

Divided by a common language

Divided by a common language?: Conceptualizing identity, discrimination, and alienation.

Leda Blackwood^I

Nick Hopkins^{II}

Steve Reicher^I

School of Psychology, University of St. Andrews^I

School of Psychology, University of Dundee^{II}

Author note: This research was funded by the Scottish Institute of Policing Research.

Address for correspondence: Leda Blackwood, School of Psychology, University of St. Andrews,

St. Andrews, Fife. KY16 9JU. Email: lmb11@st-andrews.ac.uk

Divided by a common language

Introduction

Post 9/11, the Madrid bombing of 11th March 2004 and the London bombings of 7/7, and following the discovery that (in many cases) home-grown terrorists had been responsible, there has been a sea change in the way cultural difference is viewed. Where once difference was prized as the sign of a vibrant society (Prins & Salisbury, 2008), it is now feared as a sign of retreat from civil engagement (Cantle, 2001), perhaps even a retreat towards more sinister forces that stand against society. This new perspective was forcefully expressed in a speech by the British Prime Minister, David Cameron:

“In the UK, some young men find it hard to identify with the traditional Islam practiced at home by their parents, whose customs can seem staid when transplanted to modern Western countries. But these young men also find it hard to identify with Britain too, because we have allowed the weakening of our collective identity. Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream. We’ve failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they want to belong. We’ve even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run completely counter to our values.”

David Cameron, 5th Feb, 2011, Munich Security Conference

For Cameron, for his government and for the State, alienation from the ‘mainstream’ is a problem because it makes people – notably young Muslim men – vulnerable to recruitment by extremists and hence a threat. This formulation of the problem encourages the linking of security, especially counter-terrorism, with concerns over social cohesion and support for integrationist policies (see Husband & Alam, 2011).

The UK government’s ‘Prevent’ strategy (HM Government, 2008, 2011), which aims to

Divided by a common language

“prevent people from being drawn into terrorism and ensure that they are given appropriate advice and support” (UK Home Office, 2011), is underpinned by this conceptualisation of the crisis we face. Under the umbrella of ‘Prevent’, a raft of initiatives has been funded to build resilient communities; challenge extremist ideology and support mainstream voices; and to support young people who have been identified as vulnerable. In this chapter we focus on just one of these initiatives, the Workshop for Raising Awareness about Prevent (Home Office: WRAP), which is designed for public sector professionals who have a duty of care (e.g., teachers, youth workers, health workers), as well as those in the private sector (e.g., shopping centre security officers). For us, WRAP is significant because it provides a clear explication of the dominant model of the radicalisation process that informs national policy and practice.

In this chapter we consider how the underlying assumptions of the dominant model fit with current social psychological theorising and research. In doing so, one of our aims is to untangle our own tongues. Over the last two years we have been conducting research with Muslim communities in Scotland. We have been looking at interactions with societal authorities and how these may contribute to processes of alienation, and indeed, to rendering people open to the influence of ‘radical’ voices. In the course of our work, we have met many senior police officers, including some centrally involved in counter-terrorism measures. In these meetings, we have been struck by the extent to which we share a common language. Like us, they speak about the importance of identity and the pernicious effects of prejudice and discrimination. Moreover, there is a willingness to acknowledge that the processes that radicalise are quite normal and intelligible.

Yet, despite such agreement, we constantly find ourselves in difficulty when trying to communicate with those promoting the current counter-terrorism agenda. In part, this may be because our interests differ. The police have a practical interest in *identifying* potential extremists and either preventing their radicalisation or de-radicalising them. Accordingly, the police’s focus – both analytically and practically – is on ‘them’ and on ‘their’ vulnerability. However, our interest is in *practices contributing* to alienation – how majority society and in particular societal

Divided by a common language

representatives come to be seen as ‘other’ – and so our gaze is on the dynamic interaction between the authorities and Muslims. While this difference in interest is important, we believe that there is more at issue: Perhaps it is our use of the same terms to denote different things that impedes communication?

Accordingly, our aim in this chapter is to analyse precisely how a common language divides us as researchers from the authorities. We will compare and contrast the ‘official’ analysis of how identity, influence and discrimination combine to drive alienation and radicalisation, with our own analysis of these things. We hope this is not mere self-indulgence, but can serve the serious purpose of elucidating how we, as social-psychologists, can contribute to the understanding of alienation and radicalisation. The importance of this has been driven home to us by an awareness of how social psychological theories are not simply used to explain the world. Rather, they are used in official policies to shape the world people – especially minorities – occupy and experience.

This link between theory and practice is central to our analysis of WRAP. WRAP is a training workshop organised around a video. It comes with a facilitator’s handbook detailing a number of group exercises in which participants explore the processes through which people are radicalised. In 2010, two of the authors attended one of the first WRAP sessions conducted in the UK. Drawing on our own observations and on supporting documentation (e.g., the Facilitator’s Handbook), we will first describe the structure and logic of the WRAP workshop and how this is designed to develop participants’ understanding of radicalisation processes to the point where people can recognize and refer individuals who may be vulnerable. This will allow us to clarify the key social-psychological assumptions of the dominant model. We will then discuss our own approach which is rooted in social identity theorising (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987). In doing so it will become ever-clearer how the common vocabulary of identity, influence and discrimination divides us.

To foreshadow the argument: WRAP is based on an explanation of radicalisation processes as deriving from (a) a series of ‘risk factors’, including racism and discrimination, which (b)

Divided by a common language

undermine individual identity, and therefore, (c) make people more receptive to social influence by radical individuals and groups. This leads to a practical focus on identifying individuals who are at risk either because of their individual biography or because of their withdrawal from mainstream cultural practices. By contrast, we argue that racism and discrimination are (a) social practices which embody an alienated relationship with the dominant society, and hence, (b) are central to the formation of identities in which authorities are outgroup and those who challenge them are ingroup. Our approach leads to a practical focus on the relationship between authorities and minorities and on the ways in which the treatment of minorities by authorities may serve to sustain a notion of these authorities as an antagonist. More specifically, and more troubling as concerns WRAP and other counter-terrorism measures, we address whether the very act of focussing on minority cultural expression as a sign of danger may be one of the things that sours the relationship between minority group members, officialdom, and majority society more generally.

The WRAP analysis

WRAP opens with a characterisation of terrorism as a social crime which, much like stealing to support a drug habit, can best be tackled by rooting out and addressing the underlying social and psychological causes. Indeed, the message conveyed in the video is that *'If terrorism is a social crime, then there's only one place to look for a solution: our communities'*. This not only makes terrorism an issue of everyday concern to community members, it also represents a first step to explicating the radicalisation process in terms that may be familiar through their association with other social crimes (e.g., drug use).

The workshop progresses this message by first asking participants to identify common crimes affecting their community. Everything from low-level littering and graffiti to gang violence and murder were listed and the facilitator listed terrorism alongside these others as a crime to which all were vulnerable. Returning to the video, the narrator, Dr Phil Hammond (a GP, comedian and after-dinner speaker) provided a brief history of terrorism before interviewing a historian. Asked "is

Divided by a common language

there such a thing as a typical terrorist?” the historian explained “we’re all capable of being enthusiasts for a cause” and that although there were occasional acts carried out by lone individuals, group dynamics were crucial in producing terrorism. Indeed he concluded:

“History proves it. The groups we surround ourselves with define who we are and what we do. A sense of belonging can drive otherwise ordinary people, especially the young and vulnerable, to extremes.”

Social influence and the group

This awareness of the role of group processes has much to recommend it. Gone is the simplistic notion that terrorists are ‘mad’ or ‘bad’ – or as George Bush put it to a meeting of Muslim leaders at the White House on 26th September 2001: “they’re flat evil”. Rather than terrorist action being incomprehensible, we are encouraged to see it as the outcome of a process familiar to us all – a process of social influence. The next group exercise elaborated on this by inviting participants to return to their list of community crimes and to identify whether these crimes were purely individual acts or would likely feature “persuasion, inducement, or incitement”. Summarising participants’ deliberations, the facilitator concluded that “most crimes have a strong social element to them and individuals can be manipulated into doing things they might not ordinarily do”. Participants were then invited to share their own stories of where they themselves had succumbed to social influence. By way of introduction, the facilitator volunteered a personal example in which she and her husband sought to influence each other in relation to how they spent their Saturday afternoons (watching sport or going shopping). At the end of this interactive session the facilitator emphasised that “criminals and terrorists don’t do anything different to what we do in normal life; they use normal processes”.

On the one hand, what we see here is a normalisation of social influence: it is part of the fabric of our everyday lives. On the other hand, it is a very limited conceptualisation. It is one in which influence is mediated by inter-personal power and manipulation, and results in people being

Divided by a common language

pulled away from what they actually wanted – and by implication from their true selves. This understanding has important consequences for the unfolding analysis of radicalisation processes. As we will see in the next section, the analytic focus is on the individual and his/her vulnerabilities, and on pressure from other people that leads the individual to be overwhelmed and coerced into doing something they did not really want to do.

Corroding Identity

One of the most striking features of the workshop was the use of a powerful scene from a commercial film *This is England* (2006), which depicts the lives of white working class young people in the early 1980's (a period of economic and social crisis). The clip shown features a young adolescent (Shaun) drawn to racist thuggery by an older man (Combo). The interaction between the two – a young lad who has lost his father in the Falklands War, and a racist skinhead with a criminal record – is dramatic. On the one hand there is Shaun and his experience of poverty, bullying and the loss of his father. On the other is the charismatic Combo. Combo hones in on Shaun's vulnerability and offers him the option of joining an alternative family where he can feel pride in himself and solidarity with the memory of his father. The workshop's analysis of how Combo does this is crucial: he takes Shaun's *personal* loss and links it to a *collective* narrative about Thatcher's Britain. What happened to Shaun's father, Combo argues, exemplifies how the lives of white working-class people are treated as valueless in a country surrendered to immigrants.

The critical assumption here is that the political narrative offered by the influence agent (Combo) is entirely parasitic upon the vulnerability of the influence target (Shaun). Or, to put it the other way round, the vulnerable are passive vessels whose understanding is provided entirely by an outside influence agent. This omits the significance of the specific nature of the target's experience. More precisely, it omits the way in which people actively evaluate different influence agents in terms of their ability to provide a perspective that makes good sense of their experiences (Hopkins, 1994).

Divided by a common language

Narrative and experience

With these ingredients in place, the workshop moved to modern Britain and the threat from Al-Qaeda-inspired terrorism. The facilitator attributed the success of Al-Qaeda to its ability to take global grievances about the West's actions in the Muslim world, and to link these to individuals' personal experience of social ills such as unemployment, racism, and family breakdown. British Muslim grievances, centred on foreign policy and on experiences of racism, discrimination, and social exclusion, are recognized as central to the problem of radicalisation. As the video's narrator explains "As a doctor, grievance is something I see a lot of. I've seen it lead to anger, to despair, to alienation; but rarely a desire to kill", and the focus then shifts to the ways in which an Al-Qaeda narrative can play on personal grievances. The dynamics involved in this exploitation are explored through an interview with a professional working in addiction and draws parallels between the susceptibilities that result in addiction and radicalisation. According to him the vulnerabilities that make someone prone to radicalisation start in early childhood "because we all rely on the sort of first years of our life to develop an identity" and he continues:

"They may be having problems in school, they may be having problems subsequent to that in terms of finding a role for themselves, finding a job, employment, issues like this, and also particularly in relationships too. [...] they can experience an episode of racism or rejection that really then opens the wound wide wide open again so that they're left with this great big gaping chasm of not sure where they fit in. Now that's when the extremists turn up, and they begin to feed them with an ideology that appears in the form of a remedy, when actually it's the worst poison."

The central message is the power of narrative to transform what is personal into a collective sense of grievance. In common with social-psychological models of collective mobilization and leadership (Reicher, Haslam, & Hopkins, 2005), recruiters are described as providing a narrative or

Divided by a common language

ideology that (a) explains people's grievances in group terms and in so doing defines a 'them and us' relationship; and (b) provides a way of acting on these grievances and so of shaping the world. However, and as we have already seen, in the WRAP analysis of these processes, the relationship between the narrative adopted and the reality of the vulnerable person's situation is not considered. This is particularly clear if we explore the way in which discrimination is conceptualized.

Discrimination is recognised as an important experience relevant to the processes of alienation and radicalisation. However, such experiences are understood as significant because they undermine the individual's ability to have a clear sense of identity and so make them vulnerable to others' influence. In an important sense, such an approach individualises the experience of discrimination and turns it into a personal vulnerability factor for social processes to operate on. This account of discrimination also places it on an equal footing with all manner of personal difficulties that make people vulnerable. One of the problems with treating all these difficulties as equivalent and as having a common effect (i.e., the degradation of the individual's identity and hence autonomy) is that our ability to understand the relationship between particular experiences and the adoption of particular identities is compromised. Once again, it becomes harder to consider how the specific experience of discrimination shapes people's sense of who they are and where they stand in relation to others (notably the dominant society and its official representatives).

This lack of attention to the specifics of experience, in turn, means that we have very little analytic purchase on the influence process. If influence is bound up with an absence of identity, as is implied in talk about the role of identity crisis in making one vulnerable to influence, then it becomes hard to see why one narrative would be adopted over another. Rather the narrative adopted by the vulnerable individual (and hence their new identity) would depend on whoever turns up—whether this is the drug pusher; the purveyor of mass destruction; or indeed the 'de-radicalising agent'. Yet, as much social psychological research shows, the influence process cannot be analysed in such a content-free manner. Not all messages are equally likely to be accepted, and these limits to the acceptance of certain messages require we pay due attention to the content of individual

Divided by a common language

identities and to the everyday lived experiences that sustain (or indeed, compromise) such self-definitions.

Referral

As detailed above, the workshop implies that participants should be alert to individual vulnerabilities and how others may exploit these. Moreover, participants were encouraged to consider referring people to the authorities, and the duty to protect vulnerable individuals from the exploitative influence of those who would corrupt them was repeatedly emphasised. Thus, in the video, a School Principal explains who the real victim was in the radicalisation process: “when we actually boil it down and we actually look at the individuals concerned, we need to think about the hearts and minds of those concerned, and they are largely the victims, because they have not been given an alternative way”.

With regard to what is being asked of participants, the emphasis is on exercising professional judgement and (in the words of the video’s narrator) “healing that wound that the violent extremist can come along and infect”. Importantly, “human relationships do the damage but human relationships can also undo the damage [... for] the simple act of talking and sharing, or recognising and referring, can make all the difference”. In this context the addiction psychiatrist mentioned earlier attributes one individual’s “de-radicalisation” to a relationship he formed with a prison guard which allowed him to see the non-Muslim world in a new light: “He was really kind to me. It can’t be right that they’re all animals in that case”. Here again, we find a refrain familiar to social psychologists: the potential for contact to challenge stereotypes and the sense of ‘us and them’ that those intent on creating conflict must create and maintain (e.g., see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Although brief, we hope the above gives some sense of the logic to the WRAP programme. As we have seen, it is permeated by talk of identity, influence and discrimination. The clearest image that results is of a young person struggling to establish an identity and who experiences a

Divided by a common language

personal crisis of some sort which makes them vulnerable to the influence of others. The humiliation of discrimination is one such crisis, but only one amongst many. These include grievances about foreign policy, educational failure, drug use, and the idea (voiced by the addiction psychiatrist) that “young Muslims today don’t have an obvious cultural home”.

With this cocktail of concepts permeating the ways in which radicalisation is spoken about, it is perhaps unsurprising that we should encounter difficulties in communication with the police and others involved with the security agenda. When we speak of identity, discrimination, and influence, they have heard these ideas before and have a strong sense of how these social psychological dynamics operate to alienate young Muslims. The problem, of course, is that our analysis of the concepts is rather different and draws attention to a number of issues that the dominant model does not foreground or illuminate.

An alternative analysis

From a social psychological perspective, what stands out in WRAP is the centrality of a particular view of identity processes in explaining radicalisation. On the one hand, there is personal identity which, if properly established, operates as a protective factor. On the other hand, there are group-based identities which satisfy our need to belong. Moreover, the weakness of the former leads to the power of the latter. To the extent that one’s personal identity is poorly established or in crisis, one is drawn to others and the sense of identity they can provide. In turn, social influence is contingent upon the fragility of one’s identity. Such an approach places the group outside (and indeed, antagonistic to) the ‘authentic’ individual self. Moreover, this approach orients to processes of coercion and compliance, rather than genuine social influence. That is, it does not consider how others’ views don’t just determine what we feel we *must* do, but shape our beliefs and hence what we genuinely *want* to do.

In contrast, we adopt the social identity theoretical perspective (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) which emphasises the ways in which our sense of

Divided by a common language

self is routinely based upon group memberships, and how genuine social influence is bound up with the processes of identifying with valued social groups. Research guided by this theoretical perspective shows we are neither influenced by anyone (regardless of their identity), nor by any message (regardless of its content). Rather, we are influenced by those we regard as knowledgeable about the ingroup and its situation (i.e., ingroup members rather than outgroup members; Mackie, Worth, & Asuncion, 1990; McGarty, Haslam, Hutchinson, & Turner, 1994) and by messages that are congruent with ingroup identity (e.g., van Knippenberg & Wilke, 1992). Thus, although the WRAP perspective attempts to render intelligible the everyday normality of the processes by which people may be radicalised, it actually works with a conception of identity that undermines its ability to understand everyday influence and how this is made possible through meaningful group memberships and a viable sense of identity.

Critically, the WRAP model overlooks important aspects to the experience of discrimination. Although it recognises that discrimination is important, WRAP treats it as an individual-level experience that is significant because it renders the individual vulnerable to exploitation by others seeking to weave that personal hurt into a narrative established on a false sense of ‘them and ‘us’. From our perspective, however, the key point is that group memberships are integral to our understandings of who we are and provide the lens through which events, like discrimination, are judged. For example, if one identifies strongly as a Scottish Muslim but finds the authorities treating oneself or other Scottish Muslims as an alien other, this will impact on the way that one conceptualises the relationship between Muslims and authority. This does not mean that one experiences a crisis of identity which makes one vulnerable to others’ influence. Rather, it means that one must re-evaluate one’s hitherto taken-for-granted assumptions about the relationships between the categories of Muslim and Scottish and the dual identifications that many hold (Hopkins, 2011). In turn this may impact upon one’s self-definition and who one orients to when considering how to act.

Lest this seem overly abstract, consider an example from our own research in which we

Divided by a common language

have explored Scottish Muslims' experience of being questioned when travelling by air. In these interviews, our participants routinely described themselves as Scottish and saw themselves as decent, law-abiding members of the community. Yet, far from this self-definition being validated in their interactions with security officers at the airport, they find themselves routinely stopped, pulled aside under the curious gaze of fellow passengers, and subjected to questioning which they experience as disrespectful. This disrespect compromised all sorts of valued identities: their sense of themselves as proud and loyal Scots, as virtuous Muslims, as respected professionals, as successful businesspeople, and much more besides. Indeed, although they enter the airport with a solid but complex view of themselves and their identity, they find themselves positioned and treated in terms of a single identity and according to another's view of what that identity entails. Moreover, this is routinely done in a public context where others can observe them being so positioned and treated (Blackwood, Hopkins, & Reicher, under review).

These experiences of discrimination were personally painful and humiliating. However, they were also collective. Many had such experiences, and if they did not, they certainly knew of others who had them. All interviewees reflected on what such experiences meant and implied for them as Scottish Muslims. Indeed, such experiences shaped the contours of their identity, and thereby who they were willing to trust and cooperate with. Even those who reported relatively benign experiences at airports held doubts about the wisdom of trusting the authorities. The sense of injustice at being judged and treated inappropriately encouraged interviewees to limit the information they would share with the authorities, and several even reported being untruthful because they feared inappropriate responses by the authorities. Perhaps more surprisingly, the attention our interviewees received from airport authorities led them to feeling distanced from their fellow passengers, perhaps because of embarrassment or because they were absorbed with monitoring their own behaviour. Paradoxically this is opposite to the kind of contact experience advocated by WRAP and by integrationist policies. These dynamics all have important implications for minority group members' experience of citizenship (Hopkins & Blackwood, 2011).

Divided by a common language

None of this is to deny the importance of influence agents in the process of radicalisation. Certainly, our research shows that the experience of discrimination leads people to lend more credence to those who criticise authority and less credence to those who urge engagement with authority. Even those highly supportive of engagement bemoaned their loss of influence. But the point, yet again, is that this is not due to an underlying process of vulnerability leading to an acceptance of any charismatic influence source—were this the case, why is it that only the radical voices gain in authority? Rather the ability of radical voices to influence stems from the fact that the specific nature of discrimination episodes is consonant with a construction of authority as an outgroup for Muslims. That is, it makes anti-authority narratives more normative and hence more influential. In sum (and unlike the WRAP analysis) the link between the structure of experience and the content of narratives is critical to an understanding of radicalisation.

Conclusion

Hopefully, this all too brief account of the very different ways in which identity, influence and discrimination may be conceptualised gives some hint of how and why our attempts to communicate our analysis have been so difficult. But does any of this really matter? Perhaps, when all is said and done, the difference between the two approaches is rather marginal? If there are good reasons why academics might become exercised about the precise meanings of this or that construct, there are precious few why non-academics should be so exercised, especially if such detail has little implication for those others' operational practices. However, we believe the critique sketched out above *does* have implications for operational practices.

The broad logic to the WRAP programme is to encourage those with a duty of care across a range of public services (and beyond) to be alert to signs of vulnerability in the community (especially, but not solely in young male Muslims); and, in the exercise of their professional judgement, to support and/or refer such people to the authorities. Inevitably the surveillance Muslims experience at airports is distinctive from this in its form and intensity, and it would be

Divided by a common language

misleading to over-generalise from it. However, it illuminates the potential risks of encouraging yet more attention on Muslims or indeed any minority group. However well-intentioned, the actions of professionals and other authorities may be judged discriminatory and set in train the dynamics we observed in our interviewees' accounts. Thus, we could expect feelings of distress and anger as valued identities are compromised by others' assumptions. So too, given that these experiences and feelings are widely shared within this specific community, we could expect the socially-shared norms that guide community members' behaviour to develop in directions that reduce confidence in and co-operation with the authorities and allied agencies. Furthermore, there is the danger that such attention can (as in the airport), isolate Muslims from non-Muslims. The common experience of being watched as the (potential) enemy can create a common identity rooted in enmity. In the attempt to stop people becoming vulnerable to extremists one may have created a reality and an experience in which the extremist narratives make more sense to those who, hitherto, would have shunned them.

We do not mean to say that professionals should not, in the general course of their duties, be alert and sensitive to people's concerns and vulnerabilities. But how they understand and respond to these is critical. It may be objected that all this places too much emphasis on the perspective and actions of the authorities. Certainly, many in positions of authority may doubt that their own perspective and behaviour can indeed be so consequential. Yet, for many minority group members, the interactions that count for their understanding of how they are viewed by society are the interactions they have with people in positions of authority—those who have the power to act on their definitions of whether one is included or excluded from society. For all these reasons, the authorities' understanding – including their theorisation of the social psychology of identity, discrimination and influence – is important.

This understanding is based on interpretations of the relevant social psychological processes with which we would take issue. Indeed, we believe the conceptualisations of identity, and of processes leading to alienation and radicalisation, are limited in ways that not only lead to the

Divided by a common language

wrong conclusions, but may lead to practices which risk further alienating members of the Muslim community. Particularly problematic are practices which locate the problem of alienation and disaffection in ‘them’ and their vulnerabilities; and invite (whether explicitly stated or not) an ever-widening circle of security and allied professionals to participate in monitoring and referring those who they deem to be ‘vulnerable’.

In conclusion, it is important to recognize the many important positives about the WRAP message and the understanding this reflects within government and in the national security community. In particular, there is an effort to normalise the radicalisation process. Within this, there is acknowledgement that social grievances play an important role in rendering people susceptible to voices advocating violence, and of the need for society to address these grievances. What is missing is a reflexive understanding that, through their actions, authorities may inadvertently contribute to the grievance-formation process. What is needed is a change in analytic focus from being entirely about ‘them’ (marginalized groups) to greater self-awareness and investigation of authorities’ perspectives and practices, and how they impact upon others’ understandings of where they stand.

In the post 9/11 era there is a sense in the West of national identities in crisis and social cohesion under threat. The UK government’s view is that we are engaged in a battle to win young Muslim men’s hearts and minds and provide them with a solid ‘British’ identity—an inoculation against the combined effects of disappointment and ‘extremist’ Muslim voices. There is, however, another perspective: one that sees the problem as not in ‘them’ and nor even in ‘us’ but in interactions that problematize people’s identities. According to this perspective, perhaps the most important strategy available to government is one that limits the degree to which authorities become part of the grievance-formation process. In a real sense it is up to authorities whether the kinds of experiences they create for members of marginalized groups are ones that accord with a message of ‘them and us’. To finish in the language of this book, it is excessive fear as expressed through an intrusive gaze that constitutes people as “other”, which transforms diversity into disengagement and that makes the richness of civil society into something decidedly uncivil.

Divided by a common language

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Scottish Institute of Policing Research.

References

- Blackwood, L.M., Hopkins, N.P., & Reicher, S.D. (2011). *I know who I am, but who do they think I am?: A study of encounters between Muslims and authorities at the airport*, Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Bush, G (26th September 2001). Meeting of Muslim leaders at the White House. Retrieved from [http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Transwiki:Terrorism_\(disambiguation\)/Evil_Doers](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Transwiki:Terrorism_(disambiguation)/Evil_Doers)
- Cameron, D. (5th Feb, 2011). Speech given at the Munich Security Conference. <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference/> (retrieved 24/8/2011).
- Cantle (2001). *Challenging local communities to change Oldham*. Retrieved from <http://www.oldham.gov.uk/cantle-review-finalreport.pdf>.
- HM Government (2008). *The Prevent Strategy: A guide for local partners in England; Stopping people becoming or supporting terrorists and violent extremists*. London.
- HM Government (2011). *Prevent Strategy 2011*. London. Retrieved from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/counter-terrorism/prevent/prevent-strategy/>.
- Home Office *WRAP: Workshop to Raise Awareness of Prevent, Facilitator's Full Script*.
- Hopkins, N. P. (1994). Peer group processes and adolescent health-related behaviour; more than 'peer group pressure' ? *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 4, 329-345.
- Hopkins, N. P. (2011). Dual identities and their recognition: Minority group members' perspectives. *Political Psychology*, 32, 251-270.
- Hopkins, N. P. & Blackwood, L. M. (2011). Everyday citizenship: Identity and recognition. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 215-227.

Divided by a common language

Husband, C. & Alam, Y. (2011). *Social cohesion and counter-terrorism: A policy contradiction?*

Bristol: The Policy Press.

Mackie, D. M., Worth, L. T., & Asuncion, A. G. (1990). Processing of persuasive in-group

messages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 812-822.

McGarty, C., Haslam, S. A., Hutchinson, K. J., & Turner, J. C. (1994). The effects of salient group

memberships on persuasion. *Small Group Research*, 25, 267-293.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 90, 751–783.

Prins, G. & Salisbury, R. (2008). Risk, threat, and security: The case of the UK. *RUSI Journal*, 153

6 – 11.

Reicher, S., Haslam, A. & Hopkins, N. (2005). Social identity and the dynamics of leadership:

Leaders and followers as collaborative agents in the transformation of social reality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16 (4), 547-568.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin &

S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Turner, J., M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group*.

Oxford: Blackwell.

UK Home Office (2011). Retrieved from [http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/counter-](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/counter-terrorism/prevent/prevent-strategy/)

[terrorism/prevent/prevent-strategy/](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/counter-terrorism/prevent/prevent-strategy/).

van Knippenberg, D. & Wilke, H. (1992). Prototypicality of arguments and conformity to ingroup

norms. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 22, 141-155.