

Running head: OUT-GROUP ATTITUDES

Intercultural Relations in a Multicultural Society: Predicting Tongans' Attitudes toward Maori
and New Zealand Europeans/ Palangi Groups

By

Malia Alisi Tatafu

A thesis

submitted to Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Science in Cross-Cultural Psychology

Victoria University of Wellington

2014

Abstract

Contemporary intergroup relations and perceptions research has largely focused on majorities' perspectives while neglecting the perspectives of minorities. However, for a multicultural society to be successful, mutually positive intergroup attitudes are important, and multiple perspectives need to be considered.

This research drew on Ward and Masgoret's (2006) Integrative Model (IM) of attitudes toward immigrants to examine contact, threat (realistic and symbolic), and intergroup emotions (anger and fear) as predictors of Tongans' attitudes toward New Zealand Europeans/Palangi people and Maori. It also tested: 1) the effects of perceived discrimination to determine if this explained additional variance in out-group attitudes beyond that accounted for by contact, threat and emotions; and 2) target group (Palangi/Maori) as a moderator of the predictor variables.

Two hundred and forty-four Tongans (age range 15-83 years) resident in New Zealand participated in the study. In line with the hypotheses, hierarchical regression analysis controlling for age, gender, educational level, English language proficiency and employment status indicated that greater contact and lower levels of symbolic threat predicted positive out-group attitudes and fear predicted negative attitudes. Furthermore, the addition of perceived discrimination to the regression model significantly accounted for additional variance in out-group attitudes and appeared to mediate the effect of fear, which was no longer significant. Contrary to expectations, however, these effects were not moderated by out-group (Palangi/Maori) target.

The findings are discussed in relation to New Zealand's social, economic and political context. In addition, the contributions offered by a minority perspective on intergroup relations are elaborated, and the applications of the findings are described along with recommendations for future research. In the end, understanding minorities' perspectives is crucial for promoting positive intergroup relations in New Zealand as well as in other multicultural societies particularly those with long histories of cultural plurality and prolonged intercultural conflicts.

Dedication

For my late mother and my role model in life, Liona Tatafu, you left me to fulfill the dreams that we set together. Toka 'i he Fiemalie 'a e 'Eiki (Rest in God's Peace).

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank God for making the completion of this thesis possible. I could never have done this without your divine love.

I would like to acknowledge the invaluable support, patience and dedicated guidance of my supervisor Professor Colleen Ward. I cannot thank you enough for believing in me while embarking on this incredible journey. Without your intellectual support I would never have reached my dream. Special thanks for allowing me to analyze the data that we collected as part of the project on mutual intergroup perceptions and relations in New Zealand.

I wish to thank Adrienne Girling and Jessie Wilson for your input and dedication to the construction of this project. I would also like to mention the commitment of the Tongan field assistants to the collection of the rich data analyzed in this thesis. To the Tongan Communities in Wellington, Christchurch and Auckland, thank you for taking time to participate in this study. Without your participation, I would never have become aware of the issues concerning our perspectives as a minority group in this country.

I would like to convey my sincere thanks to New Zealand AID (NZ Aid) for the financial support which allows me to stay in New Zealand and complete this thesis. To Victoria University of Wellington (VUW) financial service, thank you for the extra financial assistance during the first half of this academic year.

It is also worth acknowledging Dalice Sim for assisting me with my data analysis, Beth, Adrienne, Elizabeth and the VUW Student Learning Support Services (SLSS) for proof reading and providing invaluable feedback on my thesis. To the Centre of Applied and Cross-cultural Research (CACR), Adrienne, Agnes and Claudia, thank you for the mentorship and encouragement throughout this academic journey.

I would like to acknowledge these people: Elizabeth O'Connor, Ruth Davidson-Toumu'a, Shona de Sain, Liz Richardson and the Te Ropu Awhina for their special contribution to my academic adventure at VUW.

To my best friend Lourdes, thanks for all your emotional support. I'm so grateful to have you as my best and supportive friend. Also thanks to these members of my family: my dad Lokei, my sisters (Petilina, Katalina and Seni), niece Lose and brothers (Tino, Maletino, 'Oto'ota and Sio), without their continuous prayers and support I would not be where I am today. To my husband Sailopa, thank you for your patience, love and understanding throughout the duration of my study.

Lastly, to the most important person in my life, who has also travelled together with me every day during this academic journey, my four year old daughter Potesio, your presence strengthened me to keep moving forward. I would never have given up because of you and you deserve to hear these three words, "I love you".

Table of Contents

Abstract	II
Dedication	III
Acknowledgements	IV
List of Tables.....	3
Overview	4
Intergroup Perceptions and Relations: Theory and Research	6
Contact Hypothesis (CH).....	6
Integrated Threat Theory (ITT)	9
Intergroup Emotions Theory (IET).....	13
Limitations of Contemporary Intergroup Research	16
Exploring Minority Perspectives: The Importance of Perceived Discrimination	19
The Current Study	21
The Research Context.....	22
Diversity in New Zealand.	23
Tongans in New Zealand.	23
Tongans’ relations with other groups.	24
Hypotheses and Research Question.....	26
Method	28
Procedure	28
Participants	29
Materials	29
Demographic information.	30
Contact.	30
Threat (realistic and symbolic threats).....	30
Emotions (anger and fear).....	30
Perceived discrimination.....	31
Out-group attitudes.	31
Results	32
Preliminary Analysis	32

Out-group Attitudes	2
Psychometric and correlation analysis	32
Comparison of the target groups	33
Prediction of Out-group Attitudes	33
Discussion	35
Tongans' Relations with Maori and Palangi people	35
Predictive Model of Out-group Attitudes	37
Intergroup contact.	37
Threat (realistic and symbolic threat).	37
Intergroup emotions (anger and fear).	39
Perceived discrimination.....	40
Moderation effects.	42
Contributions to the Intergroup Relations and Perceptions Research	43
Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research	45
Conclusion.....	47
References	53
Appendix I.....	61
Survey Distributed to Examine Tongans' Attitudes toward Maori in New Zealand	61
Appendix II	73
Survey Distributed to Examine Tongans' Attitudes toward New Zealand Europeans/Palangi people in New Zealand	73

List of Tables

Table 1.	Psychometric Properties of the Scales.....	48
Table 2.	Overall Bivariate Correlations among Out-group Attitudes and Predictor Variables.....	49
Table 3.	Bivariate Correlations among Out-group Attitudes and Predictor Variables by Target Groups (Maori/Palangi).....	50
Table 4.	Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of Contact, Threat, Emotion and Discrimination.....	51
Table 5.	Contact, Realistic Threat, Symbolic Threat, Fear, Anger and Discrimination as Predictors of Out-group Attitudes.....	52

Overview

As the world moves toward a more multi-cultural environment, the issue of cultural diversity has become a major concern. People from different groups and cultures hold different norms, beliefs and values, which can make it challenging to accept cultural differences and embrace cultural diversity. As a matter of fact, people tend to differentiate between their cultural in-groups and those belonging to the out-groups (or other cultural groups) (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Tajfel, 1982). Within the categorization process, members of different cultural groups often lack the interest to explore and become aware of the norms, values and beliefs of other cultures. Instead they tend to make judgments about other cultural groups based on the limited knowledge that they hold of them. Consequently, racial segregation, intercultural conflict, prejudice and discrimination have all become pervasive problems which require global attention and immediate solutions (Duckitt, 1992; Horowitz, 1999).

In order to minimize the negative consequences which often arise from culturally diverse societies, people must first appreciate inter-cultural relations and accept cultural differences. Improving inter-cultural relations is the core of a successful multi-cultural society. However, if a society wishes to be equitable and inclusive, multiple perspectives on inter-group perceptions and relations should be the most crucial aspect to consider. This includes the different perspectives of majority and minority groups as well as how they perceive each other.

In New Zealand, the emergence of cultural diversity has occurred quite rapidly (Ward & Lin, 2005). This is demonstrated by the country's shift from a bi-cultural society consisting of indigenous Maori and New Zealand European cultures to a more multicultural society including Asians, Australians, Americans and Pacific Island immigrants (Statistics New Zealand, 2012). Undoubtedly, the problems regarding cultural diversity and intercultural relations faced by societies with long histories of cultural plurality also exist in New Zealand (for example, the unfair treatment of people on the basis of their cultural backgrounds and discrimination in housing, education, health care and employment). Indeed, there is no better solution to such problems than raising awareness about cultural diversity and teaching people how to deal effectively with multiculturalism.

The research outlined in this thesis raises awareness of the perspectives of different groups and cultures toward others. Specifically, this study examined out-group attitudes in the

New Zealand context from a minority (Tongan immigrants) point of view. The focus was not only on the minority group's perspective but also on minorities' perceptions of both minority (Maori or Indigenous people of New Zealand) and majority (New Zealand Europeans/Palangi people) out-group targets. This is a novel concept because prior research on attitudes has mainly focused on majorities' perspectives of minorities while largely neglecting the perspectives of minorities. In addition, no prior studies have examined how out-group attitudes differ toward two out-group targets (e.g., minority versus majority groups). Since there is a lack of focus on minority groups' out-group attitudes, perceived discrimination as a major problem faced by minorities has been overlooked as a crucial determinant of minorities' out-group attitudes. As a result, the current research developed a novel predictive model by integrating discrimination together with contact, threats and emotions in order to predict minorities' attitudes toward their out-groups. In this case, the current study examined contact, threat, emotions and discrimination as predictors of Tongans' out-group attitudes toward both the Palangi majority group and Maori (another minority group).

Incorporating discrimination into a predictive model of minorities' out-group attitudes places particular emphasis on the importance of acknowledging the different perspectives of minorities within our multicultural societies. It is not just the perspectives of majorities as the dominant group in a society that matters; the minority perspective is equally as important. How majorities treat (e.g., discriminate against) minorities also matters because that can trigger minorities to reciprocate negatively toward majorities. As a result, problems with inter-group relations will still exist and ongoing expectations of negative treatments can lead to high levels of negative attitudes and social bias between majority groups and minority groups (Riek, Maitner, & Gaertner, 2006). As previously mentioned, if a society wishes to be equitable and inclusive, multiple perspectives on inter-group relations and perceptions must be considered with care. This research should therefore be considered as a significant contribution to the existing literature on intergroup relations and perceptions. It further provides essential knowledge which may assist the promotion of positive inter-cultural relations not only in New Zealand but also worldwide.

Intergroup Perceptions and Relations: Theory and Research

In this section, three theories (Contact Hypothesis, Integrated Threat Theory and Intergroup Emotions Theory) will be reviewed in terms of their successive contributions to the understanding of intercultural perceptions and relations. Empirical research will be presented, along with an effort to refine and reformulate key aspects of these theories.

Contact Hypothesis (CH)

For nearly six decades, Contact Hypothesis (CH) has long been used by researchers (e.g., social psychological researchers) as a hypothesis for explaining intergroup relations (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Cook, 1985; Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003; Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Gordon Allport (1954) is credited for introducing this hypothesis in his classic book "*The Nature of Prejudice*". Ideas in this book drew mostly from his experimental research undertaken in the United States of America (USA) that aimed to examine the nature of persistent prejudice or negative attitudes amongst Black and White Americans. Allport argued that intergroup contact can improve intergroup relations and outlined the conditions in which contact becomes most effective in reducing intergroup conflict and bias (Allport, 1954; Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011). Specifically, he suggested that in order to achieve harmonious relationships between conflicting groups, each contact situation should first possess these four features: 1) equal status, 2) common goals, 3) intergroup co-operation and 4) considerable support of the contact from authorities, laws and customs. These four features should allow conflicting groups to feel a sense of equality between their own in-groups and the out-groups. Moreover, contact in that sense will promote positive outcomes such as reduced intergroup conflicts and diminished social bias (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000).

Over the years, empirical research has focused on the CH (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Many researchers (e.g., Cook, 1985; Robinson & Preston, 1976) conducted empirical studies and initiated intervention programmes (e.g., racial and school desegregation) for improving intergroup relations based on the CH. Many of these studies and interventions have demonstrated the effective contributions of the CH for understanding intercultural relations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Other research considered the contributions of additional factors to explain the relationship between contact and positive out-group attitudes (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) but did not solely examine the relationship between contact and negative out-group attitudes or prejudice. This led many to question whether Allport's

conditions should still be considered as essential components for improving intergroup relations. Instead more attention has been paid to the process of contact and change, that is, the nature of the whole contact from the initial contact until changes occur.

Pettigrew (1998) revisited Allport's hypothesis and identified several shortcomings. Pettigrew hypothesized that the optimal conditions proposed by the CH as essential for positive intergroup contact were simply facilitating factors. Further, the CH only focused on the outcomes, particularly when positive effects occur and never addressed the process by which the effects take place. The CH also failed to specify whether these effects could be generalized to other situations, to the entire group (not just those in contact under the optimal conditions) or to uninvolved groups. Such limitations suggest that prejudice reduction does not just involve optimal intercultural contact as originally highlighted by the CH, but it is a complex process that must be understood over time (Pettigrew, 1998).

Pettigrew (1998) reformulated Allport's (1954) hypothesis, addressing three important issues. First, he argued that it is important to recognize the longitudinal and developmental features of the contact. Three stages should be considered: 1) the initial contact; 2) establishing of contact; and 3) the unification of the conflicting groups. These stages are sequential and time should be given for the groups to progressively interact and achieve one stage after another, before prejudice reduction can be observed. In other words, to confirm the role of contact in promoting positive inter-cultural relations, researchers must assess the nature of the contact over time (Pettigrew, 1998).

Unfortunately, understanding the process of contact over time is not sufficient to understand the effects of contact. As a second issue, Pettigrew (1998) added a fifth factor, which he called, 'friendship potential', to Allport's four-factor model. This additional factor emphasized that the contact situations must provide the opportunity for friendship. With such opportunities, members of the groups will then have a chance to disclose information about themselves to one another. This opportunity should also encourage repeated contact in other settings, leading to the attainment of extended contact over time.

In addition to emphasizing the importance of developmental stages and the identification of facilitating factors, Pettigrew (1998) addressed a third issue, which was the importance of past experiences between groups and the characteristics of the groups involved in the contact. Whether or not the previous interactions or experiences were pleasant can determine the effects of contact. That is, either the 'individual experience' encourages

avoidance of contact or promotes the willingness to interact repeatedly. On the other hand, 'group characteristics' such as different group values, beliefs and ideologies may impede contact. In this situation, some groups may feel that they are not ready to interact. Some may feel anxious and threatened about disclosing themselves to other groups even when they have no prior interaction experiences. Generally, Pettigrew (1998) invested great efforts in drawing together the contact setting or society, the essential and facilitating factors of contact, and individual differences and group characteristics in order to understand the process of contact over time. This formed an inclusive model for studying the effects of intergroup contact on attitudes, including both prejudice (negative attitudes) and positive attitudes. With the reformulated model, both positive and negative outcomes (e.g., positive and negative attitudes/prejudice) of the contact should now become meaningful (Pettigrew, 1998).

Meanwhile, some researchers also attempted to study the effect of contact using a variety of research methods (e.g., survey research, laboratory and field studies), not just with cultural groups but also with other non-cultural groups (e.g., homosexual individuals and mentally ill patients; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Such studies also reported the significant role of contact in promoting intergroup relations. Questions about the generalization of the effect of intergroup contact to other groups and to whether intergroup contact really reduces prejudice have also been asked.

Following this further, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) conducted a preliminary meta-analysis (an extension of this analysis is in Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) of studies that examined the effects of contact (or face-to-face interactions) on prejudice. Their findings revealed a highly significant effect of contact in reducing prejudice. The correlations between contact and prejudice in different regions with various out-group targets were as follows: the USA (mean $r = -.215$, $p < .001$), Europe (mean $r = -.217$, $p < .001$), Israel (mean $r = -.196$, $p < .001$), Canada (mean $r = -.232$, $p < .001$), Australia and New Zealand (mean $r = -.259$, $p < .001$) and Africa, Asia, Latin America (mean $r = -.205$, $p < .001$) (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Based on these findings, it is hypothesized that contact will predict positive out-group attitudes in the current study.

Moreover, the meta-analysis found that Allport's optimal conditions strongly enhanced positive intergroup contact although the conditions were not seen as essential for producing positive outcomes. The meta-analysis also revealed evidence that contact effects could be generalized to the whole group (e.g., contact with a few members leads to positive attitudes

towards the whole population) as well as the other groups or uninvolved groups (e.g., contact with African Americans in the USA leads to positive attitudes towards all Africans including those in Africa) from various settings. These findings raise further questions about the factors that influence the effect of contact on prejudice (Hewstone, 2003). Thus, there is a need to systematically study the effect of contact on negative attitudes and specify the mediators and moderators of the contact effects (Pettigrew, 2008).

Contemporary researchers have continued to study the factors that influence the effects of contact on prejudice. In a recent review by Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ (2011), mediators of the contact-prejudice relationships were seen to include both affective and cognitive factors including in-group (Gomez, Tropp, & Fernandez, 2011) and out-group norms (Cameron, Rutland, Hossain, & Petley, 2011), in-group identification (Levin, Taylor, & Claudle, 2007), enhanced empathy (e.g., Vezzali, Giovannini, & Capozza, 2010), reduced anxiety (e.g., Gomez et al., 2011 and Voci, & Hewstone, 2003) and both individual and group threats (Pettigrew et al., 2011; Ward & Masgoret, 2006). The effect sizes of the affective mediators were greater than those of the cognitive mediators (Pettigrew et al., 2011). Such findings expand our knowledge about the contact process and the differential contribution of both affective (e.g., reduced fear and anger) and cognitive factors (e.g., reduced in-group threat) to the reduction of prejudice.

In the next section, the author will elaborate on the cognitive aspects of the contact process. The focus will be on the Integrated Threat Theory (ITT) and its contribution to the prediction of out-group attitudes. It is this theory that highlights the influence of threats on people's attitudes.

Integrated Threat Theory (ITT)

In addition to the role of contact, researchers have highlighted the effects of perceived threat on out-group attitudes (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan, Ybarra, & Morrison, 2009). This section outlines Integrated Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 2000) which theorizes 'threat' as one of the factors that shapes out-group attitudes. It is the ITT that has enlightened contemporary researchers about the effects of threats posed by out-groups on the attitudes, beliefs and ideologies of in-groups. This theory is widely known for its contributions to the existing literature of intergroup relations and perceptions (Pettigrew et al., 2011; Riek et al., 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

It has long been understood that threat (a cognitive component of ITT) and fear (an

affective component of ITT) are antecedents of prejudice. Prior studies have shown ignorance and anxiety to be predictors of a number of factors, including prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 1984; 1985), realistic threat (Bobo, 1988), symbolic threat (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993) and negative stereotypes (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991). Stephan and Stephan (2000) recognized these factors as being crucial pieces in constructing a more applicable model to study people's attitudes toward other groups.

According to the original ITT, there are four basic types of threats that lead the in-group to form negative attitudes toward their out-groups. These threats are realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1999; Stephan et al., 2009). Realistic threat is any threat to the in-group's power, resources and general welfare of the group (Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, & Tur-Kaspa, 1998). Symbolic threat is any threat to a group's religion, values, belief systems, ideology, philosophy, morality and worldview (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Intergroup anxiety, on the other hand, is the type of threat that is experienced by individuals when they are personally concerned about the negative outcomes that might bring embarrassment or rejection by the out-group to the self. In addition, the person may experience fear or feelings of discomfort and avoidance at times (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Finally, negative stereotypes refer to the beliefs or expectations that the in-group holds about the out-groups (often unpleasant and negative) mainly because of the in-group's fear of the negative consequences of the unpleasant behaviours that appear to be characteristic of the out-group. According to Stephan and colleagues, these four threats (which were later reduced to only two types of threat: realistic and symbolic threat) cause prejudice or negative attitudes (Stephan & Renfro, 2002).

With its emphasis on threat, ITT shares some common themes with the Unified Instrumental Model of Group Conflict (Unified IMGC) theory (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998). Unified IMGC theorized that groups' competition (or removal of this competition) for realistic and symbolic resources determines intergroup conflicts. That is, competition leads to cognitive and affective responses, zero sum beliefs (the notion that the more your group gets, the less my group benefits) and anxiety. The main issue here is that both theories are concerned with the effects of threat. ITT highlights the threats from the out-group to the realistic and symbolic resources of the in-group. Unified IMGC focuses on threat-related cognitions arising from intergroup competition for realistic and symbolic resources and

conflicts.

To explore the effects of threat, Stephan and colleagues attempted to test the ITT model by conducting research in the United States of America (USA), Spain and Israel (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Stephan et al., 2002). In the USA, attitudes of American citizens towards immigrants from Cuba, Asia and Mexico were studied (Stephan et al., 1999). In Spain, attitudes of the Spanish towards Moroccan immigrants were examined and in Israel, the Israelis' attitudes towards Russian and Ethiopian immigrants were investigated (Stephan et al., 1998). Findings from these studies were mixed. Realistic threat, which includes threats to physical and material well-being and unequal distribution of power and resources, was a strong predictor of negative out-group attitudes in the USA and Spain but not in Israel. Symbolic threat, on the other hand, was also a strong predictor of negative out-group attitudes in the USA and was also found to be a predictor of negative attitudes toward Ethiopians but not Russians in Israel. In Spain, symbolic threat did not predict attitudes toward Moroccans. Stephan and Stephan (2000) concluded that such mixed findings were found because the four types of threat operate differently depending on the situation. In fact, those studies are relevant because they found a link between all four types of threat (realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotype) and prejudice. The authors concluded that the strength of the connection between threat and out-group attitudes depended on the nature of the relationship between the cultural groups (Stephan et al., 1998). Thus, the factors that should be considered are history of prior intergroup conflict, group status, in-group identification, current contact and in-groups' knowledge of the out-groups (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

According to Stephan and Stephan (2000), if prior intergroup relationships were dominated by a high level of conflict (e.g., prior skirmishes, competition and war over territory) then greater threats, particularly realistic threats, are likely to be perceived (Stephan et al., 1998). Similarly, if the degree of status inequality is large (i.e., either the in-group has a very high or low status relative to the out-groups), then threats will be more salient. In terms of group identification, those who strongly identify themselves with their in-group may tend to feel more threats coming from the out-group than those who have weak in-group identification (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

As briefly mentioned before, the ITT model was later refined and limited to two core threats: realistic and symbolic (Stephan & Renfro, 2002). The roles and positions of negative

stereotypes and intergroup anxiety were altered in the model. Negative stereotypes were seen to predict realistic and symbolic threats and mediate their effects on prejudice (Riek et al., 2006; Stephan et al., 2002). Intergroup anxiety, on the other hand, was redefined as a sub-type of threat, particularly realistic threat (Riek, et al., 2006). In particular, intergroup anxiety contributed to the feeling of threat when the individual was more concerned about the possibility of being embarrassed, ridiculed or rejected by out-group members. Moreover, intergroup anxiety often arises when in-group members see out-group members threatening to take away essential resources belonging to the in-group (Riek et al., 2006). The revised version of the ITT model also distinguished threats to the whole in-group (intergroup threats) and threats to the individual as a member of the in-group (inter-personal threats). The threat to one's in-group may not be felt as an individual threat; however both threats lead to certain consequences and one of those consequences is negative attitudes towards out-groups or out-group members (Stephan et al., 2009).

The perception of threats has emotional consequences (Stephan & Renfro, 2002; Stephan et al., 2009) such as fear, anger and anxiety (Mackie, Maitner, & Smith, 2009). In addition, such threat-based emotional reactions foster the elicitation of intentional behaviors. Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) documented evidence about the relationship between threat (i.e., threat to group-level resources and threat to the functioning aspects of the group), emotions (particularly anger, fear, disgust, pity and guilt) and motivational behaviors (or what they referred to as 'removed obstacles'). Their findings revealed that groups that posed similar threats to the in-group were also seen to evoke similar in-group emotional reactions (e.g., groups who posed a threat to in-group safety and property were seen to evoke fear and anger). Such findings suggest a possible relationship between emotions and out-group attitudes (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005).

As Stephan and colleagues re-situated the affective components (intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes) of the original ITT and inferred that emotion is a consequence of threat, further exploration of this threat-emotion relationship and how it contributes to the shaping of out-group attitudes is needed. There is a possibility that emotions as consequences of threat contribute to the prediction of out-group attitudes (Riek et al., 2006). The next section will elaborate on the Intergroup Emotions Theory (IET) and its contribution to the explanations of such relationships.

Intergroup Emotions Theory (IET)

The idea that emotions also contribute to the understanding of intergroup relations was first drawn from Smith (1993) (Mackie et al., 2009). Intergroup Emotions Theory (IET; Smith, 1993; Mackie et al., 2009) emerged from the theories of self-categorization and self-identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), Smith's (1993) views about the consequences of group membership, and the views of distinct emotions by appraisal theory (Mackie et al., 2009). This section briefly focuses on the development of the IET, as well as its current contribution to the understanding of intergroup relations.

IET argues that intergroup emotions are different from individual emotions. Intergroup emotions are conceptually distinct and are functional because they are experienced on behalf of the group to which the individual belongs (Mackie et al., 2009). Furthermore, intergroup emotions can be acute or chronic. Acute intergroup emotions are evoked based on the evaluation of group-relevant events/situations at a specific time. Such emotions can be chronic if the group-relevant events are repeated and evaluated continually over time. As a result, particular intergroup emotions become stable and are strongly and consistently associated with the in-groups or out-groups (e.g., anger becoming associated with an out-group so that anger is always evoked when in-group members see that group). The target events or situations can also simultaneously provoke multiple intergroup emotions over time. For example, a terrorist bombing can evoke both fear and anger emotions (taken from Mackie et al., 2009). Furthermore, individuals identify themselves with multiple group memberships and interpersonal relations and are also capable of eliciting multiple reactions (emotions) to the events and situations that are associated with those group memberships and relations (Mackie et al., 2009). In other words, our feelings as members of a group are the basis of our reactions towards the members of our out-groups (Mackie & Smith, 2002).

According to the IET, self-categorization and intergroup appraisals are the underlying mechanisms for the production of emotions. In addition, self-identification is an important aspect of this process, in that it moderates the link between self-categorization and intergroup appraisal (Mackie et al., 2009). It is the 'belonging to' and identifying the 'self' as a member of a social group that shapes the emotional aspects of the self. These emotional aspects become the core value of group membership and once they are evoked and evaluated, intergroup emotions will then elicit relevant intergroup behaviours (Mackie, Smith, & Ray, 2008).

In terms of self-categorization, everyone belongs to more than one group. Each group membership carries its own cues that are associated with being a part of that group. Once these cues are activated (e.g., hearing one's school song or one's ethnic language), the individual's self-categorization process will be triggered automatically (Mackie et al., 2008). It is self-categorization together with contextual factors (situation, event or entity) that leads to intergroup evaluation (i.e., appraisals), which, in turn, evokes specific intergroup emotions. As previously mentioned, it is our different perceptions of group-relevant objects and events (particularly our perceptions of our in-groups and out-groups) that determine our intergroup emotions. These emotions (specifically anger, anxiety, pride and guilt) then evoke intergroup behaviours (i.e., social, political and physical responses) as well as specific out-group attitudes (e.g., prejudice). According to the IET, when such emotions change, behavioural and attitudinal changes are also expected (Mackie et al., 2008).

Several researchers (e.g., Gordijn, Yzerbyt, Wigboldus, & Dumont, 2006; Smith, Seger, & Mackie, 2007) attempted to test the IET model (Mackie et al., 2009). Results show that people's self-categorization drives them to experience or report specific emotions. For example, participants were told to imagine themselves as members of a group that was either harmed by another group or else that they belonged to the group inflicting harm. When they were asked to report their feelings, participants assigned to be in the harmed group reported the feeling of 'anger' toward the perpetrators. Those who were told that they are members of the unharmed group did not report 'anger' towards the mistreated group (Mackie et al., 2009). Other studies found that different groups elicited a different set of emotions depending on the situations (e.g., Gordijn et al., 2006; Smith, et al., 2007). Such findings strongly suggest that emotions can be socially influenced by context (Mackie et al., 2009). This indicates that it may be possible to socially and contextually promote positive emotions toward out-groups over time to facilitate positive intergroup relations.

In another case, different emotions were associated with different group memberships. For instance, participants were angry if they were identified as Americans, fearful if they were identified as Democrats and felt guilty if they were identified as smokers.

According to the IET, the consequences of emotions can be disruptive at times; however, they can also serve a regulatory function which may help to sustain self and group connectedness. As previously mentioned, emotions can evoke in-group and out-group actions, which in turn direct in-group members to behave in certain ways toward the out-group

(Mackie et al., 2009). For example, anger motivates group members to confront other groups and fear motivates avoidance or withdrawal from the source. From this we can infer that certain intergroup emotions lead to specific actions and behaviours.

According to Mackie et al. (2009), intergroup anger predicts the desire to take action against the source. Anger (but not fear) was also found to predict in-group bias, out-group confrontation, defending of in-group position and support of out-group criticism by in-group members (Mackie et al., 2009). On the other hand, it has been revealed by previous research using ITT (Riek, et al., 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000) and Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory (AUM) (Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) that fear predicts prejudice or negative attitudes toward out-groups. Fear has also been considered a consequence of threat (symbolic and realistic threats) while very little is known about the mediating effects of anger on the threat-attitude relationship.

To explore the relationships between threat and emotions, Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) adopted a socio-functional approach to integrate ITT and IET. They argued that this relationship has always been masked by the general examination of threat and prejudice. In other words, most prior studies have focused on the effect of threat on prejudice and have neglected the contribution of emotions to this relationship. Findings from their study revealed that different groups elicited different emotional experiences and threats, and that specific types of threat were associated with specific emotions. In other words, groups that evoked certain in-group emotions also tended to correspond to the elicitation of the same experience of threat in the in-group. As mentioned previously, Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) stressed that the overall measure of threat (following studies on prejudice) may have hidden the unique connections between emotions and threats found in their study. These findings laid the foundations for the design of a more comprehensive model for understanding intergroup relations. In order to design such a model, it is crucial to examine the effects of threat as well as those of emotions on people's attitudes toward others. The current study will seek to address this issue by measuring symbolic threat and realistic threat as two distinct threats (as in the studies by Stephan and colleagues), and the two negative emotions of anger and fear (which have been shown to predict different out-group attitudes) will be finely examined to provide greater knowledge about the nature of out-group attitudes. Based on the theory and research reviewed here, it is hypothesized, in addition to the prediction that contact will lead to positive out-group attitudes, that realistic threat, symbolic threat and the emotions of fear and

anger will predict negative out-group attitudes.

There are some crucial limitations in earlier studies of intergroup relations that need to be addressed. These limitations serve as the launching pad for the current study. In the following section, three of these limitations will be discussed. The first is the fact that the extensive study of attitudes has mainly focused on majorities' perspectives while largely neglecting the perspectives of minority groups. Secondly, there is a lack of comparative studies examining how attitudes differ toward different out-groups (e.g., minority versus majority groups). Finally, due to a lack of focus on minority groups' attitudes toward their out-groups, the issue of perceived discrimination has also been overlooked as a potential factor that could influence the proposed relationships outlined above. Since minority groups often face discrimination, this study proposes perceived discrimination as a possible missing piece. The current study will address these issues by examining contact, threat, emotions and discrimination as predictors of a minority group's attitudes toward both the majority group and another minority group. In this case, we will specifically study Tongans' attitudes toward the majority group of NZ Europeans (herein referred to by the Tongan term Palangi, although only when the current study refers to Tongans' perspectives) and Maori, as another minority group.

Limitations of Contemporary Intergroup Research

Although prior studies on intergroup perceptions and relations have revealed that low levels of contact (Contact Hypothesis), high levels of perceived threat (Integrated Threat Theory) and negative emotions (Intergroup Emotions Theory) are known to predict negative out-group attitudes (Allport, 1954; Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Mackie et al., 2008; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Riek, et al., 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000), most of this research has been undertaken with members of the majority group and has examined their attitudes toward various minorities. This is a limitation in contemporary research because such studies only provide us with greater knowledge about the perspectives of majorities while neglecting the perspectives of minorities. Notable exceptions are studies by Corenblum and Stephan (2001), Stephan et al. (2002) and Leong and Ward (2011) which will be discussed later in this section. Few other studies have also specifically examined the effects of 'intergroup contact' on both minority and majority groups' out-group attitudes (e.g., Jasinskaja, Mahonen, & Liebkind, 2011; Gomez, Tropp, & Fernandez, 2011; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005b; Vezzali et al., 2010). Results from the intergroup contact studies reported stronger effect sizes of contact on attitudes for the majority groups ($r = .23$) than the minority groups' ($r = .18$) (Tropp &

Pettigrew, 2005b). These findings indicate that intergroup contact influences different cultural groups' attitudes to different extents. Moreover, intergroup contact may not be as important for improving intergroup relations for minority groups as it is for members of the majority group.

In Corenblum and Stephan (2001), the reciprocal effects of the four threats (realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes) between Native Americans and White Americans were explored. Realistic threat ($\beta = .26, p < .05$), symbolic threat ($\beta = .25, p < .05$), intergroup anxiety ($\beta = .31, p < .05$) and stereotype threat ($\beta = .23, p < .05$) all predicted White Americans' (i.e., the majority group) negative out-group attitudes. For the minority group (i.e., Native Americans), realistic threat did not have a direct effect on out-group attitudes while symbolic threat ($\beta = .14, p < .05$), intergroup anxiety ($\beta = .30, p < .05$) and stereotype threat ($\beta = .29, p < .05$) significantly predicted negative out-group attitudes. It is clear from this result that the effect sizes are quite different between minority and majority groups. This indicates that all four threats seem equally important for White Americans while realistic threat was not an important determinant for Native Americans' negative out-group attitudes (or prejudice). This further indicates that the out-group attitudes of minorities toward majorities are not equally determined by the same factors that determine the attitudes of majorities toward minorities.

Stephan et al. (2002) examined the same issue between Black American and White American students, although negative stereotype was measured as an antecedent of the other three threats (realistic threat, symbolic threat and intergroup anxiety). Symbolic threats ($\beta = .28, p < .05$), realistic threats ($\beta = .14, p < .10$) and intergroup anxiety ($\beta = .31, p < .10$) significantly predicted Black Americans' (i.e., the minority group) negative out-group attitudes. For the White American majority group, realistic threat ($\beta = .23, p < .10$), symbolic threat ($\beta = .13, p < .05$) and intergroup anxiety ($\beta = .37, p < .05$) also predicted negative attitudes toward Black Americans. As can be seen from these results, symbolic threat appears to have a stronger effect on the minority group's attitudes while realistic threat and intergroup anxiety influence the majority group's attitudes more than they do for the minority group. This indicates that minorities' and majorities' out-group attitudes towards one another can be determined by the same factors, albeit to different extents.

In a recent study by Leong and Ward (2011), the attitudes of Maori (i.e., a minority group) and New Zealand Europeans/Pakeha (i.e., the majority group) toward Chinese

immigrants in the New Zealand context were examined, which included threats as predictors of attitudes. Results showed that Maori ($M = 56.02$; $SD = 10.39$) perceived greater threats (which included realistic and symbolic threat) than did Pakeha ($M = 47.96$; $SD = 8.65$). Maori ($M = 23.22$; $SD = 6.37$) were also found to hold greater negative attitudes toward Chinese immigrants (a second minority group) than Pakeha ($M = 27.87$; $SD = 5.96$) (*note*: higher means indicated more favourable attitudes). This study provides a fragment of knowledge about the differential nature of out-group attitudes when looking at out-group minorities from both majorities' and minorities' perspectives.

Findings from these three exceptional studies (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Leong & Ward, 2011; Stephan et al., 2002) in addition to the finding by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) on intergroup contact effects show that both contact and threat predict out-group attitudes; however, the magnitudes of the effects are significantly different when predicting minority versus majority attitudes toward out-groups. This suggests that the effects of contact and threat are moderated by the status of the target out-group; however, as there have been so few studies undertaken with minority groups, moderation has been under investigated. This is a major limitation in contemporary research. None of the previous studies have looked at minorities' out-group attitudes toward both majority and other minority groups. Any possible moderation effects of group status on the effects of the predictors on out-group attitudes have yet to be discovered. Therefore, with the contemporary findings about intergroup contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and realistic threat (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Leong & Ward, 2011; Stephan et al., 2002), this study predicts that the effects of contact and realistic threat will be moderated by the status of the out-group target so that contact and realistic threat will exert stronger effects on Tongans' negative attitudes toward Maori than attitudes toward Palangi. There is not sufficient empirical evidence to predict how the effect of symbolic threat and intergroup emotions may be moderated by group status but we will be exploring it here.

Very little is known about the mutual perceptions between minority groups. Sibley and Ward (2012) have looked at the tendency for different groups (New Zealand Europeans/Pakeha, Maori, Pacific Nations and Asian New Zealanders) to feel positively and warmly towards their own and other groups within New Zealand. Their analyses revealed that Maori, Pakeha and Pacific Islanders view Asian New Zealanders less warmly. In addition, all groups viewed their in-groups more favourably than they view the other groups except for the Asian New Zealanders; they viewed New Zealand Europeans as favourably as they viewed

their own group. These findings reveal that there is a tendency for minorities to hold different views of both majority and minority groups. If minority groups are perceived differently at a societal level and perceive each other differently (as in Sibley & Ward, 2012), then it is important to further assess the nature of each minority group's attitudes toward one another.

At the same time, what will be the nature of the minority groups' attitudes toward both the majority group and another minority group? Target group (minority versus majority) should be considered as another essential component of studying out-group attitudes. Looking at both target groups at once could be important for understanding the factors that determine a particular group's differential perspectives of minorities and majorities. Most of the previous studies have examined the model of one group's attitudes toward another group (i.e., a majority group toward a minority group or vice versa). One study (Leong & Ward, 2011) has tested the model of two groups' perceptions of a minority group (i.e., both the majority group and a minority group toward another minority group). However, none have tested the model of a minority group's attitudes toward both a minority and the majority out-groups. This is a crucial limitation in contemporary research because the factors influencing out-group attitudes may be exhibited differently for minority groups, especially when considering the status of the target out-group. For example, as mentioned above, Corenblum and Stephan (2001) showed that realistic threat was not an important factor for understanding the minority group's attitudes toward the majority group. On the other hand, in Leong and Ward's (2011) study, realistic threat was shown to be an important predictor of a minority group's attitudes toward another minority group. However, it was found that symbolic threat was an important predictor of minorities' out-group attitudes toward both the majority group (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001) and another minority group (Leong & Ward, 2011). Following from this, it is expected in the current study that both symbolic and realistic threats will predict Tongans' attitudes toward Maori, while symbolic threat but not realistic threat will predict their attitudes towards the Palangi majority group. This hypothesis acknowledges the crucial contribution of group status, by considering the status of the participating group as well as the status of the out-groups, and additionally, the role that group status has in determining out-group attitudes.

Exploring Minority Perspectives: The Importance of Perceived Discrimination

An additional factor that this study will consider is the role of discrimination in determining out-group attitudes. This is because the intergroup research has largely been undertaken from the majority perspective and the role of discrimination in the prediction of

out-group attitudes has thus far been neglected. Minorities have always been the victims of discrimination (see *Working together: Racial discrimination in New Zealand*, Statistics New Zealand, 2012), and research has shown that discrimination has negative psychological impacts on people's well-being (e.g., Pascoe & Richman, 2009). Whether the discrimination is against oneself or one's group, such negative treatments could potentially evoke negative out-group responses (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). As one of the most pervasive negative experiences that have affected minority groups within the larger society, discrimination should seriously be considered a crucial factor that amplifies minority groups' negative out-group attitudes, particularly attitudes toward majority groups.

In previous intercultural research, negative experiences have been found to increase feelings of anxiety and threat (cited in Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). This indicates that negative experiences such as the discrimination of minority groups by majority groups could trigger and strengthen negative out-group attitudes. Supporting this notion is the psychological phenomenon of reciprocity, that is, if members of one group (e.g., the majority group) tend to like or dislike another group (e.g., a minority group), then it is likely that the minority group will reciprocate that feeling of like or dislike (Kalin & Berry, 1996). Berry, Phinney, Sam and Vedder's (2006) articulated that intercultural relations are 'multi-dimensional' as well as mutual and reciprocal. They found that experiencing greater discrimination precipitates immigrants' avoidance of the national society and the strengthening of an in-group orientation. Low levels of discrimination, on the other hand, were associated with immigrants' positive orientation towards the national society and a greater willingness to interact with members of the majority group (or the larger society). Such empirical findings documented the crucial likelihood of minority groups reciprocating the discrimination that they felt from out-groups, specifically in the form of negative out-group behaviours by the majority group. Furthermore, the findings also demonstrate the position of the majority group as the perpetrator of discrimination. Generally, the majority group is the most powerful group in a society and is in a stronger position to exert discrimination than minority groups. This notion leads to the hypothesis that the effects of discrimination on Tongans' out-group attitudes will be moderated by target group status so that discrimination will exert a stronger effect on attitudes toward Palangi (the majority group) than Maori (another minority).

A similar concept was put forth by Relative Deprivation Theory (RDT; Dion, 1986). RDT focuses on group comparisons (i.e., comparing one's in-group or group members to other

groups) and understanding groups' inequalities and disadvantages. In other words, RDT is focused on individuals' perceptions and evaluation of their relative deprivation (i.e., how their group is deprived of resources relative to other groups). With this in mind, both RDT and perceived discrimination are concerned with the disadvantaged position of the group and its members. This suggests that both perceived discrimination and feelings of relative deprivation will have strong influence on intercultural behaviours and attitudes.

As has been previously explained, intergroup relations research has focused mainly on majorities' attitudes towards minority groups who are very often the victims of discrimination. In addition, no previous studies have attempted to acknowledge the possible effects of discrimination on out-group attitudes and its importance from a minority point of view. Moreover, no research has examined the possible association between discrimination (measured with items like "They disrespected you", "They acted as if they thought you were dishonest", "They provided you with poor service in restaurants and stores") and perceived threats (particularly realistic threat). It is likely that perceived discrimination is also a form of realistic threat, since realistic threat is central to the welfare of the in-group including threats to political, economic, physical and the general well-being of the in-group. Whether discrimination is a form of realistic threat or not, it is crucial to point out that discrimination is an important variable that should be considered in predicting attitudes for minorities. Experiencing discrimination could possibly affect minorities more than the actual interactions with out-groups and experiencing threat and emotions. In this case, it is therefore expected that discrimination will explain additional variance in the current predictive model over and above the effects of contact, threat and emotions.

In the next section, the aims of the current study will be outlined, based on the issues previously discussed.

The Current Study

The current study will attempt to address the shortcomings of previous research on intergroup relations, namely the absence of research on minority groups' attitudes toward their out-groups. This study will specifically focus on Tongan immigrants as the minority group in the cultural context of New Zealand. In addition, the current research explores the role of the status of the target group (minority versus majority group) on out-group attitudes. In this case, the two target groups will be the New Zealand Europeans/Palangi majority group and the Maori minority group.

Prior findings (e.g., Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Leong & Ward, 2011 and Stephan et al., 2002) have demonstrated that the strength of the relationships between the predictors and the outcome variable (out-group attitudes) were quite different (i.e., different effect sizes) when examining majority versus minority out-groups. Additionally, very little is known about the role of group status (target out-group) for minority groups' perspectives. None of the previous research on intergroup perceptions and relations has examined minorities' attitudes towards both majority and minority groups.

As mentioned previously, discrimination is an important aspect of intercultural relations which affects both psychological well-being and behaviour (e.g., Pascoe & Richman, 2009). Minority groups have always been the victims of majority groups' discrimination. Since the current study will focus on the nature of a minority group's attitudes, discrimination will be considered as a crucial predictor of out-group attitudes alongside other known predictors (contact, threat and the emotions of fear and anger).

The current predicting model is based on Ward and Masgoret's (2006) Integrative Model (IM). This is an inclusive predictive model of attitudes toward immigrants and is expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of out-group attitudes. Specifically, contact, threat (realistic and symbolic threats), emotions (fear and anger) and discrimination will be integrated into a hierarchical model to examine their predictive strength on a minority group's out-group attitudes towards both the majority and another minority group. It is therefore expected that a three-step model in the current study will provide an inclusive approach for understanding a minority group's attitudes toward two target out-groups.

The Research Context

The context of the current study is New Zealand, a country in the South Pacific Ocean which was originally settled by Maori (*tangata whenua*) in the 10th century AD. New Zealand has been a country of immigrants even before the British settlement in the early 19th century (Smelt & Lin, 2009). Since then, immigrants from other countries including the Pacific Islands have settled in New Zealand. Settlement in the late 19th century and early 20th century was encouraged by labour shortages, although immigration was largely from traditional European source countries (Teaiwa & Mallon, 2005). Changes to the immigration policy to one which favoured skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants in 1986 and 1991 resulted in a huge influx of immigrants from Asian countries (Leong & Ward, 2011; Ward & Masgoret, 2008). There is no

doubt that immigration policy changes are driving the country towards a highly diverse environment and a more multicultural society.

Diversity in New Zealand. New Zealand has been moving from a mono-cultural society (which was built on the tribal base of Maori or New Zealand's indigenous people) to a bicultural society (comprised of Maori and European descendants) (Thomas & Nikora, 1992) and to a contemporary New Zealand that is now known to be a multicultural society composed of immigrants from around the world (Ward & Lin, 2005). Clearly it is the effect of immigration that is giving rise to the emergence and growth of cultural diversity.

According to Statistics New Zealand (2012), there were significant increases in the populations of different ethnic groups in New Zealand between 1991 and 2006. The number of Pacific people in New Zealand rose from 5% of the population in 1991 to 6.5% in 2001 while numbers of Asians rose from 3.0 to 6.6%. For other ethnic groups including Arabs, Iranians and Latin Americans, an increase of 0.2% in 1991 to 0.7% in 2001 was observed. Recently in the New Zealand Census 2006 (Statistics New Zealand, 2012), 67.6% of the New Zealand population was composed of European descendants, 14.6% of Maori, 6.9% of Pacific people, 9.2% of Asians and 1.7% of other ethnicities. Such facts not only provide information about ethnic groups' population densities but also reflect the continuous change of the ethnic groups' population numbers between 2001 and 2006. Clearly, a trend of a continuous rise in the population of each ethnic minority group in New Zealand has been observed.

According to Statistics New Zealand (2012), the New Zealand population is projected to continue rising between 2006 and 2026. The New Zealand European/Palangi population is projected to increase by 0.4% every year, Maori by 1.3%, Asian by 3.4%, and 2.4% for Pacific populations.

Tongans in New Zealand. Tongans are a Pacific Island people who began to migrate to New Zealand in the 1960s mainly for economic reasons. This migration has always been seen by Tongans as a great opportunity to increase their income and to fulfill family obligations, as well as cultural functions in their Tongan communities. Despite the fact that most Tongans in New Zealand have a relatively low income and send almost half of their remittances back home to assist with their families (Statistics New Zealand, 2012), Tongans are still highly satisfied with their lives in New Zealand. It is not the income that measures the success of Tongans; often it is considered more important how they contribute to their cultural

obligations (including religion) and the welfare of their families (The Encyclopedia of New Zealand, 2012).

Between 1986 and 2006 the Tongan population in New Zealand grew faster than any other Pacific ethnic group (Statistics New Zealand, 2012). Between 1990 and 2001, the major growth of the Tongan ethnic group was seen to be mainly based on the number of New Zealand-born children early arrivals had (The Encyclopedia of New Zealand, 2012). Since then, the number of new arrivals has still been high. This is supported by the fact that in 2001, the number of Tongan immigrants who indicated that they were born overseas (particularly in Tonga) increased by 27.6% from 1991 (New Zealand 2001 Census) (Statistics New Zealand, 2012). At present, Tongans are the third largest Pacific group in New Zealand with most residing in the Auckland (80%), Wellington (5%) and Christchurch (2%) regions (New Zealand Census, 2006) (Statistics New Zealand 2012).

Tongans' relations with other groups. Very little is known about the relationship between Tongans and other ethnic groups in New Zealand. Therefore studies have to rely mainly on information about Pacific People in New Zealand (Earle, 1995; Pacific Health Chart Book, 2004). Tongan people (as a Pacific ethnic group) are seen as one of the minority groups (Teaiwa & Mallon, 2005) who reside in the most deprived neighborhoods in New Zealand (Pacific Health Chart Book, 2004). In addition, Tongans (including other Pacific Island groups) are viewed as more disadvantaged compared to other cultural groups. In fact, Pacific peoples (including Tongans) are one of the minority groups that receive poor health care and unfair treatment with regards to employment, education and housing (Pacific Health Chart Book, 2004).

Taking a closer look at Pacific people's connection to Maori and the New Zealand Europeans/Palangi group, it has been shown that comparable levels of Pacific people and Maori are welfare dependent due to low median income rates. Maori see Pacific people as draining the country's welfare system, thus threatening Maori's realistic resources. At times, the relationship between Maori and Pacific people is referred to as 'comradeship' compared to their relative relationship with Palangi. Also Maori-Pacific relationships are believed to be strengthened by a common history and shared cultural traits and values. According to Teaiwa and Mallon (2005), Maori are believed to originally hail from the Pacific (particularly the Polynesian island groups such as the Cook Islands and the Society Islands). This could mean

that Maori has a junior sibling role to Pacific people and that there should be a feeling of connectedness and closeness between Maori and Pacific Islanders, a feeling that may possibly trigger both Maori and Pacific Islanders to socially categorize themselves into one cultural group. However, Maori do not accept to be known as a younger sibling of Pacific people and do not refer to themselves as evolved from the Pacific. This is a complete denial of being related to the Pacific people as an older sibling. Teaiwa and Mallon (2005) call such Pacific-Maori relationship 'ambivalent kinship'.

What is interesting about the existing information about Pacific communities in New Zealand is that sports, theatre and television highlight their ability to contribute to society. Excelling in sports (e.g., increasing numbers of Pacific Islanders are members of the All Blacks national rugby team) draws Pacific people, Maori, Palangi and other ethnic groups together. These are the means by which people can get access to and become increasingly aware of cross-cultural relations. In other words, sports, theatre and television provide a context for Palangi, Maori, Pacific Islanders (including Tongans) and other minority groups to engage in mutual interactions and appreciate cultural diversity in the New Zealand cultural context.

As previously mentioned, Pacific people (including Tongans) have a brotherhood connection with the Maori group while very little is known about their relationship with the Palangi group. In fact, Pacific people as a minority group and Palangi as the majority group have more frequent involuntary contact. This happens because Palangi people constitute the majority ethnic group in New Zealand. That is, Palangi people out-number the other minorities thereby making it possible for minorities to see them more often than other minority group members. This reality triggers the current expectation that Tongans will report more contact with Palangi than Maori.

In terms of Pacific people's feelings of warmth and threat, Sibley and Ward (2012) found that Pacific people express high levels of warmth toward Palangi (referred to in their study as Europeans) just as they feel toward the Maori people. However, Pacific people viewed Palangi people as more threatening to the in-group than the Maori group. These findings trigger the current expectation that greater threat (both realistic and symbolic threats) will be reported for Palangi than Maori.

A similar idea drawn from the group differences in contact and threat is also directed toward perceived discrimination and negative out-group attitudes. Being the majority group, there is a greater likelihood that the Palangi group will discriminate against Tongans more than the Maori group does. Statistics New Zealand (2012) has provided facts about racial discrimination of Pacific Island people by the majority group in New Zealand society. This fact gave rise to the expectation that Tongans will report more perceived discrimination by the Palangi group than by Maori. With the idea of reciprocity that has been discussed earlier, greater threats and more discrimination reported for the Palangi group could trigger Tongans to report more negative attitudes toward Palangi (the perpetrator) than toward Maori. This could be a way of reciprocating the greater threats and discrimination that Tongans experience from the Palangi group. Therefore it is expected that Tongans will report more negative attitudes toward Palangi than Maori.

Hypotheses and Research Question

In light of the research available on intergroup relations and perceptions and the culturally diverse environment of New Zealand, the specific hypotheses for this study are:

1. Lower levels of contact, greater threat (realistic and symbolic) and more negative emotions (i.e., anger and fear) will predict negative out-group attitudes.
2. The effects of contact will be moderated by the status of the out-group target so that contact will exert a stronger effect on attitudes toward Maori than attitudes toward Palangi.

For threat, it is expected that;

3. The effects of realistic threat will be moderated by the status of the out-group target so that realistic threat will exert a stronger effect on attitudes toward Maori than attitudes toward Palangi.

For discrimination;

4. The effects of discrimination will be moderated by target group status so that discrimination exerts a stronger effect on attitudes towards Palangi than attitudes toward Maori.

5. Discrimination is also expected to explain additional variance and predict out-group attitudes over and above the effects of contact, threat and emotions.

For variable differences as function of target group it is expected that;

6. Tongans will report more contact with Palangi than Maori.
7. Greater threat will be reported for Palangi than Maori.
8. Tongans will report more perceived discrimination from Palangi than Maori.
9. Tongans will report more negative attitudes toward Palangi than Maori.

The research question is;

Will target group moderate the effects of symbolic threat and intergroup emotions?

Method

Procedure

In order to test the hypotheses and explore the research question asked in this thesis, the current researcher analyzed a set of data that was collected as a part of a larger project investigating intergroup relations and perceptions in New Zealand. The study was approved by Victoria University of Wellington, School of Psychology Human Ethics Committee. For the purpose of the current study, Tongan immigrants in New Zealand were chosen as the population to investigate. The current study sampled urban areas (Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch) as these areas had greater numbers of Tongans (Statistics New Zealand, 2012).

Prior consultation with the Tongan communities in New Zealand gave the project investigators greater insights into the most effective way to distribute the surveys to the Tongan participants. Most Tongans preferred to fill in a hard copy of the survey; therefore, printed copies of the survey were distributed for data collection. An online version of the survey was also available for those that preferred to use the internet.

Tongans were recruited to take part in this study by Tongan field assistants through their contacts in the Tongan communities including family networks, church groups and cultural groups. To begin, participants were asked to complete an anonymous questionnaire. Participation in this study was voluntary and a debriefing statement was given to each participant at the end of the study.

To ensure the anonymity of the survey, participants who filled in the printed copy were given two separate envelopes; one in which each participant was required to seal their completed anonymous questionnaire inside; and the other in which participants were required to provide their personal details (e.g., name and postal address) so that a \$15 shopping voucher could be sent out to them as a token of appreciation for their time and effort. For those who completed the survey online, they were directed to a separate link after completing the whole survey to fill in their personal details for their tokens.

¹This is part of a larger project on mutual intergroup perceptions and relations led by Professor Colleen Ward, Victoria University of Wellington. This survey was developed by a research team including Malia A. Tatafu, Jessie Wilson and Adrienne Girling. The data collection for Tongan participants was conducted by Malia A. Tatafu with the assistance of members of the Tongan communities in New Zealand.

Participants

Two hundred and forty four Tongans ranging in age from 15-83 years ($M = 35.31$, $SD = 13.55$) participated in this study. Eight of the participants did not indicate their age. There were 134 (56%) female participants and 107 male participants. Three of the participants did not indicate their gender. All participants were residents of New Zealand with 44 (19.4%) New Zealand born participants; 184 (80.7%) overseas born participants and 16 participants who did not indicate their country of birth. Ninety seven (40.2%) participants were New Zealand citizens, 144 (59.8%) were not and three participants did not indicate whether they were New Zealand citizens or not.

Of the 233 participants who specified their highest educational level, 3% had primary education, 46.8% secondary, 27% received a post-secondary certificate/diploma, 9% completed a vocational qualification/trade certificate and 9.9% gained a tertiary degree, while 4.3% achieved a postgraduate degree. Eleven participants did not indicate their educational qualification. For participants' employment status, 150 (62.5%) indicated that they are currently employed while 90 (37.5%) indicated that they are currently unemployed. Four of the participants did not indicate whether they are employed or not. In terms of the participants' English Language Proficiency (ELP), 215 (89.7%) indicated their proficiency was average to excellent.

The current study analysed the data collected from Tongan immigrants in New Zealand to examine the out-group attitudes of Tongans towards the indigenous people of New Zealand (Maori) and New Zealand Europeans/Palangi people. In the current study's sample, 134 (55%) of the participants answered the questions regarding attitudes towards Maori and 110 participants answered the questions regarding out-group attitudes towards the Palangi group in New Zealand.

Materials

Parts of the questionnaire were adapted from existing questionnaires that have been used in previous national studies and were modified for its language appropriateness for the current study. The survey included demographic information and measures of contact, threat, emotions, discrimination and attitudes towards Maori and Palangi groups in New Zealand. The demographic information and scales used for measuring the variables of interest are briefly explained below (see Appendices for complete surveys).

Demographic information. Demographic data that consisted of age, gender, ethnicity, country of birth, citizenship, English language proficiency (ELP) (Participants were asked to rate their English language proficiency on a 5-point scale; endpoints: *Poor - Excellent*), educational level and employment status were asked in this study.

Contact. To measure the quality and quantity of Tongan contact with Maori and Palangi groups, a 6-item scale adapted from Ward and Masgoret (2006) was used. Questions like “How often do you interact with Palangi/Maori in your school or workplace?” (endpoints: *Never - Very Often*) and “How would you rate the quality of your contact with Palangi/Maori?” (endpoints: *Very unpleasant- Very pleasant*) were asked. Responses were made on 5-point scales, and higher scores indicate more frequent and more pleasant contact. Overall, the scale demonstrated a good reliability ($\alpha = .80$) measure. See Table 1 for the internal psychometric properties of the measurements by target out-group.

Threat (realistic and symbolic threats). Realistic and symbolic threats posed by Maori and Palangi groups to Tongans were measured using two 7-items scales (one for realistic threat and one for symbolic threat) based on Stephan, Ybarra and Bachman's (1999) scale. To measure realistic threat, items such as “Palangi/Maori have too much political power” and “Palangi/Maori decrease job opportunities for Tongans” (endpoints: *Strongly disagree – Strongly agree*) were asked. Responses were made on 5-point scales, and higher scores corresponded to a high level of perceived realistic threat. Overall, the realistic scale demonstrated good internal consistency ($\alpha = .79$).

Items such as “Palangi/Maori have values that are not compatible with Tongan values” and “Palangi/Maori want Tongans to give up their culture” (endpoints: *Strongly disagree - Strongly agree*) were asked to measure symbolic threat, with higher scores corresponding to greater perceived symbolic threat. The overall reliability of the symbolic threat items was high ($\alpha = .83$).

Emotions (anger and fear). To measure the feelings of anger and fear about Maori/Palangi, a 5-point rating scale (endpoints: *Not at all - Extremely*) derived from Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) was used. Four items were used to measure “anger” (angry, outraged, hostile and resentful) and four items were used to measure “fear” (anxious, frightened, nervous, and vulnerable). Higher scores indicate high levels of emotions. Overall, the internal consistency of the anger ($\alpha = .78$) and fear ($\alpha = .72$) measures were acceptable.

Perceived discrimination. To measure how often Tongans personally experienced discrimination in their day-to-day life in New Zealand, a 4-point rating (endpoints: *Never - Often*) scale with eight items adapted from Williams, Yu, Jackson and Anderson's (1997) study was used. Sample items included "They disrespected you" and "They threatened or harassed you" with higher scores corresponding to greater discrimination. The discrimination scale demonstrated a high level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .90$).

Out-group attitudes. The measure of out-group attitudes was asked to indicate the agreement or disagreement with ten different evaluative and emotional reactions towards Palangi/Maori. Items adapted from Ward and Masgoret (2006) such as "Palangi/Maori have many qualities I admire" and "In general, I don't like the way Palangi/Maori behave" (endpoints: *Strongly disagree - Strongly agree*) were used. Items were scored on 5-point scales, and higher scores indicated more positive attitudes. The scale also demonstrated a high reliability ($\alpha = .84$) measure overall.

Results

The results of the statistical analyses are reported in three sections; first is a preliminary analysis which includes psychometric properties and inter-correlations of the scales; second is a comparison of contact, threat, emotion and discrimination by target group using a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA); and lastly, a hierarchical regression analysis with main and interaction effects to predict out-group attitudes was conducted.

Preliminary Analysis

Psychometric and correlation analysis. The psychometric properties of the scales used to measure the variables in the current study are presented in Table 1. The dependent variable (i.e., out-group attitudes) and the six predicting variables (contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat, fear, anger and discrimination) all had internal reliability ($\alpha > 0.7$) measures both overall and by target group.

Mean scores indicated that the overall level of perceived discrimination ($M = 1.98$, $SD = 0.74$) was low while the level of negative emotions (fear, $M = 2.17$, $SD = 0.80$; anger, $M = 2.23$, $SD = 0.85$) and symbolic threat ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 0.86$) was moderately low. Mean scores for realistic threat ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.84$) and contact ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 0.91$) fall more within the mid-range. The mean score for out-group attitudes ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 0.73$) indicates that these groups were viewed favourably.

To examine the relationship between out-group attitudes and the predictor variables (contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat, fear, anger and discrimination), a bivariate correlation analysis was conducted (see Table 2). All variables were found to significantly correlate with the dependent variable (i.e. out-group attitudes). Realistic threat ($r = -.48$, $p < .01$), symbolic threat ($r = -.53$, $p < .01$), fear ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$), anger ($r = -.23$, $p = .01$) and discrimination ($r = -.30$, $p < .01$) were negatively correlated with out-group attitudes. In contrast, contact ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) was positively related to out-group attitudes.

These correlations are reported by target group in Table 3. In line with the overall findings, all correlations were significant and in the predicted direction with the exception of anger, which was not related to out-group attitudes ($r = -.13$) for the Palangi target.

Comparison of the target groups

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat, fear, anger and discrimination by target group. Age, gender, education, English language proficiency (ELP) and employment were entered as covariates, contact, threats and emotions as the dependent variables and target group was entered as the fixed factor. A significant multivariate main effect for target group ($F(5, 214) = 10.69, p < .001$; Wilk's $\lambda = .77$, partial $\epsilon^2 = .23$) was found.

Given the significance of the overall test, the uni-variate main effects were further examined. Significant uni-variate main effects for target group were obtained for contact ($F(1, 224) = 12.23; p < .001$; partial $\epsilon^2 = .53$), realistic threat ($F(1, 224) = 5.711; p < .05$; partial $\epsilon^2 = .03$), symbolic threat ($F(1, 224) = 12.69; p < .001$; partial $\epsilon^2 = .06$) and discrimination ($F(1, 224) = 36.49; p < .001$; partial $\epsilon^2 = .14$) but not fear and anger. Mean scores indicated that Tongans have more contact with Palangi, see them as posing greater threat and as a greater source of discrimination (see Table 4).

Prediction of Out-group Attitudes

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to examine the effects of contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat, fear, anger and discrimination on out-group attitudes. Six interaction terms were further calculated to examine whether the effects of the predicting variables on out-group attitudes are moderated by group status. All predicting variables were centered before the interaction terms were constructed. Although the VIF and Tolerance statistics were within the conventional boundaries, the two variables (symbolic threat and realistic threat) are highly correlated, so the results should be viewed with caution.

Step 1 tested for differences in out-group attitudes between target groups (Maori and Palangi) controlling for 'age', 'gender', 'educational level', 'ELP' and 'employment status'. Step 2 examined the effects of contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat and the emotion variables (i.e., anger and fear) on out-group attitudes and perceived discrimination was entered in the third step. In the final step, six interaction terms were created to examine whether 'target group' moderates the effects of the predicting variables (contact, threat variables, emotion variables and discrimination) on out-group attitudes. Table 5 presents the summary of the conducted hierarchical regression analysis.

After controlling for age, gender, education, ELP and employment status in step 1, target group (Maori and Palangi) did not predict out-group attitudes. Contact ($\beta = .24, p < .001$) was found to be a positive predictor of out-group attitudes, and symbolic threat ($\beta = -.37, p < .001$) and fear ($\beta = -.14, p < .05$) were negative predictors of out-group attitudes in Step 2. This step accounted for 35% of the variance in the outcome measure. Contact ($\beta = .29, p < .001$) remained a positive predictor and symbolic threat ($\beta = -.35, p = .001$) remained a negative predictor of out-group attitudes in Step 3; however, 'fear' lost significance when the discrimination variable was entered in Step 3. Discrimination ($\beta = -.20, p < .01$) was a negative predictor of out-group attitudes and accounted for 2.4% of additional variance. The three-step model brought the total proportion of the explained variance to 39.3% for out-group attitudes.

The final step did not account for a significant amount of additional variance, and none of the interaction terms were significant. Therefore, out-group status did not moderate the effects of contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat, fear, anger and discrimination on out-group attitudes.

Discussion

The current study drew on Ward and Masgoret's (2006) Integrative Model (IM) to examine the out-group attitudes of a minority group (Tongan immigrants) toward the majority group (New Zealand Europeans/Palangi) and another minority group (Maori/indigenous people) in New Zealand. This study had three main aims. The first aim was to examine the effects of contact, realistic threat, symbolic threat, anger and fear on the out-group attitudes of the Tongan minority. The second aim was to determine whether target group moderated the effects of these predictor variables on out-group attitudes. The final aim was to investigate the effects of perceived discrimination on out-group attitudes as this was deemed to be a key component of intergroup relations when viewed from a minority group perspective.

It was hypothesized that contact would positively predict out-group attitudes while realistic threat, symbolic threat, fear, anger and discrimination would negatively predict minorities' out-group attitudes. It was also expected that target group status would moderate the effects of contact, realistic threat and discrimination on out-group attitudes. Furthermore, perceived discrimination was expected to predict out-group attitudes above and beyond the effects of contact, threat and intergroup emotions. These hypotheses were partially supported. Results indicated that contact, symbolic threat and discrimination are significant predictors of minorities' attitudes toward ethnic out-groups within New Zealand's multicultural society, but these effects are not moderated by out-group status.

Tongans' Relations with Maori and Palangi people

As a prelude to the construction of a predictive model of attitudes toward out-groups, the over-arching characteristics of Tongans' relationships with Maori and Palangi were explored. Comparative analyses indicated that Tongans' had more frequent contact with Palangi. They saw the Palangi group as posing a greater threat (both realistically and symbolically) and as a greater source of discrimination than Maori.

These comparative findings are not surprising given that the Palangi group have the social, political and economic power base in New Zealand (NZ Parliamentary Library background note, 2000) so in turn they have the power to discriminate against out-groups. The results are in line with aspects of Esses et al.'s (1998) Unified Instrumental Model of Group Conflict (Unified IMGIC) theory which indicates that majority groups use discrimination to retain their advantaged position in a society. According to Unified IMGIC, members of

different groups (majorities and minorities) within a society are determined to protect their in-groups by competing for realistic and symbolic resources. Consequently, competition often leads to the exertion of discriminatory behaviours from the more powerful and competitive group (the majority) toward members of their out-groups (minorities) (Esses et al., 1998; Duckitt & Parra, 2004).

As Palangi people constitute the majority ethnic group in New Zealand, it is not surprising that Tongans have more frequent contact with them than with Maori. Indeed, it is unlikely that contact with Palangi people could be avoided. In other words, Tongans do not always make the choice to have contact with Palangi: as contact with the majority group is the norm. That being the case, minority-majority contact is likely to be of a superficial nature. Furthermore, Tongans and Palangi people are most likely to interact in contexts (e.g., shopping, public transportation) where there is no opportunity to create potential friendships. This type of contact does not provide Tongans with additional information about the Palangi group. Instead, such involuntary contact could mean that greater threat is felt by Tongans (as a minority group). A prior study found that more involuntary contact and greater perceived threats are both associated with prejudice (in both majorities and minorities) (Hraba, Brinkman, & Gray-Ray, 1996). However, the exact relationship between involuntary contact and perceived threat is not yet known. Future studies are further recommended to consider the voluntariness of the contact and its association with perceived threats to determine whether more involuntary contact leads to greater perceptions of threats for minorities.

In the same way, more contact with Palangi and seeing them as posing a greater threat to the in-group also provides a possibility for Tongans to perceive them as the source of discrimination against the in-group. Supporting this notion is the current correlational finding which shows that contact was associated with greater discrimination overall and a greater discrimination for the Palangi group specifically. This further indicates that greater (as well as involuntary) contact could also mean greater perceived threat and greater perceptions of discrimination felt by Tongans from their out-groups.

Compared to Palangi, Tongans have less contact with Maori. Given the smaller Maori population, it is likely that contact is more voluntary and actively sought. Moreover, this contact may be in contexts where Tongans and Maori share disadvantaged positions such as unskilled labour occupations (e.g., trade workers and machine operators) (Parliamentary Library background note, 2000) and residence in low-income neighborhoods (Earle, 1995).

Such contact could have triggered both groups to provide each other with an opportunity for friendship. This is an opportunity that Pettigrew (1998) referred to as ‘friendship potential’, which is relevant for encouraging favourable and repeated contact over time and the reduction of negative out-group attitudes.

The next section will discuss in depth the main findings of the current research which emerged from the examination of the predictive model of minorities’ (Tongans) out-group attitudes toward the majority (Palangi group) and another minority (Maori) group. This predictive model consists of contact, threat (realistic and symbolic threat), emotions (anger and fear) and discrimination which are hypothesized in this study to be predictors of Tongans’ attitudes toward Palangi and Maori out-groups.

Predictive Model of Out-group Attitudes

The research findings revealed that when personal background factors such as age, gender, education, English Language Proficiency (ELP), and employment are controlled, contact, symbolic threat, fear and perceived discrimination are significant predictors of out-group attitudes; however, the hierarchical regression analysis suggests that the effects of fear may be mediated by perceived discrimination. The components of the predictive model are elaborated in the following sections.

Intergroup contact. Contact played a crucial role in shaping the out-group attitudes of minority groups. This finding is in line with Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analysis of intergroup contact, which reported that intergroup contact leads to the reduction of prejudice. It also provides support for Allport’s Contact Hypothesis (CH) in which he argued that intergroup contact can improve intergroup relations (Allport, 1954). In this study, contact was a positive predictor of out-group attitudes from a minority group’s (Tongans) point of view. Therefore, contact could be used as a way to promote positive intercultural relations between a particular minority group with both the majority group and other minority groups within a multicultural society.

Threat (realistic and symbolic threat). Although one approach would be to merge the distinct measures of symbolic and realistic threats into one global measure of threat, the author chose to keep these variables separate for theoretical reason (i.e. following ITT) and also because the current regression analysis did not point to problems with multicollinearity. Results from the current study suggest that symbolic threat (i.e., threats to a group’s religion,

values, belief system, ideology, philosophy, morality and worldview) (Stephan & Stephan, 2000; Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005), but not realistic threat (i.e., threats to the in-group's power, resources and general welfare of the group) (Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald & Turkaspa, 1998), negatively predicts Tongans' out-group attitudes. This finding is in accordance with Corenblum and Stephan's (2001) research. Although both realistic and symbolic threats were equally important for majorities (i.e., White Americans felt threatened by Native Americans both realistically and symbolically), realistic threat did not exert a significant effect on minority group's (Native Americans) attitudes toward the majority. In the same vein, Stephan et al. (2002) found that realistic threat had a stronger effect on majorities' out-group attitudes while symbolic threat significantly and more strongly influenced minorities' out-group attitudes. With this finding, Stephan et al. (2002) postulated that majorities may tend to dislike minorities due to their threats to the majority's power in the larger society. This leads to the current speculation that powerful groups seem to be more concerned about the in-group's power, resources and the general welfare of the group and therefore feel that minorities threaten their realistic resources. In this case, majorities are threatened that minorities may undermine their dominant position within the society and that their power base may be weakened. According to Stephan and colleagues, majorities may feel that their group has more to lose to minorities than vice versa.

Alternatively, for minority groups (in this case Tongans), the different values, beliefs, norms, roles and practices of their out-groups (majority and minority groups) can be seen as a major source of threat to their symbolic resources. In this case, minorities see out-groups as threatening to change what makes them "who they are". This idea is in line with the speculation by Stephan and Stephan (2000) that symbolic threat is a special type of threat that is felt by low status groups or minorities. Minorities in this sense seem to be more aware of their cultural differences with their out-groups and "feel pressure to assimilate" (Stephan et al., 2002, p.1250). Indeed, minorities are reluctant to lose their symbolic resources and culture, which are fundamental to their psychological well-being within the wider society (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Minorities treasure these as fundamental to their psychological well-being. Therefore they consider any attempts to change or manipulate these resources as a moral crime because it robs them of their core cultural values. In that sense, there is no doubt that symbolic threat influences minorities' attitudes toward those who do not belong to their cultural groups.

Intergroup emotions (anger and fear). The Intergroup Emotions Theory maintains that intergroup emotions can evoke out-group actions that direct behaviours toward their out-groups (Mackie et al., 2009). That is, our feelings as members of a group influence our reactions toward the members of another group (Mackie & Smith, 2003; Miller, Smith & Mackie, 2004). Negative emotions such as anger and fear can motivate in-group members to react against out-group members by confronting them or avoiding further interactions (Mackie et al., 2009). Based on that knowledge, anger and fear were integrated into the predictive model to examine their impacts on the out-group attitudes of minorities.

Although the IET states that intergroup emotions can evoke out-group attitudes and behaviour, results of the current study reveal that anger was not a significant predictor of Tongans' out-group attitudes. This is a new finding because no prior studies have focused on the specific effects of anger on minorities' out-group attitudes. However, studies have found that anger predicts other related forms of intergroup behaviour such as in-group bias, out-group confrontation, defending of in-group position and support of out-group criticism by in-group members (Mackie et al., 2009). Speculatively, the current result may have emerged because anger seems to be an emotion experienced by those with power (Mackie, Devos & Smith, 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This explanation is supported in a study by Mackie et al. (2000) which found that groups who felt that their in-groups have power were more likely to elicit anger towards their out-groups and furthermore, they felt that they could act against them.

Specific to the current study, Tongans are a relatively powerless minority group and therefore may have considered both out-groups (Maori and Palangi) as more advantaged and having greater power than the in-group. The Palangi group is currently considered as the majority group in number, as well as being the group with the greatest political power in New Zealand. Maori, on the other hand have special privileges in New Zealand with regards to the Treaty of Waitangi and are known as *tangata whenua* (the original people of Aotearoa New Zealand) (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, 2013; Smelt & Lin, 2009). This status has given them a range of entitlements, such as recognition of their language, acknowledgement of their culture (Sibley, Houkamau & Hoverd, 2011) and the return of (or compensation for) their lands that were 'confiscated' by the government (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, 2013). Because anger is considered an emotion for those with power and Tongans are considered less powerful than Maori and Palangi, it is not surprising

that anger did not predict Tongans' attitudes toward these groups. What is important about this finding is that anger does not play a role in predicting the out-group attitudes of a relatively powerless group (e.g., Tongans) toward more powerful out-groups.

In contrast, the results of the current study revealed that fear is a significant predictor of out-group attitudes. This finding supports prior studies that focussed on the Integrated Threat model and found that intergroup anxiety (herein referred to as fear) influenced out-group attitudes (Gudykunst & Nishida, 2001; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

A possible explanation for this finding is based on the idea that fear arises from powerlessness (Mackie et al., 2000). Fear is an emotion that predicts withdrawal or moving away from opposition, instead of going against and confronting it (Spanovic, Lickel, Denson & Petrovic, 2010). Groups that consider themselves weak and feel that they do not have the capability to confront more powerful out-groups have been shown to experience greater fear. In this case, the current finding that fear, but not anger, predicted Tongans out-group attitudes suggests that fear is an emotion that influences the out-group attitudes of relatively powerless groups.

Further to this, an important finding emerged which may shed more light on the relationship between fear and out-group attitudes. That is, fear only predicted out-group attitudes before perceived discrimination was entered into the predictive model. This is a novel finding that highlights that perceived discrimination may mediate the effects of intergroup emotions, particularly the effect of 'fear' on minorities' out-group attitudes. This point will be discussed in the following section.

Perceived discrimination. The novel inclusion of perceived discrimination as a predictor of minorities' out-group attitudes in the current study is a step forward in the intergroup relations and perceptions research. This new integration is based on the idea that the perspectives of minorities have been neglected in previous research, while greater attention has been given to the perspectives of majorities. Most importantly, discrimination is a major social problem that all minority groups face, including minority groups in New Zealand (New Zealand Ministry of Social Development, 2010). As expected, perceived discrimination significantly predicted Tongans' negative out-group attitudes toward Maori and Palangi and also added additional variance to the effects of the traditional predictors (i.e., contact, threat

and emotions) on out-group attitudes. This finding gives additional support to the proposition advanced by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) that negative treatments could potentially evoke and strengthen negative out-group responses. Although it has long been known that discrimination affects well-being (Pascoe & Richman, 2009), the current finding further reveals that discrimination also affects intercultural relations.

The current finding is in accordance with the psychological phenomenon of reciprocity; that is, groups tend to reciprocate feelings that they express to one another (Kalin & Berry, 1996; Phinney, Sam & Vedder, 2006). In that situation, greater perceived discrimination (as a negative experience) could lead to the reciprocation of negative attitudes by the victims toward the perpetrators. Specific to the current findings, Tongans are likely to reciprocate the perceptions of discrimination from out-group members with negative attitudes. This also suggests that there is a possibility for Tongans to reciprocate positively if there is no discrimination from the out-groups. In that case, if Palangi, Maori and Tongan people mutually reciprocate without discrimination, then it is more likely that positive out-group attitudes will ensue.

As mentioned earlier, when discrimination was entered into the model, fear lost its significant effect on out-group attitudes. The current study set forward a possible explanation for this effect. That is, discrimination may have mediated the effects of fear on out-group attitudes so that fear leads to greater perceptions of discrimination, which, in turn, affect out-group attitudes. This suggests that if Tongans are fearful of their out-groups then it is more likely that they will perceive greater discrimination from them. This could also lead to the exertion of negative attitudes toward their out-groups. However, to the author's knowledge, no prior studies have examined the mediation effect of discrimination on the relationship of fear and out-group attitudes. Therefore this relationship is open for future studies. Furthermore, a longitudinal study would be required to determine the nature of this relationship.

In addition to the above explanations, the current study set forward two theoretical or conceptual questions with regards to the measure of discrimination. Is perceived discrimination just a form of realistic threat that is felt by the minority group and which should be included in the measure of realistic threat for minorities; or are realistic threat and perceived discrimination different psychological constructs?

With regards to the first conceptual question, discrimination could be a form of realistic threat. The current study directs our attention to how these two factors are measured. To the author's best knowledge, no prior research has investigated the association between discrimination and realistic threat. In this study, perceived discrimination was measured with items such as "They disrespected you", "They acted as if they thought you were dishonest", "They provided you with poor service in restaurants and stores" (see Appendix I and II). Realistic threat on the other hand was measured with items like "Palangi/Maori have too much political power", "Palangi/Maori have an unfair share of country's resources", "Palangi/Maori get better health care services than Tongans" (see Appendices). Realistic threat items seem to be central to the welfare of the in-group including threats to political, economic, physical and general well-being of the in-group (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Discrimination items too, also seem to revolve around similar issues regarding the welfare of the in-group, physical and general well-being. With regards to the correlational analyses in this study, discrimination was moderately correlated with realistic threat overall and also moderately associated with realistic threat in both target groups. Although the correlation indicates a moderate relationship between realistic threat and discrimination, the relationship between discrimination and realistic threat appeared stronger for the Palangi group than overall and in the Maori group. It therefore may be the case that perceived discrimination items are more closely aligned with the realistic threat only when minorities view the realistic threat posed by majority groups.

However, discrimination may also be a different psychological construct from realistic threat. Discrimination items refer to unfair treatment (including experiences of physical abuse) on the bases of ethnicity. Realistic threat items on the other hand reflect in-group's concern about the possibility that out-groups can overtake that which belongs to the in-group (e.g., power, resources and welfare), anything ensuring the maintenance of their status. Future research is recommended to investigate this link to confirm whether perceived discrimination is different from realistic threat or whether discrimination is another form of realistic threat that is felt in particular by minorities from their out-groups.

Moderation effects. Group status has been considered by a number of contemporary researchers as a variable that can influence the effects of the predictors (e.g., intergroup contact) on out-group attitudes (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Nida, 2011; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). Surprisingly, results from the current study reported no moderation effects of group

status. That is, the effects of contact, threat, emotions and discrimination on out-group attitudes were not moderated by the target groups. The same effects were observed whether out-group attitudes were directed toward Palangi or Maori.

Speculatively, the Maori group may have been considered by Tongans as a special type of minority group that is more advantaged in New Zealand than the Tongan minority group. In fact, as mentioned earlier, the status of Maori as the *tangata whenua* (i.e., indigenous people of New Zealand) has given them special entitlements. For example, the Maori language is an official language of New Zealand (Sibley, Houkamau, & Hoverd, 2011), and they have special rights over the land (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, 2013). When considering the special status of Maori, Tongans' attitudes towards both groups may not have been based on the differences between status because both groups are relatively more advantaged than the Tongan group. Therefore, future research should investigate a minority group (e.g., Samoans or immigrants from the other Pacific Islands) that is more similar in status to the in-group minority (Tongans) and replicate the same study to observe any possible moderation effects by target group status.

Contributions to the Intergroup Relations and Perceptions Research

As previously mentioned, this study was conducted to address the limitations in the contemporary intergroup relations and perceptions research. The perspective of minority groups has been neglected in previous research mainly because earlier studies have paid more attention to how the majority group deals with different minority groups as new settlers in their society. In the present research, the perspectives of minorities have been acknowledged. This might be a starting point for empirical studies to focus on the psychological factors affecting minority groups within the larger society. Raising awareness of the perspective of minorities can assist policy makers in implementing programmes that can help to mitigate the problems regarding intergroup relations within multicultural societies. However, a socially cohesive and harmonious society cannot be achieved without the participation of all groups (Berry, 2006; Berry, 2011; Berry & Kalin, 1995). With that, majorities and minorities should be familiarized with the idea of multiculturalism. That is the idea that living together in a multicultural society and conforming to a multicultural way of life is acceptable and generally supported (Berry, Poortinga, Breugelmans, Chasiotis & Sam, 2011).

Understanding how minorities perceive not only the majority group but also other minority groups provides us with a more balanced view on the perspective of minorities. With the novel inclusion of perceived discrimination as a predictor of minorities' attitudes, this research demonstrates that the factors affecting majority groups' out-group attitudes should not necessarily be generalized to the study of minority groups' out-group attitudes. This research is therefore a step forward in the study of attitudes because the findings indicate that different groups' attitudes may be influenced by different social factors.

Another important contribution of the current study relates to the finding that symbolic threat, but not realistic threat predicts the out-group attitudes of minorities. This finding converges with Corenblum and Stephan's (2001) study which also found that symbolic threat but not realistic threat predicted minorities' out-group attitudes. There have been very few studies from the minority perspectives that replicated Corenblum and Stephan's (2001) study in a different cultural context and found the same result. This study therefore makes a strong case for the consideration of symbolic threat as a crucial factor for understanding minority group's experiences in a multicultural context.

The current study's contributions to the existing literature on intergroup relations and perceptions research can also be seen through its possible applications. To apply the knowledge obtained from the current study, policy makers could set up programmes (e.g., mixed volunteer work opportunities for both majority and minority group members) to encourage positive and meaningful contact between groups. It is through meaningful contact that the reduction of perceived threats, fear and anger toward one another can be achieved. With a higher level of contact, greater support for multiculturalism can also be observed (Spoonley, Gendall, & Trlin, 2007). In addition, meaningful contact could lessen or avoid the discrimination of minorities by their out-groups. However, this could only be done through mutual support for implementing a multicultural policy that concentrates on the need for different cultural groups (including both majority and minority groups) to "value cultural diversity" and "accommodate differences" (Ward, 2012). At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that education should also contribute to this step. Previous research on this topic has shown that New Zealanders who have completed higher levels of education (e.g., tertiary) have more favourable attitudes toward minorities (or immigrants) than those who have completed lower levels of education (e.g., primary and secondary) (Gendall, Spoonley, &

Trlin, 2007; Ward & Masgoret, 2008). Encouraging people to value education and reach higher levels of education could ensure that both minorities and majorities avoid sliding down the slippery slope of perceived threats, fear, anger and discrimination, which in turn could determine prolonged negative attitudes toward one another. Moreover, raising awareness and teaching cultural groups (including the socialization of children) about the differences in cultural values and world views (Duckitt, 2001) can help people to deal effectively with multiculturalism.

The current research not only launches a predictive model for studying the attitudes of minorities, but also provides empirical insights into how Tongans perceive Palangi and Maori groups in the multicultural context of New Zealand. As New Zealand walks through the door of multiculturalism, it is crucial to tackle the issues regarding intergroup relations. One of those issues is the discrimination faced by Pacific islanders (including Tongans), particularly at work places, in education, health care and housing (Statistics New Zealand, 2012). Without a predictive model that focuses on understanding the perspectives of minorities in New Zealand, policy makers would still rely on the perspectives of majorities as the only compass for improving intergroup relations. Perhaps it is time to pay more attention to the factors that influence minorities' (particularly Pacific Islanders) behavioural and psychological well-being in New Zealand, for "the goal of an inclusive society is to ensure that not every dimension of society maps onto a single centre full of wealth and privilege, with dark shadows of the impoverished and voiceless surrounding it" (Liu, 2005, p. 85).

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

The current study used self-report measures to examine the attitudes of Tongans toward Palangi and Maori. Self-report measures administered in the current study may have influenced the findings due to the weaknesses commonly caused by subjective measures. A second limitation may be the influence of social desirability. This is because people may be more sensitive to questions regarding their perceptions of others and especially how they perceive their out-groups within a multicultural context. In that case, Tongan respondents may have answered questions in a manner that could avoid embarrassment (Fisher, 1993) and could alter how they appear to their out-groups and other cultural groups within New Zealand society.

In addition, this study limits the selection of its target groups to just Palangi (majority) and Maori (minority) groups. Although the Maori group is considered a minority group in New Zealand, their privileged position in New Zealand society could have influenced how Tongans perceive this group. However, this special status is questionable at times because in reality both Maori and Pacific Islanders (including Tongans) are quite comparable in terms of receiving poor health care, discrimination in jobs, education and housing and both groups are highly dependent on government welfare benefits (Pacific Health Chart Book, 2004). Future research should replicate this study in New Zealand with other minority groups (e.g., Samoans and other Pacific Island ethnic groups) and examine their attitudes toward other minority groups (apart from Maori) that are relatively equal in their minority group status.

Special attention should be given to the separate measures of symbolic and realistic threats. As viewed in the current analysis, these two variables were highly correlated although the VIF and Tolerance statistics were within acceptable range. It is therefore recommended for future studies to combine these two measures into a global measure of threat.

Additional consideration should be given to the cross-cultural replication of the current predictive model; therefore, it is also recommended that this predictive model be tested with minority groups in other culturally diverse societies. New Zealand is a country with a high immigration rate and attitudes towards immigrants are considerably positive (Ward & Masgoret, 2006). Therefore it is crucial to examine the perspectives of minorities in societies with long histories of cultural plurality, including countries with high immigration rates. In addition, it would be important to apply the knowledge gained from the study of minorities by seeking a way to mitigate the negative effects of contact, threat, emotions and discrimination on their negative out-group attitudes.

As the current research focused on the impact of discrimination on minorities' perspectives, future longitudinal research is recommended to examine the mediating effect of discrimination on the relationship of fear and out-group attitudes over time. Future studies are also recommended to investigate the conceptual and empirical relationship between perceived discrimination and realistic threat. Despite the need for future studies, the current research has made a significant contribution to the field. It has presented a more comprehensive model that can be used in future research which concentrates on the perspective of minorities within multicultural societies.

Conclusion

With a world that is moving towards a more multicultural environment with increasing migration and gradual growth in cultural diversity, intergroup relations should be studied carefully in order to create equitable and inclusive societies. For this reason, it is crucial to understand what contributes to how different cultural groups (both majority and minority groups) perceive each other. However, the existing knowledge about intergroup relations has mostly been based on the perspectives of majorities toward minorities while at the same time ignoring minorities' perspectives. Indeed, for a society to be socially cohesive and harmonious, the perspectives of minorities also need to be considered.

The present research is a step forward in that it contributes to the limited knowledge about the attitudes of minorities toward their out-groups. Being discriminated against by the wider society affects minority group members' well-being and shapes their attitudes toward out-group members. It is by understanding what contributes to the out-group attitudes of minorities that can frame how plural societies evaluate the promotion of positive intergroup relations and maintain harmony in a culturally diverse world. At the same time, both majority and minority groups need to appreciate the roles they have in shaping each other's out-group attitudes. If they become aware of their own attitudes, group differences can also be seen; greater equality can be achieved and by consequence a successful multicultural society can be anticipated.

As a final remark, multicultural societies must consider the perspectives of minorities if they wish for equitable, inclusive and harmonious societies. With that, it is time to pay more attention to the factors that influence minorities' behavioral and psychological well-being in New Zealand if this country wishes for a successful multicultural society.

Table 1

Psychometric Properties of the Scales (N = 244).

	M (<i>SD</i>)	Cronbach's α	M (<i>SD</i>)	Cronbach's α	M (<i>SD</i>)	Cronbach's α	<i>N items</i>
	Maori		Palangi		Overall		
Out-group attitudes	3.73 (0.75)	0.85	3.70 (0.72)	0.83	3.72 (0.73)	0.84	10
Contact	3.03 (0.85)	0.77	3.48 (0.92)	0.81	3.23 (0.91)	0.80	6
Realistic threat	2.96 (0.79)	0.77	3.14 (0.89)	0.83	3.04 (0.84)	0.79	7
Symbolic threat	2.55 (0.86)	0.84	2.86 (0.82)	0.80	2.69 (0.86)	0.83	7
Fear	2.26 (0.82)	0.74	2.05 (0.77)	0.69	2.17 (0.80)	0.72	4
Anger	2.24 (0.87)	0.81	2.22 (0.84)	0.75	2.23 (0.85)	0.78	4
Discrimination	1.74 (0.64)	0.88	2.24 (0.77)	0.88	1.98 (0.74)	0.90	8

Note: M = Mean scores, *SD* = Standard Deviation, *N* = Number of items

Table 2

Overall Bivariate Correlations among Out-group Attitudes and Predictor Variables (N = 244).

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Out-group attitudes						
2 Contact	.30**					
3 Realistic threat	-.48**	-.12				
4 Symbolic threat	-.53**	-.12	.82**			
5 Fear	-.32**	-.14*	.35**	.30**		
6 Anger	-.23**	.02	.36**	.32**	.53**	
7 Discrimination	-.30**	.24**	.41**	.39**	.24**	.32**

*Note: * p <.05, ** p <.01*

Table 3

Bivariate Correlations among Out-group Attitudes and Predictor Variables by Target Groups (Maori/Palangi) (N = 244).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Out-group attitudes		.29**	-.38**	-.43**	-.30**	-.13	-.23*
2 Contact	.34**		-.09	-.12	-.01	.05	.22*
3 Realistic threat	-.58**	-.21*		.78**	.44**	.42**	.43**
4 Symbolic threat	-.61**	-.21*	.84**		.33**	.32**	.35**
5 Fear	-.35**	-.20*	.32**	.34**		.54**	.34**
6 Anger	-.31**	-.01	.32**	.34**	.53**		.32**
7 Discrimination	-.39**	.14	.36**	.35**	.28**	.38**	

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, Lower diagonal = Maori correlation matrix, Upper diagonal = Palangi correlation matrix.

Table 4

Mean Scores (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) of Out-group attitudes, Contact, Threat, Emotion and Discrimination (Maori N = 134, Palangi N = 110).

Variables	M		(SD)	
	Maori		Palangi	
Out-group attitudes	3.73	(0.75)	3.70	(0.72)
Contact	3.06	(0.83)	3.47	(0.95)
Realistic Threat	2.94	(0.79)	3.22	(0.89)
Symbolic Threat	2.53	(0.86)	2.93	(0.82)
Fear	2.26	(0.82)	2.10	(0.78)
Anger	2.23	(0.87)	2.30	(0.83)
Discrimination	1.74	(0.65)	2.30	(0.75)

Table 5

Contact, Realistic Threat, Symbolic Threat, Fear, Anger and Discrimination as Predictors of Out-group Attitudes (N = 226).

Steps	Out-group Attitudes			
	1	2	3	4
Age	.04	.06	.05	.04
Gender	.12	.09	.12*	.12*
Education	.05	.05	.05	.04
ELP	.02	-.07	-.04	-.05
Employment	.02	.06	.06	.07
Target group	-.04	-.01	.05	.03
Contact		.24***	.29***	.28***
Realistic threat		-.10	-.06	-.17
Symbolic threat		-.37***	-.35***	-.34*
Fear		-.14*	-.11	-.06
Anger		-.03	.01	-.05
PD			-.20**	-.26**
TG x Contact				.02
TG x Realistic threat				.12
TG x Symbolic threat				-.01
TG x Fear				-.10
TG x Anger				.09
TG x PD				.09
R ² Change	.02	.35***	.02**	.02
R ²	.02	.37	.39	.41

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; Numbers/values entered (except for R² and R² Change values) = Beta/ β ; ELP = Ethnic language proficiency, PD = Perceived discrimination, TG = Target Group; these variables were coded as TG 0 = Maori, 1 = Palangi; Employment 1 = Yes, 2 = No; Gender 0 = female, 1 = male.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin*, *71*, 319-341.
- Berry, J.W. (2006). Mutual attitudes among immigrants and ethno-cultural groups in plural societies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*, 719-734.
- Berry, J.W. (2011). Integration and multiculturalism: Ways towards social solidarity. *Papers on Social Representation*, *20*, 2.1-2.21.
- Berry, J.W., & Kalin, R. (1995). Multicultural and ethnic attitudes in Canada: An overview of the 1991 national survey. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *27*, 301-320.
- Berry, J.W., Phinney, J.S., Sam, D.L., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An international review*, *55*, 303-332.
- Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., Breugelmans, S.M., Chasiotis, A. & Sam, D.L. (2011). *Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bobo, L. (1988). Group conflict, prejudice, and the paradox of contemporary racial attitudes. In P. Katz & D. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy* (pp. 85-114). New York: Plenum Press.
- Branscombe, N.R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R. & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and context of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social Identity: Context, commitment, content*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Hossain, R., & Petley, R. (2011). When and why does extended contact work? The role of high quality direct contact and group norms in the development of positive ethnic intergroup attitudes amongst children. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *14*, 193-206.
- Cook, S. W. (1985). Experimenting on social issues: The case of school desegregation. *American Psychologist* *40*, 452-460.
- Corenblum, B., & Stephan, W.G. (2001). White fears and native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *33*, 251-268.
- Cottrell, C.A. & Neuberg, S.L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to "prejudice". *American Psychological Association*, *88*, 770-789.

- Dion, K.L. (1986). Responses to perceived discrimination and relative deprivation. In J.M. Olson, C.P. Herman, & M. P. Zanna (Eds), *Relative deprivation and social comparison: The Ontario symposium* (Vol.4, pp. 159-179), Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dovidio, J.F., Eller, A. & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*, 14, 147-160.
- Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L. & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6, 5-21.
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 41-113). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). Psychology of prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1182-1193
- Duckitt, J., Parra, C. (2004). Multidimensional group identification and out-group attitudes in four ethnic groups in New Zealand. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 237-247.
- Eagly, A.H. & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotype and attitudes toward men and women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 543-558.
- Earle, D. (1995). Pacific islands people in Aotearoa/ New Zealand: Existing and emerging paradigms. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 4, 14-23.
- Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137-166). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Esses, V.M., Jackson, L.M., & Armstrong, T.L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigrations: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54, 699-724.
- Fisher, R.J. (1993). Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 303-315.
- Gendall, P., Spoonley, P., & Trlin, A. (2007). The attitudes of New Zealanders to immigrants and immigration: 2003 and 2006 compared. Retrieved from http://newsettlers.massey.ac.nz/publications_pdfs/Gendall,%20Spoonley%20and%20

rlin%20OP%20No.%2017.pdf

- Gomez, A., Tropp, L.R., & Fernandez, S. (2011). When extended contact opens the door to future contact: Testing the effects of extended contact on attitudes and intergroup expectancies in majority and minority groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*, 161-173.
- Gordijn, E.H., Yzerbyt, V., Wigboldus, D., & Dumont, M. (2006). Emotional reactions to harmful intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 15-30.
- Gudykunst, W.B., & Nishida, T. (2001). Anxiety, uncertainty, and perceived effectiveness of communication across relationships and cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25*, 55-71.
- Hraba, J., Brinkman, R., & Gray-Ray, P. (1996). Comparison of Black and White prejudice. *Sociological Spectrum, 16*, 129-157.
- Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact: Panacea for prejudice? *The Psychologist, 16*, 352-355.
- Horowitz, D.L. (1999). Ethnic conflicts. Structure and strategy in ethnic conflict: A few steps toward synthesis. In B. Pleskovic & J.E. Stiglitz (1999), *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economic 1998* (pp. 345-370). Washington, USA: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/THE WORLD BANK.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Mahonen, T.A., & Liebkind, K. (2011). Ingroup norms, intergroup contact and intergroup anxiety as predictors of the outgroup attitudes of majority and minority youth. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 346-355.
- Kalin, R., & Berry, J.W. (1996). Interethnic attitudes in Canada: Ethnocentrism, hierarchy and reciprocity. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 28*, 253-261.
- Leong, C-H., & Ward, W. (2011). Intergroup perceptions and attitudes toward immigrants in a culturally plural society. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 60*, 46-65.
- Levin, S., Taylor, P.L., & Caudle, E. (2007). Interethnic and interracial dating in college: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*, 323-341.
- Liu, J.H. (2005). History and identity: A system of checks and balances for Aotearoa/ New Zealand. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh., & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities Departures and Destinations* (p.85). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Mackie, D.M., Devos, T., & Smith, E.R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive actions in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*,

602-616.

- Mackie, D.M., Maitner, A.T., & Smith, E.R. (2009). Intergroup emotion theory. In T.D. Nelson (Ed.) *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination* (pp. 285-308). New York: Psychology Press.
- Mackie, D.M., & Smith, E.R. (Eds.) (2002). *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Mackie, D.M., Smith, E.R., & Ray, D.G. (2008). Intergroup emotions and intergroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Compass*, 2, 1866-1880.
- Miller, D.A., Smith, E.R., & Mackie, D.M. (2004). Effects of intergroup contact and political predispositions on prejudice: Role of intergroup emotions. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 7, 221-237.
- Ministry of Health and Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (2004). *Tupu Ola Moui: Pacific Health Chart 2004*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.
- Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (2013). Maori in the 20th century. Retrieved from <http://www.tepapa.govt.nz/WhatsOn/exhibitions/SliceofHeaven/Exhibition/Maori/Pages/Landrights.aspx>
- New Zealand Ministry of Social Development (2010). Perceived discrimination. Retrieved from <http://socialreport.msd.govt.nz/civil-political-rights/perceived-discrimination.html>
- Nida, B. (2011). Asymmetrical effects of contact between minority groups: Asian and Black students in a small college. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17, 186-194.
- Parliamentary Library, Background note (2000). Gaps between ethnic groups: Some key statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.nz/NR/rdonlyres/A42343F5-E218417F-91C0-F616E148F3F7/436/009EthnicGaps1.pdf>
- Pascoe, E.A., & Richman, L.S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A metaanalytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 531-554.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Reviews Psychology*, 49, 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T.F., & Tropp, L.R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (2008). Future directions for intergroup contact theory and research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32*, 187-199.
- Pettigrew, T.F., Tropp, L.R., Wagner, R., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advance in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 271-280.
- Riek, M.R., Mania, R.W., & Gaertner, S.L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 336-353.
- Robinson, J.W., & Preston, J.D. (1976). Equal-status contact and modification of racial prejudice: A re-examination of the contact hypothesis. *Social Forces, 54*, 911-924.
- Sibley, C.G., Houkamau, C.A., & Hoverd, W.J. (2011). Ethnic group labels and intergroup attitudes in New Zealand: Naming preferences predict distinct ingroup and outgroup biases. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 11*, 201-220.
- Sibley, C.G., & Ward, C. (2012). *Mapping the psychological state of nation: A barometer test of New Zealand's multicultural status*. Manuscript under review, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). Social dominance theory: A new synthesis. In *Social dominance* (pp. 31-57). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Smelt, R., & Lin, Y.J. (2009). *Cultures of the world: New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.co.nz/books?id=u9KtyO7d5CUC&printsec=frontcover&dq=Smel+and+Lin,+2009&hl=en&sa=X&ei=MM4OUcuGNIPjlAX5iIDICw&ved=0CDAQuUwAA>
- Smith, E.R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In D.M. Mackie, D.L. Hamilton (Eds.), et al. *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 297-315 of xiv). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- Smith, E.R., Seger, C.R., & Mackie, D.M. (2007). Can emotions be truly group level? Evidence for four conceptual criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*, 431-446.
- Spanovic, M., Lickel, B., Denson, T.F., & Petrovic, N. (2010). Fear and anger as predictors of motivation for intergroup aggression: Evidence from Serbia and Republika Srpska. *Intergroup Relations, 13*, 725-739.

- Spoonley, P., Gendall, P., & Trlin, A. (2007). Welcome to our world: The attitudes of New Zealanders to immigrants and immigration. Retrieved from http://newsettlers.massey.ac.nz/publications_pdfs/Spoonley,%20Gendall%20and%20Trlin%20OP%20No.%2014.pdf
- Stangor, C., Sullivan, L. A., & Ford, T. E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. *Social Cognition, 9*, 359-380.
- Statistics New Zealand (2012). *People born overseas*. Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/population/births/people-born-overseas.aspx
- Statistics New Zealand (2012). *Working together: Racial discrimination in New Zealand*. Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/asian-peoples/racial-discrimination-in-nz.aspx
- Stephan, W.G., Boniecki, K.A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K.S., Jackson, L.A., McNatt, P.S., & Renfro, C.L. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1242-1254.
- Stephan, W.G., & Renfro, C.L. (2002). The role of threat in intergroup relations. In D.M. Mackie and E.R. Smith (Eds), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*, (pp. 191-207). New York: Psychology Press.
- Stephan, W.G. & Stephan, C.W. (1984). The role of ignorance in intergroup relations. In N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp.229-257). New York: Academic Press.
- Stephan, W.G. & Stephan, C.W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 157-175.
- Stephan, W.G., & Stephan, C.W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp.23-45). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O. & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice towards immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*, 2221-2237.
- Stephan, W.G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C.M., Schwarzwald, J. & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 559-576.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Morrison, K. R. (2009). Intergroup threat theory. In T. D.

- Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 43-60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Teaiwa, T., & Mallon, S. (2005). Ambivalent kinships? Pacific people in New Zealand. In: J.H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 207-229). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- The Encyclopedia of New Zealand (2012). Story: Tongans. Retrieved from <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/tongans/1>
- Thomas, D.R., & Nikora, L.W. (1992). From assimilation to biculturalism: Changing patterns in Maori-Pakeha relationships. Retrieved from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/787/Thomas-Nikora...;jsessionid=684D17D407085DBA65079396A2759E4B?sequence=1>
- Tropp L.R., & Pettigrew, T.F. (2005b). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*, 951-956.
- Vezzali, L., Giovannini, D., & Capozza, D. (2010). Longitudinal effects of contact on intergroup relations: The role of majority and minority group membership and intergroup emotions. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 20*, 462-479.
- Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*, 37-54.
- Ward, C., & Lin, E-Y. (2005). Immigration, acculturation and national identity in New Zealand. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Ward, C., & Masgoret, A-M. (2006). An integrated model of attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 671-682.

- Ward, C., & Masgoret, A-M. (2008). Attitudes toward immigrants, immigration, and multiculturalism in New Zealand: A social psychological analysis. *International Marketing and Reports*, 42, 227-248.
- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 30, 422-442.
- Ward, C., (2012, October, 26). Has multiculturalism in Europe & New Zealand failed? Colleen Ward, CACR (Video file). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K3AaCjv0yvo>
- Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socioeconomic status, stress, and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2, 335-351.

Appendix I

Survey Distributed to Examine Tongans' Attitudes toward Maori in New Zealand

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON

Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui



Mālō e lelei

You are invited to participate in a study about Tongans' attitudes toward Maori. This is part of a larger project about ethnic relations in New Zealand. The research is conducted by Professor Colleen Ward of Victoria University of Wellington with the support of Tongan field assistants.

Your participation in the project will involve completing a questionnaire. This will take approximately 20-30 minutes.

All responses are ANONYMOUS.

You do not have to complete this survey. Your participation is VOLUNTARY. If you begin the survey but decide not to finish it, you may withdraw from the research without having to give a reason.

If you complete the questionnaire it will be understood that:

- a) you have consented to participate in the research
- b) you consent to publication of the results, under the condition that your participation remains anonymous, and
- c) you will receive a \$10 food or petrol voucher as a token of our appreciation for your participation.

Please note that the data collected for this study will remain with the investigator, be stored securely for at least five years, and be shared only with competent professionals on a case by case basis.

If you have any queries about the project, you may contact Professor Colleen Ward at the School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, P.O. Box 600, Wellington. Phone: 04-4636037. Email: Colleen.Ward@vuw.ac.nz.

The results of the study will be posted at www.vuw.ac.nz/cacr no later than March 2011. You may also request a copy of the results to be mailed to you.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Colleen Ward

Professor of Psychology

Please read each question carefully, but give the response that first comes to mind. There are no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in your opinions.

Instructions

Because this questionnaire will be recorded using a digital scanner, please mark your responses carefully. Please use a black or blue pen, and indicate your answers in this way:

1. Statement	1 2 ● 4 5
--------------	-------------------------------

If you need to change an answer, please cross out the incorrect one this way:

1. Statement	1 2 ✕ ● 5
--------------	-------------------------------

On the following pages, we will ask some questions about yourself and how you behave in particular situations. Please answer the question using the provided rating scales. For example, fill in 2 if you eat fruit only very seldom. Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

	Never	Very Seldom	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
1. I eat fruit.	1	●	3	4	5	6	7

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui



1. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the following scale.
 1= strongly disagree
 2= mildly disagree
 3= neutral, neither agree nor disagree
 4= mildly agree
 5= strongly agree

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
1. We should recognise that cultural and racial diversity is a fundamental characteristic of New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is appropriate that Maori (te reo) is an official language of New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is a good thing to have festivals that reflect the cultural diversity of New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is only fair that Maori be compensated for the loss of their land.	1	2	3	4	5
5. It is a good thing for any society to be made up of people from different races, religions and cultures.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Waitangi Day should be a national celebration of biculturalism.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Iwi (Maori tribes) should have the basic right to manage their own affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
8. It is important to reduce economic inequalities across ethnic groups in New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
9. It is important to recognise that New Zealand is a bicultural country.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Ethnic groups should be encouraged to maintain their native languages.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Maori language should be taught in all primary schools.	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is important that the government does not interfere with iwi (tribal) affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
13. It is important to accept a wide variety of cultures in New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
14. It is important to close the socio-economic gaps between Maori and Palangi/NZ Europeans.	1	2	3	4	5

2. What are your views about the different ethnic groups in New Zealand? Please rate each of the following groups from 0 to 100, where 0 is very unfavourable and 100 very favourable.

Chinese _____

Samoan _____

Indian _____

Maori _____

Fijian _____

Tongan _____

Palangi/
NZ European _____

3. Please indicate how often you have personally experienced the following forms of mistreatment by **Maori** in your day-to-day life in New Zealand on the following scale.

- 1= never
- 2= rarely
- 3= sometimes
- 4= often

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
1. They disrespected you.	1	2	3	4
2. They provided you with poor service in restaurants or stores.	1	2	3	4
3. They acted as if you were unintelligent.	1	2	3	4
4. They acted as if they were better than you.	1	2	3	4
5. They acted as if they were afraid of you.	1	2	3	4
6. They acted as if they thought you were dishonest.	1	2	3	4
7. They called you names or insulted you.	1	2	3	4
8. They threatened or harassed you.	1	2	3	4

4. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about **Maori** people.

1= strongly disagree

2= mildly disagree

3= neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4= mildly agree

5= strongly agree

Maori...	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
1. Have too much political power.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Have values that are not compatible with Tongan values.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Have an unfair share of the country's resources.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Do not appreciate Tongan culture.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Get preference in obtaining rental housing.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Do not share our views on life.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Get better health care services than Tongans.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Have some unacceptable traditions.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Increase the crime rate in this country.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Want Tongans to give up their culture.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Are a drain on the country's welfare services.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Are not religious people.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Decrease job opportunities for Tongans.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Threaten our culture.	1	2	3	4	5

5. The following questions relate to how often you spend time with **Maori** people.

- 1= never
- 2= hardly ever
- 3= sometimes
- 4= often
- 5= very often

	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Often	Very often
1. How often do you interact with Maori in your school or workplace?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often do you interact with Maori in your social life?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often do you interact with Maori in your neighbourhood?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you interact with Maori in your church?	1	2	3	4	5

6. Do you have any friends who are **Maori**?

Not at all					Very many
1	2	3	4	5	

7. How would you rate the quality of your contact with **Maori**?

Very Unpleasant					Very Pleasant
1	2	3	4	5	

8. How do you feel about **Maori**?

I feel:	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very much	Extremely
Angry	1	2	3	4	5
Hopeful	1	2	3	4	5
Outraged	1	2	3	4	5
Pleased	1	2	3	4	5
Hostile	1	2	3	4	5
Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5
Resentful	1	2	3	4	5
Sympathetic	1	2	3	4	5
Frightened	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfied	1	2	3	4	5
Vulnerable	1	2	3	4	5
Inspired	1	2	3	4	5
Nervous	1	2	3	4	5
Fascinated	1	2	3	4	5
Anxious	1	2	3	4	5
Interested	1	2	3	4	5
Disgusted	1	2	3	4	5

9. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the following scale.

1= strongly disagree

2= mildly disagree

3= neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4= mildly agree

5= strongly agree

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
1. Maori have many qualities I admire.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The more I see Maori, the less I like them.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Maori have made an important contribution to New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
4. There are many things I like about Maori.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Things would be better in New Zealand if there were fewer Maori.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I like having Maori in my community.	1	2	3	4	5
7. In general, I have little respect for Maori.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I don't like the way Maori take advantage of their status in NZ.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Maori are basically good people.	1	2	3	4	5
10. In general, I don't like the way Maori behave.	1	2	3	4	5

10. We would like to ask you some questions about yourself. You will never be personally identified in this research project or in any publication.

1. What is your gender?	Female	Male	2. What is your age?			
	*	*				
3. Are you Tongan?	Yes	No	4. What country were you born in?	NZ	Other	
	*	*		*	*	
5. Are you a NZ citizen?	Yes	No				
	*	*				
6. What is your English language proficiency?	Poor	Below Average	Average	Above Average	Excellent	
	1	2	3	4	5	
7. What is the highest educational qualification you have achieved?	Primary school qualification	Secondary school qualification	Post secondary certificate/diploma	Vocational qualification/trade certificate	Tertiary degree	Postgraduate degree
	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Are you currently in paid employment?	Yes	No				
	*	*				
9. If you are not currently employed are you:	Looking for work?	A student?	Other?			
	*	*	*			

**Mālō e lelei**

Thank you for participating in this research. The study examined Tongans' attitudes toward Maori in New Zealand.

Previous research has shown that certain factors predict how people view members of other ethnic groups. We tend to have more negative attitudes towards groups that we have little contact with, that are perceived as threatening, that discriminate against us, and that make us feel angry or afraid. Our general attitudes about issues such as biculturalism and cultural diversity are also known to affect our perceptions of ethnic groups.

This study examined the ways in which these factors work together to influence attitudes toward Maori. The research also tells us how Tongans feel about this group in comparison with other ethnic groups in New Zealand.

The research is significant because we know very little about Tongans' views on ethnic issues in general and their perceptions of native-born New Zealanders more specifically. The research is helpful because the findings will give us clues about how to improve relationships across ethnic groups in New Zealand. This is particularly important not only because the Pacific population is growing, but also because cultural diversity is increasing, and the country is becoming home to larger numbers of new immigrants.

Thank you again for participating in this research.

Colleen Ward



In order to receive your voucher, please complete the following:

Name: _____

Postal address: _____

E-mail: _____

I would like a food petrol voucher (please circle).

If you are returning this with your survey, please ensure that it is put in the separate envelope marked “voucher.” Seal the voucher envelope and return in the larger envelope along with the survey.

If you would like to receive a summary of the research findings, please tick here.

↑ I would like to receive a summary of the findings by: e-mail post (please circle one)

Appendix II

Survey Distributed to Examine Tongans' Attitudes toward New Zealand Europeans/Palangi people in New Zealand

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui



Mālōe lelei

You are invited to participate in a study about Tongans' attitudes toward Palangi. This is part of a larger project about ethnic relations in New Zealand. The research is conducted by Professor Colleen Ward of Victoria University of Wellington with the support of Tongan field assistants.

Your participation in the project will involve completing a questionnaire. This will take approximately 20-30 minutes.

All responses are ANONYMOUS.

You do not have to complete this survey. Your participation is VOLUNTARY. If you begin the survey but decide not to finish it, you may withdraw from the research without having to give a reason.

If you complete the questionnaire it will be understood that:

- d) you have consented to participate in the research
- e) you consent to publication of the results, under the condition that your participation remains anonymous, and
- f) you will receive a \$10 food or petrol voucher as a token of our appreciation for your participation.

Please note that the data collected for this study will remain with the investigator, be stored securely for at least five years, and be shared only with competent professionals on a case by case basis.

If you have any queries about the project, you may contact Professor Colleen Ward at the School of Psychology, Victoria University of Wellington, P.O. Box 600, Wellington. Phone: 04-4636037. Email: Colleen.Ward@vuw.ac.nz.

The results of the study will be posted at www.vuw.ac.nz/cacr no later than March 2011. You may also request a copy of the results to be mailed to you.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Colleen Ward

Professor of Psychology

Please read each question carefully, but give the response that first comes to mind. There are no right or wrong answers. We are only interested in your opinions.

Instructions

Because this questionnaire will be recorded using a digital scanner, please mark your responses carefully. Please use a black or blue pen, and indicate your answers in this way:

1. Statement	1 2 ● 4 5
--------------	-------------------------------

If you need to change an answer, please cross out the incorrect one this way:

1. Statement	1 2 ● ● 5
--------------	--------------------------------

On the following pages, we will ask some questions about yourself and how you behave in particular situations. Please answer the question using the provided rating scales. For example, fill in 2 if you eat fruit only very seldom. Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

	Never	Very Seldom	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Very Frequently	Always
1. I eat fruit.	1	●	3	4	5	6	7



1. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the following scale.

- 1= strongly disagree
- 2= mildly disagree
- 3= neutral, neither agree nor disagree
- 4= mildly agree
- 5= strongly agree

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
1. We should recognise that cultural and racial diversity is a fundamental characteristic of New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is appropriate that Maori (te reo) is an official language of New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
3. It is a good thing to have festivals that reflect the cultural diversity of New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It is only fair that Maori be compensated for the loss of their land.	1	2	3	4	5
5. It is a good thing for any society to be made up of people from different races, religions and cultures.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Waitangi Day should be a national celebration of biculturalism.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Iwi (Maori tribes) should have the basic right to manage their own affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
8. It is important to reduce economic inequalities across ethnic groups in New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
9. It is important to recognise that New Zealand is a bicultural country.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Ethnic groups should be encouraged to maintain their native languages.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Maori language should be taught in all primary schools.	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is important that the government does not interfere with iwi (tribal) affairs.	1	2	3	4	5
13. It is important to accept a wide variety of cultures in New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
14. It is important to close the socio-economic gaps between Maori and Palangi/NZ Europeans.	1	2	3	4	5

2. What are your views about the different ethnic groups in New Zealand? Please rate each of the following groups from 0 to 100, where 0 is very unfavourable and 100 very favourable.

Chinese _____

Samoan _____

Indian _____

Maori _____

Fijian _____

Tongan _____

Palangi/ NZ European _____

3. Please indicate how often you have personally experienced the following forms of mistreatment by **Palangi** in your day-to-day life in New Zealand on the following scale.

- 1= never
- 2= rarely
- 3= sometimes
- 4= often

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
1. They disrespected you.	1	2	3	4
2. They provided you with poor service in restaurants or stores.	1	2	3	4
3. They acted as if you were unintelligent.	1	2	3	4
4. They acted as if they were better than you.	1	2	3	4
5. They acted as if they were afraid of you.	1	2	3	4
6. They acted as if they thought you were dishonest.	1	2	3	4
7. They called you names or insulted you.	1	2	3	4
8. They threatened or harassed you.	1	2	3	4

4. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about **Palangi** people.

1= strongly disagree

2= mildly disagree

3= neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4= mildly agree

5= strongly agree

Palangi...	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
1. Have too much political power.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Have values that are not compatible with Tongan values.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Have an unfair share of the country's resources.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Do not appreciate Tongan culture.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Get preference in obtaining rental housing.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Do not share our views on life.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Get better health care services than Tongans.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Have some unacceptable traditions.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Increase the crime rate in this country.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Want Tongans to give up their culture.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Are a drain on the country's welfare services.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Are not religious people.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Decrease job opportunities for Tongans.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Threaten our culture.	1	2	3	4	5

5. The following questions relate to how often you spend time with **Palangi** people.

- 1= never
- 2= hardly ever
- 3= sometimes
- 4= often
- 5= very often

	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Often	Very often
1. How often do you interact with Palangi in your school or workplace?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How often do you interact with Palangi in your social life?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How often do you interact with Palangi in your neighbourhood?	1	2	3	4	5
4. How often do you interact with Palangi in your church?	1	2	3	4	5

6. Do you have any friends who are **Palangi**?

Not at all					Very many	
1	2	3	4	5		

7. How would you rate the quality of your contact with **Palangi**?

Very Unpleasant					Very Pleasant	
1	2	3	4	5		

8. How do you feel about **Palangi**?

I feel:	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very much	Extremely
Angry	1	2	3	4	5
Hopeful	1	2	3	4	5
Outraged	1	2	3	4	5
Pleased	1	2	3	4	5
Hostile	1	2	3	4	5
Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5
Resentful	1	2	3	4	5
Sympathetic	1	2	3	4	5
Frightened	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfied	1	2	3	4	5
Vulnerable	1	2	3	4	5
Inspired	1	2	3	4	5
Nervous	1	2	3	4	5
Fascinated	1	2	3	4	5
Anxious	1	2	3	4	5
Interested	1	2	3	4	5
Disgusted	1	2	3	4	5

9. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement using the following scale.

1= strongly disagree

2= mildly disagree

3= neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4= mildly agree

5= strongly agree

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neutral	Mildly agree	Strongly agree
1. Palangi have many qualities I admire.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The more I see Palangi, the less I like them.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Palangi have made an important contribution to New Zealand.	1	2	3	4	5
4. There are many things I like about Palangi.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Things would be better in New Zealand if there were fewer Palangi.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I like having Palangi in my community.	1	2	3	4	5
7. In general, I have little respect for Palangi.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I don't like the way Palangi take advantage of their status in NZ.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Palangi are basically good people.	1	2	3	4	5
10. In general, I don't like the way Palangi behave.	1	2	3	4	5

10. We would like to ask you some questions about yourself. You will never be personally identified in this research project or in any publication.

1. **What is your gender?** Female Male
- * *
2. **What is your age?** _____
3. **Are you Tongan?** Yes No
- * *
4. **What country were you born in?** NZ Other
- * *
5. **Are you a NZ citizen?** Yes No
- * *
6. **What is your English language proficiency?**
- | | | | | |
|------|---------------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| Poor | Below Average | Average | Above Average | Excellent |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
7. **What is the highest educational qualification you have achieved?**
- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|---------------------|
| Primary school qualification | Secondary school qualification | Post secondary certificate/diploma | Vocational qualification/trade certificate | Tertiary degree | Postgraduate degree |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
8. **Are you currently in paid employment?** Yes No
- * *
9. **If you are not currently employed are you:**
- | | | |
|-------------------|------------|--------|
| Looking for work? | A student? | Other? |
| * | * | * |



Mālō e lelei

Thank you for participating in this research. The study examined Tongans' attitudes toward Palangi in New Zealand.

Previous research has shown that certain factors predict how people view members of other ethnic groups. We tend to have more negative attitudes towards groups that we have little contact with, that are perceived as threatening, that discriminate against us, and that make us feel angry or afraid. Our general attitudes about issues such as biculturalism and cultural diversity are also known to affect our perceptions of ethnic groups.

This study examined the ways in which these factors work together to influence attitudes toward Palangi. The research also tells us how Tongans feel about this group in comparison with other ethnic groups in New Zealand.

The research is significant because we know very little about Tongans' views on ethnic issues in general and their perceptions of native-born New Zealanders more specifically. The research is helpful because the findings will give us clues about how to improve relationships across ethnic groups in New Zealand. This is particularly important not only because the Pacific population is growing, but also because cultural diversity is increasing, and the country is becoming home to larger numbers of new immigrants.

Thank you again for participating in this research.

Colleen Ward



In order to receive your voucher, please complete the following:

Name: _____

Postal address: _____

E-mail: _____

I would like a food petrol voucher (please circle).

If you are returning this with your survey, please ensure that it is put in the separate envelope marked “voucher.” Seal the voucher envelope and return in the larger envelope along with the survey.

If you would like to receive a summary of the research findings, please tick here.

↑ I would like to receive a summary of the findings by: e-mail post (please circle one)