordinate ingroup might improve intergroup relations (Dovidio et al., 2007, 2009), superordinate outgroups could enable overgeneralizations of negative attitudes and intensify feelings of threat. Indeed, Allport (1954) already indicated that categories are often large clusters of objects in which as much as possible is assimilated. Similarly, Blumer (1958) argued that the creation of large and abstract entities of others is particularly likely to induce prejudice. Accordingly, distant threats might activate a superordinate outgroup in which reactions toward these threats are generalized among all included outgroups, which might explain how distant intergroup threats carry over.

In sum, despite their importance and potential implications, little is known about carry-over effects of distant intergroup threats. Nevertheless, recent observations — such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks — suggest that carry-over effects might specifically occur when observers associate the distant and local outgroups with each other (e.g., because they share the same world religion), which might represent a perceived connection through a shared superordinate outgroup (e.g., Muslims in general). Thus, carry-over effects might be particularly likely to occur when global observers perceive local outgroups to share a superordinate outgroup membership with the distant outgroup seen as causing the threat.

Dissertation Overview

In this dissertation we focus on the local psychological implications of threats from distant outgroups by investigating when and how such distant intergroup threats can carry over into local prejudice. More specifically, we look at whether and when carry-over effects occur for distant symbolic (Chapter 2 and 3) and realistic intergroup threats (Chapter 3), which processes underlie carry-over effects (Chapter 3 and 4), and close by exploring whether more positive news about distant outgroups could carry over as well, thus potentially improving local intergroup reactions (Chapter 5). In the

last chapter (Chapter 6), we discuss the theoretical and practical implications of the studies in the different chapters, as well as limitations and directions for future research. In most of our chapters, we use ongoing international events to test our predictions (e.g., threats from the Egyptian uprisings, the global economic downturn, or terrorist attacks), which we will discuss in more detail in the respective chapter. Below, an overview is given of the empirical chapters[4] (Chapter 2 to 5), in which our research questions are addressed.

Chapter 2. Threat by association: Do distant intergroup threats carry over into local intolerance?

The main goal of Chapter 2 is to experimentally test whether carry-over effects of intergroup threat occur. As was already discussed above, not much is known about carry-over effects, and what is known is generally based on observations rather than controlled empirical studies. Therefore, we empirically test whether media-based information about distant events can induce feelings of intergroup threat, and investigate whether these feelings of threat relate to intolerance toward local outgroups. Based on earlier observations and literature (e.g., Allen & Nielsen, 2002; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew, 2009; Shook et al., 2007; Tausch et al., 2010; Walther, 2002), we hypothesize that carry-over effects are particularly likely to occur toward local outgroups that are psychologically *associated* with the distant outgroup rather than toward outgroups in general.

In addition, based on the characteristic of symbolic and realistic threat, we argue and expect that perceived symbolic threats of distant outgroups easily activate such an association that connects the distant with local outgroups. Symbolic threats concern threats to the ingroup's values (Stephan et al., 2009), which make these

[4] Note that the empirical chapters were written such that they could be read independently as individual research papers. For that reason, the chapters necessarily overlap to a certain extent with each other.

threats broad, abstract, and difficult to ascribe to one specific outgroup. Symbolic threats could therefore easily transcend the specific intergroup context and be applied to other, associated, outgroups as well. Moreover, as symbolic threats are central to group-identities (De Dreu & Van Knippenberg, 2005; De Dreu, Vries, et al., 1999; Harinck & Ellemers, 2014), they might be specifically likely to activate an association that resembles a superordinate outgroup through which carry-over effects could occur. Realistic threats, on the other hand, are more concrete and should therefore be more easily attributed to a specific outgroup, which could hinder the psychological activation of associations, and thereby lower realistic threats' carry-over potential.

We test these predictions in three studies. In correlational Study 2.1 we inspect whether perceived threats from the Arab uprisings relate to intolerance toward local Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch citizens. In Study 2.2 and 2.3 we experimentally test whether reports on the potential accession of Turkey to the European Union (EU) induce feelings of intergroup threat and affect intolerance toward local Turkish-, Moroccan-, and Polish-Dutch citizens. For this purpose, we manipulate whether the reports contain information that could be considered potentially symbolically (e.g., other culture than most EU member states) or realistically (e.g., high costs of accession) threatening. The results of all three studies are in line with the idea that particularly distant symbolic threats are predictive of intolerance toward associated local outgroups.

Chapter 3. When foreign threats turn domestic: Two ways for distant realistic intergroup threats to carry over into local intolerance

Although we suggested in Chapter 2 that symbolic threats are more likely associated with local outgroups and therefore have more carry-over potential than realistic threats, we do believe that realistic threats can carry over too. Therefore, the main aim of Chapter 3 is to identify what *types of association* could enable carry-over effects of distant *realistic* threats. Even though realistic threats are more concrete than

symbolic threats (Stephan et al., 2009) and, accordingly, more easily attributed to a specific outgroup (Esses et al., 1998; Maddux et al., 2008), the outgroup and/or the threat caused by this outgroup could still be associated with other outgroups and thus carry over. In Chapter 3 we identify two types of associations that could induce indirect carry-over effects.

Firstly, distant and local outgroups could be connected to each other through a *group-based association* in which both outgroups are perceived to have similar worldviews, cultural identities, or values. This group-based association enables reactions toward the distant outgroup to carry over toward local outgroups (even though these local outgroups might not be seen as threatening). For instance, Dutch citizens who perceive realistic threats from Greece's involvement in the global debt crisis might become prejudiced toward Greeks. This prejudice toward Greeks could then be generalized to local outgroups that are culturally associated with Greece (e.g., groups with a "Mediterranean" culture such as Turkish-Dutch citizens). Secondly, the distant and local outgroups could also be connected to each other through a *threat-based association*, in which both outgroups are perceived to pose a similar type of threat. For instance, when Dutch citizens are confronted with realistic threats from Greece's involvement in the global debt crisis, they might be alerted to potential economic threats from Polish labor immigrants and become (more) prejudiced toward those local immigrant outgroups.

We test these pathways in two studies. In Study 3.1, we use the context of the potential accession of Turkey to the EU. We argue that a group-based association could explain carry-over effects toward Turkish- and Moroccan-Dutch citizens because these groups are typically seen as culturally related to Turkey but not very economically threatening (e.g., González et al., 2008). A threat-based association, on the other hand, could explain carry-over effects toward Polish-Dutch citizens as this outgroup is generally seen as economically threatening but unrelated to the Turkish culture (Dagevos, 2011; De Boom, Weltevrede, Rezai, & Engbersen, 2008; Van Doorn, Scheepers, & Dagevos, 2012). In Study 3.2, we test these associations in the

context of the global debt crisis and investigate whether Dutch' perceptions of threats from Greece affect local intolerance. The results are in line with the relevance of both associations and their relation with local intolerance, and thus to carry-over effects of distant realistic threats.

Chapter 4. From global threats to local intolerance: The role of superordinate outgroups.

Where Chapters 2 and 3 focus on the *whether* and *when* questions concerning the occurrence of carry-over effects of distant intergroup threats, Chapter 4 focuses specifically on the *how*. In Chapter 4 we explore in two studies the idea of *superordinate outgroups* and test (a) whether individuals can psychologically construe superordinate outgroups and (b) whether these superordinate outgroups can explain the occurrence of carry-over effects. More specifically, and in line with our findings from Chapter 2 and 3, we predict that a superordinate outgroup can be based on a perceived *common identity* (e.g., culture or religion) or *common fate* (e.g., similar levels of wealth).

In Study 4.1 we instruct participants to construe superordinate outgroups based on the aforementioned commonalities from a list of nationalities (e.g., Turks, Germans, Brazilians). In Study 4.2, we experimentally test whether a fictitious threat from Tajikistan could carry over into intolerance toward local Turkish-, Moroccan-, and Indonesian-Dutch citizens, depending on the superordinate outgroup that was experimentally activated (Middle-Eastern versus Asian). In line with our reasoning, these studies indicate that individuals are able to construe both types of superordinate outgroups and that carry-over effects only occur when the distant and local outgroup were included in the same superordinate outgroup.

Chapter 5: Bad news spreads quickly, good news stays remote? The carry-over potential of positive and negative news about distant situations.

In the final empirical chapter of this dissertation we test whether more positive news about distant events (e.g., the Arab Spring) could result in similar, yet positive, carry-over effects as distant bad news covering intergroup threats. That is, may distant positive events enhance local tolerance, just as distant negative events may enhance local intolerance? We argue that although similar processes might apply to distant good news (for positive generalizations see Lolliot et al., 2012; Pettigrew, 2009; Tausch et al., 2010), good news might have less carry-over potential than bad news. Specifically, research on a positive-negative asymmetry in information processing suggests that negative information is particularly prone to get generalized among outgroups (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs, 2001; Rozin & Royzman, 2001; Skowronski & Carlston, 1989) and thus to carry over.

We compare the effects of distant good and bad news in two experimental studies in which we manipulate the valence of the news report (i.e., either a positive or a threatening framing) on the Syrian civil war (Study 5.1) and the Egyptian uprisings (Study 5.2). As predicted, distant bad news has a larger (and negative) impact on local tolerance than distant good news.