

Summary

The Effect of Infrahumanization on Support for Intergroup Peace Intentions

Ahmet Demirdağ¹

Ankara University

Derya Hasta²

Ankara University

Full citation for this article:

Demirdağ & Hasta (2020). The effect of infrahumanization on support for intergroup peace intentions. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 35(Özel Sayı), 34-55.

A successful peace process and a lasting peace need extensive support from the majority of the society (Bar-Tal, 2000). It has been argued that one of the key elements that hinder social support to peace efforts is the denial of full humanity to the adversary (Bar-Tal & Ben-nink, 2004; Kelman, 2008; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008). Consistent with this, research suggests that a crucial prerequisite of sustainable intergroup peace after intractable conflicts is that the conflicting parties should stop dehumanizing each other (e.g., Tam et al., 2008; Wohl & Branscombe, 2005).

Data indicate that at least one-third of the Turkish society strictly opposed a peace process initiated in 2013 regarding the Kurdish question in Turkey (Bilgesam, 2013; Habertürk, 2013; T24, 2013). This study aims to explore whether the level of support for the peace process among Turkish and Kurdish groups is related to infrahumanization.

According to infrahumanization theory (Leyens et al., 2000, 2007), people tend to perceive outgroups as less than humans through attributing more uniquely human emotions (i.e., secondary emotions, such as hope, pride, shame, guilt) to their ingroups than to outgroups. However, they do not show such a bias in attributing non-uniquely human emotions (i.e., primary emotions, such as surprise, pleasure, fear, sadness) to the ingroup and outgroup.

This tendency of ascribing less uniquely human emotions to outgroups, in turn, results in discriminatory attitudes and behaviors toward outgroups. Research indicates that the more secondary emotions are attributed to an outgroup, the more the possibility that it receives help and fine treatment (Cuddy et al., 2007; DeLuca-McLean & Castano, 2009). More importantly, regarding phenomena related to intergroup peace, it has been shown that associating a rival group with lesser secondary emotions is related to unwillingness to forgive (Tam et al., 2007), to

empathize with (Cehajic et al., 2009), to accept an apology from (Wohl et al., 2012), and to stop blaming (An-drighetto et al., 2012) this group for its past misdeeds.

Moreover, expressing oneself using secondary emotions increases the perceived humanity of ingroup members but decreases the perceived humanity of outgroup members since outgroups are not believed to possess human essence (Vaes et al., 2006). Thus, when outgroup members express themselves with secondary emotions, they are reacted negatively or unpleasantly (e.g., Vaes et al., 2003, 2011). In line with this, when an outgroup offers an apology with secondary emotions for its past aggression against the ingroup, the likelihood of acceptance of this apology is significantly decreased, compared to when expressing the apology using primary emotions (Wohl et al., 2012).

In light of this literature, the following hypotheses are tested:

1. When a pro-peace process call is made by an ingroup versus outgroup member, the outgroup member will be ascribed less secondary emotions than the ingroup member; and the peace process will be less supported after the outgroup's peace call. (Study 1)
2. When a pro-peace process call is made by an ingroup versus outgroup member using secondary emotions, the outgroup member will be attributed less secondary emotions than the ingroup member, and the peace process will be less supported after the outgroup's peace call. (Study 2)
3. When a pro-peace process call is made by an ingroup versus outgroup member using primary emotions, there will be neither a differentiation in the attribution of secondary emotions to the ingroup and outgroup members nor a differentiation in the level of support for the peace process. (Study 2)

Address for Correspondence: ¹Res. Asst. Ahmet Demirdağ, Ankara University, Faculty of Languages and History-Geography, Department of Psychology, 06100 Sıhhiye / Ankara, ahmetdemirdagg@gmail.com, ORC-ID: 0000-0002-1288-4830

²Assoc. Prof., Ankara University, Faculty of Languages and History-Geography, Department of Psychology, dhasta@ankara.edu.tr, ORC-ID: 0000-0002-6299-0666

Study 1

Method

Participants

Participants were 86 undergraduates from public universities in Ankara and Mardin ($M_{age} = 21.55$, $SD = 2.93$; 42 Kurdish, 44 Turkish; 70% female, 30% male).

Materials and Procedure

Turkish and Kurdish participants read a pro-peace call consisted of 120 words and supposedly made by a member of an activist group whose aim is to support the peace process and who has no political ties with any political groups. The call briefly mentions the history and current status of the Kurdish problem and asks the reader to support their pro-peace activities. Participants were randomly assigned to ingroup and outgroup conditions. For ingroup-outgroup manipulation, before reading the peace call, participants were given a written instruction in which they were asked to think that the pro-peace call was made personally to them by either an ingroup or an outgroup member (i.e., Turkish or Kurdish).

Dependent Measures

After reading the pro-peace call, participants completed *Infrahumanization* and *Peace Process Support* scales, respectively, both of which were developed in a pilot study.

The *Infrahumanization Scale* consists of six primary emotions (three positive and three negative emotions, respectively: surprise, caring, calmness; panic, anger, irritation; $\alpha: .63$) and six secondary emotions (three positive and three negative emotions, respectively: love, sympathy, nostalgia, melancholy, resentment, guilt; $\alpha: .62$). Pre-tests were conducted on pilot data to ensure that the secondary emotions have higher humanity ratings than the primary emotions, with no difference of valence (positivity level) between them. The participants were asked to decide to what extent the pro-peace activist is able to experience each of the 12 emotions on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *extremely*). The lower scores on the secondary emotions scale indicate more infrahumanization of the target. Primary emotions do not reflect infrahumanization. They were used for control purposes.

The *Peace Process Support Scale* consists of five items measuring the extent to which one is willing to support the peace process behaviorally (e.g., "To distribute leaflets supporting the peace process"). Three of the items were adapted from Pereira et al.

(2009), while two items were developed by the researchers. The participants were asked first to think the actions in the scale that were offered to them by the pro-peace activist and then to decide to what extent they are willing to follow the offers on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *extremely*). Higher scores indicate higher intention to support the peace process ($\alpha: .94$).

Results and Discussion

The primary emotions, secondary emotions, and peace process support scores were submitted to a 2 (participant's ethnicity: Turkish-Kurdish) X 2 (pro-peace activist's ethnicity: Turkish-Kurdish) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The analysis produced a significant participant's ethnicity X pro-peace activist's ethnicity interaction for secondary emotions ($F(1,82) = 21.39$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .21$) and the peace process support scale ($F(1,82) = 13.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$), but not for primary emotions ($F < 1$). As hypothesized, Turkish participants attributed less secondary emotions to a Kurdish pro-peace activist than a Turkish pro-peace activist; similarly, the Kurdish participants attributed less secondary emotions to a Turkish pro-peace activist than a Kurdish pro-peace activist, suggesting that participants from both ethnicities favor the ingroup pro-peace activist over the outgroup one when attributing uniquely human emotions. However, neither Turkish participants nor Kurdish participants differentiated their ingroup from the outgroup when attributing primary emotions. Together, these results suggest that both Turkish and Kurdish participants tended to infrahumanize a pro-peace activist from the other ethnicity by less ascribing uniquely human emotions to them after reading their pro-peace call. Furthermore, Turkish participants supported the peace process less when the pro-peace call was made by a Kurdish activist. However, Kurdish participants' support for the peace process did not differ as a function of whether it was made by a Turkish or Kurdish activist. Consistent with infrahumanization literature, these findings imply that, for Turkish participants (but not for Kurdish participants), infrahumanization of the target resulted in less support for the peace process when the peace call was made by the outgroup. Moreover, these findings suggest that Kurdish participants' support for the peace process was related to neither the ethnicity of the pro-peace activist nor the degree to which one has been infrahumanized. This finding can be interpreted within the framework of collective action research (see general discussion below).

Study 2

Method

Participants

Participants were 365 undergraduates from public universities in Ankara and Mardin ($M_{age} = 22.21$, $SD = 3.23$; 165 Kurdish, 200 Turkish; 60% female, 40% male).

Materials and Procedure

The manipulation material and procedure were identical to those used in the first study, with one exception: Eight new conditions were added to the design. To this end, an additional paragraph consisting of 22 to 29 words was added to the pro-peace call. In the paragraph, a Turkish or Kurdish pro-peace activist expresses their emotions about the peace process using predetermined primary or secondary emotions. Based on the condition, the pro-peace call includes pairs of positive primary emotions (pleasure, affection), positive secondary emotions (hope, pride), negative primary emotions (fear, sadness), or negative secondary emotions (disappointment, disenchantment). Pre-tests were conducted on pilot data to ensure that the secondary emotions have higher humanity ratings than the primary emotions, with no difference of valence between them. Turkish and Kurdish participants were randomly assigned to a 2 (pro-peace activist ethnicity: Turkish-Kurdish) X 2 (emotion type: primary-secondary) X 2 (emotion valence: positive-negative) between subject factorial design. All instructions and procedures, including ingroup-outgroup manipulation and random assignment procedures, were identical to those in the first study.

Dependent Measures

After reading the pro-peace call, participants completed the same *Infrahumanization* (primary emotions, $\alpha: .66$; secondary emotions, $\alpha: .59$) and *Peace Process Support* ($\alpha: .95$) scales used in the first study.

Results and Discussion

The primary emotions, secondary emotions, and peace process support scores were submitted to a 2 (pro-peace activist ethnicity: Turkish-Kurdish) X 2 (emotion type: primary-secondary) X 2 (emotion valence: positive-negative) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Univariate analyses were performed on significant effects obtained in MANOVA.

The ingroup-outgroup main effect

The analysis yielded a significant pro-peace activist's ethnicity main effect for primary emotions ($F(1,192)$

$= 6.73, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03; F(1,157) = 13.20, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$), secondary emotions ($F(1,192) = 34.10, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15; F(1,157) = 22.05, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$), and support for the peace process ($F(1,192) = 7.34, p < .01, \eta^2 = .04; F(1,157) = 3.37, p = .068, \eta^2 = .02$), for Turkish and Kurdish participants respectively. Both Turkish and Kurdish participants attributed less secondary emotions to the outgroup pro-peace activist than to ingroup pro-peace activist, suggesting that both groups infrahumanize the outgroup (the same pattern in the attribution of primary emotions points to the ingroup favoritism effect. Yet the associated effect sizes suggest that the effect of infrahumanization exists beyond this bias). Further, both of the groups also supported the peace process less when the pro-peace call was made by an outgroup pro-peace activist. Together, these findings imply that infrahumanization of the outgroup translated into a decline in intentions to support the peace process.

The ingroup-outgroup X emotion type interaction

For Turkish participants, a significant emotion type X pro-peace activist's ethnicity interaction was obtained for secondary emotions ($F(1,192) = 5.39, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$), but not for primary emotions ($F < 1$) and support for the peace process ($F(1,192) = 2.68, ns, \eta^2 = .01$). For Kurdish participants, this interaction was significant for all dependent variables: Secondary emotions, $F(1,157) = 51.68, p < .001, \eta^2 = .25$, primary emotions, $F(1,157) = 8.44, p < .01, \eta^2 = .05$, and support for the peace process, $F(1,157) = 25.70, p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$. Specifically, Turkish and Kurdish participants attributed less secondary emotions to the outgroup member than the ingroup member when they express the pro-peace call with secondary emotions. Turkish and Kurdish participants also supported the peace process less when the outgroup member made the pro-peace process call with secondary emotions (the difference was in the expected direction but not significant in the Turkish sample). These results suggest that, for both groups, receiving a pro-peace call from the outgroup containing secondary emotions leads to infrahumanization of the target, resulting in lesser support for the peace process.

As pointed out above, we obtained some unexpected findings implying that ingroup favoritism may have confounded the participants' responses. Regarding ingroup-outgroup main effects, both Turkish and Kurdish participants attributed more primary emotions to the ingroup than the outgroup. Concerning ingroup-outgroup X emotion type interactions, Turkish participants attributed more secondary emotions to the ingroup than to the outgroup when primary emotions were used in the pro-peace call. Kurdish participants attributed more primary emotions to the ingroup than to the outgroup when

the pro-peace call was made with secondary emotions. These results suggest that Turkish and Kurdish participants also tend to favor their ingroup in general over the outgroup, beyond or in addition to inhumanizing the outgroup—i.e., an ingroup favoritism effect in perceiving the ingroup as being more emotional than the outgroup. However, one should also note that the magnitude of effect sizes for attribution of secondary emotions (i.e., inhumanization) are bigger than those for attribution of primary emotions, meaning that there is a unique effect of inhumanization above and beyond ingroup favoritism.

General Discussion

The findings from both studies suggest that Turkish and Kurdish participants are inclined to inhumanize the outgroup by associating its members with secondary emotions less than ingroup members, and accordingly, are reluctant to back the peace efforts made by the outgroup. This pattern is more pronounced for both groups when the pro-peace call contains secondary emotions, as opposed to primary emotions. In other words, pro-peace efforts by the outgroup expressed with secondary emotions decrease the willingness of both ethnicities to support these efforts, presumably, because they do not believe that the other group has the capacity to experience these emotions. One notable finding was that Kurdish participants' willingness to support the peace process was higher than Turkish participants' willingness in both studies. This is in line with the collective action research, which demonstrates that low-status groups are more motivated to participate in collective action that promises a change in favor of their group's interests. As members of the low-status group, Kurdish participants' responses may be influenced by their perception that they have suffered more from the decades-long armed conflict in the country's Kurdish populated areas. Overall, the results from both studies are generally in line with our predictions and suggest that inhumanization of outgroups can lead to unfavorable reactions to outgroups' requests regarding support for intergroup peace, especially when the request contains secondary emotions.

References

- Andrighetto, L., Mari, S., Volpato, C., & Behluli, B. (2012). Reducing competitive victimhood in Kosovo: The role of extended contact and common ingroup identity. *Political Psychology, 33*(4), 513-529. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00887.x.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2000). From intractable conflict through conflict resolution to reconciliation: Psychological analysis. *Political Psychology, 21*(2), 351-370. doi:10.2307/3791795.
- Bar-Tal, D. & Bennink, G. H. (2004). The nature of reconciliation as an outcome and as a process. In Yaacov Bar-Siman-Tov (Ed.), *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation* (ps. 11-38). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bilgesam (June 2013). Çözüm sürecine toplumsal bakış (Society's view on the peace process). Bilgesam Yayınları, Rapor No:57, Haziran 2013: <http://www.bilgesam.org/Images/Dokumanlar/9-2-2014012036cozumsureci.pdf>.
- Cehajic, S., Brown, R., & Gonzalez, R. (2009). What do I care? Perceived ingroup responsibility and dehumanisation as predictors of empathy felt for the victim group. *Group Processes ve Intergroup Relations, 12*, 715-729.
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Rock, M. S., & Norton, M. I. (2007). Aid in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina: Inferences of secondary emotions and intergroup helping. *Group Processes ve Intergroup Relations, 10*, 107-118.
- DeLuca-McLean, D. & Castano, E. (2009). Infra-Humanization of ethnic minorities: The moderating role of ideology. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 31*(2), 102-108. doi:10.1080/01973530902880258.
- Habertürk. (29 September 2013). Bugün seçim olsa (If there is an election today). Retrieved May 01, 2014, from <http://www.haberturk.com/gundem/haber/881600-bugun-secim-olsa>.
- Kelman, H. C. (2008). Reconciliation from a social-psychological perspective. In A. Nadler, T. Malloy, & J.D. Fisher (Eds.), *Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation* (ps. 15-32). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leyens, J.P., Paladino, P. M., Rodriguez, R. T., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez, A. P., & Gaunt, R. (2000). The emotional side of prejudice: The role of secondary emotions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 186-197.
- Leyens, J.P., Demoulin, S., Vaes, J., Gaunt, R., & Paladino, M. P. (2007). Infra-humanisation: The wall of group differences. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 1*, 139-172.

- Nadler, A., & Shnabel, N. (2008). Instrumental and Socioemotional Paths to Intergroup Reconciliation and the Needs-Based Model of Socioemotional Reconciliation. In A. Nadler, T. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation* (ps. 37-56). Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Pereira, C., Vala, J., & Leyens, J. P. (2009). From infrahumanization to discrimination: Mediation of symbolic threat needs egalitarian norms. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 336–344.
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Tausch, N., Maio, G., & Kenworthy, J. (2007). The impact of intergroup emotions on forgiveness in Northern Ireland. *Group Processes ve Intergroup Relations*, 10, 119–136.
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Cairns, E., Marinetti, C., Geddes, L., & Parkinson, B. (2008). Postconflict reconciliation: Intergroup forgiveness and implicit biases in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64, 303–320. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00563.x.
- T24. (13 April 2013). Çözüm sürecine kim ne kadar destek veriyor? (Who supports the solution process and to what degree?). Retrieved May 01, 2014, from <http://t24.com.tr/haber/cozum-surecine-kim-ne-kadar-destek-veriyor,227644>.
- Vaes, J., Paladino, M. P., Castelli, L., Leyens, J. P., & Giovanazzi, A. (2003). On the behavioral consequences of infra-humanization: The implicit role of uniquely human emotions in intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 1016–1034.
- Vaes, J., Paladino, M. P., & Leyens, J.P. (2006). Priming uniquely human emotions and the in-group (but not the out-group) activates humanity concepts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 169–181.
- Vaes, J., Paladino, M. P., & Magagnotti, C. (2011). The human message in politics: The impact of emotional slogans on subtle conformity. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 151, 162–179. doi: 10.1080/00224540903510829
- Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Forgiveness and collective guilt assignment to historical groups depend on level of social category inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 288–303. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.288
- Wohl, M., Hornsey, M., & Bennett, S. (2012). Why group apologies succeed and fail: Intergroup forgiveness and the role of primary and secondary emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(2), 306-322. doi:10.1037/a0024838