



Office of the Prime Minister's Chief Science Advisor
Kaitohutohu Mātanga Pūtaiao Matua ki te Pirimia

This briefing was provided to the PM by way of a summary of the Rapid Response Issue (RRI) of the New Zealand Psychology Journal dedicated to reflections on the immediate aftermath of the Christchurch shooting. The issue is publicly accessible here:

<https://www.psychology.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/NZJP-Issue-481.pdf>

The RRI brought together local experts and opinion leaders and – mindful of the low Muslim population in Aotearoa New Zealand and our (thankfully) limited experience with acts of terror – solicited expert views from Australia, the UK and the US to add to our own voices. Obviously this represents the voice of a single discipline – psychology – and other disciplines will bring other lenses with time. While effort was made to include authors beyond those psychologists practising in the Western tradition, this voice still dominates.

The briefing was prepared at pace by the Juliet Gerrard (PMCSA), Marc Wilson (Journal Editor), Ian Lambie (Chief Science Advisor for Justice) and Stuart McNaughton (Chief Science Advisor for Education). It may inform more complete pieces of evidence synthesis across the Chief Science Advisor Forum and government.

1. High level themes highlighted by the issue

1.a. What do we know about prejudice against Muslims in Aotearoa New Zealand?

1.a.i. *Terrorism anxiety is low overall but predicts antipathy towards Muslims*

Here, and elsewhere in the Western world, Muslims are viewed negatively, and more negatively than other groups defined by their religion (particularly since 9/11). It may be that New Zealanders don't have a good sense of who 'Muslims' are, because the majority of New Zealand-based Muslims are Asian (and 'Asians' are viewed considerably more positively than 'Arabs' and 'Muslims') suggesting that the community at large is operating from a stereotype. Terrorism anxiety (though low overall) predicts antipathy towards Muslims. Muslims may also be more easily 'distinguishable' from adherents to some other faiths because of dress and racial markers, and therefore a more obvious target for prejudice.

1.a.ii. *Prejudice towards Muslims reflects attitudes, education and religious knowledge, but not religion per se*

Prejudice is lower with greater knowledge of religions and with general historical and social knowledge. The more educated someone is, the more warmth towards and acceptance of Muslims and other groups. Positive attitudes to Muslims depend on having the specific knowledge of religious practices and beliefs. Attitudes towards Muslims reflect people's attitudes towards religion in general, but not their own religious affiliation or identity – Christians are no more negative about Muslims than irreligious New Zealanders and people who feel more positive to religion also feel more positive to Muslims

1.a.iii. *There is evidence that increased hours watching the 'news' is associated with increased anti Muslim prejudice*

The ways information is represented is very important; there is evidence that increased hours watching the 'news' is associated with increased anti-Muslim prejudice; this reflects selective attention by media outlets to stereotype-consistent stories about Muslims and Islam, and frames non-Islamic terrorism differently (domestic terrorism tends to use very different framing).

1.a.iv. *"In March it was Muslims, but it could also be Jews, or Hindus, or even Christians."*

John Duckitt's (2001) so-called 'Dual Process Model' of intergroup relations predicts that prejudice arises through one of two pathways, or both. Put simply, if you experience a childhood lacking in affection, you develop a cold-hearted personality that leads you to see the world as dog eat dog, and the best place to be is sitting with the big dogs at the top of the pile. Keeping your pack at the top means growling and, yes, snapping at dogs you don't like.

On the other hand, maybe your parents hugged you, but they never let a mistake or misstep go unpunished. When this happens, you develop a rigid, conforming personality that sees the world as a dangerous place where everyone is out to do you wrong. Who keeps you safe? The "authorities", of course, and you want them to punish anyone who doesn't do as they're told. How do we know who is out to do us harm? We can start with people who look and think differently.

A lot of racism can be explained by this model of childhood experience affecting our personalities, informing how we view the world and how we mitigate threats to status and security. It also explains a lot of sexism (women getting uppity and threatening the status quo) and homophobia (gays violating our traditions). But this is everyday, garden variety prejudice. Terrorist acts, though they target people based on difference, are much less common than causal racism and sexism.

These two pathways have been validated internationally and explain around half the variation in people's prejudice. Antipathy towards Muslims is predicted by both pathways, and we can infer from this that Muslims are seen both as dangerous (to both our safety and our culture) and to the social and political hierarchy. Importantly, these things also predict (in subtly different ways) negative attitudes towards other religion-based groups. The important takeaway here is that in March it was Muslims, but it could also be Jews, or Hindus, or even Christians. Indeed, Duckitt's (and other's) work also notes that prejudice is 'generalized' – people who hate Māori also tend to hate Asians, and rainbow community, and women, and ... so on. International researchers working on the '*Prejudice Census*' argue that prejudice isn't 'just' a psychological construct but also a political and performative one – prejudice can be in the eye of the beholder (reflecting the values of relevant groups), and it is a potent tool to characterise someone as prejudiced

1.a.v. *Acceptance of Muslims needs to be more than symbolic.*

Concrete forms of acceptance and multi-culturalism are required which are experienced as accommodating the everyday lives of Muslims such as prayer spaces at schools and universities, providing for cultural-based practices (e.g. halal food, alternatives to alcohol), acceptance of interactional practices (e.g. handshaking). Acceptance is also dependent on representation of Muslims in societal institutions (e.g. as teachers, as recovery / trauma psychologists). Strengthening our bicultural identity can be a basis on which to build multicultural tolerance and inclusion.

1.a.vi. *Striving for Balance.*

Young Muslims in Aotearoa / New Zealand appear able to achieve a balance between maintenance of cultural traditions and participation in and adoption of new cultural values and norms. Faith based coping strategies are once source for achieving balance. This finding also signals the role of community / civic engagement for well being.

1.b. Understanding Terror

1.b.i. *Models of understanding 'everyday' prejudice do not capture evolution into terror attacks*

At the same time, the prejudices that research has tended to focus upon are 'everyday' prejudices, and the view of the collective expertise is that these models of understanding prejudice do not capture the evolution of these banal antipathies into those embodied in terror attacks. This is a little like our ability to predict suicide – we're good at predicting suicidal thoughts (because they're relatively common, like prejudice) but we're extremely poor at predicting suicide attempts (because they involve subtly different mechanisms, and they occur at a much lower base rate).

Post-9/11 there has been an increase in attention to how extremism leading to attacks like March 15th happen. This has been a difficult topic because it is unusual in most contexts (and therefore low base rate) and comes with numerous ethical challenges – how do / should we protect the anonymity of research



‘participants’? How do we even access extremists? How do we ensure the safety of researchers if we try? These issues have prevented several fantastic research programmes before they even got off the ground. That said, there are examples of programmes that have proposed pathways to terror, one of which is covered in the RRI. Others are summarised briefly in section 3.

1.b.ii. *The dangers of “us and them” can be subverted by an inclusive definition of “us”*

Reicher and colleagues identify five steps to terrorism and describe both how this played out in Christchurch and how the Governmental response worked to delegitimize the attacks, in a way that perfectly subverted the radical agenda by the way ‘us’ was consistently and inclusively defined.

The five steps in this framework for understanding terrorism are below. Other frameworks are covered briefly in section 2.

- (1) defining the in-group (‘us’) and out-group (‘them’)
- (2) in ways that are exclusive and deny humanity and other positive traits to the outgroup. Meanwhile,
- (3) representing the in-group as noble and virtuous, and
- (4) the out-group as a (at it’s strongest an apocalyptic) threat to the in-group. Satisfying these conditions leads to the final step,
- (5) in which the destruction of the out-group is not only permissible, but morally obligatory.

1.c. National Identity, Nationalism, and Patriotism

1.c.i. *Our identities and our prejudices are a product of the communities to which we belong – reducing extremism requires an understanding of how to reduce virtual and face-to-face communities that foster these views*

Individual prejudice and intolerance are not useful concepts by themselves. We need to also understand how ideologies are formed, identities are constructed, and how to develop collective positive values and social norms. Reducing discrimination, intolerance and extremist acts depends on knowing how to prevent or reduce virtual and face to face communities which increase exclusive in-group identities and promote views such as right wing authoritarianism and social dominance that privilege higher status over lower status groups. These ideologies are associated with prejudices, and different combinations underlie how prejudice plays out with different groups (Muslims, Christians, Jews Arabs etc....).

1.c.ii. *Identifying with an in-group predicts prejudice towards groups with whom we don’t identify*

It is important that people feel an attachment to their nation (or to some other ‘thing’). Indeed, research shows we all have multiple ‘social identities’ (e.g., as a man/woman, as a New Zealander, as a Catholic, as a rugby fan, etc) and our wellbeing benefits from these. However, we also know that identifying with an ingroup predicts prejudice towards groups with whom we don’t identify. Research shows that New Zealanders define being a ‘true’ New Zealander in terms of being Pākeha or Māori. People who do not fit this ideal are excluded symbolically and behaviourally (e.g., micro-aggressions like “Your English is really good”, or “I know you live in Miramar, but where are you really from?”). A third of the people who define

New Zealand-ness in terms of race (European / Māori) are more negative towards Muslims specifically, and diversity in general.

In-group identity can increase as well as reduce tolerance and understanding. A strong 'ethnic' identity or a strong nationalism orientation if held as part of a 'majority' group (e.g. 'white'), is associated with more negative attitudes to Muslims and others. The critical conditions are whether the in-group membership (including 'ethnic') is defined exclusively or whether it also promotes collective values for civic and national affiliation. Having or developing a strong cultural identity and national or civic identity are not mutually exclusive (e.g. "A proud Muslim and a proud New Zealander"). Indeed, a strong cultural and bicultural identity can be an enabler if this is 'internalized' rather than at a surface level. Institutions such as schooling have an important role to play in the process.

1.c.iii. Biculturalism, Māori histories and knowledge

Aotearoa is a bicultural nation with a particularly concrete relationship between Māori and Pākehā, and there are ongoing challenges about remediating our colonial history. Racism, as experienced by Māori identifies having shared knowledge as critical for that process; that is, knowledge of our colonial history. However, a future narrative based on recovery and learning with shared values and norms is possible. Māori values such as Manaakitanga and whanau provide a basis for widely held norms and values underpinning inclusion and concern for others' well-being.

Bicultural identities are present in Aotearoa / New Zealand and provide a basis on which to build greater shared norms and values for inclusion and tolerance. There is evidence that a stronger identity can enable holding multiple identities, with consequent outcomes for well-being and positive mental health. There is also suggestion that mainstream media have represented the perpetrator in ways that stress his individuality, where Islamic extremism or Māori activism typically devolve to group-based categorisations. It will be important to support Māori, Muslim and other scholars to understand the events and their aftermath.

1.c.iv. Immigrant families face a multi-generational challenge here – NZ-born Muslims (for example) may know only New Zealand and self-identify as New Zealanders

Research in Europe shows that this exclusion from identity categories plays an important role in radicalization. This becomes increasingly important as generations pass, and as young people lose their attachment to their 'homeland' identity, but find themselves excluded from mainstream national identity. New Zealand is a young nation and this will be a growing challenge for us.

1.c.v. The stronger one's identification as a white New Zealander, the more opposed to multiculturalism one is

There are different ways to 'hold' your identity with your nation however. Nationalism is the uncritical belief that your nation is better than, and should be enforced upon, others. Patriotism reflects the more critical affection we feel for our nation. The stronger one's identification as a white New Zealander, the more opposed to multiculturalism one is. Pākehā who are nationalistic are twice as negative. However, Pākehā who are patriotic are half as negative.

The trust people have in the institutions of a society is lower if they are subject to discrimination and bias. Communities and institutions should focus on highlighting how identities are compatible and promote shared similarities and a common sense of belonging. The differential actions of institutions to groups



(e.g. both Muslims and Māori receiving greater surveillance than white supremacists) undermine trust or prevent trust from developing. When prejudice occurs it leads to distrust in authorities, specifically because the victim perceives that they are not seen as compatible with the dominant group.

1.c.vi. *Defining ourselves with values and behaviours of civic engagement benefits well-being, flourishing, and resilience following tragedy and adversity and allows people who may not fit the prototypical race-based understandings of New Zealandness to be included*

Civic engagement is associated with well-being and 'flourishing'. It occurs through participation (e.g. volunteering, helping neighbours), values (e.g. believing we can make the world a better place), commitment (e.g. intention to engage in voting), community belonging (e.g. involvement in groups such as sports clubs), social trust (e.g. believe most people are fair) and interpersonal generosity. Religious community engagement can have positive or negative relationships with tolerance, inclusiveness and acceptance of Muslims and others. The issue is whether the religious community increases knowledge and attitudes and social activism to challenge stereotypes, rather than encouraging faith based discrimination. For example, one study found self-identified Christians are more likely to identify with right wing authoritarianism and social dominance than non-religious participants, and of having an in-group bias towards Christians and against atheists.

2. An article by article ‘in a nutshell’ commentary by the Editor

<p>Understanding the terror attack: Some initial Steps</p>	<p><i>Margaret Wetherell</i></p>	<p>p.6</p>	<p>Margaret is the most widely-cited Psychology academic in the country, and the co-author of <i>Mapping the Language of Racism</i>.</p> <p>She suggests two things for the future: 1) Short-term, helping with trauma; 2) Longer-term, inter-disciplinary investigation with Muslim colleagues and scholars to understand “new international communities of hate”.</p> <p>She also has four specific recommendations. “Let’s not evoke lone wolves and/or the universality of prejudice”. “Focus on ideological flows and identity dynamics” (suggests we have become too accepting of hate and white ethno-nationalism and maybe Christchurch will create necessary reflection), “Supporting Muslim and Māori scholars in gazing back” (ensure that it’s not only senior white males leading the academic commentary), “understanding the fine lines of leadership”</p>
<p>Coping with loss and bereavement: An Islamic perspective</p>	<p><i>Sunnya Khawaja and Nigar G. Khawaja</i></p>	<p>p.10</p>	<p>The Khawajas (based in Queensland) were who I was pointed to by the President of the US Institute for Muslim Mental Health when I was looking for Muslim voices to drive this endeavour.</p> <p>This is an accessible introduction to Islamic approaches to the world, and specifically death. Suggests, among other things, that religious coping is important and that Muslims will take particular kinds of strength from (odd as it may sound) the timing of this atrocity during prayers, and that their loved ones will be granted a place in heaven as a result. They note that Muslims are ‘collectivist’ in their orientation and that this means a collective approach to grieving. They end with a recommendation (or rather hope) that allied health can be supported to better understand clients of different faiths, and the role of religious coping. My personal experience in the context of clinical psychology is that this is indeed a deficit.</p> <p>Highly recommended to be read in full.</p>
<p>The road to Christchurch: A tale of two leaderships</p>	<p><i>Stephen Reicher, Alex Haslam and Jay Van Bavel</i></p>	<p>p.13</p>	<p>These eminent researchers are based in Europe and Australia; Reicher has spent time in Aotearoa. This was re-printed with permission of the British Psychological Society.</p> <p>Includes a selective analysis of the manifesto, noting the tensions this involves. They describe their own theorising around radicalization and show how Christchurch ‘fits’, highlighting how the boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ are used to justify the atrocity AND how the same processes were used by Ardern to subvert the narrative. This is an elegant,</p>

			skilful, analysis and that warrants reading in full. It supports the analyses in other articles about ingroups, outgroups and the importance leaders of defining “us” as inclusively as possible.
Prejudice is about Collective Values, not a Biased Psychological System	<i>Michael J. Platow, Dirk Van Rooy, Martha Augoustinos, Russell Spears, Daniel Bar-Tal and Diana M. Grace</i>	p.16	<p>I contacted these folks because of a project they run in Australia called the Prejudice Census – an on-line questionnaire allowing people anywhere at any time to report instances of prejudice that they have experienced. Basically it collects together community experiences that those community members subjectively define as prejudice.</p> <p><i>“What we see as truth today may well be challenged as prejudice tomorrow. But if we seek a world of intergroup tolerance and acceptance, we must develop collective values and a shared definition of who we are that will enable this to come to fruition.”</i></p>
A screening instrument for assessing psychological distress following disasters: Adaptation for the March 15th, 2019 mass shootings in Christchurch, New Zealand.	<i>Martin J. Dorahy and Neville M. Blampied</i>	p.23	<p>This paper describes the adaptation of a screening tool they had initially developed for assessing post-trauma reactions to the quakes, for use with people potentially affected by the terror attacks. They identify three groups – those who show little distress, those who are moderately symptomatic and need to be watched, and those with high and diverse symptom profiles and unlikely to spontaneously ‘recover’ (thus needing immediate intervention). This approach may prove useful for future traumatic events.</p>
Exploring New Zealand National Identity and Its Importance for Attitudes toward Muslims and Diversity	<i>Kumar Yogeeswaran, M. Usman Afzali, Nadia P. Andrews, Elizabeth A. Chivers, Meng-Jie Wang, Thierry Devos, and Chris G. Sibley</i>	p.29	<p>Kumar Yogeeswaran and others at Canterbury led this work. The second author lost fifteen friends in the killings. The paper describes what a national survey suggests 15,000 people think characterises the ‘true’ New Zealander, and then use those to predict how people feel about Muslims specifically, and diversity in general. Two take away messages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The more people frame new Zealand-ness in racial and cultural heritage terms (and 35% did this) the more negative they are. - Framing national identity in terms of ‘civic’ characteristics (respecting laws and institutions) doesn’t predict more positive attitudes but it doesn’t predict negative ones either. <p>They cite research showing that framing national identity in terms of civic attributes increases the sense of belonging of Asian New Zealanders, and that conflation of whiteness with national identity reduces engagement of ‘non-whites’ in terms</p>

			<p>of things like voting and other positive behaviours, as well as producing poorer health outcomes.</p> <p>Assimilation (where migrants drop their native identity and assimilate that of the host nation) leads to more prejudice. Multiculturalism (where everyone retains their identity but alongside one another) have limited positives, and interculturalism (we strive towards a changing and new identity together) may be the way forward.</p>
<p>A Critical Narrative Review of Research about the Experiences of being Muslim in New Zealand</p>	<p><i>Colleen Ward, Jaimee Stuart & Zeenah M. Adam</i></p>	p.36	<p>Ward established the Centre for Applied Cross-Cultural Research about 15 years ago. Zeenah Adam is a Muslim clinical psychologist who completed her Master’s with Ward.</p> <p>The commentary describes how New Zealand Muslims see themselves, and ‘their pathways to positive psychological and social outcomes’.</p> <p>Some take homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best outcomes are associated with maintaining one’s original culture AND holding the host culture. E.g., “A proud Muslim and a proud New Zealander”. • Religion is an important source of coping for anyone – religion predicts better physical and mental health. • Outcomes for migrants (and anyone) are strongly predicated on having a shared sense of family beliefs, attitudes, and aspirations. Strengthening families strengthens individuals. • Stressed basic importance of understanding what Islam is for tolerance.
<p>Beyond tokenistic solidarity in the wake of the Christchurch terrorist attacks: Insights from psychology, and practical suggestions for action</p>	<p><i>Zahra Mirnajafi and Fiona Kate Barlow</i></p>	p.47	<p>Mirnajafi is an emerging Muslim researcher, Barlow is an up-and-coming researcher in intergroup tolerance. Both are based in Australia.</p> <p>They start by making the point that after an event like this, bystanders and broader community can solicit support through expressing their grief and sadness and this will help. However, for the Muslim community their grief will be ongoing, and is situated in a broader context in which Muslims are viewed with antipathy.</p> <p>The article essentially makes the point that symbolic support (talking about inclusion, etc) is important but not sufficient if it’s not accompanied by action. In fact, symbolic support without action is tokenistic, and backfires.</p> <p>Takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority group are motivated to be unprejudiced but that’s stressful. Stress can be reduced by increasing contact. - It’s existentially uncomfortable to believe we live in a world in which prejudice and terror occur. Acknowledging this makes people unpopular.

			<p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Talk to children (don't assume they're as unprejudiced as you), include Muslim teachers and administrators, narratives in schools, and Ramadan lunch spaces - In other organisation spaces, similar recommendations, including Halal options, consider 'sober tables' or parts of functions that don't include alcohol, prayer spaces, recognition of holidays, educate people to ask about propriety of shaking hands. - Educate yourself, Speak up when you see prejudice playing out, push for more inclusive representations in the media.
<p>News headlines or ideological beliefs: What affects readers' interpretations of news stories about immigration, killing in the name of religion and other topical issues? A cross-cultural analysis</p>	<p><i>Anita A. Azeem, John A. Hunter and Ted Ruffman</i></p>	<p>p.56</p>	<p>Azeem is a Muslim clinician and early-career researcher, Hunter an Irish social psychologist specialising in intergroup relations, and Ruffman is a developmental psychologist who had recently become interested in the development of prejudice in children.</p> <p>The basic question in this empirical piece is whether news media (which we know influences attitudes in the direction of framing) change people's opinions, or whether they merely 'activate' predispositions reflecting people's underlying ideology. They present data from the US and Pakistan and show that it's ideology that influences how people interpret news media. They conclude that this means one-off negative headlines aren't likely to cause change in opinions, but that ongoing negative media will likely impact.</p> <p>The particular ideological constructs they look at are social dominance and authoritarianism – this happens to be my intellectual territory too. Essentially, the extent to which you endorse social hierarchies and submission to authority and tradition are the foundation of things like your political orientation (left/right, conservative/liberal). Indeed, in NZ the dominance side is the foundation for your position on economic issues, and authority the foundation of social issue attitudes, Together they predict about half of the variation in political attitudes (that is, an R-squared of .50).</p>
<p>White Nationalism and Multiculturalism Support: Investigating the Interactive Effects of White Identity and National Attachment on Support for Multiculturalism</p>	<p><i>Danny Osborne, Nicole Satherley, Kumar Yogeeswaran, Diala Hawi & Chris G. Sibley</i></p>	<p>p.62</p>	<p>Diala Hawi is a Muslim researcher.</p> <p>The way we think about ourselves in relation to our nation can be nuanced. Nationalism is defined as the blind belief that our nation is better than others (and others should be more like ours) while patriotism reflects a love for one's nation. In this empirical piece the group investigate how nationalistic and patriotic attitudes moderate (interact with) the relationship between white identity and support for multiculturalism, and that's what they find.</p> <p>First, nationalistic attitudes predict anti-multicultural attitudes, while patriotism predicts stronger multicultural attitudes. The stronger one's identity as a white New</p>

			Zealander, the less supportive one tends to be of multiculturalism. But if you're strongly nationalistic then the relationship between white identity and multiculturalism is twice as strong, while patriotism halves it. In short – encouraging national superiority narratives and beliefs lays a stronger foundation for people to oppose multiculturalism, while emphasising patriotic (critically-informed love for one's nation) is a potential avenue for intervention.
<p>Encouraging flourishing following tragedy:</p> <p>The role of civic engagement in well-being and resilience</p>	<p><i>Jill G. Hayhurst, John A. Hunter and Ted Ruffman</i></p>	p.71	<p>In this empirical piece the authors make the argument for encouraging civic engagement as a way to increase resilience and wellbeing in the wake of tragedy. After controlling for the usual suspects (age, SES, etc) they show that about a third of participants' wellbeing is accounted for by their civic engagement, and that this engagement is strongly associated with flourishing. Civic engagement was also predictive of resilience (to a lesser extent) after controlling for SES, age, AND wellbeing.</p> <p>The basic take homes are that engagement with community, volunteerism, and helping others are just basically good for us, AND following tragedy the tendency to look after ourselves may be a natural one, but not as good for us as helping others. I imagine that the same thing would have been found after the Chch quakes (student volunteer army, etc).</p>
<p>Terrorism Anxiety and Attitudes toward Muslims</p>	<p><i>Diala Hawi, Danny Osborne, Joseph Bulbulia, and Chris G. Sibley</i></p>	p.80	<p>Another study which draws on the massive data set from the New Zealand Attitudes and Values Study. The basic finding here is that antipathy towards Muslims predicts anxiety over terrorism. Overall, terror anxiety is quite low, however. Terror anxiety was itself predicted by personality as well as by liberal/conservative orientation (and to a lesser extent left-right). Nationalism predicts more anxiety, but patriotism does not.</p> <p>I think patriotism is a good point of intervention, and things like ANZAC day both an illustration of this and a site for enhancing it.</p> <p>The authors go on to note that in spite of the association between Islamic extremism and terrorism, much domestic terrorism is carried out by non-Muslims and isn't defined in the same ways. They call for greater care by the media in elective attention and framing of acts of terror.</p>
<p>Ingroup Favouring Evaluations in Response to Belonging Threats in Public and Private Contexts</p>	<p><i>Kathryn H. Fahey, John A. Hunter, Damian Scarfe and Ted Ruffman</i></p>	p.90	<p>Another empirical (laboratory) piece from Otago. Hunter has worked for decades in the context of identity research which shows, among other things, that feeling identification with something (e.g., identifying as a New Zealander, a rugby fan, a woman, etc) is good for you, it also predicts antagonism towards outgroups (people who aren't your group). He's recently focused instead on belonging and shows that this tends to be associated with more positive outcomes both for individuals and their attitudes towards others.</p>

			<p>In this, they use a paradigm called ‘Cyberball’ in which you deliberately ostracise people. They show that people who are ostracised show an ingroup-bias – they still say they like their group more than another group, even though they’ve been left out. One explanation is that they hope to be kept in the ingroup.</p> <p>Being left out can lead to even stronger actions to remain a part of a group. Just because someone is a loner doesn’t mean they don’t want to belong.</p>
<p>They Are Us? The mediating effects of compatibility-based trust on the relationship between discrimination and overall trust</p>	<p><i>Mariska Kappmeier, Bushra Guenoun and Remaya Campbell</i></p>	p.97	<p>Guenoun is a Muslim researcher.</p> <p>This empirical piece looks at African-American and Māori New Zealander’s distrust of authorities (the police) in the face of discrimination. They test a mechanism for how discrimination might reduce trust, and report that discrimination leads to less trust, but the specific kind of trust affected is what they call ‘compatibility’ trust – whether you perceive others to think of you as like themselves. Based on this, they argue that encouraging people to share a sense of similarity reduces the damaging effects of discrimination.</p>
<p>Parent talk about the wellbeing of others in disciplinary situations relates to younger children’s empathy</p>	<p><i>Kangning Du, Mary Buchanan, Jill Hayhurst, and Ted Ruffman</i></p>	p.106	<p>Up to age six, research shows that the more parents talk about the emotions and wellbeing of others, the more empathy children display. Actually, research shows generally that talking about our own emotions is a pretty good indicator of wellbeing, and that children who grow up in environments where emotion talk is discouraged are more likely to ‘internalise’ –self-harm, get depressed, etc.</p> <p>In this study, children felt greater empathy for someone who had been harmed more, than someone who had been harmed less. Children whose parents talked about the victim’s emotions/wellbeing displayed more empathy.</p> <p>This is consistent with my own (and others’ research) on the importance of emotional understanding and skills – emotional skills are a ‘broad-spectrum antibiotic’ for wellbeing, both one’s own and that of others.</p>
<p>Representing Islam: Experiences of women wearing hijab in New Zealand</p>	<p><i>Eileen Ash, Keith Tuffin and Ella Kahu</i></p>	p.114	<p>This article is a summary of interviews with six hijab-wearing Muslim women, and it highlights several things that they routinely experience what I would consider prejudice but they don’t always interpret in that way. It also stresses how religion is a source of coping with these experiences, as is the pride in representing Islam.</p> <p>It also represents work that predates the attacks in Chch by more than a year, and was submitted to the Journal six months ago – I included it in this issue because it was timely.</p>
<p>Attitudes to Religion Predict</p>	<p><i>Benjamin R. Highland,</i></p>	p.122	<p>Another NZAVS-based empirical piece.</p>

<p>Warmth for Muslims in New Zealand</p>	<p><i>Geoffrey Troughton, John Shaver, Justin L. Barrett, Chris G. Sibley and Joseph Bulbulia</i></p>		<p>“Results show that both (1) positive general attitudes towards religion and (2) church attendance are positively correlated with warmth toward immigrants, Arabs, and Muslims. In contrast to past results, religious identification is not reliably associated with warmth toward immigrants, Arabs, or Muslims.”</p> <p>Suggests that education about religion (and not religious instruction per se) is a potential point of intervention.</p>
<p>A community-based test of the Dual Process Model of Intergroup Relations: Predicting attitudes towards Christians, Muslims, Hindus, Jews, and Atheists</p>	<p><i>Marc Stewart Wilson</i></p>	<p>p.133</p>	<p>In this I describe analysis of a data set of 1000 general population participants in a survey that included some of the standard predictors of prejudice, and asked people how they felt about Muslims, Christians, Hindus, Jews, and Atheists. The take homes include that Muslims, alone of the religion groups, we viewed negatively on average. Antipathy towards Muslims was explained by a combination of concern that the world is dangerous <i>and</i> competitive. Muslims threaten both people’s sense of physical and cultural security, as well as the ‘traditional’ social hierarchy. Importantly, attitudes towards Hindus were similarly predicted, while attitudes towards Jews were predicted by competitive worldviews, and attitudes towards Christians are murky – competitive worldviews predict antipathy, but believing the world is dangerous means you like Christians more. The important thing is that the same things that predict disliking Muslims are also associated with dislike for other religion-based groups...</p>
<p>“This is not us”: But it is. Talking about the right time to raise the issue of colonisation</p>	<p><i>Waikaremoana Waitoki</i></p>	<p>p.140</p>	<p>Moana Waitoki is President-elect of the NZ Psyc Society, and was very active in identifying ways for the NZPsS to help. Some of these are described in the paper, and she goes on to make a broader point about race in New Zealand. I suspect this may be one of the more controversial pieces in the issue. She finishes with ten recommendations that overlap with those offered by other contributors. Highly recommended to be read in full.</p>