AMERICAN ENOUGH? ATTITUDES TOWARD IMMIGRANTS, PATRIOTISM,

AND NATIONALISM

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY

NOELANY PELC, M.A.

DENTON, TX

AUGUST 2016

DEDICATION

To my best friend, partner, confidante, and endless source of sustenance, Christopher Pelc, for forever believing in me, lifting me, and carrying me across the finish line.

To my baby bird, Mikel, who grew with me through this project, providing unconditional love, warmth, and filling my days with wonder.

To my parents for planting the seeds and nourishing the inspiration for this project.

To my longest-standing teacher and father, Roberto Swazo, who modeled a journey of impossible lengths. Thank you for teaching me to question everything and pursue anything.

To my safety net and mother, Dagmar Swazo, who represents nothing less than unconditional positive regard and love without conditions.

To my brother Tito Swazo, who reminds me that we are still kids, and time is just a concept.

To my chair and mentor, Debra Mollen, for cultivating my curiosity, encouraging me to use my voice, and lighting the path. Your endless dedication, attention to detail, passion, and encouragement bolstered me from the beginning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe my sanity to all of my peers in the Counseling Psychology and School Psychology program, who shared tears, hopes, dreams, and provided resilience during every stage of the program. I am especially grateful to Sarah Khan, Dena Abbott, and Laura Oei, who shared your friendship, families, and love when I was lost in Texas. You remind me that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts and have special places in my heart.

Finally, words cannot adequately capture the gratitude I have for my family, extended and immediate for all of the late-night phone calls, words of encouragement, unfailing support, and joy in each achievement. This dream has been a possibility because of you. Chris, I share this milestone with you, above all others.

ABSTRACT

NOELANY PELC

AMERICAN ENOUGH? ATTITUDES TOWARD IMMIGRANTS, PATRIOTISM, AND
NATIONALISM

AUGUST 2016

The United States (U.S.) has fostered powerful bonds, strengthening a collective identity

to country and compatriots. Recent political and immigration events have challenged

beliefs about what it means to be an American and who should be included in its cultural

practices. Although there has been significant literature published on the nature of

nationalism, patriotism, and in-group and out-group identification in other fields, less

research has explored the complex interactions of numerous demographic variables on

the perception of American identity from a psychological perspective. Participants

completed a demographic questionnaire, the Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale

(Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999), Nationalistic Attitude Scale (Kosterman & Feshbach,

1989), Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Scale (Zakrisson, 2005), Social Dominance

Orientation (SDO) Scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), American Identity

Measure (Schwartz et al., 2012), and the Measure of Fear-Based Xenophobia (Veer et al.,

2013). As predicted, politically conservative participants born in the U.S. reported higher

levels of fear-based xenophobia, while politically progressive participants with low levels

of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, fear-based xenophobia, and Social Dominance

Orientation endorsed higher levels of sociocultural competence. Consistent with

predictions, those with high levels of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, fear-based xenophobia, Social Dominance Orientation, uncritical patriotism, and those who identified as U.S-born., were more likely to object to immigrants participating in traditionally-U.S. rituals, although responses were tempered if hypothetical immigrants were said to respect America's institutions and laws, identify as Americans, and speak English. Unexpectedly, results linked higher nationalistic attitude scores, identifying as non-White, and having a low-to-mid-SES with a stronger sense of American identity, while linking high levels of RWA to lower levels of American identity. Counseling psychologists should conceptualize how people integrate multiple cultural identities within the U.S. across the lifespan, experience national identity as protective or exclusionary, and manage acculturative stress. This study's findings inform our understanding of out-group derogation, social justice advocacy individually and nationally, and multicultural competence in a changing nation (Sehgal et al., 2011; Stuart, 2004). Implications for theory, research, practice, and training were detailed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale and Statement of Problem

On July 16th, 2013, Marc Anthony took the field at a Major League Baseball (MLB) game in Queens, New York to sing "God Bless America" (Berlin, 1938). This event sparked a heated national debate, as social media became an outlet for many viewers to share their frustration, outrage, and confusion over the choice in artist (Aravosis, 2013; Moreno, 2013; Urbanski, 2013). Media sources such as Twitter were flooded with comments questioning Anthony's qualifications, not as an artist or musician, but rather whether he was American *enough* to sing a patriotic song during a decidedly American sporting event (Aravosis, 2013; Carrero, 2013; Urbanski, 2013). Marc Anthony, a New York native whose family emigrated from the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico, was characterized by some as un-American, and therefore, unfit to perform or engage in a traditional ritual (Carrero, 2013; Moreno, 2013). One viewer questioned, "To be selected to sing God Bless America for the MLB All Star Game shouldn't you at least be FROM America?" (Urbanski, 2013). Another viewer similarly questioned Anthony's suitability to perform and alluded to a breach in the national tapestry, inquiring, "Is Marc Anthony going to sing 'God Bless America' in Spanish? # borderproblems," (Publicshaming.com, 2013) which was echoed by others who stated, "#cleanitup, #hesnotamerican" (Publicshaming.com, 2013).

1

This event generated controversial discussions emblematic of ongoing tensions surrounding race, ethnicity, American identity, and inclusion in American rituals. One month prior to Anthony's performance, social media similarly demonstrated a feverish uptick when San Antonio native Sebastien de la Cruz sang the national anthem during a National Basketball Association game (Moreno, 2013). Numerous viewers challenged de la Cruz's status as a U.S. citizen, asserting that his Mariachi clothing ensemble indicated a deviation from authentic American identity, representing a flaw in efforts to maintain in-group and out-group boundaries (Moreno, 2013). More importantly, these events and their subsequent impact on online conversations reflect a deeper movement, rooted in U.S. history and the social construction of belongingness to groups. Passionate attitudes related to group identity have been shaped through traditions, rituals, and sentiments that have served to maintain group unity, while simultaneously propagating negative attitudes and responses toward those who are seen as violating the established rules for identity (Manevska & Achterberg, 2013).

Nationalism and patriotism have fostered a collective identity, promoting political agendas and strong affect for individuals, groups, and countries (Anbarani, 2013; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Papastephanou, 2013; Vincent, 2009). As citizens determine ways they can participate most loyally and contribute to national programs, many nations produce informal and formal definitions of what it means to hold a national identity (Anbarani, 2013; Maxwell, 2010). These definitions bi-directionally inform and are informed by customs, traditions, appearances, beliefs, and behaviors of those who consider themselves

to be compatriots (Finell, Olakivi, Liebkind, & Lipsanen, 2013). Defining what it means to hold a national identity also often stipulates that out-group members present a threat to the internal structure of the nation, giving way to theories of competition and threat (Billig, 2002; Hawley, 2011; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Tajfel, 1982). Immigrants, then, are often perceived as a threat to the cultural traditions and existing ethnic composition of a nation, inciting concern about the integration of new cultural/ethnic influences (Hawley, 2011; Valentova & Alieva (2014). Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA), or a rigid tendency to oppose change in convention or tradition (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Altemeyer, 1981, 1996) and Social Dominance Theory (SDO), which proposes a propensity toward group comparison in an effort to establish a social hierarchy (Childs, 2011; Pratto et al., 1994), have both been associated with the perception of threat.

In the U.S., immigration has significantly impacted the demographic structure, with as many as 12 to 20% of individuals currently living in the U.S. having been born in other countries (Newman, 2013; Pang et al., 2010; Shobe, Coffman, & Dmochowski, 2009). The influx of an ethnically and culturally diverse population has challenged the currently-held definitions of U.S. identity. Existing literature has explored characteristics thought to be consistent with residents of the U.S. as Americanness or as components of American National Identity (ANI) (Dovidio, Gluszek, John, Ditlmann, & Lagunes, 2010; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011). Many U.S. residents identify themselves as *Americans*, although the term is not typically representative of residents living in the other countries that comprise North and South America. In an effort to reflect the culturally-relevant

terminology consistent with previous literature and reflective of common terminology, this author will refer to residents of the U.S. as Americans or U.S. Americans interchangeably while simultaneously recognizing the limitation noted above.

Purpose of Study

Exploration of the beliefs of U.S. citizens is particularly relevant, as historical events demonstrate a complex interaction between the image of the U.S. as a place of refuge for many immigrants (Ainslie, 2011; Wiley, Deaux, & Hagelskamp, 2012), juxtaposed against a strong history of out-group derogation, as evidenced by marked prejudice and discrimination towards African Americans (Katz & Hass, 1988; Kwate & Meyer, 2010), the internment of Asian Americans (Segal, Kilty, & Kim, 2002; Shrake & Chen, 2012), and recent social movements to combat the cultural influences of Latino(a) immigrants, particularly from Mexico in the southern border states (Brown, 2013; Newman, 2013; Newman, Hartman, & Taber, 2012). As the composition of the U.S. changes, it is important to explore how diverse individuals are perceived, particularly if they are seen as deviating from the established understanding of Americanness. During 2015 and 2016, presidential election debates and political party affiliation was strongly driven by discussions of immigration reform, fear of infiltration from outsiders, and shifts in value systems due to progressive agendas. Furthermore, this study sought to examine the impact of bias on out-group derogation, shaped by historical and cultural elements.

Within the context of psychology, ethical guidelines (American Psychological Association [APA], 2010) and "Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training,

Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists*"* (2003), there is a consistent emphasis on the encouragement of self-reflection, particularly as it relates to multicultural competence and inevitable bias. This study provided an opportunity to examine biases related to worldview, as fitting within nationalism, patriotism, and how others correspond or differ regarding the perception of Americans. These worldviews are inherently biased and influenced by ethnic identification, socioeconomic status, gender, education, ethnicity, and past experiences (Dottolo & Stewart, 2008),

Human beings are socialized within a cultural context, internalizing messages related to hierarchical systems, social norms, and group identity, necessitating a comprehensive inquiry that addresses the intersectionality of the aforementioned variables (Cole, 2009). The current investigation explored the experiences of students and the general population. By uncovering the ways participants have internalized these cultural messages and negotiated conflicts of threat to the idea of American identity, educators can determine the efficacy of current curriculum topics, materials, and goals; identify additional areas for continued focus; and determine areas of bias that can be addressed within the context of the classroom. Similarly, faculty within training and supervisory contexts can challenge students to explore areas of growth, particularly through self-reflection in promoting multicultural competence (Sehgal et al., 2011; Stuart, 2004). Finally, this study aimed to illustrate the experience of individuals who are attempting to navigate a complex process of discovering and concretizing their own identities, comparing their experience with that of a broader national identity, and

5

perhaps re-defining what it means to be an American in light of recent diversification. Through this window into the experience of participants, clinicians can better determine how to guide clients in a way that promotes social advocacy.

Review of the existing literature demonstrated a gap in the number of studies conducted in the U.S., with most research on national identity, nationalism, and patriotism being conducted in countries outside of the U.S. (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Finell et al., 2013; Green et al., 2010; Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012; Manevska & Achternberg, 2010; Spry & Hornsey, 2007; Valentova & Alieva, 2014; Wagner, Becker, Christ, Pettigrew, & Schmidt, 2012). Furthermore, studies that have utilized U.S. samples to survey the relationship among American identity, nationalism, and patriotism have not taken into account many intersecting demographic and ideological variables that work in tandem to influence bias, attitudes, and behavior (Citrin, Wong, & Duff, 2001; Dovidio et al., 2010; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012). This study sought to address these gaps by sampling a diverse population of individuals within the U.S., reflecting a broad set of demographic variables while also taking into account political views, and exploring the ways in which out-group members are seen when they attempt to perform rituals often reserved for U.S. Americans. This study sought to address the relationships between American National Identity, Americanness, race, level of education, SES, level of patriotism, nationalism, ethnic identification, political affiliation, academic major, immigration status, perception of participation in rituals associated with U.S. American identity, derogation of out-group members, and perceived sociocultural competence. This

6

was the first study, to this author's knowledge, to incorporate these variables into a cohesive study.

General Research Questions

The framework for this research study was guided by a general exploration of the relationship between self-reported scores on American identity, patriotism, nationalism, SDO and RWA and their relationship to perception of others as U.S. Americans. More specifically, this study examined the ways in which immigrants are perceived when performing traditionally-U.S. rituals. Furthermore, this study sought to investigate the impact of perceived sociocultural competence in a multicultural society and its relationship to xenophobia and exclusion/inclusion of immigrants in U.S. American rituals. These relationships were studied as they were impacted by numerous demographic variables.

Key Terminology

Because many of the concepts introduced and explored within this manuscript are often discussed across disciplines in a variety of contexts with slightly different implications, brief operational definitions are offered in this section.

Race: Although previously utilized to describe perceived phenotypical or biological traits that differentiated groups, race is currently understood as a social construct, and "given concrete expression by the specific social relations and historical context in which they are embedded. Racial meanings have varied tremendously over time…" (Omni & Winant, 2010, p.15). It is meaningful to note that in the U.S., race often

7

defaults to a comparison between individuals identified as being White and others

perceived to be non-White (Omni & Winant, 2010). The literature on race and race

relations utilizes a variety of terms to identify racial categories and often utilizes ethnicity

and race interchangeably. For the purposes of this manuscript, this author has chosen to

utilize the term ethnicity, or self-reported race/ethnicity, utilizing racial categories only

when citing original works.

Ethnicity: While often discussed within the same context of race, ethnicity refers

to the shared cultural practices and heritage of a group, rather than any specific physical

attributes. Learned customs include a common language, style of music, manner of

clothing, and religion, among other factors (Schwartz et al., 2012).

Ethnic identity: Ethnic identity has been described as a complex and interactive

process, referring to "an aspect of one's self-concept derived from one's awareness and

knowledge of membership in an ethnic group, coupled with the emotions, behaviors, and

values attached to ethnic group membership" (Lee, 2005, p. 37).

Multicultural competence: Multicultural competence involves a process of

introspection, self-examination, and self-awareness into one's own biases and worldview,

particularly in the ways that they may differ from those of other cultural groups (Sehgal

et al., 2011; Stuart, 2004). In psychotherapy, multicultural competence refers to the

ability to engage with diverse groups in an ethical manner, utilizing clinical interventions

or decision-making processes that take into account sociocultural context (Sehgal et al.,

2011).

Americanness: Americanness is a subjective theoretical construct encompassing traits, characteristics, behaviors, and beliefs that residents of the U.S. are assumed to possess (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011). Furthermore, Americanness can be described on a continuum, with some individuals identifying or evaluating others on traits of Americanness (Dovidio et al., 2010).

Xenophobia: Xenophobia encompasses affective, behavioral, and attitudinal responses towards individuals identified as outsiders, described as eliciting states of fear, distrust, hostility, or strong dislike for out-group members (Veer et al., 2013).

Out-group derogation: Out-group derogation has been described as the process of engaging in devaluing comparison between one's in-group and perceived out-group, often experiencing negative affective responses and attributing negative characteristics to out-group members (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; McClain, Johnson Carew, Walton, & Watts, 2009).

English-Only policies: English-Only policies are also referred to as *Official-English* policies, stemming from a desire to establish English as the primary language in the U.S. The institution of English-Only policies has previously been utilized to deny translation services to non-English speaking residents, reduce or eliminate bilingual education programs, and limit the use of other languages when conducting or receiving governmental services (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011).

Intersectionality: Intersectionality highlights the importance of multiple diversity variables, as they interact and are compounded, to influence an individual's perceived

9

sense of self and experience in the world. Intersectionality refers to the theoretical notion

that consideration of multiple categories of membership provides a more accurate

depiction of identity (Cole, 2009).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

National Identity

Historically and currently, national identities have served to bind together groups

of individuals, generating a source for individual and collective self-esteem and fostering

common bonds between diverse persons (Anbarani, 2013; Cameron & Berry, 2008;

Schwartz et al., 2012; Wright, Citrin, & Wand, 2012). These identities often promote

engagement and interest in the civic activities of the nation and promotions of agendas

that advance group welfare (Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Wright et al., 2012). National

identity is defined as a rich patchwork quilt, comprised of values, shared traditions, and

beliefs from which unique cultures stem (Anbarani, 2013; Cameron & Berry, 2008;

Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Wright et al., 2012). Anbarani (2013) described the formation of

national identity as the development of a "system of shared meanings to interpret and

make sense of the world…" (p. 61), highlighting the way in which citizens begin to

understand their role in society and the roles of others, while other scholars have

emphasized the importance of relationships with other groups (Finell et al., 2013).

Moreover, these identities have been found to be independent from ideological

memberships, transcending political party lines into a deeper-rooted sense of national

belonging (Huddy & Khatib, 2007). National identity can be characterized as a broad

construct from which several other cultural ideals have stemmed, including concepts of patriotism and nationalism, which have shaped perceptions of in-groups and out-groups.

Patriotism

Patriotism and the role of a *patriot* have long existed to fuel passion, love, and attachment to a community, nation, or state to which one belongs (Vincent, 2009). Stemming from the ancient Roman roots of *patria* or *patrius*, patriotism and patriot have represented a historical connotation of early political structure with one's native city or familiar place of residence (Vincent, 2009). Vincent (2009) emphasized the relationship between the origins of the word patria or patriotism, with the Roman term for *father* or *paternal* roles of men in Roman antiquity, further linking citizenship to a role of loyalty towards one's perceived family (Nielsen, 2004). Feminist critique highlights the use of patriarchy as a gendered term, drawing attention to a hierarchical structure of power that has endured, embedded into modern-day language (Patil, 2013).

While the term patriot has endured for centuries, the root definition has shifted significantly over time, transforming in response to political need, cultural changes, and generational cohorts (Ali, McFarlane, Lees, & Srivastava, 2013; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Roberts, 2013). Ali et al. (2013) explored the complexities in defining patriotism as a construct, identifying traces of interwoven concepts including values, ideals, heroism, and faith within the collective consciousness of the U.S., eschewing a ubiquitous definition. Other explorations of patriotism have revealed strong facets of individualism, egalitarianism, and roots of the American Dream (Bratta, 2009; Stoll, 2009). Following

the September 11th , 2011 attacks in the U.S., patriotism was re-defined, as citizens

engaged in debates regarding its "'true' meaning" (Spry & Hornsey, 2007, p. 151) and

function (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Transue, 2007; Vejar, 2015). Furthermore,

individuals appear especially likely to seek displays of national symbols and ways of

demonstrating their allegiance during times of conflict (Transue, 2007). Similarly, several

authors have pointed to historical global events during which presidents or political

leaders attempted to utilize changing definitions of patriotism to legitimize acts of war or

to dispel disagreement among citizens in war times, emphasizing loyalty to country

(Knox & Wagganer, 2009; Roberts, 2013; Spry & Hornsey, 2007) and condemning

dissention as "acts of betrayal" (Nincic & Ramos, 2012, p.374). Following World War I

in U.S. history, patriotism was tied into performing as a soldier, honoring war veterans,

and engaging in duties to one's country, impacting the way in which men identified with

their country (Nielsen, 2004).

  Historically, a collective patriotic identity has served to provide as powerful

psychological protection, providing a sense of belonging and security during times of

insecurity or conflict (Sahar, 2008; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). During times of external

threat, political strife, or physical conflict, a perceived common threat can oftentimes

serve as a uniting force, facilitating the resolution of internal political disputes and

generating a source of collective strength in numbers (Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Transue,

2007). Furthermore, political leaders have frequently sought to appeal to the patriotic

13

spirit when attempting to mobilize large-scale national endeavors or political movements (Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Roberts, 2013).

More recently, patriotism has been characterized by a broad cluster of affective experiences related to pride, attachment, commitment, loyalty, and love toward one's country (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Vincent, 2009; Wagner et al., 2012) and the degree to which citizens experience these feelings (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Huddy & Khatib, 2007). Nincic and Ramos (2012) further defined attachment to the current social institutions and norms within the existing state as important elements of patriotism. Embedded in the discussion of patriotism is the underlying implication that citizens enact or express their loyalty by engaging in "the virtues of membership" (Vincent, 2009, p.348). Vincent (2009) highlighted the role of cultural norms associated with participating in friendships, communities, or civic duties to demonstrate one's level of patriotism. In the U.S., further themes have emerged, linking patriotism to strength, both economic and military, as well as a desire to establish uniformity in the nationalistic ideals (Ali et al., 2013). Over time, the linking of morality and loyalty to one's country for the pursuit of social cohesion, universal law, and American practices have generated complex definitions of what it means to be an American and engage patriotically in its practices (Ali et al., 2013; Vincent, 2009).

Papastephanou (2013) explored the polarization of "those who saw patriotism as a virtue and those who presented it with equal force as a vice" (p.23). Numerous authors have emphasized the possibility of the spirit of patriotism to be manipulated and

14

weaponized for the self-interest of a few with access to political power, while serving as a tool to conceal harmful political intentions (Nincic & Ramos, 2007; Roberts, 2013). Others have alluded to the notion that the process of establishing pride in a collective identity can lead to hostility towards others, intolerance of change, xenophobia, and aggression towards those considered to be members of an out-group (Spry & Hornsey, 2007; Transue, 2007). Similarly, researchers have identified a relationship between high endorsement of patriotism and desire for the installation of English-only legislation in the U.S., accentuating a linguistic component of collective identity (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011). A Canadian study found women endorsed slightly higher levels of patriotism as compared to men, reporting a greater sense of pride in the multicultural atmosphere perceived to exist in their country (Cameron & Berry, 2008). This gender effect disappeared when researchers controlled for items relating to multiculturalism, indicating that there may be different forms of patriotism (Cameron & Berry, 2008).

Additionally, because patriotism is an ever-changing ideal often confounded by variations and transformations over time, individuals who identify as patriots may diverge in views from others within their same nation, state, or country in the way in which they practice their patriotic beliefs (Vincent, 2009). Finally, others argue that patriotism can lead to a loss of "bad faith," fostering self-deception about potential conflicts between human rights and laws or acts instituted by governing bodies within the country (Costa, 2011, p.9) and a tendency to engage fervently in societal practices

15

according to an abstract concept with little judicious exploration (Nincic & Ramos, 2007).

Blind/uncritical patriotism. The tendency for some individuals to be uncritically supportive of their nation-state has been referred to as *blind* or *uncritical patriotism* (Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Martin, 2012; Papastephanou, 2013; Sahar, 2008; Spry & Hornsey, 2007; Wagner et al., 2012). Uncritical patriotism can be conceptualized as a propensity to defer to figures of authority, utilizing the agenda of the country as a moral and political compass above all other sources of information (Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Papastephanou, 2013). Furthermore, individuals who score high on scales of uncritical patriotism have historically perceived their governmental institutions as infallible entities, denouncing criticism of political figures, agendas, or ideals as unpatriotic (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). Uncritical patriots may also engage in selective exposure to information that is pro-U.S., choosing to filter contradictory news (Sahar, 2008). Staub (1997) described the spirit of uncritical patriotism as "my country right or wrong" (p.214).

Spry and Hornsey (2007) found that individuals who endorsed items of uncritical patriotism were more likely to demonstrate negative attitudes toward immigration and principles of multiculturalism compared to individuals who endorsed few items related to uncritical patriotism. Although patriotism has been an engrained theme of the U.S. narrative, some authors have argued that citizens have demonstrated a resistance toward uncritical patriotism, in instances following events of the Cold War and the September

16

11th attacks in 2011 (Nincic & Ramos, 2012). These findings suggest that although individuals in the U.S. may be more likely to look to their leaders for guidance during moments of national crises, they may also be inclined to question the outcomes of political decision-making as a patriotic pursuit.

Constructive patriotism. In contrast to uncritical patriotism, several scholars have explored a more critical and reflective style of patriotism, referred to as *constructive patriotism* (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Papastephanou, 2013; Spry & Hornsey, 2007; Vincent, 2009). Constructive patriotism embodies a dual sense of responsibility to nation and state, while equally valuing ways in which challenging the status quo may potentially generate positive change (Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). This variation of patriotism involves weighing universal human ideals and values that may contradict the current ideological direction of their country, while demonstrating a desire to "take a critical stand against one's own government" (Papastephanou, 2013, p. 22).

Previous scholars have found that constructive patriotism is not necessarily correlated with political ideology (Huddy & Khatib, 2007), and researchers have not linked constructive patriotism with negative attitudes toward immigration, multiculturalism, nor with a positive attitude toward assimilation (Spry & Hornsey, 2007). Constructive patriotism has, however, been positively associated with engagement in political endeavors, political knowledge, and a sense of efficacy in political decision-making (Sahar, 2008). Individuals who align themselves with a more reflective approach

17

to patriotism reject potential actions that may hinder long-term progress or challenge the well-being of human life, seeking to cultivate a positive group identity through loyalty for progressive change (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). Spry and Hornsey (2007) clarified that "both blind and constructive patriots feel attached to their country; the difference lies in the way this attachment is expressed and lived" (p.152).

Nationalism

As with patriotism, nationalism has likewise eluded a singular definition, generating significant disagreement among scholars and engendering abundant variations and permutations of the construct (Anbarani, 2013; Maxwell, 2010). Anbarani (2013) posited that while all persons and societies are divided into and belong to nations as a means of demarcation for political power and autonomy, researchers have historically disagreed about how nation, ethnicity, state, and nationalism are related. Various common elements and themes, however, appear to remain generally consistent among definitions, including:

> [a] national consciousness or awareness of oneself as part of a group, national
>
> identity or identification with the group, geographical identification or a
>
> geographical dimension to the group, patriotism or love of the group, and
>
> demands for action to enhance the group (Anbarani, 2013, p. 62).

Additional descriptions of nationalism include discussion of political mobilization, movement, or political ideology in the way in which the group establishes solidarity

within the nation and independence from external political forces (Finell et al., 2013; Maxwell, 2010; Papastephanou, 2013). Smith (2013) proposed a comprehensive definition of nationalism, comprised of diverse attributes, and stemming from modern and pre-modern origins, including:

> …clearly demarcated territory with a centre and recognized borders, a legal-political community, with a single, standardized legal system, a mass participation including civil and political rights for all members or citizens, a mass public culture disseminated to all members through a standardized, mass public education system, the political status of sovereignty in an 'international' system of sovereign nation states, legitimizing in terms of nationalist ideologies. (p.173)

Historical definitions of a nation. Ernest Renan, a French theologian, linguist, and historian, asserted his belief that a nation could not be delineated by its language, race, interests, geography, or religion, but rather that it should be understood as a *spirit*, embodying an intangible common thread (Hutchinson, Reynold, Smith, Colls & Kumar, 2007). Shortly after Renan suggested an abstract definition of a nation, Joseph Stalin similarly challenged the idea of a nation defined by races and tribes, asserting his belief that nations were formed by its territory, language, and economic tradings (Hutchinson et al., 2007). During this time period, Max Weber and Karl Wolfgang Deutsch were concurrently redefining the idea of nation, expressing the belief that myths, ethnic communities, common history, and shared ancestors facilitated social obedience to established national symbols and norms which organized a group of people (Anbarani,

19

2013). Anthony Giddens, a British sociologist, noted that nations exist in relationship to, and within the context of, other nations and nation-states (Hutchinson et al., 2007). He described the process of establishing and maintaining a nation as the administrative practices that determine territorial boundaries and govern internal and external laws or norms to prevent violence (Anbarani, 2013; Hutchinson et al., 2007). Finally, Clifford James Geertz, an American anthropologist, approached the concept nation from an anthropological perspective, addressing civil roles that determine citizenship and ethnic identifications that define groups (Anbarani, 2013; Hutchinson et al., 2007). Anbarani (2013) suggested that many of the aforementioned variables are implicated and generally believed to influence the understanding and formation of a nation, with the necessary political leadership governing the protection and maintenance of the underlying cultural components of a nation. The experience of nationalism, once a nation has been instituted, sustains the newly-formed nation-state, driving and promoting the needs of the greater national good (Bratta, 2009).

Philosophical roots. Birch (1989) intimated that while nationalism appears to have its roots in philosophy stemming back to the 1700s, nationalism does not appear to have a distinct progenitor who has been credited with coining the term, further drawing uncertainty into the modern-day discussion of nation and state. Philosophy and the age of Enlightenment appear to have fostered early intellectual seeds of early definitions of nation and nationalism, with J.J. Rousseau's assertions that all members of society should actively organize institutions of government as a means of creating political societies

(Birch, 1989). Johann Gottfried Herder and Johann Gottlieb Fichte, however, challenged this notion, claiming that separate languages and shared customs were the defining features of independent nations (Anbarani, 2013). Fichte also shared early claims that some superior languages were the result of "pure" and "natural" qualities which were lacking in other languages (Birch, 1989).

These early viewpoints have endured and been closely associated with concepts of superiority, dominance, and perspectives on nationalism (Wagner et al., 2012). Herder and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel shared similar positions on the establishment of nations, contending that nationalism was a moral notion which could improve the spiritual health and well-being of humankind, leading to peace and cohesion (Anbarani, 2013). Emile Durkheim re-examined their assertions, hypothesizing that humans do not construct nations as a means of establishing morality, but rather, are moral beings because people have the capacity to live in organized societies (Anbarani, 2013). Moreover, he emphasized that nations are created where "political bonds and cultural unity are found together," and where individuals can feel bound to their state through patriotism (Anbarani, 2013, p.63).

Modern approaches. Currently, there are two general schools of thought regarding the origin of nationalism (Anbarani, 2013). Individuals who ascribe to the primordialist or perennialist perspective argue that ethnic relations and ethnic or cultural groups form the foundation of a nation, maintained by neighborhoods, communities, and families (Anbarini, 2013). Geertz suggested that nations are shaped according to blood

21

ties, race, habitat, and common languages (Anbarini, 2013). This primordialist/perennialist approach emphasizes the importance of ethnic roots and social biological theory, referencing the tendency for nations to emerge consistently according to common cultural traditions (Anbarani, 2013).

Others who ascribe to the modernist or instrumentalist movement have proposed that nations and the concept of nationalism are the modern outcomes of bureaucracy, capitalism, and secularism (Anbarani, 2013). Modernists/instrumentalists point to several variables from which nationalism has sprouted, including the invention of printed language and use of media, nationalistic/political doctrine, and industrialization (Anbarani, 2013; Anderson, 2006; Gellner, 1983). The standardization of a regional language is thought to have provided the opportunity for citizens of a nation to understand themselves and others who shared in printed communication as compatriots, utilizing communication as a representation of others within their community who would likely never encounter many of their neighbors or fellow nationals (Anbarani, 2013; Anderson, 2006). The ability to share a common thread and receive identical messages through media communication shaped the collective perception of the nation and joined the public who had access to these materials (Anderson, 2006).

Hobsbawn (1990) implied that tradition was invented as a means of furthering political agendas, national identity, and doctrine by fashioning national symbols, historical phenomena, and engineering social innovations. Thus, nationalism became a source for political legitimacy that was first and foremost a political principle (Gellner,

1983; Hobsbawn, 1990). Finally, the modernist/instrumentalist movement cites the

emergence of industrialization, urbanization, and capitalism as providing a fertile ground

for the development of nationalism (Anbarani, 2013; Gellner, 1983). According to

Gellner (1983), "the process of industrialization and urbanization destroyed the structure

and construction of traditional culture and categorized many people in new urban classes"

(p. 65). In this sense, although nation groups may hold a general perspective of a

collective nation, nations are also home to numerous multifaceted, segregated, and

layered social groups that have been more recently re-defined as societies become more

specialized and complex.

   Ethnic/racial nationalism. Further generating depth to the concept of nationalism

has been a theoretical distinction between ethnic/racial nationalism and cultural

nationalism (Maxwell, 2010; Park, 2013; Vejar, 2015; Wright et al., 2012). At the center

of ethnic nationalism is a conviction that groups of people who share a common ancestry

receive and perceive distinct and exclusive birthrights to the nation in which their

ancestors were born (Vejar, 2015). The notion of a biological inheritance or blood lineage

generates an "architecture of race thinking" that links some while excluding others (Park,

2013, p. 581). These intersections merge concepts of nation, racism, nationalism, and the

"racialization of belonging" (Park, 2013, p. 583). Similarly coupling concepts of familial

ties to one's homeland is the concept of pledging allegiance to a motherland or

fatherland, which has emerged across cultural divides and transcended various historical

periods, further associating nationalism to biological or genetic ties (Vejar, 2015). In this

context, language has provided a depiction of the strong sense of ancestral lineage such that researchers can understand ties to country.

William Hamilton, who investigated genetics during the 1960s and 1970s, provided the intellectual and scientific framework from which the Genetic Similar Theory emerged, identifying that humans attempt to gravitate toward individuals who share common ideas, values, demographics, and seek out others who reinforce their own traits (Rushton, 2005; Vejar, 2015). The Genetic Similar Theory further provides credence to the perception that individuals demonstrate a tendency to seek and maintain homogeneity within established groups, a construct known as endogamy. Endogamy has also been associated with a matching of individuals within similar racial, ethnic, religious, and social class groups, all of which are generally found in nation groups (Tabili, 2005; Vejar, 2015). Endogamy mirrors principles of nativism, in which homogeneity of language and culture are valued, often favoring ethnic loyalties within a group (Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008).

History has provided several demonstrations of past attempts to apply ethnic nationalism on a grand scale, often to the detriment of various cultural out-groups. Adolf Hitler's aspiration during World War II, guided by principles of ethnic nationalism, prompted the pervasive initiative to execute and extinguish entire ethnic groups (Vejar, 2015). Similar initiatives were also enacted in Rwanda in 1994, during which time ethnic group conflict resulted in a widespread genocide, following an internal group conflict between the Hutus and Tutsis (Vejar, 2015). Currently, instability among the Sunnis,

Shiites, and Kurds continues to create intergroup conflict in the Middle East, as shared

soil has done little to reduce cross-cultural and interethnic group conflict (Vejar, 2015).

Ethnic nationalism provides an additional lens through which nationalism can be

explored as an intricate and multifaceted concept, which influences the national

collective, as individuals attempt to navigate these complexities.

 Cultural nationalism. Cultural nationalism encompasses a similarly complex

constellation of variables, tying into the ways in which culture or cultural variables can

become a stand-in for race, generating exclusion and division between groups (Park,

2013; Wright et al., 2012). Similarly to ethnic/racial nationalism, or defining a nation

according to various visible and often racialized physical markers, cultural nationalism

emphasizes the ethnocultural components of ascribed U.S. identity that categorize some

as Americans and others as aliens, outsiders, or immigrants (Wright et al., 2012). In

Canadian studies, Hage (2006) argued that inclusion or exclusion is not necessarily

reflected consistently according to historical events or generational cohorts, but rather is

influenced by perception, cultural movements, and the fickle cultural shifts that

determine what aspects of identity are preferable or authentic at varying points of time

(Park, 2013; Wright et al., 2012). Cultural nationalism is exemplified by the ways in

which individuals participate in, practice, and perform cultural and civic components of a

national identity, such as development of prescribed skills, adherence to mores and laws,

and the explicit adaptation of the political institutions set in place within one's country

(Park, 2013).

Differentiating Between Patriotism and Nationalism

Although patriotism and nationalism have similar philosophical underpinnings and are often discussed in tandem, scholars have worked to disentangle the nuanced implications of each term (Bratta, 2009; Nincic & Ramos, 2007; Papastephanou, 2013). It is important to note that some sources appear to define these concepts by transposing tenets often used to differentiate the terms, further reflecting the theoretical split among experts in delineating the relationship and distinctions between patriotism and nationalism (Nincic & Ramos, 2007; Papastephanou, 2013; Spry & Hornsey, 2007; Wagner et al., 2012). Fundamentally, patriotism and nationalism reveal interrelated and mutual elements of emotional connection or identification with a nation which manifest differently (Papastephanou, 2013; Wagner et al., 2012). Anbarani (2013) emphasized the importance of feeling a bond to a homeland in nationalism, supporting political, economic, and social goals, often implying the support of the national political agenda. Patriotism, however, may not necessarily correlate with political programs (Anbarani, 2013). Papastephanou (2013) considers patriotism to center around the emotional components and undertakings of individuals who demonstrate a broader sense of allegiance than simply an allegiance to a specific nation-state or country.

Papastephanou (2013) proposed that the goals of patriotism include a desire for generosity and common liberty, while nationalism seeks to promote homogeneity, oneness, and a shared agenda. Additionally, some authors intimate that attachment to a nation, as reflected by nationalism, often results in the enhancement of a nation's power

26

or superiority, inviting comparison between in-groups and out-groups of each nation-state (Becker, Enders-Comberg, Wagner, Christ, & Butz, 2012; Bratta, 2009; Spry & Hornsey, 2007; Wagner et al., 2012), while patriotism "can be self-referential," in the way in which identity development takes place within a group of compatriots (Wagner et al., 2012, p. 320). Similarly, patriotism involves a sense of pride of the nation's history and past accomplishments without conjuring a competitive spirit (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008). In general, while nationalism and patriotism influence and are impacted by similar forms of social connection, patriotism often refers to the internal and felt experience of belonging to a group, while nationalism involves the proceedings that influence national institutions and goals of a country. The claiming of a national identity, however, has been correlated with cultural traditions, positive associations with ancestral bonds, and generally negative attitudes towards individuals immigrating (Finell et al., 2013).

Social Identity Theory

Henri Tajfel, a Polish-born Jew, survived several experiences in concentration camps during World War II, forever impacting the way in which he understood relationships between groups and cementing his place among Social Psychology theorists (Billig, 2002). He developed an anti-Freudian stance, as did many cognitive social psychologists of his time, rejecting the notions of prejudice and intergroup conflict as individual dynamics, choosing instead to explore broader social dynamics (Billig, 2002; Tajfel, 1982). Early works, published in the 1980s, highlighted his theoretical stance and detailed his Theory of Social Identity, touching on themes of prejudice,

27

depersonalization, and dehumanization (Billig, 2002; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). At its core, Social Identity Theory (SIT) proposes that human beings seek to generate positive social identities by establishing and differentiating their collective units from other established groups (Becker et al., 2012; Billig, 2002; Huddy & Khatib, 2007; Insko et al., 1992; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Although the experience of belonging to a broader group has been found to reduce in-group competition, negative evaluation of other in-group members, and conflict (Transue, 2007), the drive that maintains the boundaries of the in-group also serves to generate intergroup conflict, as groups strive to maintain their identities as separate and positive (Becker et al., 2012; Han, 2013). It is equally important to emphasize that while SIT outlines numerous aspects of group discord, SIT can also be understood as a theory of group freedom, accentuating the process by which oppressed groups challenge the status quo to influence ascribed stereotypes and identities (Billig, 2002; Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

SIT explores and centers around the process of establishing group attachment, as well as the consequences of group identification, such as discrimination, xenophobia, bigotry, and prejudice (Insko et al., 1992; Schwartz et al., 2012; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Tajfel (1982) suggested that conflict between groups stems from social comparisons, as members attempt to strengthen and reinforce their own sense of self-worth and self-esteem through their group roles by determining and establishing superiority of collectives (Insko et al., 1992; Han, 2013; McClain et al., 2009). In many ways, the impression of exclusivity can produce the illusion of group delineations and boundaries

28

(Transue, 2007). SIT can be characterized as a theory of perceived threat, not necessarily emphasizing real economic competition between groups, but rather the importance of a relativistic appraisal of one's social standing (Insko et al., 1992; McClain et al., 2009).

Moreover, social psychologists have identified a human tendency to scan the social environment, as individuals endeavor to categorize others into perceived in- or out-groups they see as relevant (Billig, 2002; Brown, 2013; Transue, 2007), crafting their own norms and in-group expectations (Wagner et al., 2012). This process of rapid grouping may be more common during times of heightened political fear or threat (Brown, 2013), and individuals may be unlikely to generate their own categorical labels, but rather to assimilate the available pre-existing categories (Billig, 2002). In this way, patterns of prejudice, stereotyping, and out-group rejection begin to emerge, as people are socialized into utilizing the cultural categories of grouping (Billig, 2002). Huddy and Khatib (2007) found that U.S. citizens were more amenable to having their taxes increased when their tax dollars were interpreted to benefit other Americans, while demonstrating more resistance when participants were under the impression that their money would benefit underprivileged groups in the U.S. Previous studies have also linked higher levels of attention to politics, voting turnout, and knowledge of current events to a greater sense of national identification, hypothesized to be influenced by their observance of group norms, such as political involvement (Huddy & Khatib, 2007). It has been suggested that individuals are influenced by exposure to national symbols, shifting their perception and sociocultural lens from any combination of subgroup

29

identities (i.e., gender), to that of a national identity perspective, simply by being exposed

to symbols associated with their nation of residence (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008).

<center>**Ethnic Identification and Group Membership**</center>

Although often used interchangeably, scholars have identified *group membership*,

group consciousness and *group identity* as three distinct constructs (McClain et al.,

2009). Group membership, the process of generating categories of people according to

subjective traits, occurs separately from each individual's desire to belong to said group

(McClain et al., 2009). While some groups demonstrate flexible categorical boundaries,

many groups also demonstrate rigid and indiscriminate assignment of people, such as in

the delineation of race (McClain et al., 2009). Race has historically been defined

according to perceived biological or phenotypical differences, although anthropological

observations note that the definitions of race have shifted over time and that race is best

defined as a social construct (Omni & Winant, 2010). Ethnicity, on the other hand, is

defined according to practices and traditions held by a group of individuals, influencing

language, clothing, symbols, and music (Schwartz et al., 2012). Group identification

refers to the internal experience of belonging to a specific group, demonstrating

attachment to the perceived set of shared beliefs, traditions, ideas, and interests of others

within the grouping (McClain et al., 2009; Meuleman, Bekhuis, Lubbers, & Scheepers,

2013).

Group identity is often described as a term associated with Social Identity Theory,

emphasizing the way in which members derive identity from group membership

<center>30</center>

(McClain et al., 2009). In accordance with Social Identity Theory, the demarcation between groups can fuel a tendency to compare in-group members to out-group members (Billig, 2002; McClain et al., 2009; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Group consciousness, as an umbrella term, refers to a process of identifying with other in-group members, sharing beliefs about the social standing of their group and strategies for improving their social position (McClain et al., 2009; Tyler, 2011). The concept of group consciousness can be applied to many identity variables, including ethnicity, class, and gender, as stratified systems exist in the aforementioned social groups (McClain et al., 2009). In this way, group consciousness relies on the existing social context, varying over time and adapting to the ever-changing cultural zeitgeist (McClain et al., 2009). Although the image of Asians and Asian Americans has been portrayed differently over time, moving from the fear of yellow peril to a model minority group, several scholars have asserted that the modern positive stereotypes that have been ascribed to Asians/Asian Americans serve as an example of success through hard work (McCoy, Wellman, Cosley, Saslow, & Epel, 2013; Segal, Kilty, & Kim, 2002; Shrake & Chen, 2012).

Racial consciousness has been explored as a branch of group consciousness, focusing on the experience of feeling connected to others within the identified racial group and generating a sense of loyalty and glorification of one's racial group (McClain et al., 2009). Among racially marginalized groups, racial consciousness has been found to provide a sense of solidarity, uniting members who may vary in other diversity variables and serving to generate a sense of power within the group (McClain et al., 2009).

31

Furthermore, a feature of racial consciousness involves a sense of being inseparably linked to other group members, often stemming from a shared cultural history (Dawson, 2001), or a belief that events that impact some members of their group will eventually impact all members of the group (McClain et al., 2009).

In a similar vein, individuals can also experience a stronger attachment to their ethnic group than their ascribed racial group (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012; Tyler, 2011). According to Schwartz et al. (2012) ethnic identity consists of a personal reflection of what ethnicity means on a personal level, as well as a demonstrative commitment to engage in practices consistent with their interpretation of their ethnic group. Previous findings in a U.S.-based study revealed, for example, that individuals who have strong levels of identification with White people were more likely to espouse and promote English-only policies, whereas Latino(a)s who did not identify strongly with Hispanic people were likely to support similar English-only policies (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011). Moreover, although identities are often layered, with national identity, racial identity, and ethnic identity among others, scholars debate that racial and ethnic identity are complex constructs that may shift to the forefront or background depending on the context, policy, group composition, or event (McClain et al., 2009; Tyler, 2011).

Ethnic Competition Theory/Group Threat Theory

Ethnic Competition Theory and Group Threat Theory both hypothesize that individuals from different demographic groups experience hostility towards one another

or engage in conflict as a result of competition for limited resources (Dovidio et al., 2010; Hawley, 2011; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Accordingly, immigrants may present as an economic threat to the previously established system of financial stratification, particularly if resources are already scarce (Hawley, 2011; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Others contest that immigrants not only pose an economic threat, but also a cultural threat, which will be addressed in the subsequent section of this chapter (Brown, 2013; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Newman, 2013). Although communication and a shared social/collective understanding and meaning-making process of potential dangers benefit individuals within established groups (Green et al., 2010), people also respond with antagonism to real or imagined threats (Hawley, 2011).

Researchers have identified various forms of threat, ways in which the construct for threat can be interpreted, including: economic threat, specific threat, symbolic threat, perceived threat, and actual threat (Brown, 2013; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Newman et al., 2012; Valentova & Alieva, 2014). Threats can be grouped into two major categories: realistic/specific threats and perceived threats (Valentova & Alieva, 2014). Realistic or specific threats are characterized by competition in the labor market, competition for economic or political power, and crime threat, all of which can be measured using objective facts and figures to quantify the relationship between immigration and resources (Insko et al., 1992; Newman et al., 2012; Valentova & Alieva, 2014). Economic threat falls within the broader umbrella of actual or specific threat, highlighting the financial consequences of vying for limited goods, services, or

employment (Brown, 2013; Hawley, 2011; Insko et al., 1992). Although few studies have examined the relationship between gender and threat regarding immigrants, Valentova and Alieva (2014) found that Eastern European women were more likely to report anti-immigrant attitudes only if they were employed. Women demonstrated concern about the number of available jobs, as they generally experience a more vulnerable role in the workforce and may feel greater levels of economic threat than men (Valentova & Alieva, 2014). More generally, Manevska and Achterberg (2013) asserted that individuals who experience less financial stability or who are in a precarious socioeconomic class experience greater levels of economic threat. Changes in nationwide demographics, impacted by immigration, can also sway the direction of political power according to the new voting influence of immigrants, which can present as a challenge or threat to existing political structures (Hawley, 2011).

Symbolic threats are generally understood to encompass endangerment to established cultural norms, including beliefs, values, identities, and the process of assimilation (Meulmeman et al., 2013; Newman et al., 2012; Valentova & Alieva, 2014). Moreover, cultural threat is an extension of symbolic threat, accentuating concerns related to the loss or erosion of cultural traditions, including language, practices, and ethnic makeup of the country (Newman et al., 2012; Newman, 2013; Schwartz et al., 2012; Valentova & Alieva, 2014). Finally, how individuals experience and interpret dynamic intergroup changes and conflict impact their levels of perceived threat, which constitutes a more subjective interpretation (Newman et al., 2012; Valentova & Alieva,

34

2014). Speicher and Bruno Teboul (2008) identified five components of strong reactions to perceived threat, including: concern reflected in polls or in reaction to media coverage of a symbolic threat, hostility toward individuals marked as threats, consensus with others within their group about the perception of a threat, disproportionality in the intensity of the response to threat ratio, and volatility in the way in which reactions to a threat may emerge and subside. Subsequently, individuals in the U.S. who have identified immigrants as posing a threat to cultural or economic interests are significantly more likely to convey higher levels of hostility or animosity toward immigrants which influences attitudes toward immigration policies (Hawley, 2011; Newman et al., 2012; Wilson, 2001).

Cultural Threat

Cultural threat is categorized as a symbolic threat, believed to center around threats to intangible constructs, such as values, beliefs, and identity, all of which form significantly meaningful aspects of understanding of self within culture (Brown, 2013; Newman, 2013). Within the U.S., cultural threat revolves around the perception that the predominant American identity is somehow under siege as a result of high levels of immigration and changing cultural conventions (Brown, 2013; Cameron & Berry, 2008; Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). Brown (2013) alluded to the notion that frequent usage of language in the media such as "securing our borders," (p. 57) "immigrant takeovers," (p. 57) "immigrant invasions," (p. 59) and concern about the potential loss of "our language and life," (p. 59) reflect the internal apprehension some citizens experience

that fuels a collective fear of change. Individuals living in the U.S. may experience

apprehension related to the way in which immigrants will assimilate to culture in the

U.S., expressing concern about differences in religion, culture of origin, and language

(Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Newman et al., 2012; Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman,

1999).

Spry and Hornsey (2007) described this concern as a fear of cultural

contamination, during which the elements seen to constitute the very essence of

American identity are at risk of becoming diluted, polluted, or fouled by the insertion of

new cultural infusions (Newman et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2012). This theory has been

particularly emphasized for non-Western immigrants, who may demonstrate more

frequent deviations from traditional U.S. values than those from other Western nations

(Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Furthermore, digression from cultural U.S. values is

correlated with increased negative perceptions and feelings toward ethnic minorities,

demonstrating an intersection between ethnic nationalism and cultural threat (Manevska

& Achterberg, 2013; Van der Waal, Achterberg, Houtman, De Koster, & Manevska,

2010). Studies in Europe have identified similar responses, with citizens of European

countries expressing concern that groups will become less distinct and challenge the

formation and maintenance of positive in-group identity (Finell et al., 2013).

The process of engaging in intercultural contact, whereby members of differing

groups maneuver the co-habitation process, often results in the borrowing of aspects of

each other's cultures, known as acculturation, which can produce culture shock or

36

acculturative stress for some or all parties involved (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). As individuals acclimate themselves to varying cultural environments, they typically develop cultural and social skills necessary to navigate in the changing settings, or experience sociocultural adaptation (Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). Some members of the group, however, find themselves challenged by this process, particularly if they understand themselves to be in a pre-existing weak cultural position or if they perceive deficiencies in their sociocultural competence (Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). Sociocultural competence includes the ability to interact in a comfortable setting with others outside of one's own cultural group, the ability to communicate effectively with others, and to perform tasks and accomplish goals in everyday situations within one's context (Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). In a 2011 study, Cokley et al. found that "racial minorities were more comfortable with interracial interaction than European Americans, and more liberal students were more comfortable with interracial interaction than more conservative students" (p. 195), suggesting that ethnicity and political leanings impact perceived sociocultural competence. Furthermore, individuals with more years of education were found to purchase or consume more diverse products, such as international films or products, perhaps indicating a link between education, product consumption and exposure to other ethnic cultures (Meuleman et al., 2013). Students, particularly those at progressive institutions or within majors that promote awareness of other cultures or tolerance of cultural differences, often demonstrate less crystalized attitudes or more openness to

differences than the general population (Green et al., 2010). Along these lines, past literature has found that women are more likely to enter social science majors, which often promote more exposure to global issues (Burge, 2006).

The use of language and the ability to communicate has been discussed as a core component of sociocultural competence, identifying language barriers during daily interactions as a noticeable threat to one's sense of competence (Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). Many individuals born in the U.S. are proficient in English, while often not developing strong communicative skills in other languages (Newman et al., 2012). Monolingual individuals can experience significant levels of cultural threat when interacting with non-English speaking immigrants (Newman et al., 2012). Previous scholarship has found that individuals who identify themselves as White Americans are more likely to perceive immigrants who speak little or no English as threats to American culture (Newman et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2012; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008), with other natives of the U.S. expressing desire to have English spoken in all public areas or while in the presence of other Americans (Paxton & Mughan, 2006). Newman et al. (2012) also found that individuals who identity as White were more likely to favor lower levels of immigration and more rigorous deportation policies for immigrants living in the U.S. without documentation if they perceive immigrants to present as cultural threats.

Ethnic Threat

Ethnic threat can be conceptualized as a symbolic or actual threat, depending on the context and perceived impact (Brown, 2013; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Santa

Ana (2002) utilized the term *brown tide rising*, while Newman (2013) described a similar phenomenon as the *browning of America*, both illustrating the changing ethnic population of the U.S. This construct has sparked discussion of the physical and ethnic transformations that are visible to natives, as ethnic groups' immigration, settling, and integrating themselves into mainstream U.S. society (Brown, 2013: Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Similar to cultural threat, the increased frequency of multiracial/multiethnic relationships can generate fear of a loss of distinct ethnic/racial groups and cultural capital in the U.S., with some expressing concern that some southern territory in the U.S. could be so invaded, that it would be lost in a secession movement to other countries (Brown, 2013; Huntington, 2004).

Immigration

The process of immigration, during which individuals leave their country of origin to settle into a new country, has considerably shifted the demographic population of the U.S., increasing ethnic and racial diversity within the U.S. during recent decades (Schwartz et al., 2012; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). While it is difficult to identify accurately precise statistics related to documented and undocumented immigrants, recent studies suggest that nearly 12% of individuals currently living in the U.S. were born outside of the continental U.S. (Newman, 2013; Shobe et al., 2009), with some studies suggesting immigrants compose upwards of 20% of the current population (Pang et al., 2010). Furthermore, unauthorized entry into the U.S. has significantly increased, with an estimated of 11 to 12 million individuals immigrating illegally into the U.S. by between

39

2000 and 2010 (Hawley, 2011; Newman, 2013). Other studies suggest roughly 500,000 individuals immigrate to the U.S. illegally each year (Pang et al., 2010). Of all immigrant groups, Latino(a)s comprise the largest population, encompassing nearly 56% of the total population growth between 2000 to 2010 (Newman, 2013) and accounting for nearly 35 million individuals (Shobe et al., 2009). Statistical models suggest non-White ethnic groups will become the largest ethnic group in the U.S., with non-White Hispanic groups overtaking other racial/ethnic groups between 2040-2050, (Brown, 2013; Ortman & Guarneri, 2009; Roberts, 2013), followed by Asian immigrants, while other ethnic groups remain relatively stable in terms of percentage of the population (Ortman & Guarneri, 2009).

A national survey of Latino(a)s living in the U.S. conducted in 2002 found that 62% of first-generation immigrants disclosed speaking very little to no English, with 72% of Mexican immigrants endorsing the aforementioned level of language dominance (Newman et al., 2012). In a 2004 national survey of Latino(a)s, nearly 88% of Latino(a)s asserted the belief that future generations of immigrants living in the U.S. should maintain fluency in Spanish, with 40% of the population stating that they did not believe it to be essential to speak English in order to be considered an American (Newman et al., 2012). Other research has revealed a contrasting view, with Lee (1997) identifying a desire in immigrant parents for their children to become proficient in English. Nonetheless, additional literature has suggested that the preservation of a native language does not interfere with the ability for immigrants to learn English, with many immigrants

successfully blending aspects of their native culture with the mainstream fabric of U.S. culture (Citrin, Lerman, Murakami, & Pearson, 2007; Schwartz et al., 2012; Tran, 2010). Scholarship has found that "immigrants have always shifted to English monolingualism within three generations for pragmatic reasons" (Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008, p. 178). Furthermore, the relationship between national identity and immigration status is a complex dynamic, with numerous dimensions and variables contributing to the way immigrants identity with their nation of residence, including language (Finell et al., 2013).

In the Southwest region of the U.S., historical events surrounding cessation, land battles, and conquests between previously Mexican territories reflect an added layer of complexity in the immigration discussion (Brown, 2013; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Shobe et al., 2009). Southern border states may still be experiencing conflict between a desire to introduce, maintain, and uphold cultural traditions and identities unique to this location, once belonging to Mexico, and which may hold significance for many of the natives who identify strongly as bicultural (Brown, 2013; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Shobe et al., 2009). Furthermore, fear of a *reconquista*, a re-conquering of this territory, may generate a sense of threat or struggle between various cultural groups, making this population a particularly rich and complex sample, as residents debate the process of *securing* the border between Mexico and the U.S. (Brown, 2013; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011). This border, however, extends beyond a physical demarcation and delves into deeper-rooted concerns about the cultural implications of a cultural exchange.

Hugh Raffles (2011) utilized the following description of the immigration process:

> Like humans, plants and animals travel, often in ways beyond our knowledge and control. They arrive unannounced, encounter unfamiliar conditions and proceed to remake each other and their surroundings. Designating some as native and others as alien denies this ecological and genetic dynamism. It draws an arbitrary historical line based as much on aesthetics, morality and politics as on science, a line that creates a mythic time of purity before places were polluted by interlopers. (p. 86)

For most individuals, contact with immigrants generally occurs sporadically and informally, often while completing daily activities and in passing (Newman et al., 2012). These brief interactions, however, yield the formation of perceptions and beliefs about these groups of people (Newman et al., 2012).

Perception of Immigrants

Immigrants have been cast in varied roles, most of which are distinctly pejorative, ranging from villains to usurpers and menaces to society. Park (2013) identified three major categorical themes in the way in which immigrants are often seen, identifying the *fraudulent citizen*, *the recalcitrant alien*, and the *citizen of convenience*. Recalcitrant aliens are portrayed and understood as intractable in their beliefs, maintaining many of their cultural practices in spite of general public attempts to encourage assimilation (Park, 2013). These immigrants are seen are refusing to comply and are perceived as defiant,

such as an example of a Muslim woman who wears traditional veils or head coverings while carrying out daily tasks (Park, 2013). The image of a covered woman poses a threat to the mainstream culture, "signifying danger, criminality, and terrorism," despite the fact that she is simultaneously often described as a victim of an oppressive religious tradition (Park, 2013, p. 587). While the public may demonstrate a desire to free or liberate this woman, her refusal to abandon her native cultural practices is likely to engender feelings of anger, rejection, and a desire for her either to assimilate or remove herself from the country (Park, 2013). Cameron and Berry (2008) suggested that youth who immigrate or are born to immigrant parents often feel torn between their culture of origin and the adoption of the country in which they established a new residence, feeling pressure to conform while desiring to maintain parts of their heritage identity.

Citizens of convenience, however, are depicted as exploitative characters, seeking to siphon resources, goods, and services from a generous national host (Park, 2013). Citizens of convenience are depicted as demanding, ruthless, and entitled in the way they integrate themselves into society, particularly in their use of education, healthcare, or financial assistance programs (Park, 2013). Furthermore, these citizens are portrayed as ungrateful and disloyal to the host nation, manipulating the political system to achieve a better quality of life while demonstrating devotion to their country of origin through glorification of their homeland (Park, 2013). Similarly to recalcitrant aliens, citizens of convenience are thought to be lethal (Brown, 2013), harmful, and dangerous, posing threats to the social balance (Park, 2013), while also being evaluated as less competent,

43

intelligent or well-educated (Dovidio et al., 2010). Shnabel, Ullrich, Nadler, Dovidio and Aydin (2013) argued that members of out-groups or immigrant groups can also be viewed as incompetent but warm, with an inverse relationship in the rating of each factor. Immigrants or foreigners who are perceived to be competent are more likely to be seen as immoral and cold, demonstrating a polarization in perception (Shnabel et al., 2013). These traits are attributed to the core of who these individuals are, permeating their culture of origin and seen as internal characteristics of immigrants (Park, 2013).

Lastly, fraudulent citizens are portrayed and understood as a combination of recalcitrant aliens and citizens of convenience, believed to have achieved citizenship through deceitful or dishonest practices (Park, 2013). They are represented as culturally obstinate, preserving practices and beliefs from their native countries, refusing to assimilate, and possessing traits of criminality or delinquency (Park, 2013). Many of the assumptions made about fraudulent citizens are based on visible differences, particularly visible ethnic or racial differences, guiding a belief that these groups have somehow *conned* their way into joining mainstream culture where they do not belong (Park, 2013). This conceptualization supports the idea of immigrants as *elusive perpetrators* who enter the U.S. under the cover of night, seeping through porous borders, thwarting the law of the land, and denigrating the legal process (Brown, 2013).

Immigrants, particularly those of color, are often attributed significantly high levels of negative characterological traits, with individuals identifying as White demonstrating an increased sensitivity to violations of conventional standards or

44

perceived characterological deficits that impact the ascribed U.S. American identity (Dovidio et al., 2010; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Moreover, White Americans may also seek more severe punishment of individuals who are seen as deviating from the standards of Americanism and who breach moral standards, demonstrating strong negative responses towards ethnic/racial immigrants (Dovidio et al., 2010; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013), particularly when immigrants are granted *cultural accommodations* not afforded to other citizens (Park, 2013). Women in Eastern Europe experienced a greater sense of immigrant crime threat than men, which may reflect a sense of physical vulnerability and stereotypes surrounding the lethality of immigrants (Valentova & Alieva, 2014).

The International Organization for Migration reported that individuals are also likely to overestimate the perceived number of immigrants in their country (Deen, 2011). Participants in the U.S. misestimated that the percentage of immigrants living in the U.S. was around 39%, while national statistics estimated the number of migrant residents at 14% of the population (Brown, 2013; Deen, 2011). Results from studies conducted in Italy demonstrated a similar phenomenon, with residents estimating the migrant population to be close to 25%, while statistics indicate a population of nearly 7% (Brown, 2013; Deen, 2011). Men have also been found to be more likely to overestimate the number of immigrants within their country compared to women, perhaps as a result of greater exposure to immigrants outside of the home (Valentova & Alieva, 2014).

Immigrants, foreigners, and outsiders have also been historically linked with the concept of disease or contamination, sparking the naming of various health epidemics after differing groups of non-nationals, including the designation of *Chinese disease* coined by the Japanese or the *French pox* named by the English (Green et al., 2010). Animals that are also generally associated with images of vermin, such as lice, rats, and cockroaches, have similarly been utilized to illustrate or describe groups of outsiders historically (Green et al., 2010). Individuals who endorse anti-immigrant attitudes and those who score high on scales of prejudice express significantly higher levels of germ aversion related to out-groups and express fear of contextual threat of disease, such as the transmission of the avian flu by Asian groups (Duncan, Schaller, & Park, 2009; Green et al., 2010). These attitudes are likely to spark a desire to avoid immigrants or out-groups, increase xenophobic attitudes, and produce responses of fear or disgust (Faulkner, Schaller, Park, & Duncan, 2009; Green et al., 2010). Although disgust is a natural and largely unlearned response to many tastes, smells, and colors, disgust can also be translated and transmitted through socialization to apply to members of out-groups who are perceived to violate values of the mainstream culture (Green et al., 2010; Joffe & Staerklé, 2007).

Documented and Undocumented Immigrants

Although perceptions of immigrants have been found to be affectively charged, anti-immigrant attitudes also appear to be context-specific, varying by state, manifesting differently across groups of immigrants according to the size of the immigrant population

per location and eliciting different responses according to varying immigration policies (Campbell, Wong, & Citrin, 2006; Ha, 2010; Hopkins, 2010; Newman et al., 2012). Research has indicated that residents of the U.S. perceive immigrants differently according to status of documentation and level of legalization (Brown, 2013; Dovidio et al., 2010; Newman, 2013; Park, 2013; Wright et al., 2012). The perception of immigrants as opportunists who exploit the benevolence of their new country of residence fuels concerns about a nation overrun by foreigners who should be better regulated (Brown, 2013; Newman et al., 2012; Park, 2013). Although demographic and sample information was not provided, a 2007 Gallup poll indicated that 62% of U.S. citizens consider illegal immigration to be of great importance, with 43% indicating a belief that the U.S. was somehow engaged in a losing battle with the monitoring of immigration (Dovidio et al., 2010). Many of these respondents expressed concern about levels of unemployment, lack of employment opportunities, and tax repercussions of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. (Dovidio et al., 2010). Previous investigations have found that individuals who live in close proximity to large numbers of documented immigrants are more likely to support measures for liberal immigration, while people who have consistent contact with or who live close to high numbers of illegal immigrants are more likely to oppose similar immigration policies (Hawley, 2011; Hood & Morris, 1998).

Several states have sought to enact legislation to limit the amount of access immigrants have to social services and integration into mainstream society, with states like Missouri seeking to ban access to all public universities, assistance, or benefits in

47

2007 (Brown, 2013). In 2011, Alabama sought to require all persons to provide documentation of their legal status to law enforcement officials under various circumstances, authorizing legal action against individuals who were identified to be harboring, concealing, or shielding illegal immigrants and to legislate harsher punishments for those who falsified identification documents (Brown, 2013). Similarly, as of 2012, 30 states had sanctioned a variation of Official English language legislation, with many of these states also pursuing the elimination of bilingual services and education (Newman et al., 2012). A six-pronged approach to reduce the number of illegal immigrants has been identified by numerous states:

> Eliminating access to jobs through mandatory employer verification of Social Security numbers and immigration status; ending misuse of Social Security and IRS identification numbers, which illegal immigrants use to secure jobs, bank accounts, drivers licenses, and other privileges, and improved information-sharing among key federal agencies; increasing apprehensions and detention of illegal immigrants through partnerships between federal immigration authorities and state and local law enforcement agencies, reducing visa overstays; doubling the number of non-criminal, non-expedited removals; passing state and local laws to discourage the settlement of illegal aliens and to make it more difficult for illegal aliens to conceal their status (Park, 2013, p. 58).

Although the individual pieces of legislation are meaningful, the nature of the movement

towards limiting access and the perception of immigrants indicates a significantly larger

social undertaking related to intergroup relations.

"Americanness"/American Identity

Although a meaningful and often-discussed identity, American identity,

Americanness, or Americanism, can vary significantly in definition from one individual

who identifies as an American to another (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011). While many

residents of the U.S. often choose to identify as Americans, this term can be interpreted

as reflecting an ethnocentric perspective, failing to acknowledge residents of other North

American countries or South American countries as Americans. Nonetheless, consistent

with the literature that reflects the self-described identification of many U.S. residents, in

the current investigation, U.S.-American or American was utilized throughout this

narrative. Moreover, American identity is individually constructed through a meaning-

making process, by which residents formulate a unique understanding of themselves as

an inhabitant of the U.S. and which is further incorporated into a collective identity of a

national whole (Dovidio et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2012). In this way, each person is

responsible for their own exploration of what being an American looks like, often while

participating in cultural activities related to their subjective identity and while

experiencing a sense of attachment and connection with their country and identified

fellow Americans (Dovidio et al., 2010; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012).

American identity is often described according to two general, albeit broad, categories,

with some individuals identifying more strongly with a national ethnic dimension of American identity (i.e., "being born in America" or "having lived in America for the majority of one's life") (Dovidio et al., 2010, p. 65), or a civic dimension (i.e. "be patriotic" or "respect America's political institutions and laws") (Dovidio et al., 2010, p. 65).

Americanism also appears to vary among ethnic/racial groups and impacts whether or not individuals who identify as Americans are perceived to be sufficiently American by others (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012). Citrin et al., (2001) found that participants who identified as White or African American were significantly more likely to express a nativist and assimilationist understanding of American identity than Latino(a)s, highlighting a belief that authentic Americans are born within the U.S. Schwartz et al. (2012) found that individuals who disclosed being of Asian descent identified with an American identity to a significantly lesser degree than Whites, with some arguing that while Asians are less likely than other racial/ethnic groups to retain their native language fluently across generations in an effort to assimilate, there may also be awareness of phenotypical differences that can serve as visual reminders of their deviation from stereotypical standards of Americaness (Citrin et al., 2007; Devos & Heng, 2009; Lee, 2005; Schwartz et al., 2012).

Latino(a) individuals have most often demonstrated moderate scores on American identity exploration and affirmation/commitment to the nation, with third- or later-generation participants reporting significantly higher levels of commitment to the country

50

than first-generation Latino(a)s (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012).

Individuals who identify as Middle Eastern appear to identify similarly with American

identity as Whites, although they are more likely to be introspective about the construct

of Americanism and to explore their own identity within the broader national identity

(Schwartz et al., 2012). These personal identification findings are meaningful given

scholars' findings that Whiteness-or the perception of Whiteness-is often closely linked

with American identity (Dovidio et al., 2010; Gershon & Pentoja, 2011; Schwartz et al.,

2012). Previous findings have indicated that "White Americans were judged most similar

to-virtually synonymous with Americans…Black Americans were rated next most similar

but significantly lower than White Americans; they were followed by Latino Americans,

Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Arab Americans" (Dovidio et al., 2010, p. 64),

respectively. These results provide credence to an internal process of self-identification

that is influenced by, yet also separate from, outsider perspective of one's own level of

Americanness. Latino(a)s may demonstrate a hopefulness and optimism about their

ability to succeed and assimilate into U.S. culture, as they are often seen as more similar

to White Americans than most other underrepresented groups, besides Black/African

Americans, and often interject beliefs related to success through hard work, that has also

been identified as a core component of the American Dream (Ainslie, 2011; Wiley et al.,

2012).

The distinctions between felt Americanness and perceived Americanness

commanded noteworthy media attention following the *I am an American* campaign

51

launched 10 days after the terroristic events of September 11th, 2001 (Ad Council, 2004; Weber, 2013). The campaign featured U.S. citizens of varying religions, ages, races, and ethnicities in 30 or 60 second montages, with featured participants repeating the phrase, "I am an American" (Ad Council, 2004; Weber, 2013). The commercials proceeded with striking musical compositions holding patriotic significance, while the phrase "E Pluribus Unum" or "Out of Many, One." was displayed across the screen (Ad Council, 2004; Weber, 2013). The campaign was launched in an attempt to demonstrate *diversity-patriotism*, described by Asultany (2007) as a process by which groups of varying racialized identities are seen to be absorbed, for a temporary period, into the theoretical community of Americans, utilizing individuals differences as a defining point of the nation. Moreover, the campaign sought to encourage citizens' tolerance and acceptance during a period of confusion, suspicion, and fear of individual differences by providing visual images of diverse individuals who identified themselves as part of the American collective (Weber, 2013). Others have defined this concept as *biculturalism*, with individuals identifying with their own ethnic group while simultaneously identifying with a superordinate national identity, such as Americanness (Schwartz et al., 2012).

Although there are clear historical examples of the ways in which American identity is often redefined to become more inclusive according to contextual or societal needs, Weber (2013) maintained that the general definition of Americanness is still by and large narrow. Cronin (2004) critiqued the *I am an American* campaign, suggesting

52

that the advertisements do "not so much represent society *as it is* but society as it *should be*" (emphasis in original, p. 113).

Weber (2013) stressed the differentiation within American identity of *safe* Americans and *unsafe* Americans, describing the concept of diversity-patriotism as a fragile balance, emerging from the antiquated concept of the U.S. as a *melting pot* into which individual differences can be reduced to a homogeneous collective. Individuals are deemed unsafe when their own unique cultural identities and variables are not so easily assimilated into the American ideal or when individuals are unwilling to conform to the prescribed cultural practices (Weber, 2013). The *I am an American* campaign appeared to capitalize on the concept of representing safe Americans, providing images of diverse yet ambiguous cultural differences, with little to no visible markers of identities that would defy the ideal of a melting pot (Weber, 2013). For example, the campaign presented individuals with varying skin colors as a source of diversity, although no distinguishable ethnic or cultural markers were provided. The delicate balance that is portrayed of American identity can present a challenge for some individuals, who may feel obligated to choose between performing or identifying as a good citizen or choosing to identify in ways that feel authentic, but challenge the status quo (Walker, 2007; Weber, 2013).

Exploration of American identity has increased dramatically since the 2001 terrorist attacks, indicating a desire for better understanding of intergroup relationships in the U.S. (Schwartz et al., 2012). While a consistent and concrete definition of American

identity may be elusive, scholarship has demonstrated this construct to be measurable as a fluid and individually-constructed perception (Schwartz et al., 2012).

Variables Used to Define "Americanness"

Various elements, behaviors, mindsets, values, and traits have been identified as being linked to the perception of Americanness (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Dovidio et al., 2010; Park, 2013; Schwartz et al., 2012; Wright et al., 2012). In 2008, a Cooperative Congressional Election Study, consisting of a national sample of 1,000 participants identifying as American, generated a list of attributes believed to be components of Americanness (Wright et al., 2012). The most prominent features of Americanness were believed to be: "being born in America, being Christian, speaking English, respecting America's institutions and laws, feeling like an American, getting ahead on one's own hard work, treating people equally, being involved in politics" (p. 472). Some of the aforementioned characteristics and features have similarly emerged in other studies with language surfacing as a significant point of contention and seemingly-important variable (Dovidio et al., 2010; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Park, 2013; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). It is important to note that while Black/African Americans may be born in the U.S., speak English as their first language, and endorse the aforementioned beliefs associated with Americanness, research based on appearance of skin color alone highlighted the tendency for Black/African Americans to be seen as less American than White participants (Dovidio et al., 2010). From 2014 through 2016, a high number of highly publicized and politicized cases of White police officers shooting Black/African

American men, often unarmed and nonviolent, to death mobilized groups of activists

seeking to assert that Black/African citizens, particularly men, are not as valued in the

U.S. and are somehow seen as sufficiently different from the White majority (Bacon &

Welch, 2015; Schmidt & Apuzo, 2015; Williams, 2014). In light of these meaningful

cultural and contextual variables, it seemed important to determine how these movements

have impacted how Black/African Americans perceive American identity.

For some U.S. citizens, the use of a language other than English symbolizes a

rejection of American values and is therefore considered a threat to national cohesion and

unity (Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008).

Some findings have suggested that Americanness is strongly correlated with a desire to

challenge voting rights for non-English speakers and bilingual education (Gershon &

Pantoja, 2011; Schildkraut, 2003). Interestingly, this value does not seem to be uniquely

U.S.-American, but has also been found in Canadian national identity studies (Cameron

& Berry, 2008; Park, 2013). Although the use of spoken English has been identified as a

core component of being an authentic American, further investigation has also identified

that individuals who speak with non- U.S. native accents are also categorized as out-

group members (Dovidio et al., 2010; Kinzler, Shutts, DeJesus, & Spelke, 2009). While

accents that vary from region are generally easily distinguished and can generate feelings

of distinctiveness, these accents do not deviate from an ethnic perception of the American

stereotype in the same way non-native accents do (Dovidio et al., 2010; Kinzler et al.,

2009). These findings suggest that there is some flexibility for diversity in the definition

of Americanness and begin to outline some of the parameters that serve to identify some as un-American.

In addition to the aforementioned characteristics Wright et al. (2012) identified, general ethnic ties and religious affiliations include more of the salient or visible components of American identity, aside from the use of language, particularly depending on the way in which an individual chooses to practice their spiritual beliefs (Cameron & Berry, 2008). Park (2013) highlighted some of the cultural differences that may be visible for some who observe specific religious practices, such as the use of a head covering during daily activities, relating the maintenance of a non-Western religion as a challenge to the dominant Christian religion. Others have emphasized invisible identities, characteristics or traits, such as work ethic, individualistic tendencies, and self-reliance; engagement in popular national sporting events; supporting of political movements; consumption of traditionally American foods; and listening to American music as additional civic activities demonstrating Americanness (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Park, 2013; Schwartz et al., 2012). A framework for understanding these traits is provided through parents, media, and peers, and informs the way in which American identity is transferred across generations or instilled in new ones (Schwartz et al., 2012).

National/Patriotic Rituals and Symbols

Representing various aspects of Americanness, U.S. citizens have forged numerous cultural artifacts which are also described as national symbols (Knox &

Wagganer, 2009). These national symbols are demonstrative of the history of the country, its areas of pride and achievement, and provide concrete exemplifications of a united nation in a way that can easily be understood by in- and out-groups (Finell et al., 2013; Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008). Cultural symbols or artifacts, however, can present themselves in various ways, such as through visual depictions, musical compositions, literary compositions, fables, memorials, and decorations, among others (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Knox & Wagganer, 2009; Lawrence, 1990; Roberts, 2013). These symbols are ascribed meaning by the way in which they are practiced and embedded in the cultural framework, becoming living expressions of national sentiment (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008). Furthermore, national symbols often illustrate complex and abstract cultural concepts, conveying information about the formation of the nation and its uniqueness (Finell et al., 2013). In the U.S., scholars have identified certain national practices, rituals, and symbols, all linked to the history of the nation which continue to signify cultural values (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Park, 2013; Roberts, 2013).

As far back as 1787, when the U.S. Constitution was written and signed, additional literary symbols have become synonymous with the history of the U.S. and its values, including The Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and the Federalist Papers (Roberts, 2013). The Pledge of Allegiance was also later instituted, becoming an integral component of the U.S. narrative, as many schoolchildren continue to recite this piece of writing in scholastic settings (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Martin, 2011,

2012). The image of the bald eagle has similarly been utilized to represent freedom, wildness, and American identity, drawing on metaphorical attributes of royalty, strength, authority, rebirth, and resurrection, several of which also stem from Christian religious symbolism (Lawrence, 1990). The bald eagle, originally selected to decorate the national seal in 1782, continues to be utilized in public spaces on stamps, coins, decorations, local and national insignias, logos, recruitment posters, and many other settings as a symbol of national pride (Lawrence, 1990).

Additionally, Speicher and Bruno Teboul (2008) maintained that countries also hold certain symbols as sacred, further linking religious ideals to cultural artifacts. In the U.S., the national anthem and the American flag have both been regarded as prominent, even sacred, representations of American culture (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Nincic & Ramos, 2012; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). Previous polls of American citizens indicated an increase in approval ratings and perception of President Obama's level of patriotism of broadcast events during which he wore an American flag lapel pin with some viewers demonstrating outrage during moments when the lapel pin was missing (Nincis & Ramos, 2012). These examples of cultural symbols, although meaningful and functional, are often complex, adaptable, and highly influential of the national public (Lawrence, 1990). Moreover, because national symbols are perceived to be representative of numerous valuable emotional constructs, out-group threat to these symbols could be perceived as an attack on the cultural values that comprise the country (Finelle et al., 2013).

The interpretation of symbols, similar to the multifaceted aspects of nationalism and patriotism, can also form from varying sentiments. Symbols that are construed to represent confrontation or competition between groups are described as polarized national symbols, while symbols understood to present the nation as a unique entity from other countries are labeled non-polarized national symbols (Finell et al., 2013). Finnish studies of national symbols ascertained that individuals who identified more strongly with Finland were more likely to identify their country by utilizing polarized symbols and report higher levels of negative out-group affective responses than those who reported lower levels of identification (Finell et al., 2013). This study suggests a continued relationship between national identification, the use of symbols, and intergroup relationships.

The American flag. The American flag was one of only two national symbols created by the U.S. government, along with the national seal, that continue to evoke strong emotional connections in residents of the U.S. (Lawrence, 1990; Nincic & Ramos, 2012). Following the terroristic events of September 11th, large retail stores reported significant increases in the sales of flags, with Wal-Mart "reportedly [selling] 116,000 flags on September 11th and 250,000 the next day, compared with 6,400 and 10,000 on the same days a year earlier" (Bratta, 2009, p. 232). Several authors have intimated that U.S. residents seek out symbols of comfort, strength, and resilience during moments of fear, threat, or conflict with an enemy as a way of demonstrating allegiance to a unit that is larger than oneself (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Nincic & Ramos, 2012).

In many ways, citizens also utilize an overt process of displaying flags as a means of indicating their level of national allegiance, patriotism, and love of country to neighbors and community members, generating cultural norms and expectations about deportment and duty during times of collective crisis (Bratta, 2009; Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Martin, 2011; Nincic & Ramos, 2012). Martin (2012) and Bratta (2009) suggested that residents of the U.S. are socialized into national ideology and educated about the importance of symbols, such as the national flag or the Pledge of Allegiance from an early age, beginning in early scholastic training (Glass, 2009). Kemmelmeier and Winter (2008) corroborated this sentiment, highlighting the process of socialization by virtue of associating the flag with meaningful occasions such as sporting events, national holidays, home displays, and the institution of holidays such as Flag Day. The veneration of this national symbol permeates U.S. culture, with memorials, galleries, and exhibits dedicated to the symbolism and importance of the flag (Glass, 2009).

As with any use of symbolism, there is much room for interpretation and dual representation of intended use and the way in which these symbols are construed. Although national flag displays are often used to represent unity and loyalty to the nation, some research has indicated that exposure to the U.S. flag can sometimes prime participants to recall constructs related to aggression, power, and war (Becker et al., 2012; Finell et al., 2013). Kemmelmeier and Winter (2008) proposed that the flag has often been historically utilized as a source to rally unity in times of war or conflict with enemies, potentially triggering a sense of aggression towards other nations or out-groups,

who may be perceived as national enemies. The American flag may also serve as a tool to "silence all dissent," functioning to create consensus under a common emblem (Bratta, 2009, p. 241). Studies exploring exposure to the American flag have identified an increase in nationalism, albeit little to no increase in feelings of patriotism, further indicating a link between the flag and political ideology, a desire to see the U.S. as a superior country to others, and potential exclusion of others (Becker et al., 2012; Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008). Becker et al. (2012) suggested, however, that the relationship between flag exposure and these experiences of nationalism or intergroup conflict are not "unidirectional but depend rather on the social context," (p. 5) which has also been suggested in previous literature (Finelle et al., 2013; Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008).

Music as a patriotic symbol. Music has long been identified as a medium to convey and express cultural content, merging sounds from region-specific instruments, with language appropriate to the region, and content reflecting ideas, experiences, hopes, challenges, and numerous other intangible cultural components (Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012). International studies of music have also demonstrated significant reflections of changing themes in music and music education in schools located in Asian-Pacific countries that have previously held stronger Confucian beliefs, as nationalism is re-defined as a result of globalization (Hebert, 2006). Historical and sociocultural explorations of U.S. music have revealed various functions of music and music education throughout various time periods, such as World War II (Beegle, 2004), as tools for

61

infusing American unity in the academic curriculum (Beegle, 2004; Jorgensen, 2007). Music has also functioned to rouse residents and citizens during times of political discord and celebration and to galvanize residents into the spirit of patriotism as an enduring and powerful oral symbol of the collective experience (Marden, 1904; Sharp, 2009).

Media and cinematic projects often provide an abbreviated version of cultural traditions and scenarios reflecting salient societal themes (Sharp, 2009). Although patriotic songs are commonly interspersed in various genres of cinema, popular films depicting moments of heroic acts of patriotism as they are narrated by patriotic songs include *Casablanca* (Wallis, 1942), *The Sound of Music* (Wise, 1965), *The Hunt for Red October* (Neufeld, 1990), and many other movies depicting war or combat (Sharp, 2009). Patriotic music of often utilized during moments of resistance, defiance, celebration, unity, and hopefulness which reinforces the idea of rousing morale by instilling a sense of collective solidarity (Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012; Sharp, 2009).

The Star-Spangled Banner. Francis Scott Key, a Georgetown lawyer, composed a poem recounting the events of a Baltimore harbor battle between the U.S. and Great Britain, masterfully illustrating the moments during which he attempted to determine the victor of the battle, by searching for the conqueror's flag in the morning (Rothman, 2014; Sharp, 2009). Although his poem was later set to a tune composed by John Stafford Smith and used by military bands during the Civil War and World War I, it was not made the official anthem of the U.S. until 1931 when President Hoover so appointed the composition (Berg, 2014; Rothman, 2014; Sharp, 2009). This song, composed during a

critical moment of the nation's history, presents a unique optimism that has carried the message of success and victory across generations (Sharp, 2009) and was utilized during sporting events for the first time during World War I in remembrance of those serving in the armed forces (Carter, 2000). The use of the anthem during sporting events similarly "hint[s] that the modern sports spectacle is a civilized alternative to war" (Sharp, 2009, p. 4). Internationally, prizewinners and medalists are gifted the opportunity to play their national anthem, demonstrating a sense of honor for the event winners and to the winning country (Sharp, 2009). The anthem is modernly sung at the opening ceremonies of many sporting events, during civil ceremonies, graduation ceremonies, political events, and certain conventions (Sharp, 2009).

While the anthem is often equated with a sense of triumph and conquest, it also represents the underlying struggle and sacrifice of war, which is interwoven within the history of the U.S. (Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012). As a result of the weighty implications of the lyrics and the meaningful history behind the national anthem, social convention has formed surrounding the way in which the anthem is to be sung, the way in which singers should engage with the song, and the way in which audience members should behave during the singing of the anthem (Carter, 2000; Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012; Sharp, 2009; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). The Star-Spangled Music Foundation originated in 2012, formed by educators, musicians, and scholars, for the unique purpose of imparting knowledge to the general public about the national anthem (Berg, 2014). Kennedy and Guerrini (2012) have argued that a similar process of socialization should also occur

63

within the academic system, educating students about their national identity and civic duties through the use of the national anthem. Interestingly, recent research has found that "only 61% of US Americans know the words to *TSSB* [*The Star-Spangled Banner*]…" and "About two thirds of US teenagers cannot name its author" (Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008, p.178).

Several authors have also described accounts of performers violating tradition by re-arranging the song musically or vocally, not following decorum for behavior and attitude (i.e., generating parodies of the anthem or applying comedic styles), forgetting the lyrics, or failing to demonstrate proficiency in the technical aspects of the vocal performance (Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012; Rothman, 2014; Sharp, 2009; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). Others have commented on perceived violations of audience participation, with observers or spectators consuming food or drink, athletes engaging in warm-up activities, and onlookers remaining seated, or talking throughout the performance, all of which were deemed unfitting for the event (Carter, 2000).

In 2006, "Nuestro Himno" (Our Anthem), was released, broadcasting a Spanish-language version of the national anthem and inspiring nationwide outrage and anger as a result (Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). The Urban Box Office introduced a similar translation of the national anthem to the popular audience, sung by well-known Latin American artists, hoping to bring light to political issues of immigration, nativism, and biculturalism (Sharp, 2009; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). Rather than inspiring a bridge between the Hispanic community and non-Hispanic residents, communities on

both sides resisted the inauguration of the song, with some declaring "Nuestro Himno" the *Illegal Alien Anthem* (Montgomery, 2006; Sharp, 2009; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). Furthermore, former President George W. Bush publicly denounced the translated record, stating "the national anthem should be sung in English" (Clevstrom & Shin, 2006, p. 2). Radio polls also indicated resistance, with 69% of listeners agreeing with the president's statement, and 83% of readers of *The Berskshire Eagle* in 2006 similarly opposed variations of the national anthem (Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008). Although the sample information and demographics were not provided for these polls, Speicher and Bruno Teboul (2008) indicated many of the radio listeners were targeted toward Latino(a) audiences. Although an officially Spanish-translated version of the U.S. national anthem had previously been commissioned by the National Bureau of Education starting in 1919, and later translated the anthem into Yiddish, French, and Polish, the U.S. public expressed substantial backlash in 2006 in the face of a modern popularized alternate version in Spanish (Sharp, 2009; Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008; Wolfe, 2006).

  Pledge of Allegiance. In 1892, Frank Bellamy penned what would become one of the U.S.'s most prominent pieces of patriotic writing, aimed at re-building the country after the Civil War when he wrote the *Pledge of Allegiance* (POA) (Ellis, 2005; Martin, 2012; McMahon, 2014). During this time period, records indicate that "one third of United States youth from ages 5-17 were immigrants or children of immigrants" and represented an unprecedented shift in the ethnic composition of the U.S. (Martin, 2012, p. 55). James Upham, who was employed by a very popular magazine targeted for youth,

expressed concerns about the potential assimilation of immigrant children into mainstream U.S. culture, particularly as it related to their sense of country (Jones & Meyer, 2010; Martin, 2012). Upham generated momentum for an initiative, encouraging children to sell magazine certificates as tokens to purchase flags for their schools, hosting a nationwide celebration in schools on October 12, 1892, when students recited a variation of the Pledge while saluting the flag, both of which have become entrenched rituals practiced in many U.S. schools (Ellis, 2005; Martin, 2012).

Since then, the POA has only been revised on two occasions, typically reflecting the cultural and political zeitgeist of the time (McMahon, 2014). The first modification occurred in 1924, when the Pledge was slightly modified from "my flag" to "the flag of the United States of America," seeking specificity and encouragement of fidelity to the U.S. (Cayton, Perry, Reed, & Winkler, 2005; McMahon, 2014). Entering into the Cold War era, reactions to concerns about the infiltration of communism, and in the midst of an increased devotion to Christian ideals, the Pledge was modified a second time to include "under God," in 1954 (Cayton et. al., 2005; Ellis, 2005; McMahon, 2014). Although the latter addition was found to be unconstitutional in 2002, providing students the option of omitting "under God" when reciting the Pledge in schools and allowing students the freedom to decline participation in daily recitations, the POA is still currently utilized in all naturalization ceremonies and during certain patriotic events (McMahon, 2014).

Traditionally, the POA has been employed as a tool for the socialization of children, exposing youths at an early age to the ideals, traditions, and practices of the U.S. (Martin, 2011), while creating an expectation that a shared oath will preserve the cultural heritage from which the Pledge was produced and fostering fidelity and commitment to the country (Martin, 2012). This tradition has shed light on the intersection of the role of education in civic duties and in fostering feelings of patriotism in children, even while generating divisiveness between proponents of the POA in schools and opponents who challenge the way in which the POA is utilized (Martin, 2012; Nincic & Ramos, 2007; Roberts, 2013). The practice of reciting the POA with a hand covering one's heart, often while standing to face the American flag, has further linked and engrained both practices as meaningful symbols, and cemented the importance of both cultural artifacts as part of U.S. tradition (Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008).

The POA has also functioned as a source of unity and strength for adults, spurring legislation during the year following the attacks of September, 2011, with numerous states introducing bills to require schools to offer students a guided POA at some point during the day, with many schools choosing to recite the POA over the school loud speaker (McMahon, 2014). During times of recitation, most adults remove any head coverings, hats, or caps, hold their right hand over their hearts, often while directing their attention towards the U.S. flag (Martin, 2012; McMahon, 2014). This routine is well-engrained in the cultural collective and has been correlated with views of loyalty to one's country, patriotism, respect, honor, and remembrance of historic events (Martin, 2011,

67

2012; McMahon, 2014). In studies of middle school children, Martin (2011; 2012) found that many children also associated the POA with an acknowledgement of God, religion, or a creator/ruler who is in alliance with the U.S. However, students of diverse racial of ethnic backgrounds were found to perceive the POA differently, expressing concerns over issues of discrimination and poverty in U.S. history, and challenging a blind allegiance to the country (Epstein, 2001; Martin, 2011; Middaugh & Kahne, 2008).

Out-group Derogation

The derogation of persons deemed as members of an out-group can take on numerous forms and emerges from a variety of individual, social, and cultural sources (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Finell et al., 2013; Newman et al., 2012; Park, 2013). The inherent tendency for individuals to derive a group identity from group membership generates the likelihood of group comparison, often with in-group members seeking a more favorable perception of their own group, which serves as a fertile bed from which discrimination and out-group derogation can grow (McClain et al., 2009). *Insidership* and *outsidership*, however, are equally complex constructs, with few identifiable criteria for the way in which individuals move from one status to another, particularly within the context of a national identity and a perceived level of national belonging (Park, 2013). Anthropological observations have demonstrated that individuals deemed as indigenous to a region may not necessarily be perceived as belonging to the *authentic* national group, nor does the passing of time or the number of generational cohorts automatically impact the way in which an individual is seen within the broader national identity (Park, 2013).

68

Components of Americanism and Americanness are fluid and often open to interpretation by residents of the U.S.

Because national identity is composed of countless internal and external variables, bias of other out-groups does not inevitably produce out-group derogation, but rather depends on the way in which each individual defines their nation and role within their nation (Finell et al., 2013; Kemmelmeier & Winter, 2008; Wagner et al., 2012). When members perceive their national identity as encompassing confrontation and competition with other nation-states or other groups perceived as threats, individuals are more likely to develop negative out-group attitudes and affective experiences compared to those who value their nation for its unique global contributions (Finell et al., 2013). Similarly, when a nation is conceptualized as being composed of fixed attributes, such as ethnicity or race, national identity is often associated with higher levels of prejudice, than when nations are based on qualities such as a shared history, mythology, or spiritual connection to others within the group (Wagner et al., 2012). Various forms of patriotism have also been linked to out-group attitudes, with citizens scoring high on scales of uncritical patriotism demonstrating higher levels of negative out-group images, nationalism, racial policy preferences, and prejudice, while critical patriotism has not been found to demonstrate these relationships (Wagner et al., 2012). Further linking themes presented previously in this manuscript, Cameron and Berry (2008) "found that perceptions of threat mediated the negative relationship between blind (but not constructive) patriotism and support for multiculturalism and immigration" (p. 6). In other words, there appears to be a highly

69

interpretive component in the way in which residents of the U.S. perceive and respond to members of their own established in- or out-groups.

Shnabel et al. (2013) suggested that members of advantaged groups within each country may struggle to combat harmful stereotypes of disadvantaged groups, as doing so inherently threatens their own power and position within the social group. The maintenance of established values, traditions, and ideals by those in dominant groups, or those deemed to be part of the in-group, often presents in the form of oppression or deprivation of the rights of individuals within the out-groups (Ali et al., 2013; Park, 2013; Shnabel et al., 2013). This desire to establish stable national traditions can project an illusion of homogeneity in the U.S. that undermines the diversity of the general population (Ali et al., 2013). In some ways, the exclusionary attitudes of intergroup conflict informed by national identity and allegiance to country runs counter to many of the defined characteristics of justice, generosity, and progress that are core components of constructive patriotism and national progress (Ali et al., 2013; Park, 2013).

Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation

Other constructs have also been linked to prejudice and out-group derogation, particularly Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Altemeyer, 1981; Childs, 2011; Wagner et al., 2012; Zakrisson, 2005). Measures of these theoretical concepts have emerged as powerful predictors of homophobia, ethnocentrism, and prejudice (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Zakrisson, 2005). RWA encompasses a traditional and conventional

70

viewpoint, coupled with an uncritical yielding to authority and expression of hostility or aggression when encountering others who violate customary norms (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Altemeyer, 1996, 1981; Duckitt, Birum, Wagner & Du Plessis, 2002; Zakrisson, 2005).

RWA has been positively correlated with negative attitudes toward women, gay and lesbian individuals, various underrepresented ethnic groups, feminists, and obese people (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Childs, 2011; Duckitt et al., 2002; Goodnight, Cook, Parrott, & Peterson, 2014; Pratto et al., 1994; Zakrisson, 2005). Scholars have also found a link between uncritical patriotism and RWA, emphasizing an intersection of pride in one's country and desire for traditions to remain unchanged (Wagner et al., 2012). Manevska and Achterberg (2013) proposed that individuals in precarious socioeconomic classes are more likely to endorse authoritarianism, or a desire to maintain their own delicate foothold within their own group structure, while experiencing negative reactions to other ethnic groups entering their system who may pose as threats to their economic position. Socioeconomic status has also been found to influence nationalistic attitudes, with groups that are in more socially or economically vulnerable positions seeking to identify more strongly with a nation to establish a sense of safety within their nation (Han, 2013).

While RWA is generally defined as a phenomenon that occurs within a group, with members fervently attempting to maintain the status quo and conventions established by figures of authority (Altemeyer, 1996, 1981; Goodnight et al., 2014;

71

Guimond, Chatard, Martinot, Crisp, and Redersdorff, 2006), SDO is "the extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to outgroups" (Pratto et al., 1994, p. 742). SDO generally maintains hierarchical societal structures, furthering intergroup conflict in an effort to establish superiority over others (Childs, 2011; Duckitt et al., 2002, Pratto et al., 1994). Furthermore, SDO is often associated with hierarchy-legitimizing myths, with in-group individuals often generating beliefs about their group's level of superiority over others, as a tool for justification of prejudicial attitudes or discriminatory behavior (Cokley et al., 2011).

SDO has been correlated with political conservatism, perspectives related to individualism, and decreased desire to provide assistance to those who are in underprivileged social positions (Childs, 2011; Duckitt et al., 2002; Pratto et al., 1994). White individuals and men have similarly been found to hold negative views of programs such as affirmative action, indicating a complex network of contributing variables that influence prejudice, discrimination, and out-group derogation (Cokley et al., 2011). Although previous investigation has found RWA and SDO to be separate and independent constructs, each measuring different ideological beliefs and attitudes (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Childs, 2011; Duckitt et al., 2002), both philosophical principles appear to work in tandem to maintain inequitable hierarchies (Guimond et al., 2006; Zakrisson, 2005).

Rationale for the Current Study

The process of globalization has engendered strong attitudes and perceptions of immigrants and national identity (Schwartz et al., 2012; Shobe et al., 2009), engendering out-group derogation and promulgating negative images of those immigrating to the U.S. (Brown, 2013; Park, 2013). Noticeable differences between residents of the U.S. can often serve as reminders or indicators of deviation from American identity (Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). On a broad societal level, it is relevant to explore the ways in which changing national demographics influence how diverse residents are perceived and are either included or excluded in group status or practices.

A large segment of the research on nationalism, patriotism, national symbols, and immigration has been conducted outside of the U.S., often in more racially/ethnically homogeneous countries such as Finland or Sweden (Finell et al., 2013; Green et al., 2010), and European countries established far earlier than the founding of the U.S. (Manevska & Achternberg, 2010; Valentova & Alieva, 2014; Wagner et al., 2012). Other research studies have utilized Canadian (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Kennedy & Guerrini, 2012) or Australian samples (Spry & Hornsey, 2007), which highlight significantly different national historic movements and explore relationships between different ethnic/cultural groups. Because the U.S. is a comparably new nation that has undergone rapid social, political, and demographic changes through immigration, a diverse U.S. sample provided a unique opportunity to explore how these ideas have been translated and internalized by a new generation of emerging adults, and how other generations have

been similarly influenced. Review of the literature focused on studies conducted in the U.S. demonstrated significant gaps related to intersecting and contributing variables that influence the ways in which in-groups and out-groups interact.

Although previous studies conducted in the U.S. have explored the relationship between Americanness and self-reported American identity and race (Citrin et al., 2001; Gershon & Pantoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012) or ascribed American identity (Dovidio et al., 2010), this was the first study, to this author's knowledge, to expand this research through additional sociocultural variables and application of macro social concepts to micro social implications. This study sought to explore the relationships between American National Identity, Americanness, race, level of education, SES, level of patriotism, nationalism, ethnic identification, political affiliation, academic major, immigration status, perception of participation in rituals associated with U.S. American identity, and perceived sociocultural competence. Within the disciplines of social and applied psychology, intergroup relations, individual biases, and cultural competence are critical components within clinical, training, and supervision contexts (Sehgal et al., 2011; Stuart, 2004). Understanding the ways in which individuals identify within their national/cultural context, categorize others, and perceive individuals from out-groups can inform the ways in which academic curricula can be influenced to further multicultural competence (Stuart, 2004; Sue, Lin, Torino, & Capodilupo, 2009), the ways in which applicants to graduate programs in applied psychology can be understood, training can address challenges presented by acculturative shock in a multicultural society, and

74

supervision can be utilized to empower clients via trainees (Hernandez & McDowell, 2010; Seghal et al., 2011). Furthermore, clinicians are likely to encounter individuals navigating the acculturation process as a result of immigration, or as a host citizen who is attempting to reconcile internalized messages related to Americanness and intergroup competition as they seek to achieve sociocultural competence (O'Brien & Major, 2005; Syed & Azmitia, 2008). On a broader scale, this study sought to address issues related to social justice, particularly in the ways in which educators, researchers, and clinicians can advocate for diverse clients through training, teaching, or individual/group therapy (Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Lott & Webster, 2006; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011).

Hypotheses

1. It was hypothesized that self-reported American identity would be related to race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, nationalism, RWA, and SDO, such that high American identity would be associated with: White race/ethnicity (vs. non-White), female identity, low- to low middle socioeconomic status, high levels of nationalism, high levels of RWA, and high levels of SDO.

2. It was hypothesized that fear-based xenophobia would be related to political affiliation, immigrant status, sociocultural competence, American identity, student major (among participants who are students), socioeconomic status, and type of patriotism (such that high levels of fear-based xenophobia would be associated with: conservative political affiliation, non-immigrant status, low self-reported

sociocultural competence, uncritical patriotism, high American identity, non-social science major, and low socioeconomic status).

3. It was hypothesized that self-reported sociocultural competence would be related to student major (among participants who were students), socioeconomic status, political affiliation, RWA, SDO, race/ethnicity, and xenophobia (such that high levels of sociocultural competence would be associated with: social science student major (vs. other major groups), high-middle to high socioeconomic status, progressive political affiliation, low RWA, low SDO, low xenophobia, and non-White (vs. White).

4. It was hypothesized that objection to immigrant performance/participation in traditionally-American rituals would be related to RWA, type of patriotism, xenophobia, student major (among participants who are students), and immigration status (such that a high probability of objection to immigrant performance/ participation would be predicted by: high RWA, uncritical patriotism, high fear-based xenophobia, non-social science major, and non-immigrant status-second generation immigration status or later).

5. It was hypothesized that individuals who objected to immigrants participating in or performing traditionally-American rituals would report that the following factors would be most important in changing their objection (speaking fluent English and respecting America's institutions and laws). These factors are listed order of predicted importance.

6. It was hypothesized that individuals who identify as politically conservative would rate being born in the U.S., speaking fluent English, and having no foreign accent as being important variables in American identity, in comparison to the other listed variables.

7. It was hypothesized that Latino(a) and Asian American participants would report respecting America's institutions and laws as well as becoming successful through their own hard work as being important variables in American identity, while African American/Black participants would report being White as the most important variable in American identity

8. It was hypothesized that the majority of participants would endorse being born in the U.S., identifying as an American, enjoying American sports, and respecting America's institutions and laws as being the four most important variables, in this order, when considering someone to be an American.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Five hundred and twenty-seven individuals over the age of 18 were recruited through social media, political forums, and public universities to participate in the current study (see Appendix A). Of the 527 participants who initially accessed the study, 470 completed the surveys in their entirety. While the sample was predominantly White and female, there was good representation among people of diverse ethnicities. See Table 1.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Categorical Demographic Variables

	N	%
Race/Ethnicity		
White/European American	276	58.7
Hispanic/ Latino(a)	68	14.5
Black/African/African American	67	14.3
Native American	2	.4
Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander	35	7.4
Bi- or Multiracial/Ethnic	18	3.8
Other	4	.9

Continued

Sex		
Male	87	18.5
Female	382	81.3
Intersex	1	.2
Student		
Yes	412	87.7
No	58	12.3
Major		
Science and Computers	23	5.6
Medicine and Allied Health	205	49.8
Social Sciences	138	33.5
Other	46	11.2
Currently Employed		
Yes	285	60.6
No	185	39.4

Most participants were students ranging from early adulthood through older age, although the average age of participants was young adult. See Table 2.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Continuous Demographic Variables

	N	*M*	SD	Min	Max
Age	469	24.09	9.88	18	73
Years of Education	470	14.47	2.64	12	25

Procedure

Participants were recruited through APA, student, community, religious organization, and military listservs as well as through postings on social media and snowball sampling (see Appendix A). The title and purpose of the study was altered to minimize the risk of demand characteristics. Potential participants were invited to participate in a study titled Attitudes and Perceptions about Being American. Individuals who indicated interest were provided with the following description and purpose: "This study will ask you some basic demographic information, attitudes about the perception of immigrants engaging in American rituals, beliefs about what it means to be an American, and your degree of comfort when interacting with diverse individuals. The purpose of this research is to explore how demographic variables and attitudes impact the perception of Americanness." Participants were provided with the Informed Consent form (see Appendix B), supplying them with information related to the study, potential benefits, risks, and ways of reaching the researchers with questions or concerns.

Participants were provided with six online measures, grouped together into a comprehensive survey through the use of PsychData. PsychData allows participants to complete studies online without linking personal identifying information to their responses and provides a secure network for collecting data. Participants were asked to complete a consent form, a short demographics questionnaire, and six scales, which were counterbalanced for order effects. After participants provided electronic consent, they were prompted to respond to questions regarding their level of patriotism, nationalism, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, American identity, and Fear-based xenophobia. They were also asked questions related to their level of perceived sociocultural competence and perception of immigrants performing or participating in traditionally-American rituals. Some student participants, those enrolled through the same university as the researcher, were eligible to receive research credit if they were registered in applicable courses. All participants were eligible to enter into a drawing to receive one of five gift cards for $20. Participants were asked to provide their preferred e-mail, which was maintained in a separate database from their responses. Participants were asked their preferred method for receiving the gift card, either mailing address or electronic gift card.

Instrumentation

Demographics Questionnaire and Attitudes toward Americanness

Participants completed an author-generated questionnaire gathering demographic information and attitudes toward Americanness (see Appendix C). The first question

participants were asked was, "In a few short sentences, please provide your definition of who an American is (i.e., what do you consider to be important in considering whether someone is or is not an American?)." Participants had the ability to generate their own definition, without priming or bias introduced by exposure to subsequent questions. The questionnaire also gathered information regarding participants' age, annual household income, gender, race/ethnicity, level of education, academic major (as applicable), sex, and generational cohort. Although socioeconomic status (SES) encompasses more complex variables than household income alone, for the purposes of this study, and in accordance with recent data on income (Alhanati, 2012; Francis, 2012), household income was divided into socioeconomic status groups as follows: $23,000 and below as low SES, $24,000-$32,000 as low middle class, $33,000-$60,000 as mid middle class, $61,000-$100,000 as upper middle class, and $101-$150,000 and up coded as high SES. Participants who fell in between categories (i.e., $23,500) were asked to determine if their financial situation would be best described by rounding up or down. The following two statements were posed to participants: "I would mind if an immigrant sang the national anthem at a national event, like a Major League baseball game" and "I would mind if an immigrant led the *Pledge of Allegiance* at a national event, like a national basketball game," to which they responded by marking "yes" or "no." This question set was meant to target attitudes towards immigrants participating in traditionally-U.S. American rituals. Participants who responded that they would mind if an immigrant participated or led a national ritual were asked if their decision would be impacted

82

differently if they perceived the performer to hold one or more of the following traits: *Born in the U.S., is Christian, speak fluent English, respect America's institutions and laws, identify as an American, have become successful through their own hard work,* or *are involved in politics*. Participants were also provided an opportunity to generate their own response by marking *other*. These categories were drawn from Wright et al.'s (2012) work on Americanness and variables associated with Americanness. Similarly, participants were asked to identify variables they believed were important markers of an American from the following list: *Born in the U.S., Christian faith, speak fluent English, respect America's institutions and laws, identify as an American, have become successful through their own hard work, are involved in politics, identify as White, have no foreign accent, enjoy American sports, these are not important in American identity,* or *other*. The aforementioned list further expanded on Wright et al.'s (2012) categories, allowing participants to select from a varied list or provide their own marker of an American. Finally, participants were asked to rate their level of sociocultural competence by answering four investigator-created questions related to their degree of comfort in a multicultural society. Questions were scored on a 5-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating higher self-reported sociocultural competence; one item was reverse-scored. Scores were averaged, using the mean as an overall score of sociocultural competence. Questions were generated to explore four domains typically associated with sociocultural competence, including self-reported ability to engage in communication, level of comfort in interacting with individuals of different faith/religious views, self-reported comfort

with immigrants, and ability to complete tasks effectively while working in tandem with people of diverse backgrounds. These domains have been posited as impacting internal self-efficacy and a sense of well-being in one's society (Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012). The current study demonstrated an alpha of .68 in measuring sociocultural competence, suggesting the scale produced a somewhat questionable reliability score.

Patriotism (Blind and Constructive)

The Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale (BCPS) (Schatz et al., 1999; see Appendix D) is a 19-item scale developed to assess blind or uncritical patriotism and constructive patriotism. The BCPS demonstrated an alpha of .87 during initial testing (Schatz et al., 1999). When analyzed separately, the items correlating with blind patriotism were found to have an alpha of .88 and items correlating with constructive patriotism demonstrated a .67 alpha. A later replication demonstrated alphas of .79 and .71 for blind patriotism and constructive patriotism, respectively. The scale was normed on two sets of undergraduate college students, ($N = 291$ and $N = 253$), with items measuring a staunch alliance to one's country or an attachment based on critical evaluation of the country's direction. Items are scored on a 6-point scale, with higher scores correlating with higher levels of uncritical patriotism. Schatz et al. (1999) found that blind patriotism was positively associated with perception of foreign threat, nationalism, selective exposure to pro-U.S. information, and political disengagement, while critical patriotism was correlated with political efficacy, interest, and knowledge of political events. For the current study, the BCPS' Cronbach's alpha was .71.

Nationalism

The Nationalistic Attitude Scale (NAS) (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; see Appendix E) is an 8-item scale that was originally developed to explore the differences between nationalism and patriotism. The authors began with a 120-item Patriotism/Nationalism Questionnaire, identifying an iterated principal factor analysis to extract 6 factors, one of which was a series of questions loading highly onto nationalistic attitudes. The scale produced an alpha of .80, with little overlap with other factors-patriotism, internationalism, civil liberties, world government and smugness (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989). The scale was normed on three sample groups ($N = 239$) including high school students, college students, and an association of building contractors. Items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a stronger sense of nationalism. The NAS was correlated with Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford's (1950) Ethnocentrism scale, reflecting the scale's tendency to measure downward comparisons of other nations outside of the U.S. without necessarily denigrating others (Kosterman & Feschbach, 1989) and has been identified as one of the most common scales for measuring nationalism (Schatz et al., 1999). The current study demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of .81 in measuring nationalistic attitude.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA)

The Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale (RWA) (Zakrisson, 2005; see Appendix F) is a 15-item short version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale developed by Altemeyer (1981) to assess conventionalism, authoritarian aggression, and submission to authority (Childs, 2011; Duckitt et al., 2002). The shortened scale version produced an

alpha of .78 (Zakrisson, 2005). The original 30-item version produced an alpha of .86, although it has been found to correlate significantly with SDO ($r = .47$), which was eliminated in the shortened version ($r =.20$) (Zakrisson, 2005). The RWA scale was normed on three samples of high school and university students between the ages of 17 to 50 years, with diverse backgrounds, and demonstrated an alpha between .72 and .80 in a series of three experimental samples (Zakrisson, 2005). Although the short RWA scale measures a similar construct as Altemeyer's original scale (1981), the author shortened various items to reduce confusion, substituted the word "country" to "society" (p. 865) in an attempt to reduce overlap with nationalism, and moderated language in four questions (i.e., "perversions" was changed to "untraditional values") (Zakrisson, 2005, p.866). Items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale (very negative to very positive), with higher scores correlating with a high level of authoritarian attitudes (Zakrisson, 2005). High scores were also correlated with modern sexism and modern racism, offering connections between racism, prejudice, and authoritarian attitudes (Zakrisson, 2005). Additionally, several studies have found strong reliability coefficients for the RWA scale at .85 (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006), .76 (Levin, Luoma, Lillis, Hayes, & Vilardaga, 2014), and .93 (Everett, 2013). For the current study, the Cronbach's alpha for the RWA scale was .87.

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)

The Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDOS) (Pratto et al., 1994; see Appendix G) is a 16-item scale that was modified from Pratto et al.'s original 14-item scale, developed to assess the degree of preference that participants have for inequality among social groups. The 16-item scale was found to correlate at the .75 level with the 14-item version, and produced a consistent alpha of .91 in several sample groups (Pratto et al., 1994). The extended version was modified slightly to utilize the term "group" rather than "country" or "nation," which was found to encompass more themes related to nationalism and patriotism (Pratto et al., 1994, p.757). The SDOS was normed on a sample of 1,952 undergraduate students between the spring of 1990 and 1992. Items measure the belief that some individuals are inherently inferior or superior to others. Items are scored on a 7-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a higher orientation towards social dominance (Pratto et al., 1994). The SDOS has previously been found to correlate with sexism, desire for decreased immigration, opposition to gay and lesbian rights, and endorsement of the death penalty (Duckitt et al., 2002; Guimond et al., 2006; Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius, Levin, James, & Pratto, 2000). Other studies have also found that individuals who strongly identify with their in-group and felt their group status was threatened were more likely to denigrate out-group members than individuals who reported low in-group identity or who did not perceive threat (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990). These findings offer insight into the ways in which intergroup conflict

relates to prejudice, discrimination, American identity, and fear of threat from other groups. In the current sample, Cronbach's alpha for the SDOS was .92.

American Identity

The American Identity Measure (AIM) (Schwartz et al., 2012; see Appendix H) is a 12-item scale that was developed by modifying the Multi-Group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Roberts et al., 1999), which assessed ethnic identity (Schwartz et al., 2012). The AIM was adapted to "tap into the extent to which the person has considered his or her relationship to the United States and how strongly the person is attached to the national identity and in-group" (Schwartz et al., 2012, p. 99). Studies sampling university students in 39 U.S. universities demonstrated strong correlations between additional measures of American identity and cultural behaviors associated with Americans, both suggesting convergent and construct validity (Schwartz et al., 2012). Items measure both a personal exploration of the participant's identity as an American and pride or attachment to the U.S. The scale was normed on two varying samples ($N = 1,773$ and $N = 10, 573$) and reported a reliability alpha of .73 to .83 (Schwartz et al., 2012). Items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with higher scores indicating stronger affiliation with American identity (Schwartz et al., 2012). Additional studies have found strong reliability coefficients at .88 (Schwartz, Park, et al., 2012) and .91 (Schwartz, Unger, et al., 2014). The Cronbach's alpha was .89 for the AIM in the current study.

Fear-Based Xenophobia/Threat

The Measure of Fear-Based Xenophobia (MFBX) (Veer et al., 2013; see Appendix I) is a 5-item scale assessing hostility towards and fear of perceived outsiders. The scale was developed in accordance with the Mokken Scale Procedure, which orders participants along a "latent trait T…and constructing cumulative attitude scales" (Veer et al., 2013, p. 1432). The MFBX was normed on a U.S. ($N = 608$), Dutch ($N = 193$), and Norwegian ($N = 303$) undergraduate student sample and demonstrated reliability coefficients of .77, .87, and .86, respectively (Veer et al., 2013). Items on the scale measure fear associated with vulnerability to threat and contempt, associated with a sense of superiority over others (Veer et al., 2013). Furthermore, scale items are organized in a hierarchical fashion, measuring difficult levels of perceived threat first and moving into more distanced threats relating to broader politics. Items measure: personal fear, fear of cultural change, losing identity, fear of disloyalty, and political fear (Veer et al., 2013). Items are scored on a 6-point Likert scale, with higher numbers correlating with strong xenophobic attitudes. This is one of the first measures that has been identified for use with cross-national samples, receiving strong statistical support (Veer et al., 2013). For the current study, the Cronbach's alpha on the MFBX was .89.

<div align="center">

Statistical Analyses

</div>

In consideration of the number of variables examined in this study and the interrelatedness of some constructs, many of the statistical analyses were exploratory in nature, looking at each construct and then identifying the unique contribution of each in

predicting a dependent variable. Correlations or analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were utilized depending on the nature of the variable (categorical vs. continuous).

Hypothesis 1, which predicted that White race/ethnicity and female identity would be related to American identity, was tested by utilizing One-Way ANOVAs to measure the unique associations between race/ethnicity, gender, and American identity. Separate models were used for each of the two aforementioned demographic variables. Hypothesis 1 also predicted that high levels of nationalism, RWA, SDO and low- to low middle socioeconomic status would be positively associated with American identity. Separate correlation analyses were used for each of the four aforementioned variables. A multiple regression predicting level of American identity was completed afterwards to determine the joint contribution of predictors that demonstrated statistically significant relationships with American identity. American identity served as the dependent variable.

Hypothesis 2, which predicted that a conservative political affiliation, non-immigrant status, and non-social science major (among student participants), would be positively associated with fear-based xenophobia, was tested by utilizing One-Way ANOVAs to measure the unique associations between political association, immigration status, student major, and fear-based xenophobia. Separate models were used for each of the three aforementioned demographic variables. Hypothesis 2 also predicted that low self-reported sociocultural competence, uncritical patriotism, low socioeconomic status, and high American identity would be positively correlated with fear-based xenophobia. Separate correlation analyses were used for each of the four aforementioned variables. A

90

multiple regression predicting fear-based xenophobia was completed afterwards to determine the joint contribution of predictors that demonstrated statistically significant relationships with xenophobia. Xenophobia served as the dependent variable.

Hypothesis 3, which predicted that having a social science major, progressive political affiliation, and identifying as Latino(a), Asian American, and African American (vs. White) would be positively associated with self-reported sociocultural competence, was tested by utilizing One-Way ANOVAs to measure the unique associations between student major, socioeconomic status, political affiliation, and ethnicity to self-reported sociocultural competence. Separate models were used for each of the four aforementioned demographic variables. Hypothesis 3 also predicted that low RWA, low SDO, high middle- to high-socioeconomic status, and low levels of xenophobia would be positively correlated with sociocultural competence. Separate correlation analyses were used for each of the four aforementioned variables. A multiple regression predicting sociocultural competence was completed afterwards to determine the joint contribution of predictors that demonstrated statistically significant relationships with sociocultural competence. Sociocultural competence served as the dependent variable.

Hypothesis 4, which predicted that high RWA, fear-based xenophobia, uncritical patriotism, non-social science major, and non-immigrant status (second-generation or later) would be associated with objection to immigrant performance/participation in traditionally-American rituals, was tested by running separate Point-Biserial correlation models. Models examined the aforementioned variables (RWA, SDO, fear-based

91

xenophobia, uncritical patriotism, non-social science major, and non-immigrant status) with objection to immigrant performance/participation in traditionally-American rituals to look at unique contributions of each. A logistic regression model predicting objection to immigrant performance/participation was completed afterwards to determine the joint contribution of predictors that demonstrated statistically significant relationships with objection to performance/participation.

Hypothesis 5, which predicted that individuals who objected to immigrants participating in/performing traditionally-American rituals would report that speaking fluent English and respecting America's institutions and laws would be the most important factors in changing their objection. In order to test this hypothesis, descriptive analyses were run to identify which categories received the most endorsement.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that Latino(a) and Asian American participants would report respecting America's institutions and laws and becoming successful through their own hard work as being important variables in American identity. It also predicted that African American/Black participants would report being White as the most important variable in American identity. In order to test this hypothesis, a chi-square analysis was used to obtain definitional proportions according to ethnic group and American identity.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that those participants with a conservative political affiliation would rate being born in the U.S., speaking fluent English, and having no foreign accent as being important variables in American identity. In order to test this

hypothesis, a chi-square analysis was used to obtain definitional proportions according to political affiliation and American identity.

Hypothesis 8, which predicted that speaking fluent English, being born in the U.S., identifying as an American, and respecting America's institutions and laws would emerge as the four most important variables necessary in considering someone to be an American, was tested by using frequency tables to identify a ranking of variables identified as being most important to American identity. Descriptive differences were provided, identifying the percentage of participants who endorsed each category.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between American National Identity, Americanness, ethnicity, gender, academic major, SES, level of patriotism, nationalism, ethnic identification, political affiliation, academic major, immigration status, perception of participation in rituals associated U.S. American identity, and perceived sociocultural competence. This chapter outlines the statistical methods and results of the current participants. Results will be presented starting with the sample descriptive data, followed by exploratory and preliminary analyses. Following these, the statistical results and findings will be reported by research question and hypotheses.

Sample Descriptive Data

Descriptive statistics for the scales used are outlined in Table 3. The majority of the score averages were in the mid-range, with the exceptions of social dominance orientation and sociocultural competence. Scores produced on the scales provided indicate that responses were generally averagely distributed, although participants identified lower levels of group comparison and devaluation, while rating themselves as competent in diverse settings.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Instruments

Measure	Possible Range	Range Obtained	*M*	*SD*
AIM	1 - 5	1 - 5	2.18	0.68
NAS	1 - 5	1.13 - 5	3.33	0.73
SDOS	1 - 7	1 - 7	2.37	1.03
RWA	1 - 7	1 - 6.80	3.54	0.998
Patriotism	1 - 6	1 - 5.42	3.69	0.49
FMBX	1 - 6	1 - 6	2.28	1.15
Sociocultural Competence	1 - 5	1 - 5	4.07	0.65

Note. AIM=American Identity Measure. NAS= Nationalistic Attitude Scale
SDOS=Social Dominance Orientation Scale. RWA=Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale
FMBX=Fear-Based Xenophobia scale.

Exploratory and Preliminary Analyses

Prior to conducting the primary analyses, preliminary and exploratory analyses

were conducted to examine the state of the obtained data, including testing the

assumptions associated with parametric analyses. Missing data were examined, and the

investigator determined that less than 5% of the data was missing, which was regarded as

unproblematic. Where applicable, mean scores were calculated as long as the majority of

items were answered by a given participant. Throughout analyses, missing data were

removed pairwise to increase the *n* of each analysis. The normality of continuous

95

variables was analyzed by examining the mean to standard deviation ratio, skewness, and kurtosis. These results indicated that there were no significant violations of normality. Frequencies of categorical variables indicated unequal group sizes across comparison groups, which was accounted for in primary analyses with non-parametric between group comparisons.

Lastly, simple, bivariate relationships between demographic, independent, and dependent variables were tested to determine if any additional variables needed to be controlled for in primary analyses. Specifically, relationships between sets of categorical variables were assessed using cross tabulations with Pearson's chi-square. Relationships between continues variables by categorical variables were tested using tests of difference (e.g., *t*-test, ANOVA]). The relationships between sets of continuous variables were assessed using correlational analyses, including Pearson's product moment correlations and Spearman's rho correlation where indicated. There were no relationships that were determined to be problematic and none needed to be controlled for in the primary analyses. All analyses were computed in SPSS v. 21, and significance was determined at the .05 level. Student status was utilized as a means to request student major, which was utilized in statistical analysis, although students were not compared to non-students in this study. Additionally, political orientation was determined by categorizing individuals who identified as Democrats as *progressive*, while categorizing participants who identified with Republican ideology as *conservative*. These categorizations, however,

may not capture nuanced political and ideological distinctions across and between groups (i.e., conservative-leaning Democrats, progressive-leaning Republicans, independents).

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis One

It was hypothesized that self-reported American identity would be related to race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, nationalism, RWA, and SDO, such that high levels of American identity would be associated with: White race/ethnicity (vs. non-White), identifying as female, and having a low- to low middle socioeconomic status, high levels of nationalism, high levels of RWA, and high levels of SDO.

This hypothesis was initially tested by examining the simple relationships between gender, identifying as White in race/ethnicity, SES, nationalism, RWA, and SDO as it related to American Identity. Tests of differences, including ANOVAs and non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests due to unequal group sizes, were conducted between categorical variables and American Identity. Pearson's product moment correlations were conducted between nationalism, RWA, SDO, and American Identity to examine the relationship between the continuous variables. Results of these analyses indicated significant relationships between nationalism, RWA, SES, and ethnicity. As predicted, higher levels of nationalism were associated with higher levels of American Identity, $r = .284$, $p < .001$. Contrary to predictions, however, higher RWA scores were associated with lower levels of American Identity, $r = -2.38$, $p < .001$.

Individuals with a low to low-middle dependent SES reported higher levels of American Identity ($M = 2.28$, $SD = .74$) compared to those with higher levels of SES ($M = 2.09$, $SD = .65$), $F(1, 294) = 5.02$, $p = .026$, $_p\eta^2 = .017$, which was consistent with predictions. Those who identified as White reported lower endorsement of American Identity ($M = 2.06$, $SD = .60$) than those who identified an ethnicity other than White ($M = 2.35$, $SD = .70$), $F(1, 470) = 23.01$, $p < .001$, $_p\eta^2 = .047$, contrary to predictions. There were no significant relationships between American Identity, gender, independent SES, and social dominance, all ps $> .05$, which was contradictory to the investigator's expectations.

Based on these analyses, a multiple regression was conducted to predict American Identity scores from ethnicity (White compared to non-White), RWA, SES Dependent (Low to Low-Middle compared to higher), and Nationalism. As shown below in Table 4, the overall model was significant, $F(4, 295) = 11.66$, $p < .001$, R^2 non-adjusted $= .126$, indicating that the set of predictors accounted for a significant amount of variance (13.8%) in American Identity scores. Contrary to predictions, being White compared to those who identified as non-White, was associated with lower American Identity scores, $\beta = -.234$, $p < .001$. Higher levels of nationalism were associated with higher levels of American Identity, $\beta = .205$, $p = .001$, consistent with initial predictions. The remaining predictors were not significant, $p > .05$. There was no significant evidence of collinearity in the model, indicating that there was not a significant amount of redundancy in the overall prediction model.

98

Table 4

Multiple Linear Regression Predicting American Identity

	β	*SE*	B	t	*p*	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	VIF
White	-.337	.08	-.243	-4.35	< .001	.950	1.052
RWA	-.070	.04	-.097	-1.61	.109	.819	1.220
SES Dependent	.081	.08	.056	.99	.321	.946	1.057
Nationalistic Attitude Scale	.195	.06	.205	3.42	.001	.821	1.218

Note. Model summary: $F_{(4, 295)} = 11.66$, $p < .001$, *Adj.* $R^2 = .126$. RWA=Right Wing Authoritarianism scale. SES Dependent = Individuals who reported they were not financially self-sufficient and received assistance from family.

Hypothesis Two

It was hypothesized that fear-based xenophobia would be related to political affiliation, immigrant status, sociocultural competence, American identity, student major (among participants who were students), socioeconomic status, and type of patriotism (such that high levels of fear-based xenophobia would be associated with: conservative political affiliation, non-immigrant status, low self-reported sociocultural competence, uncritical patriotism, high American identity, non-social science major, and low socioeconomic status).

Initial ANOVAs, with subsequent Mann-Whitney U tests where indicated, testing for differences in fear-based xenophobia, were conducted between major, immigrant status, and political affiliation. As predicted, those who identified as U.S.-born reported higher levels of fear-based xenophobia ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 1.08$) compared to those who identified as immigrants ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 1.10$), $F(1, 470) = 46.00$, $p < .001$, $_p\eta^2 = .090$. Additionally, those who identified as politically conservative reported higher levels of fear-based xenophobia ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.24$) compared to those who identified as liberal ($M = 1.80$, $SD = .91$), $F(1, 236) = 77.05$, $p < .001$, $_p\eta^2 = .248$, which was also consistent with predictions. Contrary to investigator predictions, there was not a significant relationship between college major or sociocultural competence on fear-based xenophobia, all ps > .05.

Based on these initial analyses, multiple regressions were used to predict fear-based xenophobia from immigrant status (U.S. born compared to non-U.S. born) and conservative political identity (compared to liberal political identity). The overall model

100

was significant, F (2, 235) = 51.04, $p < .001$, *Adj. R^2 = .299*, indicating that these sets of predictors accounted for a significant amount of the variance (30.5%) in fear-based xenophobia scores (see Table 5). Being U.S. born, as compared to being an immigrant, was associated with higher fear-based xenophobia, *Beta* = .246, $p < .001$. Similarly, identifying with a conservative ideology, as compared to a liberal ideology, was associated with higher levels of fear-based xenophobia, *Beta* = .440, $p < .001$, all of which were consistent with predictions.

Table 5

Multiple Regression Predicting Fear-based Xenophobia

	B	*SE*	*Beta*	t	P	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	VIF
U.S.-born	.963	.22	.246	4.37	< .001	.944	1.059
Conservative	1.089	.14	.440	7.82	< .001	.944	1.059

Note. Model summary: F (2, 235) = 51.04, $p < .001$, *Adj. R^2 = .299*

Hypothesis Three

It was hypothesized that self-reported sociocultural competence would be related to student major (among participants who were students), socioeconomic status, political affiliation, RWA, SDO, race/ethnicity and xenophobia (such that high levels of sociocultural competence will be associated with: social science student major (vs. other major groups), high-middle to high socioeconomic status, progressive political affiliation, low RWA, low SDO, low xenophobia, and non-White (vs. White).

Initial analyses were conducted to test the bivariate relationships between key predictors and sociocultural competence. As predicted, those with a progressive political identity reported higher levels of sociocultural competency ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .57$), as compared to those who identified as politically conservative ($M = 3.88$, $SD = .78$), F (1, 236) $= 8.56$, $p = .004$, $_p\eta^2 = .035$. Pearson's product moment correlations revealed significant relationships between sociocultural competency and RWA, $r = -.243$, $p < .001$, social dominance, $r = -.291$, $p < .001$, and $r = -.418$, $p < .001$, which was also consistent with initial predictions. There were no significant relationships between sociocultural competency and social science major, being non-White, and SES, all ps $> .05$.

A multiple regression analysis predicting sociocultural competency was conducted based on significant findings discussed above; see Table 6. As shown, the overall model was significant, F (4, 235) $= 22.52$, $p < .001$, $Adj.$ $R^2 = .268$. When controlling for the additional variables in the model, only fear-based xenophobia was significantly associated with sociocultural competency, $Beta = -.513$, $p < .001$, indicating that higher levels of fear-based xenophobia were associated with lower levels of sociocultural competency. The remaining predictors were not significantly associated with sociocultural competency scores, all ps $> .05$.

Table 6

Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Sociocultural Competency

| | B | *SE* | *Beta* | t | *p* | Collinearity Statistics | |
						Tolerance	VIF
Progressive Political Identity	-.146	.10	-.107	-1.52	.130	.633	1.579
RWA	-.001	.05	-.002	-.02	.981	.535	1.869
Social Dominance	-.066	.04	-.107	-1.55	.123	.651	1.537
Fear Based Xenophobia	-.283	.04	-.513	-7.07	< .001	.592	1.690

Note. F (4, 235) = 22.52, *p* < .001, *Adj. R²* = .268. RWA=Right Wing Authoritarianism scale

Hypothesis Four

It was hypothesized that objection to immigrant performance/participation in traditionally-American rituals would be related to RWA, type of patriotism, xenophobia, student major (among participants who were students), and immigration status, such that a high probability of objection to immigrant performance/ participation would be correlated with high RWA, uncritical patriotism, high fear-based xenophobia, non-social science major, and non-immigrant status-second generation immigration status or later.

Initial analyses were conducted to test for significant relationships between the aforementioned variables and its influence on a participant objecting to an immigrant participating in traditionally-American rituals. Objection to participation in a ritual was determined by objecting to one or both of the vignettes presented. Results of a series of one-way ANOVAs revealed four significant relationships between objecting to an immigrant participating in traditionally-American rituals and RWA, blind patriotism, patriotism, and fear-based xenophobia, all $ps < .001$, all of which were consistent with predictions. Similarly, as predicted, Pearson's chi-square tests revealed a significant relationship between objecting to an immigrant participating in traditionally-American rituals and being U.S. born, $p < .05$. In contrast with predictions, there were no significant relationships between objecting to an immigrant participating in traditionally-American rituals and construct patriotism and college major, all $ps > .05$.

Based on these initial analyses, a binary logistic regression was conducted to predict if there was a joint contribution in objecting to having an immigrant participate in a traditionally-American ritual; see Table 7. Of note, in the current analysis, 31 (7%) participants reported that they would object to an immigrant participating in a traditionally-American ritual. The overall prediction model was significant, χ^2 (5) = 175.75, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .653$. When holding all other predictors constant, the only significant predictor implicated was immigration status. In contrast with predictions, however, being an immigrant was associated with significantly greater odds of objecting to an immigrant participating in a traditionally-American ritual, *Odds ratio* = 155.70, $p < .001$. It should be noted that the obtained odds ratio may be slightly overinflated due to low observed frequencies across varying levels of each variable.

Table 7

Binary Logistic Regression Predicting Objecting to an Immigrant Participating in

American Rituals

	β	SE	Odds Ratio	p	95% CI LL	UL
RWA	.232	.32	1.26	.469	.673	2.361
Blind Patriotism	.428	.69	1.53	.535	.397	5.932
Patriotism	.849	.91	2.34	.352	.392	13.959
FMBX	.165	.24	1.18	.485	.743	1.873
Immigrant	5.048	.57	155.70	< .001	50.966	475.665

Note. χ^2 (5) = 175.75, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .653$. RWA=Right Wing Authoritarianism scale. FBMX=Fear-Based Xenophobia Scale

Hypothesis 5

It was hypothesized that individuals who objected to immigrants participating in or performing traditionally-American rituals would report that the following factors would be most important in changing their objection: speaking fluent English, being born in the U.S., and respecting America's institutions and laws. These factors are in order of predicted importance.

Frequencies and percentages of factors that would change their mind among those who reported objections to an immigrant participating in a traditionally-American ritual are shown in Table 8. In descending order, these individuals reported the following factors as potentially changing their opinion on immigrants participating in traditionally-American rituals: having respect for American institutions and laws (61.7%), identifying as an American (57.4%), speaking fluent English (40.4%), they became successful through hard work (38.3%), being Christian (14.9%), and being involved in politics (10.6%). These results were generally consistent with predictions. Themes with the greatest endorsement tend to reflect engagement and adoption of traditionally-American cultures and values, whereas there was less emphasis on factors related to religion and politics.

Table 8

Factors Related to Objecting to Immigrant Participation in American Rituals

	n	%
Christian		
No	40	85.1
Yes	7	14.9
Speak fluent English		
No	28	59.6
Yes	19	40.4
Respect America's Institutions and Laws		
No	18	38.3
Yes	29	61.7
Identify as an American		
No	20	42.6
Yes	27	57.4
Became Successful Through Hard Work		
No	29	61.7
Yes	18	38.3
Involved in Politics		
No	42	89.4
Yes	5	10.6

Hypothesis 6

It was hypothesized that individuals who identified as politically conservative would rate being born in the U.S., speaking fluent English, and having no foreign accent as being important variables in American identity, in comparison to the other listed variables.

To examine this hypothesis, a series of cross tabulations with Pearson's chi-square test was calculated; see Table 9. Participants who identified as politically conservative were more likely than those who identified as politically liberal to value the following characteristics, as important to an American identity: practicing the Christian faith, speaking fluent English, becoming successful through hard work, being involved in politics, and identifying as White, which was partially consistent with predictions. In partial contrast to predictions that having no foreign accent would emerge as a significant variable, there were no significant differences in valuing the following areas of American Identity by a function of political identity: self-identifying as an American, having no foreign accent, or enjoying American sports.

Table 9

Factors Related to American Identity by Political Identification

	Liberal		Conservative	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*
Practice the Christian faith				
No	131	98.5	95	92.2
Yes	2	1.5	8*	7.8*
Speak fluent English				
No	113	85.0	59	57.3
Yes	20	15.0	44*	42.7*
Respect America's institutions and laws				
No	44	33.1	8	7.8
Yes	89	66.9	95*	92.2*
Self-identify as an American				
No	42	31.6	24	23.3
Yes	91	68.4	79	76.7
Become successful through hard work				
No	98	73.7	55	53.4
Yes	35	26.3	48*	46.6*
Are involved in politics				
No	125	94.0	83	80.6
Yes	8	6.0	20*	19.4*

Continued

109

Identify as White				
No	132	99.2	95	92.2
Yes	1	.8	8*	7.8*
Have no foreign accent				
No	130	97.7	96	93.2
Yes	3	2.3	7	6.8
Enjoy American sports				
No	124	93.2	93	90.3
Yes	9	6.8	10	9.7
None of these are important				
No	115	86.5	94	91.3
Yes	18	13.5	9	8.7

Note. Proportions with an asterisk represent significant findings at $p < .05$

Hypothesis 7

It was hypothesized that Latino(a) and Asian American participants would report respecting America's institutions and laws, as well as becoming successful through their own hard work as being important variables in American identity, while African American/Black participants would report being White as the most important variable in American identity.

In order to evaluate this hypothesis, a series of cross tabulations with Pearson's chi-square test were calculated; see Table 10. Table 10 can be read by comparing how groups differ according to ethnicity, as indicated by subscript. For example, when

110

determining differences according to American self-identification, participants who identified as White (a) differed significantly from those who identified as Latino(a)/Hispanic (b, c) and African American/Black (c), although Latino(a)/Hispanic participants (b, c) did not differ significantly from African American/Black (c) participants. In other words, results marked with an "a" differ significantly from those marked by a "b," while those indicated by a "b" differ significantly from those identified with a "c." Results that have more than one letter indicate that they did not differ significantly from other results indicated by the same letter. A greater proportion of individuals who identified as White indicated that having respect for American institutions and laws was an important part of an American identity (81.5%), compared to those who identified as Black (62.7%), contrary to predictions. A greater proportion of Latino(a) participants reported that becoming successful through hard work was an important part of an American Identity (52.9%) compared to those who identified as White (31.5%), as predicted. Lastly, contrary to predictions, a greater proportion of Latino(a) participants reported that none of these factors were important aspects of an American Identity (20.6%) compared to those who identified as White (7.6%).

Table 10

Factors Related to American Identity by Ethnicity

	White		Hispanic		Black		Asian		Other	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Practice the Christian faith										
No	266 a	96.4	67 a	98.5	64 a	95.5	35 a	100.0	23 a	95.8
Yes	10 a	3.6	1 a	1.5	3 a	4.5	0 a	0.0	1 a	4.2
Speak fluent English										
No	198 a	71.7	55 a	80.9	44 a	65.7	31 a	88.6	18 a	75.0
Yes	78 a	28.3	13 a	19.1	23 a	34.3	4 a	11.4	6 a	25.0
Respect America's institutions and laws										
No	51 a	18.5	16 a, b	23.5	25 b	37.3	8 a, b	22.9	8 a, b	33.3
Yes	225 a	81.5	52 a, b	76.5	42 b	62.7	27 a, b	77.1	16 a, b	66.7

Continued

112

Self-identify as an American

	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%
No	73	a	26.4	31	b, c	45.6	33	c	49.3	7	a, b	20.0	6	a, b, c	25.0
Yes	203	a	73.6	37	b, c	54.4	34	c	50.7	28	a, b	80.0	18	a, b, c	75.0

Become successful through hard work

	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%
No	189	a	68.5	32	b	47.1	53	a	79.1	19	a, b	54.3	19	a, b	79.2
Yes	87	a	31.5	36	b	52.9	14	a	20.9	16	a, b	45.7	5	a, b	20.8

Are involved in politics

	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%
No	248	a	89.9	63	a	92.6	62	a	92.5	33	a	94.3	24	a	100.0
Yes	28	a	10.1	5	a	7.4	5	a	7.5	2	a	5.7	0	a	0.0

Identify as White

	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%	n		%
No	269	a	97.5	66	a	97.1	66	a	98.5	34	a	97.1	24	a	100.0
Yes	7	a	2.5	2	a	2.9	1	a	1.5	1	a	2.9	0	a	0.0

Continued

Have no foreign accent

No	270 a	97.8	67 a	98.5	64 a	95.5	32 a	91.4	24 a	100.0
Yes	6 a	2.2	1 a	1.5	3 a	4.5	3 a	8.6	0 a	0.0

Enjoy American sports

No	262 a	94.9	63 a	92.6	61 a	91.0	31 a	88.6	21 a	87.5
Yes	14 a	5.1	5 a	7.4	6 a	9.0	4 a	11.4	3 a	12.5

None of these are important

No	255 a	92.4	54 b	79.4	60 a, b	89.6	30 a, b	85.7	19 a, b	79.2
Yes	21 a	7.6	14 b	20.6	7 a, b	10.4	5 a, b	14.3	5 a, b	20.8

Note. Proportions with differing subscripts differed significantly across column, $p < .05$

Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesized that the majority of participants would endorse being born in the U.S., identifying as an American, enjoying American sports, and respecting America's institutions and laws as being the four most important variables, in this order, when considering someone to be an American.

Frequencies and percentages of all participant responses on aspects important to an American Identity are outlined in Table 11. The majority of participants, defined as greater than or equal to 51% of the sample, endorsed the following as being important aspects of an American Identity: respect for American institutions and laws (77%) and identifying as an American (68%), both of which were included in initial predictions. Across all participants, the lowest endorsed aspects of an American Identity were: practicing the Christian faith (3.2%), identifying as White (2.3%), and having no foreign accent (2.8%).

Table 11

Factors Related to American Identity for all Participants

	n	%
Practice the Christian faith		
No	455	96.8
Yes	15	3.2
Speak fluent English		
No	346	73.6
Yes	124	26.4
Respect America's institutions and laws		
No	108	23.0
Yes	362	77.0
Self-identify as an American		
No	150	31.9
Yes	320	68.1
Become successful through hard work		
No	312	66.4
Yes	158	33.6
Are involved in politics		
No	430	91.5
Yes	40	8.5

Continued

Identify as White

No	459	97.7
Yes	11	2.3

Have no foreign accent

No	457	97.2
Yes	13	2.8

Enjoy American sports

No	438	93.2
Yes	32	6.8

None of these are important

No	418	88.9
Yes	52	11.1

Open-Ended Responses

Upon initiating the current survey, participants were asked to provide a narrative statement in response to the question, "In a few short sentences, please provide your definition of who an American is (i.e., what do you consider to be important in considering whether someone is or is not an American?)." Four-hundred and seventy participants provided a response, writing between 4 and 169 words, with a median of 32 words. Upon review, narratives demonstrated various emergent categories that appeared consistently throughout the open-ended statements. Categories were identified through repetition and recurrence of themes/words, which were clustered around four major

categories: location of birth, residence, or status; roles of an American; attitudes of an American; and identification (Patton, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998); see Table 12. While the majority of participants crafted complex definitions, often offering various variables in tandem (e.g., being born in the U.S. and upholding ideals and values) or presenting two potential views (e.g., being a citizen or self-identifying as an American), statements revolved around the following central categories delineated below. While some participants provided one response ($n = 195$; 41%), the majority of participants (275; 59%) provided responses that involved at least two categories, ranging between two to six categories included. As such, percentages and response numbers displayed may equal a range totaling greater than 100% or 470 responses. Representative quotes are offered for each designated theme or category.

Table 12

Categories Identified from Open-Ended Responses Describing What it Means to be an American

Location of birth, residence, status		*n*	%
Earned	Citizenship, naturalization, residency, legal status	149	32%
Nativist	Born in the U.S., born in American continents, born on American soil (territories)	128	27%
Residence	Geographical borders of the U.S., length of time in the U.S.	73	16%
Roles			
Civic duties	Voting, jury duty, paying taxes, uphold constitution, follow laws	56	12%
Assimilative behavior	Clothing, food, celebrate patriotic holidays, comportment during rituals, live as an American	41	9%
Knows foundational history and upholds ideals	Historical context, knows historical documents (e.g., U.S. Constitution and declaration of independence, knows goal of founding members, upholds: life, liberty and pursuit of happiness	51	11%
Protect and defend	Support military, defend against contradictory agendas, fiscal and ideological threats	32	7%

Continued

Attitudes

Collective	Justice, acceptance, advocacy, progress, equality, support for Americans	65	14%
Individualistic	Capitalism, democracy, freedom, individualism, and work ethic	92	20%
Affective attachment	Appreciation, love, interest, hope, unity, and empathy for others in the U.S.	25	5%
Pride and loyalty	Pride, pledged allegiance, patriotism, faith, respect and trust in the government	88	19%

Identification

Broad and ambiguous	Ambiguous and diverse in appearance, beliefs, and background	25	5%
Self- identification	Identifies as an American, calls the U.S. home	24	5%
No true American	All Americans are immigrants. There is no *true* American.	9	2%

Note. Percentages and *n* exceed 100%, as participants were permitted to endorse multiple categories

Location of birth, residence, or status.

Nativist themes. A subset of participants (*n* = 128; 27%) reported a requirement that individuals who are deemed to be Americans be born within one of the 50 states identified to be a part of the U.S. Within this group, participants reported Americans may also be born in U.S. territories, while others yet described Americans as those born in North, Central, or South America. One respondent expressed the belief that, "An American is someone who is born on American soil (or born to American citizens even if they are out of the country)."

Location of residence. Similar to nativist themes, 73 (16%) participants reported the importance of residing within the political and geographical borders of the U.S. as a critical component of American identity. This group reported that the location of birth was not as important as establishing a residence, and participants differed on the length of time living within the U.S. necessary to obtain status as an American. Numerous participants shared sentiments similar to, "A person who resides within the borders of the U.S.," "He/she has lived in the U.S. an extended period of time (>10 years)," or "A person who…has lived in America long enough…"

Citizenship, documentation, or legal processes. A portion of participants (*n* = 149; 32%) indicated the importance of earning the opportunity to become an American, mainly emphasizing pursuit of proper channels to meet the legal requirements for citizenship, naturalization, or residency. Individuals who denied a nativist requirement for individuals to be U.S. born in order to identify as an American frequently made mention

of acquiring some degree of legal status through an authorized entity. Participants generally shared the following sentiment, "…this term would apply to people who have obtained U.S. citizenship."

Roles.

Participation in civic duties. Some participants (*n* = 56; 12%) reported participation in voting practices, jury duty, abiding by the constitution and laws at the state, regional, and federal level, along with the payment of taxes, as necessary components of holding an American identity. Civic involvement was outlined as a responsibility and duty, in exchange for identification as an American. For example, one participant stated, "A person should be able to vote and contribute in other ways," while another respondent shared, "An American…respects the government and the laws."

Cultural assimilation and performance of Americanness. Some participants (*n* = 41; 9%) also indicated the importance of *performing* as an American, specifying style of dress (although not specifying what clothing is appropriate), foods eaten (e.g., fast food), participation in patriotic holidays, and behavior during national rituals, such as standing during the National Anthem and observing the Fourth of July. One participant emphasized, "I believe to be an American you must show respect for America by standing for the pledge of allegiance and standing for the national anthem," while another posed the notion that, "…to be considered an American you have to…go out with friends, eat at fast food restaurants…"

Knowledge of foundational historic events and current events. Participants (*n* = 51; 11%) also emphasized the importance of Americans understanding the historical context of the foundation of the U.S., particularly the spirit and purpose of foundational documents, such as the U.S. Constitution; Declaration of Independence; and principles established by the founding members, including the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. Similarly, participants indicated the responsibility to remain informed of current cultural and political events as a theme of remaining connected to contextual events and movements. Respondents shared, "An American is someone who knows the history and present current events of America…," and "who works toward the values set when this country was created."

Inclination to defend and protect. A small number of participants (*n* = 32; 7%) reported a protective instinct and duty as a meaningful component of American identity. These participants emphasized support for the military, with defense against conflicting political agendas, fiscal, and ideological threats, as a primary role of an American. One individual defined Americans as, "Someone who loves America and supports those who die to protect it," with another participant affirming that, "…anyone could be considered an American if they defend their country and what it represents…" Additionally, one participant reported, "…given recent events I think of someone as an American if they take offense to the acts of terrorism displayed against the U.S."

Attitudes.

Collective attitudes that influence behavior. A group of participants (*n* = 65; 14%) indicated the significance of holding passion for the benefit of all individuals, justice, acceptance, advocacy, progress, equality, and support for all Americans. Furthermore, participants described a desire and willingness to embrace change as a core value of American identity. These participants alluded to Americans as a group that ought to advocate for the benefit of the collective. One participant shared, "I feel that being an American is to…fight for the little guy [*sic*]…and to care about people." Similarly, another respondent expressed that Americans, "…believe that all humans are created equal and everyone deserves the same opportunities."

Individualistic attitudes that influence behavior. Other participants (*n* = 92; 20%) endorsed the importance of living, instilling, and upholding the values believed to form the core of American identity, including tenets of the Protestant Work Ethic, or the value of hard work in success, promoting democracy, drive for individual success, and supporting capitalism as critical values of an American. Participants expressed, "An American is someone who believes in the values of our country…," and "someone who is a free thinker, and…who values capitalism in all forms." Similarly, others shared, "They must also agree with democracy and other foundation[al] parts of the American Dream," "being…a hardworking, upstanding citizen," and "They are proud of the idea of freedom of speech…"

Emotional attachment to fellow residents and country. Throughout definitions, some participants (*n* = 25; 5%) emphasized an affective dimension of American identity, intimating that Americans ought to experience a level of appreciation, interest, love, hope, unity and care for their fellow Americans and for the country at large. Similarly, participants suggested that Americans feel empathy during times of collective hardship, loss, success, or joy, linking outcomes to a felt experience. One participant shared that Americans, "…join together when tragedy occurs and when triumph comes" and another stated that an "American is someone who feels pain…when something bad happens to their country," and that "An American…loves the country to the depths of their heart and the people living within it…"

Pride, loyalty, allegiance, patriotism and faith in country. Throughout the narrative responses, participants (*n* = 88; 19%) made mention of an element of pride in American identity and the country, a pledged allegiance and loyalty to the nation and a sense of patriotism, as meaningful factors in American identity. Moreover, this subset of participants endorsed holding a sense of faith and trust in the country's direction, leadership, and agenda, regardless of negative perception by others or unappealing qualities of the nation. One participant stated, "To me an American is someone who would do anything for their country." These participants described a steadfast devotion and fidelity that transcends all individual differences. Another participant expressed that, "An American is someone who has pride in living in America. If one is not patriotic, they

aren't American," while another participant shared, "I think to be considered an American you have to have pride of living like one."

Identification.

Broad and ambiguous in definition. Some ($n = 25$; 5%) participants reflected on the nature of the U.S. as a diverse country, in which individuals who vary by race/ethnicity, appearance, belief systems, and backgrounds may all be identified as Americans. Participants shared, "An American is anyone. That may sound broad and ambiguous, but it is exactly what an American is—a group with such diversity and difference that truly anyone can be a part…"

Self-identification. Participants ($n = 24$; 5%) who described self-identification as a significant variable in establishing American identity differed in their belief that individuals should be born in the U.S. in addition to identifying as an American, or should simply have identified the U.S. as their home and have adopted the identity. In either case, these participants emphasized self-identification as a more meaningful marker of Americanness than legal status, race, ethnicity, religion, or political affiliation. One participant verbalized, "Identification as an American [takes place] through the lived experience of the person," and another stated, "I believe anyone who identifies themselves as an American and wants to make this country a better place is an American." Similarly, another individual shared the belief that, "An American is a person whom [*sic*] claims The United States has [*sic*] their home, regardless of birthplace origin, takes pride in what America stands for…".

No true definition. Some participants ($n = 9$; 2%) declined to provide a detailed definition, asserting that American identity is an imprecise term that hold no *true* definition. Furthermore, a subset of participants denied the nature of an *authentic* American, describing the majority of individuals in the U.S. as immigrants, and referencing the historical colonization of the U.S. of indigenous people. One participant shared, "I think that a true, 'pure-bred American' doesn't exist, since many Americans, if not most are descendants of immigrants."

Summary

This chapter outlined the statistical methods and findings from this study. Key factors related to sociocultural competency and individuals' perceptions of American identity were discussed, and differences by other diversity variables were explored. These results provided some support for the research hypotheses. The following chapter will discuss the practical implications of these findings. Additionally, the following chapter will discuss strengths and limitations of the current study as well as suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary of Major Findings

The purpose of the current study was to explore the relationships between American National Identity, Americanness, ethnicity, gender, level of education, SES, level of patriotism, nationalism, ethnic identification, political affiliation, academic major, immigration status, perception of participation in rituals associated with U.S. American identity, and self-perceived sociocultural competence. Many of the aforementioned constructs have historically been situated in fields outside of psychology, drawing from literature in economics, political science, sociology, and history. As such, this study sought to address the impact of perceived sociocultural competence in a rapidly-changing pluralistic society (Newman, 2013; Newman et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2012; Spry & Hornsey, 2007) and to explore intersecting demographic and ideological variables that may impact behavior, attitudes, and bias particularly from a psychological perspective.

Consistent with the investigator's hypotheses, results indicated that higher levels of nationalistic attitudes and low- to mid-socioeconomic status for individuals financially dependent on family members were associated with higher levels of American identity. In contrast to predictions, however, higher endorsement of RWA was associated with lower levels of American identity and non-White racial/ethnic identity was associated

128

with higher levels of American identity Non-White individuals may have a greater sense of American identity as the scale utilized in the study measured the process of actively exploring American identity, such as culture and traditions, among other variables that White participants may not actively pursue as a result of holding a privileged identity (Jensen, 2005). More specifically, participants who identified as White may assume that their identity as Americans is innate and automatically granted, eliminating a need to engage in reflection and investigation for how to perform and identify as an American. Similarly, individuals who have a traditional and/or static perception of national culture may not feel as though the current society reflects American identity as it was defined historically, given recent progressive shifts, or may not actively seek to an active role in developing American identity, as their identity may similarly be perceived as inherent or established.

Findings suggest that individuals who report feeling more comfortable in interactions with diverse groups are also more likely to identify with a desire to advocate progress and change or reform within the broader political arena, regardless of academic major, race/ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. Conversely, individuals who endorsed feeling less comfortable navigating a pluralistic society also endorsed a greater sense of distrust or fear of outsiders, an increased desire to maintain traditional values and resist change, and a greater tendency to engage in group comparison and devaluation of other groups (Altemeyer, 1996; Pratto et al., 1994), suggesting that these perceptions may translate to discomfort or uneasiness in daily interactions. The study also revealed a

relationship between conservative political affiliation, being born in the U.S., and having high levels of fear stemming from relationships with individuals perceived to be outsiders, all of which were consistent with predictions.

It was initially hypothesized that individuals with higher SES would be less likely to express comfort in interactions with out-groups, as some scholars have proposed that privileged groups may perceive changes to the status quo as potential threats to their strong social position (Shnabel et al., 2013). Individuals who identify as lower SES may come in greater contact with immigrants or racial/ethnic minorities, given that these groups are overrepresented among less privileged SES groups (Coleman, 2003; Knowles & Lowery, 2012; Kwate & Meyer, 2010; Sánchez et al., 2011). Conversely, individuals higher in SES may also develop a greater sense of comfort in pluralistic settings, given greater access and financial means to travel abroad, opportunity and emphasis placed on learning a second language, and access to higher education, where cross-cultural and global perspectives may be provided. This study demonstrated no significant relationship between SES or race/ethnicity and sociocultural competence, suggesting that fear-based xenophobia may impact many racial/ethnic groups in different ways, such that any group may perceive themselves to be comfortable or uncomfortable depending on the setting of an interaction with cross-cultural groups. It is of note that the measure to assess sociocultural competence developed for this study produced questionable reliability, and accordingly, these results should be interpreted with caution.

As predicted, individuals who endorsed a desire for tradition; resistance to change; or fear, distrust, or hostility toward perceived out-groups, along with a tendency to follow conventional customs unquestionably, were more likely to object to immigrants leading or participating in traditionally-American rituals (Spry & Hornsey 2007). Moreover, U.S.-born participants were most likely to object to immigrants participating in these ritualistic activities, supporting the initial hypothesis and furthering the notion that individuals born in the U.S. may perceive the participation of other groups as a violation of national rituals (Schwartz et al., 2012). It is possible that immigrants, however, may perceive the involvement in nationalistic rituals as symbol of civic involvement in their new country, rather than an infringement.

Participants identified respecting America's institutions and laws, identifying as an American, having become successful through their own work, and speaking fluent English, respectively, as the most influential variables in not objecting to someone who appears to be an immigrant in participating/performing traditionally-American rituals. Given the results, it appears that participants are interested in verifying that individuals who engage in American rituals hold the country in high esteem, have an investment in the national identity, demonstrate core values of individualism and effort in their behavior, and communicate using the de facto national language accepted as the national tongue.

Statistical analyses revealed that that all racial/ethnic groups identified respecting America's institutions and laws, followed by American self-identification, as the two most factors integral to an American identity. Similarly, participants who identified as White, Latino(a)/Hispanic, and Asian American identified the third most important variable as achieving success through hard work, while African American/Black participants reported speaking fluent English as the corresponding variable. Similar definitions of Americanness and related results may be indicative of a desire to draw together in response to a perceived external threat, minimizing the internal threat of cultural differences in the face of a greater peril (Wright et al., 2012). Given that data were collected in the U.S., these threats may have presented as ISIS, extremist groups or global financial crises, in addition to other politicized themes in the year 2015 when data were collected (Bergen, 2016).

Additionally, participants may have described aspirational definitions of American identity, instilled in a collective narrative that reaches all groups, even while day-to-day interactions and well-documented intergroup conflict may belie this collective description (Coleman, 2003; Knowles & Lowery, 2012; Livingston & Pearce, 2009). Results also indicated that African American/Black participants varied from other ethnic/racial groups in their definition of Americanness, not endorsing that achieving success through hard work was a significant variable. Furthermore, conservative participants differed from progressive participants in reporting Christian faith, respecting America's institutions and laws, being successful through hard work, and identifying as

132

White as being significant variables in American identity. Sahar (2008) reported that individuals who hold politically conservative views are more likely to hold individuals responsible for their social position, often associated with work ethic and ability to achieve success. Authoritarianism has been linked to conservative ideology, both functioning to maintain social cohesion and tradition, and being more likely to influence a perception of threat to social change (Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Newman et al., 2012).

Overall, participants reported that while individuals were not required to be born in the U.S., they were expected to communicate in English, demonstrate a sense of connection to the country, and respect the structure and norms established. These findings support a civic and emotional element to national identity, in addition to a shared system of communication, as a means of group identity, which was consistent in the qualitative and quantitative data. Lastly, the majority of students polled reported being within their first and second academic years of study, likely experiencing similar academic training in general education prior to specialization and perhaps accounting for little differentiation across majors, contrary to initial hypotheses.

Integration of the Findings with Existing Literature

Previous research has supported literature on nationalism as an attachment to a homeland or nation, rather than a political agenda, which is consistent with perceiving a connection to a national American identity; separate from any political ideology (Anbarani, 2013). Political ideology, however, appeared to influence the perception of

attitudes toward immigrants. Findings of this study corroborate previous literature suggesting that individuals who hold a conservative political affiliation are more likely to report fear related to vulnerability or of perceived out-group members, expressing perceived danger to social cohesion (Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Newman et al., 2012), and being more likely to take a restrictive political stance on immigration (Hawley, 2011). Results are also consistent with a body of literature suggesting that some individuals, particularly those born in the U.S., are more likely to hold nativist views of American identity, endorsing an exclusionary attitude toward individuals who are not perceived to be authentic in their identity (Citrin et al., 2001). Additionally, previous literature linking conservative political orientation with perceptions of meritocracy and the ability to progress through hard work, in addition to holding more nativist and restrictive views based on ethnicity or race, is congruent with the current study's findings (Dovidio et al., 2010; Gershon & Pentoja, 2011; Schwartz et al., 2012).

Results relating to how ethnic/racial groups may differ in perception of American identity is supported by previous literature suggesting that African American/Black individuals are less likely to believe in the American Dream and their ability to achieve success through hard work, a cogent finding given their enduring history of systemic discrimination and oppression (Livingston & Pearce, 2009). Additionally, African American/Black participants have been identified to be more skeptical of the existence of the American Dream, and their ability to achieve the American Dream than Caucasian/White, Latino(a)/Hispanic, and Asian/Asian American participants (Pelc &

Mollen, 2014). In this way, it is hypothesized that not categorizing success through hard work as a variable of American identity allows African American/Black participants to identify with a definition that is more accessible and applicable to them.

Throughout this study, fear-based xenophobia emerged as the greatest contributor to a lowered sense of sociocultural competence, consistent with literature related to the perception of symbolic or actual threat (Speicher & Bruno Teboul, 2008) and affirming a relationship between fear in one's social position and comfort in residing within a complex and diverse social environment where it may be difficult to ascertain where one belongs. Similarly, this study indicated that individuals in relatively lower socioeconomic groups were more likely to identify a stronger perception of their national identity. Existing literature has intimated that individuals in precarious social positions, such as those with lower socioeconomic status, may seek to align or identify themselves with a larger national identity to provide psychological protection (Han, 2013; Sahar, 2008; Spry & Hornsey, 2007).

Implications for Theory

Scholars have suggested that national identity may develop and manifest in formal and informal ways, encompassing common languages, practices, traditions, beliefs, or goals, among other variables (Anbarani, 2013; Maxwell, 2010). Results of the current study suggested that self-identification as a present-day member of a nation emerged as more salient and meaningful than race/ethnicity, political affiliation, and nation of origin, when considering how Americanness is defined. Consistent with

135

previous findings, nationalism, in many ways, surfaced as an intangible defining factor, what has been referred to as a spirit (Hutchinson et al., 2007), transcending concrete demographic and ideological lines to reveal a deeper-rooted sense of belonging (Huddy & Khatib, 2007). Furthermore, all ethnic/racial groups coalesced in their identification of the two most prominent variables associated with American identity, suggesting a shared view of collective values and beliefs. These results deviate from the tenets of ethnic competition theorists, who have suggested that changes in the national ethnic/racial composition threaten the value system of the U.S. (Schwartz et al., 2012; Valentova & Alieva, 2014). Contrary to predictions, ethnic, racial, and religious affiliation as potential variables of threat, were not frequently discussed in narrative responses or selected within categorical responses; rather, participants emphasized positive attributes of American identity, including civic participation, active involvement and contribution to the country and community, participating in a transparent process of documentation, and contribution to the country and community members.

Results, however, supported concerns related to economic and symbolic threats (Meulmeman et al., 2013; Newman et al., 2012) discussed within ethnic competition theory (Dovidio et al., 2010; Hawley, 2011). Participants strongly endorsed the notion that Americans not violate the values, ideals, traditions, and cultural norms believed to formulate the intangible cohesion of the nation (Brown, 2013; Newman, 2013). The current study indicated that individuals who identify within lower echelons of socioeconomic status were more likely to seek to identify with a larger national identity,

which may provide a sense of hope, comfort, and protection. Given that the majority of the sample consisted of participants who identified as female, and considering previous research suggesting that women and individuals in uncertain financial positions may perceive a greater threat to their financial state with the inclusion of new individuals into the job market (Valentova & Alieva, 2014), it appears that perceived economic threat continue to be supported.

The current findings also support patriotism and nationalism as separate constructs, revealing that participants are more likely to differ on the direction of the nation according to political affiliation, rather than differing on seeing themselves as belonging to the nation (Nincic & Ramos, 2007; Papastephanou, 2013). In other words, this study's findings supported the idea that national identity transcends the different ways in which individuals may seek to support their country of residence (Nincic & Ramos, 2007; Papastephanou, 2013). Similarly, further supporting the distinction between constructive and uncritical patriotism (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Wagner et al., 2012), participants who scored higher in constructive patriotism were not likely to object to immigrant participation, while individuals who scored highly in uncritical patriotism were significantly more likely to do so.

Uncritical patriotism, the tendency to defer to authority and establishing one's own moral compass according to the country's agenda (Spry & Hornsey, 2007), emerged as a significant marker in the objection of immigrants engaging in traditions reserved for residents of the country. These results suggest that there is a process for conveying

messages related to symbolic threat and fear of out-groups internalized by those who look to support their country without question or self-reflection (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Wagner et al., 2012). The aforementioned findings are consistent with an existing body of literature and supports a link between a sense of well-being, efficacy, and security, as they relate to interactions with individuals who are perceived to threaten the established system (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Wagner et al., 2012).

Sociocultural competence has been defined as the ability to interact comfortably with others outside of one's cultural group, including communicating effectively and accomplishing goals or tasks within a diverse setting (Newman, 2013). Right-wing authoritarianism is often discussed as a rigid tendency to oppose change in tradition or in convention (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Altemeyer, 1996, 1981). Social dominance orientation is generally characterized by a propensity to establish a comparative social hierarchy, generally to determine where one fits within the social structure (Duckitt et al., 2002, Pratto et al., 1994). Additionally, fear-based xenophobia has been utilized to define fear and hostility toward perceived outsiders (Veer et al., 2013). Although the vast majority of participants did not endorse or craft flagrantly derogating responses ($n = 2$; .4%), results supported the notion that participants who are steadfast in their beliefs that American identity be enacted with traditional customs, with little change to the historically-cultural markers of Americanness, such as the use of language, dominant religion, and dominant ethnic/racial groups; and feel uncertain, confused, and may react with hostility in having their role within society challenged or altered.

Social identity theory posits that individuals strive to generate positive identities, binding with others to create a collective and unique entity within the broader social system (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In order to maintain a clear separation between themselves and others, individuals often develop exclusionary attitudes and practices that seemingly protect the unity of the unit, along with a sense of self-worth through the identity created (Transue, 2007). When applied to the context of the U.S., this theory appears to create a paradoxical dilemma. Previous findings and current results indicate that participants encourage the process of assimilation, by which outsiders are oriented and urged to take on the characteristics of the group they seek to enter (Meulmeman et al., 2013; Newman et al., 2012), although they often encounter resistance, fear, distrust, animosity, and rejection as they attempt to integrate themselves (Veer et al., 2013). This may be particularly true if individuals seek to modify the guidelines set in place for group membership by identifying with or holding multiple identities or questioning their role, through what Tajfel (1982) discussed as the theory of group freedom or the desire to influence stereotypes and ascribed identities.

This study affirmed a relationship between fear of out-groups, a tendency to compare groups in hopes of maintaining one's sense of worth through their identified group, a desire for adherence to tradition, as well as holding a conservative political affiliation, as it relates to lowered sense of comfort in interactions that extend outside their perceived cultural group. In other words, daily interactions may serve as constant

prompts to assess one's role and value in society, and may generate confusion, distress, and discomfort, as the rules become ambiguous within a changing context.

Implications for Practice

The *Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists* (APA, 2003) task practitioners with considering the broad sociocultural context in which clients exist, and striving to provide culturally competent services to groups of individuals who represent an array of ethnic and racial identities. Clinicians may work with bi-cultural individuals or individuals who have strong racial or ethnic ties to groups outside of the U.S., and who may choose to maintain complex cultural identities and integrate traditions from multiple identities (Louie, 2009; Syed & Azmitia, 2008). For some individuals, failure to adopt and assimilate to one cultural group or national identity may be seen as violating norms or lead to a sense of separation from their country of residence (Moreno, 2013). Given this conceptualization, it would be meaningful to co-create a space where clients can explore, claim, and reconcile their identities and cultural practices in ways that feel authentic, congruent, and representative of their experience as a means of fostering resilience (Chávez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999; Wiley et al., 2012).

Women have historically experienced less social privilege and hindered access to education and work opportunities and financial stability (Collins, 2009; Denmark & Paludi, 2008), leading to a sense of uncertainty about their social status (Valentova & Alieva, 2014), which was supported by results in this study linking socioeconomic status

to strength in national identity. Given that women may be more at risk of being displaced from their social standing following sociocultural disruption, some researchers have suggested that disadvantaged individuals (Godfrey & Wolf, 2016), such as women, may engage in a process of system-justification, seeking to make meaning out of their circumstances and roles and coping with systems that appear to benefit some while simultaneously oppressing others (O'Brien & Major, 2005). Psychologists working with women should consider sociopolitical and sociocultural influences that shape development, power differentials, and biases related to women's mental health and ability to provide culturally competent services, as emphasized in the *Guidelines for Psychological Practice with Girls and Women* (APA, 2007; Houser, Wilzcenski, & Ham 2006).

Previous researchers have demonstrated that holding a strong sense of national identity and patriotic stance can provide a powerful source of psychological protection and security, particularly during moments of personal and national uncertainty (Han, 2013; Sahar, 2008; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). Given the results of this study, clinicians are encouraged to assist in promoting a healthy sense of identification to a larger group or collective, moving clients toward resiliency and a sense of belonging, both of which have been found to impact positively the quality of life (Coleman, 2003; Knowles & Lowery, 2012; Kwate & Meyer, 2010; Wyatt-Nichol, 2011).

Conversely, individuals may also over-identify with some aspects of their national identity, endorse exclusionary attitudes, and strongly endorse attitudes consistent with

141

right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance in ways that may be rigid or problematic within their social environments, such as place of employment, family systems, or community. Psychologists should consider utilizing a strengths-based approach to conceptualize the ways in which the client's worldview has been formed and shaped by their cultural context (Houser et al., 2006; Park & Huang, 2011). Additionally, clinicians can help clients and others with whom they work explore the underlying fears that influence perceptions of symbolic, actual, cultural, economic, and/or ethnic threat; facilitate the exploration of identity as a complex and multifaceted construct extending beyond a national identity (see, for example, O'Brien & Major, 2005; Phinney & Ong, 2007; Roberts, 1999); and address methods of honoring historical traditions in addition to naturally-evolving rituals (e.g., changes in customs) adaptive in ensuring the longevity of concepts, ideals, and practices, facilitating acceptance and flexibility.

Among clients who endorse fear-based xenophobia and whose social competence is low, therapists may find it particularly powerful to facilitate therapy groups in which diverse clients can safely explore their concerns. Such an approach is consistent with contact theory and would allow clients to challenge their assumptions within a supportive environment (Vezzali et al., 2015). Previous researchers have found that pro-LGBT attitudes can be facilitated by being exposed to and knowing at least one LGBT person (Barth, Overby & Hoffmon, 2009; Herek & Glunt, 1993), while others have identified that knowing a sex worker is related to endorsing more favorable attitudes and holding less bias toward workers in the sex industry (Long, Mollen, & Grant- Smith, 2012).

Similarly, community groups comprised of diverse ethnic and national origins/identities, geared specifically toward reducing fear, distrust, and bettering intergroup relationships, could be used to promote intergroup contact and more favorable attitudes toward others.

Psychologists are similarly encouraged to consider how their own cultural contexts mold current beliefs and attitudes that influence their perceptions of clients, particularly if participants hold different cultural identities (APA, 2003). Given a substantial body of research asserting the therapeutic alliance as an indispensable element in effecting change, consideration of barriers to the interpersonal personal process are meaningful to explore (Norcross & Wampold, 2011).

Within larger organizations, psychologists offer their expertise in various forms of service, among which include consultation and advocacy work. Guideline #6 from the *Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists* (APA, 2003) emphasizes the importance of supporting culturally informed policies, practices, and development. Clinicians can act in accordance with this guideline by staying abreast of diversity research, promoting social justice through organizational policies and hiring practices; facilitating inclusive client care that represents the diverse communities served; and including concepts of self-reflection and culturally-competent practice through their roles as teacher, consultant, supervisor, and therapist (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Constantine et al., 2007; Lott & Webster, 2006). Moreover, psychologists have the capacity to disseminate information through literature, media, and classrooms that challenges stereotypes, critically explores variables of threat,

and promote acceptance between groups (Constantine et al., 2007; Lott & Webster, 2006).

Implications for Research

The results of this study indicate that American identity may form and manifest differently for individuals who are born in the U.S. or who identify as White, as compared to individuals who are from different racial/ethnic groups or who adopt this identity after immigrating to the U.S. Measures of American Identity (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2012) often capture the degree to which individuals actively engage in self-reflection, participation, and investigative practices related to Americanness. Individuals who have lived in the U.S. for multiple generations or who identify as White may believe that their identity as an American is granted and assumed. Other scales or assessment tools for measuring American identity may be more effective in reflecting or measuring a stable sense of belonging to the U.S.

Given that this study explored theoretical and aspirational visualizations and perceptions of Americanness, future researchers could expand on these findings by polling for attitudes of deportation, English-only policies, or immigration policies in an effort to learn about applied attitudes. Similarly, researchers could further explore the meaning, impact, and potential priming effects of symbols associated with American Identity, such as the bald eagle, American flag, or Liberty Bell. Furthermore, these findings could be strengthened by generating vignettes with accompanying visual images of diverse individuals participating in or leading traditionally-American activities or

144

rituals or by providing in vivo video clips to which participants could react. The

aforementioned scenarios move beyond theoretical scenarios and include visual cues,

both of which may produce confirmatory or distinct results from the current study.

While this study investigated the relationship between race/ethnicity and

immigration status as they intersected with values of American identity, it would be

meaningful to expand the study into the perception of other diversity variables that may

be deemed as harmful to the moral or cultural traditional values (Dovidio et al., 2010;

Manevska & Achterberg, 2013). Future researchers could explore perception of threat

and fear as it relates to sexual orientation and diverse religious views within American

identity.

According to the Southern Poverty Law Center, the number of hate organizations

dramatically increased in the years following President Barack Obama's initial election in

2008, nearly ten-fold, from 149 recorded hate groups, to 1,360 in 2011 (Potok, 2013).

This rapid growth in extremist groups within the U.S. have been conjectured to

symbolize a backlash to a visual reminder of a changing demographic within the most

prestigious position of power in the U.S. (Potok, 2013). During the campaigning season

of 2015-2016, Republican frontrunner Donald Trump received support from White

supremacist groups, fomenting nationwide debates about the direction of the nation and

ethnic/racial tension (Schrekinger, 2015). It is notable that the data gathered for the

current study were collected prior to the major political presidential campaigning season

of 2015-2016 and prior to several notable acts of extremist violence within the U.S.

(Bergen, 2016), both of which incited often-divisive conversations about patriotism, American values, and border protection. It would be meaningful to collect data following the national presidential election of 2016 as a comparative study, particularly depending on the election's results.

While the investigator of this study generated a four-question scale to measure sociocultural competence, future researchers could expand this line of research by developing a more comprehensive scale to include access to and comfort in wearing clothing common in the U.S., knowledge of and experience with music in the U.S., comfort speaking the generally-accepted national language, and knowledge of and comfort consuming foods traditionally eaten within the U.S., among variables of sociocultural competence. Complex measures integrating a greater number of factors related to living in a diverse society are likely to demonstrate greater empirical support and internal reliability than the measure presented in this study. Finally, ongoing research could link results related to perception of Americanness and self-identification of national identity to traits of openness, stress outcomes, and perceived ability for upward mobility and success.

Implications for Training

This study supported the literature on uncritical patriotism, right-wing authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation as they relate to deference to authority and a greater hesitation to reconsider valued stances or views (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Childs, 2011; Wagner et al., 2012). Within the field of applied psychology, it

146

would be beneficial to consider how educators, supervisors, supervisees, students, and

mentees challenge longstanding assumptions and theories related to training, treating, or

researching immigrant populations, underserved groups, and individuals from perceived

out-groups, and to develop a greater understanding of ideological views that are shaped

by sociocultural contexts, all of which can impact openness and willingness to learn and

self-reflect (Cole, 2009; Stuart, 2004). The APA *Guidelines on Multicultural Education,*

Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists (APA, 2003)

encourage psychologists to introduce concepts of multiculturalism and diversity into

training, supervisory, and educational experiences. Supervisors can facilitate a process of

self-reflection and exploration necessary for clinicians-in-training and students as they

develop conceptualization skills, gain awareness into countertransference, and establish

therapeutic alliances (Cole, 2009; Constantine et al., 2007; Stuart, 2004). These critical

therapeutic skills involve intrapersonal and interpersonal interactions influenced by

perception of self and others (Constantine et al., 2007). The ability to challenge the status

quo would progress the field by developing theory, training methods, and research

methods that advance ethical and multiculturally competent practice (Houser, et al., 2006;

Sehgal et al., 2011; Stuart, 2004). Lee, Rosen, and Burns (2013) conducted a

multicultural content analysis of the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, investigating

variables associated with multiculturalism within articles published between 1954 and

2009. Their meta-analysis revealed "race/ethnicity, gender/sex, religion/spirituality,

sexual orientation, social status, disability, age, and intersections" (p. 154) as being most

frequently studied within the field of multiculturalism to different extents (Lee et al., 2013). While Counseling Psychology has historically championed tenets of multiculturalism (Ivey, 1979), national and political identity have been notably missing as meaningful facets of identity and, given their relevance, trainers should include them in their curricula. Additionally, trainers can implement recommendations by the APA Presidential Taskforce on Immigration (2013), which provides guidelines for working with immigrant-origin clients, referencing unique facets of working with bi-cultural individuals in the U.S.

This study explored American identity, both self-reported and perceived. Previous researchers have indicated that while these two constructs are meaningful, they are uncorrelated, as individuals may identify with a group, yet be perceived as out-group members (Dovidio et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2012). As such, professionals would be best-prepared to consider and be sensitive to the complex needs of diverse students and trainees who are in the process of self-individuation, identity development, and carving out their professional niche, but who may not be prepared for societal barriers to upward mobility (Negru, Pop, & Opre, 2013; Syed & Azmitia, 2008). Conversely, mentees and trainees may also be hyperaware of these experiences and may experience high levels of stress or anxiety, particularly if they do not feel included or feel devalued in their lived experience within their training program.

Finally, researchers have demonstrated that individuals belonging to advantaged groups struggle to challenge harmful stereotypes of disadvantaged groups, as doing do would threaten their own position and power within the social hierarchy (Manevska & Achterberg, 2013; Shnabel et al., 2013; Wagner et al., 2012). Results related to socioeconomic status and White ethnic/racial identity within this study supported the aforementioned findings. As such, educators and supervisors may benefit students by being intentional in discussing themes related to privilege, oppression, and self-reflective practice to benefit clients and society at-large (Cole, 2009; Jensen, 2005; Stuart, 2004).

Strengths of the Study

This was, to this researcher's knowledge, the first study to explore numerous ideological and demographic variables in tandem, in an effort to explore comfort within a pluralistic society, perception of Americanness, and a definition of American identity. By allowing participants both to respond to established empirically supported measures, in addition to being able to select concrete definitional categories or to generate their own definition, it was possible to create a contemporary picture of how ethnicity/race, gender, political affiliation, SES, immigration status, and ideological beliefs affect the perception of American identity. To the knowledge of the researcher, no other studies have attempted to produce a multilayered definition of self-reported national identity in addition to perceived national identity for others.

The current study also included a diverse sample in political affiliation and age that allowed for interpretation of the data collection and greater extrapolation to students and professionals, particularly in the southern region of the U.S., although generalization should be applied with caution, as participants had the opportunity to self-select given their interest in the topic. This study however, sought to reduce demand characteristics by inviting individuals to participate in a study titled, A Study of Attitudes and Perceptions about Being American, rather than the actual given title.

Finally, in order to control for priming effects that may be attributed to the order of measures, participants were asked to provide a narrative definition of American identity prior to providing demographic information or beginning study measures. Moreover, measures were counterbalanced, providing participants with a randomized opportunity to complete the surveys in one of three sequences, each changing the order of ideological variables studied.

Limitations of the Study

Although the current study explored the nature of important variables in the perception of the American Dream, there were also several sampling and methodological limitations that should be delineated. Throughout the findings, participants frequently endorsed respecting America's institutions and laws as a meaningful component of American identity and embracing diverse individuals to participate in traditionally-American rituals. This study, however, did not operationalize how participants employ this value and did not differentiate between holding and enacting this value. By

150

operationalizing this dimension of American identity, participants could likely have

provided greater depth of responses and richness of data. Similarly, in exploring

sociocultural competence, participants were not asked to provide proficiency in

language(s) spoken or understood, which research has suggested is an important variable

in ability to communicate with more diverse groups of individuals and may provide a

greater sense of comfort in interactions where English is not the primary nor only

language utilized (Newman et al., 2012).

Another limitation of the current study may stem from participants' desire to

respond in ways that were socially desirable or aspirational in nature, rather than the

manner in which Americanness is actually described, experienced, or catalogued in daily

interactions. This study did not integrate a process to differentiate between prescriptive

beliefs or the notion that Americanness ought to be defined by aspirational principles of

self-identification and shared values, and descriptive beliefs, or the true nature in which

these processes function (Hing et al., 2011). The researcher did not include a measure of

social desirability to parse out the level to which participants may have responded in a

socially desirable manner. Similarly, this study utilized a brief investigator-created

measure of sociocultural competence consisting of four questions, which had not been

previously empirically supported and which demonstrated questionable reliability that

necessitates a cautious approach to interpretation of those data.

Additionally, the study was distributed to public universities through social media

and word-of-mouth, and little information is known about the location, demographics, or

courses from which data were collected. Political orientation was determined according to self-reported political affiliation, categorizing participants who identified as Democrats as being politically progressive, while coding Republican political affiliation as politically conservative. These categorizations, however, are rudimentary and do not allow for the consideration of nuanced identities or those that may fall along the political spectrum rather than anchoring at the ends of the continuum.

Lastly, the nature of the study conducted does not lend itself to inferring causality, given that the design was non-experimental. Regression analyses, ANOVA, and chi-square analysis allow for the exploration of important relationships, but do not provide insight into causation. As such, findings should be interpreted as reflective of relationships between variables rather than as implying or establishing causation.

Conclusion

Throughout the course of its history, the U.S. has fostered powerful national bonds that have also engendered within-group and out-group exclusivity, as members seek to establish and protect cultural practices. For example, the 2016 Republican primary election season has been punctuated with anti-immigration sentiments rooted in xenophobic, racist, and pro-authoritarian views (Bergen, 2016), challenging beliefs about what it means to hold an American identity and who should be included in its cultural practices. While there is scholarship on the nature of nationalism, patriotism, in-group and out-group identification in fields of economics, political science, and history (Cameron & Berry, 2008; Manevska & Achternberg, 2010), and more recently, American

identity, little research has explored the complex interactions of demographic variables and perceptions of immigrants who engage in national rituals. While Counseling Psychology has been a leader in multicultural research, national identity and attitudes toward immigrants have been sparsely addressed, particularly as they intersect with concepts of multiculturalism and identity development.

As predicted, politically conservative participants born in the U.S. reported higher levels of fear-based xenophobia than their counterparts, while politically progressive participants with low levels of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, fear-based xenophobia, and Social Dominance Orientation endorsed higher levels of sociocultural competence. Consistent with predictions, those with high levels of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, fear-based xenophobia, Social Dominance Orientation, uncritical patriotism, and those who identified as U.S-born., were more likely to object to immigrants participating in traditionally-U.S. rituals, although responses were tempered if immigrants endorsed respecting America's institutions and laws, identified as Americans, and spoke English. Unexpectedly, results linked higher nationalistic attitude scores, identifying as non-White, and having a low-to-mid-SES, with a stronger sense of American identity, while linking high levels of RWA to lower levels of American identity.

Overall, findings supported civic and emotional elements to national identity and a shared system of communication. Socioeconomically disadvantaged individuals especially cultivated a strong national identity, while non-White individuals demonstrated greater adherence to their American identity, which White participants and those

153

endorsing RWA may assume is ascribed and static. Counseling psychologists should

conceptualize how people integrate multiple cultural identities within the U.S. across the

lifespan, experience national identity as protective or exclusionary, and manage

acculturative stress. This study's findings inform our understanding of out-group

derogation, social justice advocacy individually and nationally, and multicultural

competence in a changing nation (Sehgal et al., 2011; Stuart, 2004).

REFERENCES

Ad Council, 2004. I am an American (2001-Present) [online]. Available from:

 http://www.adcouncil.org/default.aspx?id=141 [Accessed 19 January 2015]

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The
 authoritarian personality.* Oxford, England: Harpers.

Ainslie, R. (2011). Immigration and the psychodynamics of class. *Psychoanalytic
 Psychology, 28*, 560-568. doi: 10.1037/a0025262

Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2006). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance
 orientation: Their roots in big-five personality factors and facets. *Journal of
 Individual Differences, 27*, 117-126. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.27.3.117

Alhanati, J. (2012, September 23). Which income class are you? *Investopedia.* Retrieved
 from http://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0912/which-income-class-are-
 you.aspx

Ali, A., McFarlane, E., Lees, K., & Srivastava, N. (2013). Who is a patriot?
 Psychological recolonization and the proliferation of U.S. nationalism. *Race, Gender
 & Class, 20*, 353-362. Retrieved from
 http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct
 =true&db=sih&AN=87581136&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of
 Manitoba Press

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

    Press.

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural

    education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists.

    American Psychologist, 58, 377-402. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.58.5.377

American Psychological Association (2007). Guidelines for psychological

    practice with girls and women. *American Psychologist, 62,* 949-979. doi:

    10.1037/0003-066X.62.9.949.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and*

    code of conduct with the 2010 amendments. Retrieved from

    http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/ index.aspx

American Psychological Association (2013). Working with immigrant-origin clients: An

    update for mental health professionals. Retrieved from

    http://www.apa.org/topics/immigration/immigration-report-professionals.pdf

Anbarani, A. (2013). Nation, nationalism in controversial debates and though: A review

    of origin of nation and nationalism. *Canadian Social Science, 9,* 61-67. doi:

    10.3968/j.css.1923669720130903.2764

Anderson, B. (2006). Imagined communities. *Reflections on the origin and spread of*

    nationalism. London, Verso.

Aravosis, J. (2013, July 19). American singer Marc Anthony criticized for singing God

Bless America while Latino. *America Blog*. Retrieved from

http://americablog.com/2013/07/marc-anthony-god-bless-america.html

Asultany, E. (2007) Selling American diversity and Muslim American identity through

nonprofit advertising post-9/11. *American Quarterly, 59*, 593-622. doi:

10.1353/aq.2007.0052

Bacon, B., & Welch, W. M. (2015, April 13). Tulsa reserve deputy charged with

manslaughter. *USA Today*. Retrieved from

http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2015/04/13/oklahoma-shooting-

video/25702233/

Barth, J., Overby, L. M., & Huffmon, S. H. (2009). Community context, personal contact,

and support for an anti-gay rights referendum. *Political Research Quarterly, 62*,

355–365. doi:10.1177/1065912908317033.

Becker, J. C., Enders-Comberg, A., Wagner, U., Christ, O., & Butz, D. A. (2012).

Beware of national symbols: How flags can threaten intergroup relations. *Social

Psychology, 43*, 3-6. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000073

Beegle, A. (2004). American music education 1941-1946: Meeting needs and making

adjustments during World War II. *Journal of Historical Research in Music

Education, 26*, 54-67.

Berg, G. (2014). Poets and patriots: A tuneful history of "The Star-Spangled

Banner." *Journal of Singing, 71,* 268-271.

Bergen, P. (2016, March 23). How big is U.S. terror threat? *CNN.com*. Retrieved from

    http://www.cnn.com/2016/03/22/opinions/terrorism-threat-united-states-bergen/

Berlin, I. (1938). God bless America. [Sheet Music].

Bernard, J.M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th

    Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Billig, M. (2002). 'Henri Tajfel's 'Cognitive aspects of prejudice' and the psychology of

    Bigotry': Reply. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 199-202.

    doi:10.1348/014466602760060084

Birch, H.A. (1989). *Nationalism and national integration.* London: University of

    Victoria, British Columbia.

Bratta, P. M. (2009). Flag display post-9/11: A discourse on American

    nationalism. *Journal of American Culture, 32*, 232-243. doi:10.1111/j.1542-

    734X.2009.00713.x

Brown, D. L. (2013). Manufacturing fear, creating the threat: The state of American

    immigration policy. *Journal of Latino-Latin American Studies (JOLLAS), 5*, 57-67.

    Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=sih&AN=89428450&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Burge, S. (2006). Gender differences in adolescents' planned majors and earned degrees:

    Perceived competence or early family commitment? *Conference Papers -- American*

    Sociological Association, 1.

Cameron, J. E., & Berry, J. W. (2008). True patriot love: Structure and predictors of

Canadian pride. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 40*, 17-41. doi: 10.1353/ces.2008.0022

Campbell, A. L., Wong, C., & Citrin, J. (2006). Racial threat, partisan climate, and direct

democracy: Contextual effects in three California initiatives. *Political Behavior, 28,*

129–150. doi: 10.1007/s11109-006-9005-6

Carrero, J. (2013, July 17). Baseball fans take to Twitter to protest Marc Anthony singing

God Bless America. *NBCLatino*. Retrieved from

http://nbclatino.com/2013/07/17/baseball-fans-take-to-twitter-to-protest-marc-

anthony-singing-god-bless-america/

Carter, R. (2000, May 4). Pro athletes, fans and the Star Spangled Banner. *New York

Amsterdam News*. p. 10.

Cayton, A., Perry, E.I., Reed, L., & Winkler, A.M. (2005). *America: Pathways to the

present.* Needham, MA: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Chávez, A., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1999). Racial and ethnic identity and development. In

M. C. Clark & R. S. Caffarella (Eds.), *An update on adult development theory:

New ways of thinking about the life course* (New Directions for Adult and

Continuing Education No. 84, pp. 39-47). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Childs, C. E. (2011). *Right-wing authoritarianism and prejudice: A metaanalysis*

(Master's thesis). Retrieved from EBSCOHost. https://cms.bsu.edu/-

/media/WWW/DepartmentalContent/Psychology/Docs/Childs.pdf

Citrin, J., Lerman, A., Murakami, M., & Pearson, K. (2007). Testing Huntington: Is

Hispanic immigration a threat to American identity? *Perspectives on Politics, 5,* 31-

48. doi: 10.1017/S1537592707070041

Citrin, J., Wong, C. & Duff, B. (2001). The meaning of American

national identity: Patterns of ethnic conflict and consensus. In R. Asmore,

L. Jussim and D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, inter-group conflict and conflict*

resolution (pp. 71-100). New York: Oxford University Press

Clevstrom, J., & Shin, P. H. B. (April 29, 2006). Oh, say, W can't see "Spanthem." Bush

says gotta be English-only in "banner" lyrics. *Daily News* (NY), a. News.

Cokley, K. O., Tran, K., Hall-Clark, B., Chapman, C., Bessa, L., Finley, A., et al. (2011).

Predicting student attitudes about racial diversity and gender equity": Correction to

Cokley et al. (2010). *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 4*, 162.

doi:10.1037/a0024769

Cole, E.R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist,*

64, 170-180. doi: 10.1037/a0014564.

Coleman, M. G. (2003). African American popular wisdom versus the qualification

question: Is affirmative action merit-based? *Western Journal of Black Studies, 27*,

35-44. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

=true&db=a9h&AN=10693272&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Collins, G. (2009). *When everything changed.* New York, NY: Hachette Book Group.

160

Constantine, M.G., Hage, S.M., Kindaichi, M.M., & Bryant, R.M. (2007). Social justice
and multicultural issues: Implications for the practice and training of counselors and
counseling psychologists. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 85*, 24-29. doi:
10.1177/0011000008319986

Costa, M. V. (2011). The fragility of patriotism. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook,* 9-
12.

Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and in-group bias. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 60-67. doi: 10.1080/15298860802605895

Cronin, A. (2004). *Advertising myths: The strange half-life of images and commodities*.
London: Routledge.

Dawson M.C. (2001). *Black visions: The root of contemporary African-American
political ideologies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Deen, T. (2011, December). False perceptions underpin anti-migrant sentiments. *Inter
Press Service News Agency.*

Denmark, F.L., & Paludi, M. A. (2008). *Psychology of women: Handbook of issues and
theories.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Devos, T., & Heng, L., (2009). Whites are granted the American identity more swiftly
than Asians: Disentangling the role of automatic and controlled processes. *Social
Psychology, 40,* 192-201. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335.40.4.192

Dottolo, A.L., & Stewart, A.J. (2008). "Don't ever forget now, you're a Black man in America": Intersections of race, class and gender in encounters with the police. *Sex Roles, 59*, 350-364.doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9387-x

Dovidio, J. P., Gluszeck, A., John, M-S., Ditlmann, S., & Lagunes, P. (2010). Understanding bias toward Latinos: Discrimination, dimensions of difference, and experience of exclusion. *Journal of Social Issues, 66,* 59-78. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01633.x

Duckitt, J., Birum, I., Wagner, C., & Du Plessis, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 83*, 75-93. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.1.75

Duncan, L. A., Schaller, M., & Park, J. H. (2009). Perceived vulnerability to disease: Development and validation of a 15-item self-report instrument. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37,* 541–546. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.001

Ellis, R.J. (2005). *To the flag: The unlikely history of the Pledge of Allegiance.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Epstein, T. (2001). Racial identity and young people's perspectives on social education. *Theory into Practice, 40*, 42-47.

Everett, J. C. (2013). The 12 item Social and Economic Conservatism Scale (SECS). *Plos ONE, 8*, 1-11. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0082131

Faulkner, J., Schaller, M., Park, J. H., & Duncan, L. A. (2004). Evolved disease-avoidance mechanisms and contemporary xenophobic attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 7,* 333–353. doi: 10.1177/1368430204046142

Finell, E. J., Olakivi, KA., Liebkind, K., & Lipsanen, J. (2013). Does it matter how I perceive my nation? National symbols, national identification and attitudes toward immigrants. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 54,* 529-535. doi: 10.1111/sjop.12082

Francis, D. (2012, September 13). Where do you fall in the American economic class system? *U.S. News & World Report.* Retrieved from http://money.usnews.com/money/personal-finance/articles/2012/09/13/where-do-you-fall-in-the-american-economic-class-system

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism.* Ithica: Cornell University Press.

Gershon, S. A., & Pantoja, A. D. (2011). Patriotism and language loyalties: Comparing Latino and Anglo attitudes toward English-only legislation. *Ethnic & Racial Studies, 34*, 1522-1542. doi:10.1080/01419870.2010.535549

Glass, B. D. (2009). The Star-Spangled Banner flies high, shining new light on American history. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum, 89*, 12-13.

Godfrey, E. B., & Wolf, S. (2016). Developing critical consciousness or justifying the system? A qualitative analysis of attributions for poverty and wealth among low-income racial/ethnic minority and immigrant women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22*, 93-103. doi:10.1037/cdp0000048

163

Goodnight, B.L., Cook, S.L., Parrott, D.J., & Peterson, J.L. (2014). Effects of

masculinity, authoritarianism, and prejudice on antigay aggression: A path analysis

of gender-role enforcement. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*, 437-444. doi:

10.1037/a0034565

Green, E. G. T., Krings, F., Staerklé, C., Bangerter, A., Clémence, A., Wagner-Egger, P.,

& Bornand, T. (2010). Keeping the vermin out: Perceived disease threat and

ideological orientations as predictors of exclusionary immigration attitudes. *Journal*

of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 20, 299-316. doi:10.1002/casp.1037

Guimond, S., Chatard, A., Martinot, D., Crisp, R. J., & Redersdorff, S. (2006). Social

comparison, self-stereotyping, and gender differences in self-construals. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 90, 221-242. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.2.221

Ha, S. E. (2010). The consequences of multiracial contexts on public attitudes toward

immigration. *Political Research Quarterly, 63,* 29–42. doi:

10.1177/1065912908325255

Hage, G. (2006). *The ugly assimilationists.* Retrieved from

http://unimelb.academia.edu/GhassanHage/Papers/1670772/The_Ugly_Assimilationi

sts.

Han, K. J. (2013). Income inequality, international migration, and national pride: A test

of Social Identification Theory. *International Journal of Public Opinion*

Research, 25, 502-521. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/edt011

Hawley, G. (2011). Political threat and immigration: Party identification, demographic context, and immigration policy preference. *Social Science Quarterly, 92*, 404-422. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2011.00775.x

Hebert, D. (2006). Rethinking patriotism: National anthems in music education. *Asia-Pacific Journal for Arts Education, 4*, 21–50.

Herek, G. M., & Glunt, E. K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men: Results from a national survey. *The Journal of Sex Research, 30*, 239–244. doi:10.1080/ 00224499309551707.

Hernández, P., & McDowell, T. (2010). Intersectionality, power, and relational safety in context: Key concepts in clinical supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 4*, 29-35. doi:10.1037/a0017064

Hing, L. S. S., Bobocel, D. R., Zanna, M. P., Garcia, D. M., Gee, S. S., & Orazietti, K. (2011). The merit of meritocracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 433-450. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=65289079&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Hood, M. V., & Morris, I.L. (1998). Give us your tired, your poor, . . .but make sure they have a green card: The effects of documented and undocumented migrant context on Anglo opinion toward immigration. *Political Behavior 20,* 1–15. doi: 10.1023/A:1024839032001

Hopkins, D. J. (2010). Politicized places: Explaining where and when immigrants provoke local opposition. *American Political Science Review, 104,* 40–60. doi: 10.1017/S0003055409990360

Houser. R., Wilzcenski, F. L.,& Ham, M. (2006). *Culturally relevant ethical decision-making in counseling.* (1ˢᵗ ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Huddy, L., & Khatib, N. (2007). American patriotism, national identity, and political involvement. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*, 63-77. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00237.x

Huntington, S. (2004). *Who are we? The challenges to America's national identity.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Hutchinson, J., Reynold, S., Smith, A. D., Colls, R., & Kumar, K. (2007). Debate on Krishan Kumar's the making of English national identity. *Nations & Nationalism, 13*, 179-203. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8129.2007.00284.x

Insko, C. A., Schopler, J., Kennedy, J. F., Dahl, K. R., Graetz, K. A., & Drigotas, S. M. (1992). Individual-group discontinuity from the differing perspectives of Campbell's realistic group conflict theory and Tajfel and Turner's social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55,* 272-291.

Ivey, A.E. (1979). Counseling psychology- The most broadly-based applied psychology

    specialty. *Counseling Psychologist, 8*, (3-6).

Jensen, R. (2005). White privilege shapes the U.S. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *White*

    privilege: Essential readings on the other side of racism (2nd ed.). (pp. 115-118).

    New York: Worth Publishers.

Joffe, H., & Staerkle´, C. (2007). The centrality of the self-control ethos in Western

    aspersions regarding outgroups: A social representational analysis of common

    stereotype content. *Culture and Psychology, 13*, 395–418. doi:

    10.1177/1354067X07082750

Jones, J.O., & Meyer, P. (2010). *The Pledge: A history of the Pledge of Allegiance.* New

    York, NY: Thomas Dunne Books/St. Martin's Press.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2007). Songs to teach a nation. *Philosophy of Music Education Review,*

    15, 150–160. doi: 10.2979/PME.2007.15.2.150

Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict:

    Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality*

    and Social Psychology, 55, 893-905. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.55.6.893

Kemmelmeier, M., & Winter, D. G. (2008). Sowing patriotism, but reaping nationalism?

    Consequences of exposure to the American Flag. *Political Psychology, 29,* 859-879.

    doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00670.x

Kennedy, M. C., & Guerrini, S. C. (2012). Patriotism, nationalism, and national identity in music education: "O Canada," How well do we know thee? *International Journal of Music Education, 31*, 78-90. doi: 10.1177/0255761411433722

Kinzler, K.D., Shutts, K., DeJesus, J., & Spelke, E.S. (2009). Accent trumps race in guiding children's social preferences. *Social Cognition, 27*, 623-634. doi: 10.1521/soco.2009.27.4.623

Knowles, E. D., & Lowery, B. S. (2012). Meritocracy, self-concerns, and Whites' denial of racial inequity. *Self & Identity, 11*, 202-222. doi: 10.1080/15298868.2010.542015

Knox, M. D., & Wagganer, A. M. (2009). A cultural shift toward peace: The need for a national symbol. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 15,* 97-101. doi:10.1080/10781910802545008

Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology, 10*, 257-274. doi:10.2307/3791647

Kwate, N. O. A., & Meyer, I. H. (2010). The myth of meritocracy and African American health. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*, 1831-1834. doi: 10.2105/AJPH. 2009.186445

Lawrence, E. A. (1990). Symbol of a nation: The bald eagle in American culture. *Journal of American Culture, 13*, 63-69. doi: 10.1111/j.1542-734X.1990.1301_63.x

Lee, T.J. (1997). How can there be free speech if it's only in English. *Human Rights: Journal of the Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities, 24,* 10-12.

Lee, R.M. (2005). Resilience against discrimination: Ethnic identity and other-group orientation as protective factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 36-44. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.36

Lee, D. L., Rosen, A. D., & Burns, V. (2013). Over a half-century encapsulated: A multicultural content analysis of the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1954–2009. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*, 154-161. doi:10.1037/a0031002

Levin, M. E., Luoma, J. B., Lillis, J., Hayes, S. C., & Vilardaga, R. (2014). The Acceptance and Action Questionnaire - Stigma (AAQ-S): Developing a measure of psychological flexibility with stigmatizing thoughts. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 3*, 21-26. doi: 10.1016/j.jcbs.2013.11.003

Livingston, R. W., & Pearce, N. A. (2009). The teddy-bear effect: Does having a baby face benefit Black chief executive officers? *Psychological Science, 20*, 1229-1236.

Long, S.L., Mollen, D., & Grant Smith, N. (2012). College women's attitudes toward sex workers. *Sex Roles, 66*, 117-127. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-0088-0

Lott, B., & Webster, K. (2006). Carry the banner where it can be seen: Small wins for social justice. *Social Justice Research, 19*, 123-134.

Louie, V. (2009). Beyond the American dream: How social mobility is experienced and understood in immigrant families. *Conference Papers -- American Sociological Association, 1*. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=54430154&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Manevska, K., & Achterberg, P. (2013). Immigration and perceived ethnic threat:

    Cultural capital and economic explanations. *European Sociological Review, 29,* 437-

    449. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcr085. Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=sih&AN=87988397&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Marden, O. S. (1904). *Three great American songs and their authors: The Star-Spangled*

    Banner. In C.S. Marden, *Eclectic School Readings: Stories from Life* (pp. 69-72).

    Jefferson City: American Book Company.

Martin, L. A. (2011). Middle school students' views on the United States pledge of

    allegiance. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 35*, 245-258. Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=eric&AN=EJ961806&site=ehost-live&scope=site;

    http://www.thejssr.com/

Martin, L. A. (2012). Blind patriotism or active citizenship? How do students interpret

    the Pledge of Allegiance? *Action in Teacher Education, 34,* 55-64. Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=eric&AN=EJ997141&site=ehost-live&scope=site;

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.642288

Maxwell, A. (2010). Typologies and phases in nationalism studies: Hroch's A-B-C

    schema as a basis for comparative terminology. *Nationalities Papers, 38,* 865-880.

    doi:10.1080/00905992.2010.515970

McClain, P.D., Johnson Carew, J.D., Walton, Jr. E., & Watts, C.S. (2009). Group

    membership, group identity, and group consciousness: Measures of racial identity in

    American politics? *The Annual Review of Political Science, 12,* 471-485. doi:

    10.1146/10.072805.102452

McCoy, S. K., Wellman, J. D., Cosley, B., Saslow, L., & Epel, E. (2013). Is the belief in

    meritocracy palliative for members of low status groups? Evidence for a benefit for

    self-esteem and physical health via perceived control. *European Journal of Social*

    Psychology, 43, 307-318. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1959

McMahon, M. (2014). The Pledge of Allegiance & moment of silence

    controversy. *Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence-Research Starters*

    Education, 1-6.

Meuleman, R., Bekhuis, H., Lubbers, M., & Scheepers, P. (2013). Own culture first?

    Nationalism and the preference for national cultural goods. *International Journal of*

    Public Opinion Research, 25, 436-458. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/eds024

Middaugh, E., & Kahne, J. (2008). Civic development in context. The influence of local

    contexts on high school students' beliefs about student engagement. In J.S. Bixby, &

    J.L. Pace (Eds.), *Educating citizens in troubled times* (pp.157-191). Albany, NY:

    State University of New York Press.

Miller, M.J., & Sendrowitz, K. (2011). Counseling psychology trainees' social justice

    interest and commitment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*, 159-169.

Montgomery, D. (April 28, 2006). An anthem's discordant notes; Spanish version of

"Star-Spangled Banner" draws strong reactions. *The Washington Post,* s.A, p.01.

Moreno, C. (2013, July 18). Marc Anthony addresses 'God Bless America' performance's

racist remarks after MLB all-star game. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/07/18/marc-anthony-god-bless-

america_n_3618420.html

Negru, O., Pop, I., & Opre, A. (2013). Foreshadowing identities: The relation between

achievement goals and educational identity in a sample of Romanian emerging

adults. *Cognitie, Creier, Comportament/Cognition, Brain, Behavior, 17*, 1-13.

Neufeld, M. (Producer), & McTiernan, J. (Director). (1990). *The hunt for red October*

[Motion Picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures, Mace Neufeld

Productions, Nina Saxon Film Design.

Newman, B. J. (2013). Acculturating contexts and Anglo opposition to immigration in

the United States. *American Journal of Political Science, 57,* 374-390.

doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2012.00632.x

Newman, B. J., Hartman, T. K., & Taber, C. S. (2012). Foreign language exposure,

cultural threat, and opposition to immigration. *Political Psychology, 33*, 635-657.

doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00904.x

Nielsen, K.E. (2004). What's a patriotic man to do? Patriotic masculinities of the post–

WWI red scare. *Men and Masculinities, 6*, 240-253. doi:

10.1177/1097184X03257399

Nincic, M., & Ramos, J. M. (2012). The sources of patriotism: Survey and experimental evidence. *Foreign Policy Analysis, 8*, 373-388. doi:10.1111/j.1743-8594.2011.00175.x

Norcross, J.C. & Wampold, B.E. (2011). Evidence-based therapy relationships: Research conclusions and clinical practices. *Psychotherapy, 48*, 98-102. doi: 1037/a0022161

O'Brien, L. T., & Major, B. (2005). System-justifying beliefs and psychological well-being: The roles of group status and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1718-1729. doi: 10.1177/0146167205278261

Omni, M., & Winant, H. (2010). Racial formations. In P.S. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Race, class, and gender in the United States* (pp. 13-22). New York, NY: Worth.

Ortman, J.M., & Guarneri, C.E. (2009). *United States population projections: 2000 to 2050.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/population/projections/files/analytical-document09.pdf

Pang, V. O., Stratton, T., Park, C. D., Madueño, M., Atlas, M., Page, C., & Oliger, J. (2010). The American dream and immigrant students. *Race, Gender & Class, 17*, 180-193. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=50614793&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Papastephanou, M. (2013). Inward and outward patriotism. *Review of European Studies, 5*, 20-32. doi: 10.5539/res.v5n2p20

Park, A. S. J. (2013). Racial nationalism and representations of citizenship: The

    recalcitrant alien, the citizen of convenience, and the fraudulent citizen. *Canadian*

    Journal of Sociology, 38, 579-600. Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=a9h&AN=93477467&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Park., D. C. & Huang, C. M. (2011). Culture wires the brain: A cognitive neuroscience

    perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5,* 391-400.

Patil, V. (2013). From Patriarchy to intersectionality: A transnational feminist assessment

    of how far we've really come. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society, 38*,

    847-867. doi: 0097-9740/2013/3804-0003

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paxton, P., & Mughan, A. (2006). What's to fear from immigrants? Creating an

    assimilationist threat scale. *Political Psychology, 27*, 549–568. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-

    9221.2006.00520.x

Pelc, N., & Mollen. D. (2014, August). *Ethnicity, generational cohort, and the American*

    dream. Presented at the American Psychological Association annual conference.

    Washington, DC

Phinney, J.S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic

    identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*,

    271-281. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

Potok., M. (2013, March 4). *The year in hate and extremism*. Retrieved from

    https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2013/year-hate-and-

    extremism.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L., & Malle, B. (1994). Social dominance orientation:

    A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of*

    Personality and Social Psychology, 67, 741–763. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

PublicShaming.com. (2013). *Baseball fans super angry Hispanic American superstar*

    sang 'God Bless America' at all-star game. Retrieved from

    http://publicshaming.tumblr.com/post/55715208108/baseball-fans-super-angry-

    hispanic-american

Raffles, H. (2011). *Insectopedia.* New York, NY: Vintage.

Roberts, A. (2013). Patriotism, allegiance & the nation state. *New Criterion, 31*, 33-37.

    Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=lfh&AN=84602478&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Roberts, R.E., Phinney, J.S., Masses, L.C., Chen, Y.R., Roberts, C.R., & Romero, A.

    (1999). The structure of ethnic identity in young adolescents from diverse

    ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 301-322. doi:

    10.1177/0272431699019003001

Rothman, L. (2014). How the Star-Spangled Banner became the national

    anthem. *Time.Com, 1*.

175

Rushton, J. P. (2005). Ethnic nationalism, evolutionary psychology and genetic similarity theory. *Nations and Nationalism, 11,* 489–507. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-8129.2005.00216.x Retrieved September 18, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Premier, http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=18359542&site=ehost-live

Sahar, G. (2008). Patriotism, attributions for the 9/11 attacks, and support for war: Then and now. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 30,* 189-197. doi:10.1080/01973530802374956

Sánchez, F. J., Liu, W. M., Leathers, L., Goins, J., & Vilain, E. (2011). The subjective experience of social class and upward mobility among African American men in graduate school. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*, 368-382. doi: 10.1037/a0024057

Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology, 20,* 151-174. doi:10.1111/0162-895X.00140

Schildkraut, D.J. (2001). Official-English and the States: Influences on declaring English the official language in the United States, *Political Research Quarterly, 54,* 445-457. doi: 10.1177/106591290105400211

Schmidt, M.S., & Apuzo, M. (2015, April 7). South Carolina officer is charged with

    murder of Walter Scott. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

    http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/08/us/south-carolina-officer-is-charged-with-

    murder-in-black-mans-death.html?_r=0

Schreckinger, B. (2015, December 10). *White supremacist groups see Trump bump.*

    Retrieved from http://www.politico.com/story/2015/12/donald-trump-white-

    supremacists-216620

Schwartz, S. J., Benet-Martínez, V., Knight, G. P., Unger, J. B., Zamboanga, B. L., Des

    Rosiers, S. E., & ... Szapocznik, J. (2014). Effects of language of assessment on

    the measurement of acculturation: Measurement equivalence and cultural frame

    switching. *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 100-114. doi:10.1037/a0034717

Schwartz, S. J., Park, I. K., Huynh, Q., Zamboanga, B. L., Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Lee, R.,

    & ... Agocha, V. B. (2012). The American Identity Measure: Development and

    validation across ethnic group and immigrant generation. *Identity: An International*

    Journal of Theory and Research, 12, 93-128. doi:10.1080/15283488.2012.668730

Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Des Rosiers, S. E., Lorenzo-Blanco, E. I., Zamboanga, B.

    L., Huang, S., & ... Szapocznik, J. (2014). Domains of acculturation and their effects

    on substance use and sexual behavior in recent Hispanic immigrant adolescents.

    Prevention Science: *The Official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research, 15*,

    385-396. doi:10.1007/s11121-013-0419-1

Shnabel, N., Ullrich, J., Nadler, A., Dovidio, J.F., & Aydinn, A.L. (2013). Warm or

    competent. Improving intergroup relations by addressing threatened identities of

    advantaged and disadvantaged groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*,

    482-492. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.1975

Segal, E. A., Kilty, K. M., & Kim, R. Y. (2002). Social and economic inequality and

    Asian Americans in the United States. *Journal of Poverty, 6*, 5. doi:

    10.1300/J134v06n0402 . Retrieved from

    http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=ehh&AN=9889078&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Sehgal, R., Saules, K., Young, A., Grey, M.J., Gillem, A.R., Nabors, N.A., …Jefferson,

S. (2011). Practicing what we know: Multicultural counseling competence

    among clinical psychology trainees and experienced multicultural psychologists.

    Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17, (1-10). doi:

    10.1037/a0021667

Sharp, B. S. (2009). Singing off key: Political controversies over the national anthem in

    American politics. Conference Papers -- *Southern Political Science Association,* 1-

    20.

Shobe, M. A., Coffman, M. J., & Dmochowski, J. (2009). Achieving the American

    dream: Facilitators and barriers to health and mental health for Latino immigrants.

Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work, 6, 92-110. doi:
10.1080/15433710802633601

Shrake, E., & Chen, E. (2012). *Asian Pacific American experiences: Past, present, and future*. Dubuque, IA US: Kendall Hunt Publishing Company.

Sidanius, J.F., Levin, S.F., James, L., & Pratto, F. (2000). Social dominance orientation, anti-egalitarianism and the political psychology of gender: An extension and cross-cultural replication. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30,* 41-67. doi:
10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(200001/02)30:13.0.CO;2-O

Smith, A. (2013). 'The land and its people': Reflections on artistic identification in an age of nations and nationalism. *Nations & Nationalism, 19,* 87-106.
doi:10.1111/j.1469-8129.2012.00551.x

Speicher, B. L., & Bruno Teboul, J. C. (2008). Nuestro Himno: Discursive indignation and moral panic over the translation of a national symbol. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations, 8,* 177-185.

Spry, C., & Hornsey, M. (2007). The influence of blind and constructive patriotism on attitudes toward multiculturalism and immigration. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 59*, 151-158. doi:10.1080/00049530701449489

Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the Group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations* (pp.213-228). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice toward immigrants.
Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29, 2221–2237.

Stoll, D. (2009). Which American dream do you mean? *Society, 46*, 398-402. doi:
10.1007/s12115-009-9245-2. Retrieved from
http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct
=true&db=s3h&AN=43547375&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks,
CA: Sage.

Stuart, R.B. (2004). Twelve practical suggestions for achieving multicultural competence.
Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 35, 3-9. doi: 10.1037/0735-
7028.35.1.3

Sue, D.W., Lin, A.I., Torino, G.C., Capodilupo, C.M., & Rivera, D.P. (2009). Racial
microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural
Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*, 183-190.

Syed, M., & Azmitia, M. (2008). A narrative approach to ethnic identity in emerging
adulthood: Bringing life to the identity status model. *Developmental Psychology,
44*, 1012-1027.

Tabili, L. (2005). Outsiders in the land of their birth: Exogamy, citizenship, and identity
in war and peace. *Journal of British Studies, 44*, 796–815. doi: 10.1086/431942

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of
Psychology 33,* 1–39. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup behavior* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall.

Tran, V. C. (2010). English gain versus Spanish loss? Language assimilation among second-generation Latinos in young adulthood. *Social Forces, 89,* 257–284. doi: 10.1353/sof.2010.0107

Transue, J. E. (2007). Identity salience, identity acceptance, and racial policy attitudes: American national identity as a uniting force. *American Journal of Political Science, 51*, 78-91. doi:10.1111/j.1540-5907.2007.00238.x

Tyler, K. (2011). New ethnicities and old classities: Respectability and diaspora. *Social Identities, 17*, 523-542. doi:10.1080/13504630.2011.587306

Urbanski, D. (2013, July 18). Baseball fans viciously attack singer Marc Anthony on Twitter for daring to sing 'God Bless America' at all-star game. *The Blaze.* Retrieved from http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/07/18/baseball-fans-viciously-attack-singer-marc-anthony-for-singing-god-bless-america-at-all-star-game

Valentova, M., & Alieva, A. (2014). Gender differences in the perception of immigration-related threats. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 39,* 175-182. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.08.010. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2013-34572-001&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Van der Waal, J., Achterberg, P., Houtman, D., De Koster, W., & Manevska, M. (2010). 'Some are more equal than others': Economic egalitarianism and welfare chauvinism in the Netherlands. *Journal of European Social Policy, 20,* 350–363. doi: 10.1177/0958928710374376.

Veer, K., Ommundsen, R., Yakushko, O., Higler, L., Woelders, S., & Hagen, K. (2013). Psychometrically and qualitatively validating a cross-national cumulative measure of fear-based xenophobia. *Quality & Quantity, 47*, 1429-1444. doi:10.1007/s11135-011-9599-6

Vejar, C. (2015). Ethnic nationalism. -- *Research Starters Sociology,* 1-8.

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Crisp, R. J., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Gaertner, S. L. (2015). Imagined intergroup contact and common ingroup identity: An integrative approach. *Social Psychology, 46*, 265-276. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000242

Vincent, A. (2009). Patriotism and human rights: An argument for unpatriotic patriotism. *Journal of Ethics, 13*, 347-364. doi:10.1007/s10892-009-9066-y

Wagner, U., Becker, J. C., Christ, O., Pettigrew, T. F., & Schmidt, P. (2012). A longitudinal test of the relation between German nationalism, patriotism, and outgroup derogation. *European Sociological Review, 28,* 319-332. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcq066

Walker, R.B.J. (2007). *Closing comments at the BISA, Security, Aesthetics, and Visual Culture Workshop,* Queens University, Belfast, 10 November.

Wallis, H.B. (Producer), & Curtiz, M. (Director). (1942). *Casablanca* [Motion Picture].

    United States: Warner Bros.

Weber, C. (2013). 'I am an American': protesting advertised 'Americanness'. *Citizenship*

    Studies, 17, 278-292. doi:10.1080/13621025.2013.780755

Wiley, S., Deaux, K., & Hagelskamp, C. (2012). Born in the USA: How immigrant

    generation shapes meritocracy and its relation to ethnic identity and collective

    action. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*, 171-180. doi:

    10.1037/a0027661

Williams, L.C. (2014, August 13). How the outrage over the Michael Brown shooting is

    going viral. *ThinkProgress.Org*. Retrieved from

    http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2014/08/13/3470555/social-media-ferguson-

    response/

Wilson, T. C. (2001). Americans' views on immigration policy: Testing the role of

    threatened group interests. *Sociological Perspectives, 4,* 485–501.

Wise, R. (Producer), & Wise, R. (Director). (1965). *The sound of music* [Motion Picture].

    United States: Robert Wise Productions, Argyle Enterprises.

Wolfe, Z. B. (2006, May 1). Spanish anthem been around for over 85 years. ABC News.

    Retrieved July 11, 2006, from http://abcnews.go.com/US/story?id=1911431$page=1

Wright, M., Citrin, J., & Wand, J. (2012). Alternative measures of American national

    identity: Implications for the civic-ethnic distinction. *Political Psychology, 33,* 469-

    482. doi: doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00885.x

Wyatt-Nichol, H. (2011). The enduring myth of the American dream: Mobility,

marginalization, and hope. *International Journal of Organization Theory &*

Behavior, 14, 258-279. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

=true&db=sih&AN=63231981&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Zakrisson, I. (2005). Construction of a short version of the right-wing authoritarianism

(RWA) scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 863-872.

doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.026

APPENDIX A

RECRUITMENT LETTER

Recruitment Letter

Hello,

My name is Noelany Pelc, and I am a Ph.D. candidate working under the supervision of Dr. Debra Mollen in the Counseling Psychology program at Texas Woman's University. I would like to invite you to participate in my research study. You may participate if you are at least 18 years old Participation is entirely voluntary. This study will ask you some basic demographic information, attitudes about the perception of immigrants engaging in American rituals, beliefs about what it means to be an American, and your degree of comfort when interacting with diverse individuals. The purpose of this research is to explore how demographic variables and attitudes impact the perception of Americanness.

Participation in this study requires access to the internet and involves sharing your perceptions and opinions and completing some surveys. In appreciation for your time commitment, you will be eligible to receive 1 credit of research if you are enrolled at Texas Woman's University and are registered in a qualifying class. All participants will have the opportunity to enter a raffle for one of the five $20 gift cards. Your survey responses would be collected separately from raffle entries and would not be connected. Your anonymity, however, cannot be guaranteed. There is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, and internet transactions.

You may decline participation or may withdraw without penalty at any moment. If you would like to know more information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at Nclemente@twu.edu or my advisor, Dr. Debra Mollen, at Dmollen@twu.edu.

Thank you for your consideration,

Noelany Pelc, MA

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title: A STUDY OF ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS ABOUT BEING AMERICAN
Investigator: Noelany Pelc, M.A. .... Nclemente@twu.edu 940/898-2309
Advisor: Debra Mollen, Ph.D... Dmollen@twu.edu 940/898-2317

Explanation and Purpose of the Research

You are being asked to participate in a research study for Ms. Noelany Pelc's dissertation at Texas Woman's University. This study will ask you some basic demographic information, attitudes about the perception of immigrants engaging in American rituals, beliefs about what it means to be an American, and your degree of comfort when interacting with diverse individuals. The purpose of this research is to explore how demographic variables and attitudes impact the perception of Americanness. You have been asked to participate in this study because you are at least 18 years old. Participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any moment without penalty.

Description of Procedures

As a participant in this study you will be asked to spend approximately 30-45 minutes of your time by completing three surveys and a short demographic questionnaire through an on-line survey. In order to be a participant in this study, you must be at least 18 years of age or older.

Potential Risks

The surveys will ask questions pertaining to your perceptions and attitudes of immigrants, beliefs about groups, and your relationship to the U.S. The surveys will also ask questions about how you identify what it means to be an American, along with some demographic information. You are free to take breaks if you become fatigued or withdraw at any point of the study without penalty.

Another risk in this study is loss of confidentiality. Confidentiality will be protected to the extent that is allowed by law. There is a potential risk of loss of confidentiality in all email, downloading, and internet transactions. Your personal identifying data will not be collected with the survey. Data collected through PsychData will be stored in a password protected electronic file. Should you choose to participate, you will be given an option to provide your contact information if you would like to enter a raffle or would like to have the results of the study sent to you. Please be informed that this information will not be linked to survey responses, and will be in a separate electronic file that is password protected.

The researchers will try to prevent any problem that could happen because of this research. You should let the researchers know at once if there is a problem and they will help you. However, TWU does not provide medical services or financial assistance for injuries that might happen because you are taking part in this research.

Participation and Benefits

Your involvement in this study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time. Following the completion of the study, will be provided with the option to be entered into a raffle to receive one of the five available $20 gift cards in appreciation for your participation. Not all who enter will win, and each participant is eligible to win one of the gift cards. Students at TWU will also be eligible to receive 1 research credit. If you would like to know the results of this study, we will be mail them to you.* Please be advised that although your contact information will be stored separately from survey responses, anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Questions Regarding the Study

You are welcome to print a copy of this consent form for your records. If you have any questions about the research study, please feel free to contact the researchers; their phone numbers are located at the top of this form. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research or the way this study has been conducted, you may contact the Texas Woman's University Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at 940-898-3378 or via e-mail at IRB@twu.edu.

If you have read and agree to the above statements, please click on the "Yes" button below to indicate your consent to participate.

☐   ☐
Yes   No

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD

AMERICANNESS

Demographics Questionnaire and Attitudes toward Americanness

Please answer the following items honestly and to the best of your ability.

Definition of an American

1. In a few short sentences, please provide your definition of who an American is (i.e., what do you consider to be important in considering whether someone is or is not an American?).

Perception of Immigrants and U.S. Rituals

2. I would mind if an immigrant sang the national anthem at a national event, like a Major League baseball game.

      _____ Yes
      _____ No

3. I would mind if an immigrant led the *Pledge of Allegiance* at a national event, like a national basketball game.

      _____ Yes
      _____ No

4. If you answered "yes" to either of the above questions, would you change your mind if they: (check all that apply)

    ____ Were born in the U.S.
    ____ Are Christian
    ____ Speak fluent English
    ____ Respect America's institutions and laws
    ____ Identify as an American
    ____ Have become successful through their own hard work
    ____ Are involved in politics
    ____ Other (please list):

Sociocultural Competence (#8 is reverse scored)

5. I communicate well with people whose first language is not English
    _____ Strongly disagree
    _____ Disagree
    _____ Unsure
    _____ Agree
    _____ Strongly Agree

6. I feel comfortable working on projects with people who have different faith or religious views than I do.
    _____ Strongly disagree
    _____ Disagree
    _____ Unsure
    _____ Agree
    _____ Strongly Agree

7. I feel comfortable being in social situations with immigrants from a different ethnic group.
    _____ Strongly disagree
    _____ Disagree
    _____ Unsure
    _____ Agree
    _____ Strongly Agree

8. I would worry about being paired up with people from different ethnic groups for projects at school, work, or in the community.
    _____ Strongly disagree
    _____ Disagree
    _____ Unsure
    _____ Agree
    _____ Strongly Agree

Variables Important for the Perception of American Identity

9. Please mark the variables you believe to be important in order for someone to be considered an American (check all that apply):

_____ Were born in the U.S.

_____ Practice the Christian faith

_____ Speak fluent English

_____ Respect America's institutions and laws

_____ Self-identify as an American

_____ Have become successful through their own hard work

_____ Are involved in politics

_____ Identify as White

_____ Have no foreign accent

_____ Enjoy American sports

_____ These are not important in American identity

_____ Other (please list):

10. Age: _____

11. College major (please mark the category that best fits your current academic major):

__ Arts (Design, Applied Arts, Drama/Theatre, English Language/Literature, Fine & Studio Arts, Foreign Languages, Language Arts, Music, Music Education, Dance/Performance):

__ Business (Accounting, Agricultural Business, Business Administration & Management, Business Commerce, Marketing, Finance & Financial Management, Hospitality, Sales and Marketing Operations):

__ Communications (Communications & Media Studies, Journalism, Public Relations & Advertising, Radio/ Television/ & Digital Communication):

__ Community Services (Criminal Justice & Corrections, Family & Consumer Science, Human Development & Family Studies, Parks/ Recreation/ & Leisure Studies, Social Work, and Textiles & Clothing):

__ Computer & Information Sciences (Computer & Information Sciences, Management Information Systems, Computer Programming):

__ Education (Elementary Education, Health Education, Health & Physical Education/ Fitness, Physical Education, Special Education):

__ Engineering & Technology (Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical/ Communications Engineering, Industrial Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Automotive Technology, Drafting/ Design Technologies):

__ Medicine & Allied Health (Communication Disorders Sciences & Services, Medicine, Nursing, Kinesiology, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Medical Assisting, Medical Laboratory/ Technology):

__ Science & Math (Animal Sciences, Biology, Plant Sciences, Chemistry, Geography & Cartography, Mathematics & Statistics, Science Education):

__ Social Sciences (Criminology, Economics, History, Political Science/ Government, Psychology, Sociology, General Social Sciences, Women's Studies, Gender Studies):

12. Current occupation (please list):

13. Race/Ethnicity (please mark the one category with which you feel most comfortable):

__ White/European American

__ Hispanic/ Latino(a)

__ Black/African/African American

__ Native American

__ Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander

__Bi- or Multiracial/Ethnic (Specify all): _____

__Other: _____

14. Sex: _____ Male

_____ Female

_____ Intersex

15. Years of education (e.g., a high school diploma is 12 years): ____

16. Do you consider yourself financially:

__ Independent (I do not depend on financial support from parents/family)

__ Dependent on family (I depend on financial support from parents/family)

17. If you consider yourself to be financially **independent**, please select the range that best describes your annual income before taxes. If you fall in between categories (i.e., $23,500) please determine if your financial situation would be best described by rounding up or down:

__ $19,000 and below

__ $20,000-$23,000

__ $24,000-$32,000

__ $33,000-$60,000

__ $61,000-$100,000

__ $101,000-$150,000

__ $151, 000 and above

18. If you consider yourself to be financially **dependent**, please select the range that best

describes your family's annual income before taxes. If you fall in between categories

(i.e., $23,500) please determine if your financial situation would be best described by

rounding up or down:

__ $19,000 and below

__ $20,000-$23,000

__ $24,000-$32,000

__ $33,000-$60,000

__ $61,000-$100,000

__ $101,000-$150,000

__ $151, 000 and above

19. Which of the following statements best applies to your place of birth and how long
have you lived in the United States?

      _____ I was born outside of the U.S. and moved to the U.S. BEFORE I was 10
      years old
      _____ I was born outside of the U.S. and moved to the U.S. AFTER I was 10
      years old
      _____ I was born in the U.S., but one OR both of my parents were born outside
      of the   U.S.

_____ I was born in the U.S., and both of my parents were born in the U.S., but some of my grandparents were born OUTSIDE of the U.S.

_____ I was born in the U.S., my parents were born in the U.S., and my grandparents were born in the U.S.

20. Which best describes your political affiliation?
_____ Democrat
_____ Republican
_____ Independent
_____ Other: (please list)
_____ None

APPENDIX D

BLIND AND CONSTRUCTIVE PATRIOTISM SCALE (BCPS)

Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale (Schatz et al., 1999)

Below are a number of statements relating to your perception of the U.S. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Disagree Strongly	Disagree Slightly	Disagree	Agree	Agree Slightly	Agree Strongly

1. People who do not wholeheartedly support America should live somewhere else.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

2. The United States is virtually always right.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

3. I would support my country right or wrong.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

4. The anti-Vietnam protesters were un-American.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

5. For the most part, people who protest and demonstrate against U.S. policies are good, upstanding, intelligent people.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

6. I believe that U.S. policies are almost always the morally correct ones.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

7. If another country disagreed with an important United States policy that I knew little about, I would *not* necessarily support my country's position.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

8. People should not constantly try to change the way things are in America.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

9. I support U.S. policies for the very reason that they are the policies of my country.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

10. There is too much criticism of the U.S. in the world, and we its citizens should not criticize it.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

11. It is un-American to criticize this country.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

12. We should have complete freedom of speech, even for those who criticize this country.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

13. Because I identify with the United States, some of its actions make me feel sad.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

14. People should work hard to move this country in a positive direction.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

15. If you love American, you should notice its problems and work to correct them.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

16. If I criticize the United States, I do so out of love for my country.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

17. I oppose some U.S. policies because I care about my country and want to improve it.

      1   2   3   4   5   6

18. I express my love for America by supporting efforts at positive change.

     1   2   3   4   5   6

19. My love of country demands that I speak out against popular but potentially destructive policies.

     1   2   3   4   5   6

APPENDIX E

NATIONALISTIC ATTITUDE SCALE (NAS)

Nationalistic Attitude Scale (NAS) (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989)

Below are a number of statements relating to your attitude about the U.S. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Neutral	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. In view of America's moral and material superiority, it is only right that we should have the biggest say in deciding United Nations policy.

    1   2   3   4   5

2. The first duty of every young American is to honor the national American history and heritage.

    1   2   3   4   5

3. The important thing for the U.S. foreign aid program is to see to it that the U.S. gains a political advantage.

    1   2   3   4   5

4. Other countries should try to make their government as much like ours as possible.

    1   2   3   4   5

5. Generally, the more influence America has on other nations, the better off they are.

    1   2   3   4   5

6. Foreign nations have done some very fine things but it takes America to do things in a big way.

    1   2   3   4   5

7. It is important that the U.S. win in international sporting competitions like the Olympics.

    1   2   3   4   5

8. It is really not important that the U.S. be number one in whatever it does.

    1   2   3   4   5

APPENDIX F

THE RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM SCALE (RWA)

The Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale (RWA) (Zakrisson, 2005)

Below are a number of statements relating to values you may or may not hold. Please indicate the extent to which you think a statement is positive or negative by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Negative	Negative	Slightly Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Slightly Positive	Positive	Very Positive

1. Our country needs a powerful leader, in order to destroy the radical and immoral currents prevailing in society today.

   1 2 3   4   5   6   7

2. Our country needs free thinkers, who will have the courage to stand up against traditional ways.

   1 2 3   4   5   6   7

3. The "old-fashioned ways" and "old-fashioned values" still show the best way to live.

   1 2 3   4   5   6   7

4. Our society would be better off if we showed tolerance and understanding for untraditional values and opinions.

   1 2 3   4   5   6   7

5. God's laws about abortion, pornography and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, violations must be punished.

   1 2 3   4   5   6   7

6. The society needs to show openness towards people thinking differently, rather than a strong leader, the world is not particularly evil or dangerous.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. It would be best if newspapers were censored so that people would not be able to get a hold of destructive and disgusting material.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. Many good people challenge the state, criticize the church and ignore "the normal way of living."

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. Our forefathers ought to be honored more for the way they have built our society, at the same time we ought to put an end to those forces destroying it.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. People ought to put less attention to the Bible and religion, instead they ought to develop their own moral standards.

    1   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

11. There are many radical, immoral people trying to ruin things; the society ought to stop them.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

12. It is better to accept bad literature than to censor it.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

13. Facts show that we have to be harder against crime and sexual immorality, in order to uphold law and order.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

14. The situation in the society of today would be improved if troublemakers were treated with reason and humanity.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

15. If the society so wants, it is the duty of every true citizen to help eliminate the evil that poisons our country from within.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

APPENDIX G

SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION SCALE (SDOS)

Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDOS) (Pratto et al., 1994)

Below are a number of statements relating to the way you view relationships between groups. Please indicate the extent to which you think a statement is positive or negative by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Negative	Negative	Slightly Negative	Neither Negative nor Positive	Slightly Positive	Positive	Very Positive

1. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. If some groups have more of a chance in life than others.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. Inferior groups should stay in their place.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. It would be good if groups could be equal.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. Group equality should be our ideal.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

11. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

12. We should do what we can do to equalize conditions for different groups.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

13. Increased social equality.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

14. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

15. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

16. No one group should dominate in society.

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

APPENDIX H

AMERICAN IDENTITY MEASURE (AIM)

American Identity Measure (AIM) (Schwartz et al., 2012)

Below are a number of statements relating to the way you relate to the U.S. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with a statement by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about the United States, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

    1   2   3   4   5

2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly Americans.

    1   2   3   4   5

3. I have a clear sense of the United States and what being an American means to me.

    1   2   3   4   5

4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by being American.

    1   2   3   4   5

5. I am happy that I am an American.

    1   2   3   4   5

6. I have a strong sense of belonging to the United States.

    1   2   3   4   5

7. I understand pretty well what being an American means to me.

    1   2   3   4   5

8. In order to learn more about being American, I have often talked to other people about the United States.

    1   2   3   4   5

9. I have a lot of pride in the United States.

    1   2   3   4   5

10. I participate in cultural practices of the United States, such as special food, music, or customs.

    1   2   3   4   5

11. I feel a strong attachment towards the United States.

    1   2   3   4   5

12. I feel good about being American.

    1   2   3   4   5

APPENDIX I

MEASURE OF FEAR-BASED XENOPHOBIA (MFBX)

The Measure of Fear-Based Xenophobia (MFBX) (Veer et al., 2013)

Below are a number of statements relating to your opinions about immigration. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate number on the scale below.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. Interacting with immigrants makes me uneasy.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

2. With increased immigration I fear that our way of life will change for the worse.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

3. I am afraid that our own culture will be lost with increase in immigration.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

4. Immigration in this country is out of control.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

5. I doubt that immigrants will put the interest of this country first.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

APPENDIX J

CORRELATIONS ACROSS MEASURES USED

Appendix J

Correlations Across Measures Used

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
AIM (1)							
NAS (2)	.284*						
SDOS (3)	-.042	-.440*					
RWA (4)	-.238*	-.537*	.475*				
Patriotism (5)	-.342*	-.37*	.071	.294*			
FMBX (6)	-.214*	-.336*	.427*	.445*	.293*		
Sociocultural Competence (7)	.002	.226*	.291*	-.291*	-.212*	-.481*	

Note: Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed). AIM=American Identity Measure. NAS=Nationalistic Attitude Scale. SDOS=Social Dominance Orientation Scale. RWA=Right-Wing Authoritarianism. FMBX=Fear-Based Xenophobia.