Published in final edited form as:

Self Identity. 2013 ; 12(5): 548–562. doi:10.1080/15298868.2012.705959.

Rejection of Self or Others? Majority-Minority Status Moderates Responses to Strongly Identified Members of the Outgroup

P. Niels Christensen and Sarah Kerper

Department of Psychology, Radford University

Abstract

The actor-partner interdependence model was used to examine how one's own ethnic identification – and one's interaction partners' ethnic identification – predicted reactions to mixed-group discussions. The 104 participants interacted in groups of four, with half from the ethnic majority (European Americans) and half from an ethnic minority (African-, Asian-, or Latino Americans) in each group. Analyses revealed that ethnic identification had generally positive relationships with one's own outcomes, including greater attraction to one's fellow ingroup member. However, higher ethnic identification resulted in negative outcomes for one's cross-group interaction partners, with different patterns for majority and minority members. When interacting with highly-identified members of the outgroup, minority members responded with lower self-esteem whereas majority members responded with lower group attraction.

Nearly a half-century of research on Allport's contact hypothesis has left little doubt that interactions between members of different groups are generally beneficial for intergroup relations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005). At the same time, interactions between members of different ethnic groups are often fraught with anxiety, with members of the minority fearing that they will be targets of prejudice and members of the majority fearing that they will be seen as prejudiced (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Shelton & Richeson, 2006). The juxtaposition of benefits and (perceived) costs of intergroup contact reinforces the importance of studying interactions between members of different ethnic groups. Although the Shelton and Richeson (2005) review highlights important advances in the study of interactions between members of different ethnic groups, an equal number of questions still remain. One explanation for the paucity of research in this area is the methodological challenge of studying the outcomes of intergroup contact. Indeed, such a dynamic phenomenon would best be studied in the context of unscripted social interactions between naïve participants, yet these approaches have been all too rare in research on intergroup interactions (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Hebl & Dovidio, 2005; Shelton & Richeson, 2005).

The present research was designed to advance knowledge of interactions between members of majority and minority ethnic groups. Specifically, this study evaluated the degree to which individual differences in ethnic identification are related to personal (self-esteem) and interpersonal (group attraction) outcomes of these intergroup interactions. Importantly, the

present research evaluated these outcomes in the context of unscripted interactions between members of majority and minority ethnic groups. Using this approach allowed us to investigate not only the relationship between a person's own ethnic identification and the outcomes of intergroup interactions, but also the effect of *others'* ethnic identification on one's own outcomes. This approach recognizes the explicitly social nature of intergroup contact and permitted us to address our key research question: How do people respond to high- versus low-identifying members of the outgroup?

Social Identification Predicts Group-Related Outcomes

The concept of social identification is arguably the most fundamental process in the study of groups (Postmes, Haslam, & Swaab, 2005). Social identity is defined as the "part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981, p.255). Indeed, identifying with a particular group can have important implications for the self and one's beliefs about members of the ingroup and outgroup. For example, people who report higher levels of social identification typically have greater loyalty to the group (Zdaniuk & Levine, 2001), report increased desire to stay in a group in the presence of attractive alternatives (Van Vugt & Hart, 2004), and are less able to recall instances of ingroup violence (Sahdra & Ross, 2007).

Researchers have also applied the general process of social identification to the specific case of ethnic group membership. Despite different ways of defining ethnic identification in the literature, typical approaches to measurement include a combination of behaviors related to one's ethnic group, a sense of pride in one's ethnic group, and a cognitive exploration of the role of the ethnic group in one's life. This method for assessing ethnic identification can be applied to members of either majority or minority groups, although the vast majority of this research has been with respect to members of minority groups. Results of past research suggest that one's ethnic identification is positively associated with well-being (Smith & Silva, 2011) and negatively associated with assimilation attitudes among immigrant groups (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005).

Perhaps even more interesting are questions about how a person *responds* to the high- versus low-identification of one's interaction partner. Interacting with a high-identifier from an outgroup could have many outcomes, including the possibility that these interaction partners represent a threat to one's own beliefs. That is, high-identifiers should increase the salience of any perceived conflicts in group ideology, status, or both (Branscombe, Wann, Noel, & Coleman, 1993). Thus interacting with high-identifying outgroup members can challenge how a person views oneself and the ingroup. What is more, these challenges are expected to vary for members of ethnic minority and majority groups, both of which bring distinct concerns to intergroup interactions. Whereas members of ethnic majority groups often worry that they will be seen as prejudiced, members of ethnic minority groups are typically concerned about being the targets of prejudice (Devine & Vasquez, 1998; Shelton & Richeson, 2006). Taken together, interactions with a high-identifying member of a *minority* outgroup could reinforce the specific threats experienced by a majority group member: I am perceived as an illegitimate recipient of higher status and as a potential source of prejudice.

Conversely, interactions with a high-identifying member of the *majority* outgroup could reinforce the different threats experienced by a minority group member: I am perceived as lower status and as a target of prejudice.

A growing body of research supports the contention that majority group members are threatened by interactions with high-identifying members of the minority group. Specifically, the prejudice-distribution account (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Kaiser & Wilkins, 2010) has demonstrated that White participants respond with more prejudice to high-identifying members of racial minority groups. Evidence suggests that White participants readily distinguish between high- and low-identifying minority interaction partners, experience the high-identifying partners as a threat to their world-view, and respond with prejudice themselves. In fact, recent evidence suggests that White interactants rejected highly-identified Black partners even though these partners expressed the friendliest behaviors (Kaiser, Drury, Malahy, & King, in press). This line of research suggests that members of the majority will often respond to high-identifying members of the outgroup by socially rejecting the interaction partners.

Despite the clear evidence about reactions to a high-identifying minority member, to our knowledge, no research has specifically examined how minority members respond to high-identifying majority members. However, the rejection-identification model (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002) is informative because it describes how members of minority groups respond to explicit threat from the majority group. Central to this model is the notion that prejudice from the majority group is a pervasive and stable devaluation of one's membership in the minority group. Therefore contexts that highlight the prejudice threat should, in turn, result in lower self-esteem for members of the minority groups.¹ If interactions with a high-identifying majority group member provide a similar symbolic threat, then we would expect minority group members to respond by rejecting themselves (i.e., lower self-esteem). Consistent with this hypothesis, McCoy and Major (2003) found a positive correlation between ethnic identification and depressed emotions when Latino Americans were exposed to information about prejudice against their group. Interestingly, the rejection-identification model specifically contends that such self-rejection should not occur for members of advantaged groups.

The Present Research

In summary, if high-identifying members of an outgroup represent a symbolic threat, these members should elicit a negative response from interaction partners. However, we expected that these negative reactions would vary across members of ethnic majority and minority groups. Based on research from the prejudice-distribution account, majority members should respond with social rejection of the interaction partners. But based on the rejection-identification model, minority members were expected to respond with lower self-esteem. We tested these predictions by measuring group attraction and self-esteem following free-flowing social interactions within groups of four people: two members of an ethnic minority

¹The rejection-identification model goes on to posit that these threats to psychological well-being can be dissipated via stronger identification with the ingroup. The present research does not measure these subsequent changes in ethnic identification, so this aspect of the rejection-identification model is not central to our predictions.

group and two members of the ethnic majority. Because responses within each group are non-independent, we used the actor-partner interdependence model (APIM; Kashy & Kenny, 2000; Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006) to analyze the data. The APIM allowed us to separate effects due to one's own ethnic identification from effects due to the ethnic identification of one's interaction partners. Specifically, we were able to answer three types of questions using the APIM:

Actor effect: Does my own ethnic identification predict my own self-esteem and group attraction?

Ingroup partner effect: Does the ethnic identification of my fellow ingroup member predict my own self-esteem and group attraction?

Outgroup partner effect: Does the ethnic identification of the two outgroup members predict my own self-esteem and group attraction?

Of most interest in the current study was the outgroup partner effect, which demonstrates whether people respond differently to high- versus low-identifiers. And more important, do these outgroup partner effects differ for members of majority and minority groups? Thus our hypotheses were tested examining the interactions between majority-minority status and the outgroup partner effect predicting group attraction and self-esteem. For group attraction, we expected an interaction driven by the responses of majority members. Compared to minority members, the majority members should have a stronger negative relationship between their own group attraction and the outgroup partners' ethnic identification. An interaction was also expected for analyses on self-esteem, but this interaction was predicted to be a function of the minority members. Relative to members of the majority group, the minority members should have a stronger negative relationship between their own self-esteem and the outgroup partner's ethnic identification.

We did not have specific predictions for the actor effect or ingroup partner effect. However, past research has indicated a positive correlation between ethnic identification and self-esteem (Phinney, Cantu & Kurtz, 1997), so actor effects could be associated with higher self-esteem. With regard to the ingroup partner effect, previous investigations suggest that people respond favorably to prototypical members of the ingroup (e.g., Hogg, 2001) and unfavorably to the "black sheep" members of the ingroup (Marques & Paez, 1994). Thus one might expect to find a positive relationship between ingroup partner effects and group attraction. That is, people might be more attracted to the laboratory group if it includes a highly-identified member of their own ethnic group. For both the actor effect and ingroup partner effect, we had no expectation of interactions with one's majority-minority status.

Method

Participants

One hundred-four undergraduates were recruited for the study based on their self-reported ethnicity, which was obtained from a mass screening questionnaire. This method was used so that each laboratory session could include two members of the ethnic majority and two members of the same ethnic minority. Thus, 52 of the participants were European Americans and 52 were from an American ethnic minority group (8 African Americans, 8

Asian Americans, and 36 Latino Americans). A majority of the participants were female (72%) and the average age was 18.4 years old. Participants were paid \$10 in exchange for completing the study.

Measures

Ethnic identification—Phinney's (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) was specifically developed to measure ethnic identification for a variety of groups. Responses to the 20 items on the MEIM can be aggregated into subscales or, as in the present study, 14 of the items can be combined into an overall ethnic identification score. Typical items include "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to" and "I feel a strong attachment toward my own ethnic group." Respondents indicated their agreement with each statement on 4-point scales from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*). Internal consistency for the ethnic identification score was good (majority-group members: $\alpha = .84$; minority-group members: $\alpha = .77$)

Personal self-esteem—The Rosenberg (1965) measure of personal self-esteem uses 10 items to assess one's evaluation of the self. Typical items include, "I take a positive attitude toward myself" and "I feel that I have a number of good qualities." Participants indicated their agreement with each statement using 10-point scales anchored by 0 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). The scale items demonstrated good internal consistency (majority-group members: $\alpha = .93$; minority-group members: $\alpha = .87$).

Group attraction—Following each group interaction, participants indicated their attraction to the overall laboratory group (*overall group attraction*), the other member of their own ethnic group (*ingroup attraction*), and the two members of the other ethnic group (*outgroup attraction*). Because ethnicity is not always visible to one's interaction partner, each of the three questionnaires specified which person or persons to which the items pertained (based on the participants' nametags lettered A–D). Each questionnaire included five items, based on work by Prislin, Limbert, & Bauer (2000), tap attraction to and liking for the group. Example items include, "How much would you like to socialize with these people (this person)?" and "How much do you like these people (this person)?" Responses to all items were made on 9-point scales ranging from -4 (*not at all*) to $+4$ (*very much*). Internal consistency was good across all three questionnaires, with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .90 – .94 for majority-group members and .86 – .95 for minority-group members.

Procedure

Undergraduate students reported their ethnicity during a mass prescreening session at San Diego State University. Students who indicated their willingness to participate in future studies were recruited so that each study session included 2 European Americans and 2 members of an American ethnic-minority group (i.e., 2 African Americans, 2 Asian Americans, or 2 Latino Americans). Interaction partners in the study were previously unacquainted.

Upon arriving at the laboratory, participants were taken to individual cubicles where they were asked to wait until all the participants had arrived for the study session. Participants were asked, while they were waiting, to complete the measure of ethnic identification. The students then gathered in a small classroom and were given a nametag (lettered A–D). Participants were told that the study was designed to investigate how people experience group discussions. To facilitate interaction among the group members, each group was given a total of three social problems to discuss. The experimenter gave the group one problem at a time, with five minutes to discuss each one. The problems, which were briefly described for each group on separate sheets of paper, were: using the Aztec as a mascot for San Diego State University sports team; America's immigration policy; and the number of officer-involved shootings in San Diego. These social problems were selected to allow the possibility of disagreement among the participants without explicitly asking them to discuss conflict between ethnic groups. The participants were asked to consider, as a group, what they would recommend to resolve the problem.

Following the group discussion, the participants returned to their individual cubicles to complete the measures of personal self-esteem and group attraction. After completing the questionnaires, the students were debriefed, thanked for their participation, and dismissed.

Results

Analytic Approach

The APIM analyses were conducted in SPSS 18.0 using the Mixed Models procedure as prescribed by Kenny et al. (2006; Kashy & Kenny, 2000). Laboratory group was treated as the unit of analysis. The first set of analyses examined the main effects for each predictor, which included continuous measures of one's own ethnic identification (the *actor* effect), the ethnic identification of one's fellow ingroup member (the *ingroup-partner* effect), and the average ethnic identification of the two outgroup members (the *outgroup-partner* effect). These main effect analyses also included a dummy code for one's majority/minority status. A second set of analyses examined the interaction of majority/minority status with each of the three APIM effects. Each model testing these interactions also included the main effects described above. When an actor or partner effect had a statistically significant interaction with majority/minority status, we tested and reported the simple slopes for majority and minority members following procedures by Aiken & West (1991).

Descriptive Statistics

Participants reported personal self-esteem above the scale midpoint ($M = 7.17$, $SD = 1.39$), which did not differ across members of majority versus minority groups, $t(97) = -0.02$, $p = .98$, $d = 0.004$. Participants typically experienced positive levels of attraction toward the overall group ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.12$), their fellow ingroup member ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.36$), and the two members of the outgroup ($M = 2.44$, $SD = 1.07$). Strong correlations among the attraction ratings ($r_s > .70$) suggest that participants had a strong halo effect when rating the two factions within the laboratory group. The ratings of group attraction did not vary by majority/minority status, $t_s(101) < 1.63$, $p_s > .10$, $d_s < 0.32$. Self-esteem was not correlated with any of the three group attraction measures ($r_s < |.06|$). Finally, ethnic identification was

higher among members of minority groups ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 0.38$) than members of majority groups ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 0.45$), $t(101) = 3.93$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.78$.

Main Effects for Actor and Partner Regardless of Ethnic Group Status

Table 1 lists the actor effects, ingroup-partner effects, and out-group partner effects for ethnic identification predicting self-esteem and group attraction. These effects represent the combined predictions across members of both majority and minority groups. The table also includes the main effect of majority/minority status on the outcome measures. The only statistically significant main effect was for actors: Participants who reported higher levels of ethnic identification also reported more attraction to the other ingroup member. Two marginally significant trends were also found for the actor effects, suggesting that those with greater ethnic identification reported more attraction to the outgroup members and higher self-esteem. Neither the partner effects nor majority/minority status were statistically significant predictors of group attraction or self-esteem.

Actor and Partner Effects Interacting with Majority/Minority Status

Table 2 provides the interactions between majority/minority status and the actor and partner effects for ethnic identification. Significant interactions suggest that the APIM effects differed across members of majority and minority groups.

Most central to the current study are the interactions between majority/minority status and the outgroup-partner effects, which test whether participants in the two subgroups responded differently to high-identifying members of the outgroup. The interaction between majority/minority status and outgroup-partner effects was significant for personal self-esteem and significant or marginally significant for the three group attraction measures. However, the patterns of simple slopes differed between self-esteem and group attraction. For personal self-esteem (Figure 1), members of minority groups experienced lower self-esteem following group interactions with strongly-identified members of the majority, $b = -1.40$, $t(65) = -2.24$, $p = .03$. The self-esteem of majority-group members was not reliably predicted by the ethnic identification of minority-group members, $b = 1.12$, $t(70) = 1.41$, $p = .16$. Thus, minority members – but not majority members – reported lower self-esteem following interactions with highly-identifying members of the outgroup.

Simple slopes predicting group attraction yielded the opposite pattern (Figure 2). Members of majority groups reported being less attracted to the overall group following interactions with strongly-identified members of the minority group, $b = -1.41$, $t(68) = -2.30$, $p = .02$. Yet overall group attraction among minority-group members was not predicted by the ethnic identification of majority-group members, $b = 0.45$, $t(66) = 0.93$, $p = .35$. Similar patterns occurred for the ingroup attraction and outgroup attraction measures. When interacting with highly-identified minority group members, majority members trended toward less attraction to ingroup members, $b = -1.30$, $t(71) = -1.67$, $p = .099$, and less attraction to outgroup members, $b = -1.11$, $t(71) = -1.87$, $p = .07$. However, interacting with a highly-identified members of the majority did not systematically predict minority members' attraction to ingroup members, $b = 0.69$, $t(66) = 1.12$, $p = .27$, or attraction to the outgroup, $b = 0.32$, $t(67) = 0.68$, $p = .50$.

Unlike the interactions for partner effects described above, the interaction between actor effects and majority/minority status was not significant for any outcome measure. For interactions with the ingroup-partner effect, there was only a trend for predicting overall group attraction. Interpretation of this marginal effect is limited further because the simple slopes revealed a non-significant positive effect for members of minority groups, $b = 0.65$, $t(95) = 1.58$, $p = .12$, and a non-significant negative effect for members of majority groups, $b = -0.27$, $t(96) = -0.78$, $p = .44$.

Discussion

The results generally supported the hypothesis that, across both groups, people respond negatively to strongly-identified members of the outgroup. However, members of majority and minority ethnic groups responded in different ways. Consistent with the framework of the rejection-identification model (Branscombe et al., 1999; Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002), minority group members reported lower self-esteem after interactions with highly-identified members of the majority. And in-line with the prejudice-distribution account (Kaiser & Pratt-Hyatt, 2009; Kaiser & Wilkins, 2010), members of the ethnic majority were less attracted to the group after interactions with highly-identified members of the minority outgroup. These lower levels of attraction were most pronounced for attitudes about the overall group, but trends in the same direction were found in attitudes toward the other ingroup member and attitudes toward the outgroup members.

Despite the negative outcomes following interactions with highly-identified outgroup members, analyses of actor effects revealed that stronger ethnic identification was more likely to have *positive* relationships with one's own attitudes. Furthermore, these positive relationships were not moderated by one's majority/minority status. The clearest example was for analyses on ingroup attraction, which demonstrated that stronger identification was associated with more favorable attitudes toward one's fellow ingroup member. Interestingly, however, stronger identification did not mean disliking the outgroup members. If anything, the pattern of effects suggested that ethnic identification was positively associated with attraction toward the outgroup. Finally, a trend in the actor effects suggested that stronger identification was associated with higher self-esteem, which is consistent with past research on ethnic identification (Phinney et al., 1997).

When considering the actor effects for ethnic identification, one might wonder whether one's own ethnic identification interacts with outgroup partners' ethnic identification and majority/minority status.² That is, are the negative responses to high-identifying outgroup members exacerbated or ameliorated by one's own ethnic identification? Although our study was not designed with such 3-way interactions in mind, exploratory analyses revealed that low-identifying members of the majority group responded with especially low group attraction when interacting with high-identifying members of a minority group. However, this 3-way interaction was not significant in exploratory analyses on self-esteem. Members of the minority group – regardless of their own levels of identification – responded with lower self-esteem when interacting with highly-identified members of the majority. Taken

²We thank our editor and an anonymous reviewer for raising this possibility.

together, evidence suggests that the interactive effects of actor and partner ethnic identification could be a fruitful area for future empirical studies and theory development.

Except for a lone marginal effect, no evidence suggested that the identification of the other ingroup member influenced one's own group attraction or self-esteem. These ingroup-partner effects were non-significant for analyses examining main effects and interactions with majority/minority status. Despite this null effect, we do not discount the meaningfulness of one's fellow ingroup member. Indeed, much research has already demonstrated that prototypical members are more highly regarded (e.g., Hogg, 2001) and "black sheep" ingroup members are rejected (Marques & Paez, 1994). However, any influence of the ingroup member in the present study was minimal when compared to reactions to the outgroup.

The present results highlight the importance of looking at cross-group interactions from the perspective of both actor and partner. Typical approaches to studying ethnic identification only examine whether one's outcomes are predicted by one's own identification. If such an approach had been used in the present study, the only findings would have been that having higher ethnic identification was associated with greater attraction to the ingroup. Yet by using the APIM to study the interactions of groups of participants, we found intriguing results for the effect of outgroup members' ethnic identification on important self- and group-related outcomes. Taken together, the actor and partner effects suggest that ethnic identification could represent a double-edged sword, with positive intrapersonal consequences but some potentially negative interpersonal consequences. What is more, use of the APIM allowed the present research to meet the challenge of examining "real" interactions between members of different ethnic groups instead of relying on confederates or imagined scenarios (Hebl & Dovidio, 2005; Shelton & Richeson, 2006).

Despite the strengths of the APIM, the present study is not without limitations. First, each laboratory session required the attendance of two members of the majority group and two members of a minority group. This logistical challenge limited the number of groups that could be run and, in turn, meaningful analyses on each ethnic group. We do not contend that ethnic minority groups have the same structural relationships with the White majority in terms of size and status. Yet we are also in agreement with past social psychological theories that sought to articulate general processes underlying majority-minority relations (e.g., Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Sachdev & Bourhis, 1991; Brewer, 1991). Indeed, exploratory analyses in our data found no evidence that being in a particular ethnic minority group moderated the central findings of this research. However, these exploratory analyses were likely under-powered and might miss the nuances across the three ethnic minority groups. Although a different methodological approach might be required, future research should establish if, when, and how partner effects for ethnic identification vary across specific minority groups. Another interesting path for future research would be addressing interactions between members of different minority groups.

A second challenge of the present research was conceptualizing ethnic identification. We chose to use Phinney's (1992) multigroup ethnic identity measure to assess ethnic identification in the same way across different ethnic groups (both majority and minority).

The strength of this questionnaire is its ability to measure general processes of identification across groups. Yet the measure can be criticized for not targeting groups specifically and, indeed, other research has developed measures to assess identification with particular racial and ethnic groups (e.g., Knowles & Peng, 2005; Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997). Previous investigators have even manipulated the outward expression of an interaction partner's identification with a specific ethnic group by having confederates wear hats with slogans about ethnic pride (e.g., Barron, Hebl, & King, 2011). Despite the benefits of these alternate approaches to studying ethnic identification, using the MEIM in the present research allowed us to test both actor and partner effects in interactions between different ethnic groups.

In addition to these limitations, it is reasonable to expect that aspects of the sample and procedure could have influenced the current results. Notably, we collected our data on a relatively diverse campus in southern California. It is unclear whether responses to the outgroup would be stronger or weaker in less diverse contexts. In terms of the procedure, participants had to complete the measure of ethnic identification and also discuss potentially ethnicity-relevant topics. Taken together, issues of race and ethnicity were likely somewhat higher than in other contexts. It could be that if the students had discussed more unifying topics (e.g., increases in tuition), any effects due to ethnic identification might have been smaller or immeasurable. That said, the conversation topics were chosen to reflect real areas of discussion that one would encounter in everyday life. So although not all intergroup contact would be expected to yield the current pattern of results, we do not believe that these findings are confined to the laboratory. Finally, the relatively brief duration of the social interactions could mean that the present results will better generalize to initial social interactions, rather than for enduring relationships.

Conclusion

The present research used a novel methodological and statistical approach to demonstrate the importance of ethnic identification for interactions between members of majority and minority ethnic groups. Although contact between members of different groups is crucial for reducing stereotypes and prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005), this study revealed that initial interactions among strangers can yield less positive outcomes when one's interaction partners are strongly-identified with their ethnic group. If these initial interactions go poorly, one can reasonably assume that future interactions are more likely to be avoided. And in fact, "constrict theory" has used census and survey data to argue that increasing ethnic diversity in a neighborhood is associated with lower levels of social capital (Putnam, 2007). Interestingly, constrict theory contends that diversity reduces one's trust in members of the outgroup *and* ingroup, which aligns with our finding that majority members responded with lower attraction to the overall laboratory group and to the ingroup member specifically. Constrict theory does not address the psychological processes documented in the present research, but it does provide a pattern of sociological data consistent with the long-term outcomes of uncomfortable intergroup interactions.

In light of the current findings, what steps could be taken to reduce the negative outcomes of intergroup interactions? We would not recommend a broad reduction in society's

identification with ethnic groups. Indeed, ethnic identification has noteworthy intrapersonal and intragroup benefits. Instead, one might consider the current results as having implications for how to structure intergroup contact when it occurs. It is likely that some settings for intergroup contact increase the ethnic identification of either the majority- or minority-group members. If ethnic identification is amplified for the minority group, members of the majority would increasingly reject the group. Conversely, contexts that heighten the identification of the majority group, would put members of the minority at risk of rejecting themselves. Neither outcome would be positive and could reduce the likelihood that the individuals pursue intergroup interactions in the future. Rather, contexts that moderate the ethnic identification of members of both groups are expected to yield the most positive outcomes.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by an institutional grant from the Minority Research Infrastructure Support Program at the National Institute of Mental Health (Thereasa Cronan, PI).

References

- Aiken, L.S.; West, S.G. Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1991.
- Barron LG, Hebl M, King EB. Effects of manifest ethnic identification on employment discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. 2011; 17:23–30. [PubMed: 21341894]
- Branscombe NR, Schmitt MT, Harvey RD. Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1999; 77:135–149.
- Branscombe NR, Wann DL, Noel JG, Coleman J. In-group or out-group extremity: Importance of the threatened social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 1993; 19:381–388.
- Brewer MB. The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 1991; 17:475–482.
- Devine, P.G.; Vasquez, K.A. The rocky road to positive intergroup relations. In: Eberhardt, J.L.; Fiske, S.T., editors. *Confronting racism: The problem and the response*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 1998. p. 234–262.
- Hebl MR, Dovidio JF. Promoting the “social” in the examination of social stigmas. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2005; 9:156–182. [PubMed: 15869380]
- Hogg MA. A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 2001; 5:184–200.
- Kaiser CR, Drury BJ, Malahy LW, King KM. Nonverbal asymmetry in interracial interactions: Strongly identified Blacks display friendliness, but Whites respond negatively. *Social and Personality Psychological Science*. (in press).
- Kaiser CR, Pratt-Hyatt JS. Distributing prejudice unequally: Do Whites direct their prejudice toward strongly identified minorities? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2009; 96:432–445. [PubMed: 19159141]
- Kaiser CR, Wilkins CL. Group identification and prejudice: Theoretical and empirical advances and implications. *Journal of Social Issues*. 2010; 66:461–476.
- Kashy, D.A.; Kenny, D.A. The analysis of data from dyads and groups. In: Reis, H.T.; Judd, C.M., editors. *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 2000. p. 451–477.
- Kenny, D.A.; Kashy, D.A.; Cook, W.L. *Dyadic data analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2006.

- Knowles ED, Peng K. White selves: Conceptualizing and measuring a dominant-group identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 89:223–241. [PubMed: 16162055]
- Marques JM, Páez D, Stroebe W, Hewstone M. The black sheep effect: Social categorization, rejection of ingroup deviates, and perception of group variability. *European Review of Social Psychology*. 1994; 5:37–68.
- McCoy SK, Major B. Group identification moderates emotional responses to perceived prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2003; 29:1005–1017. [PubMed: 15189619]
- Pettigrew, TF.; Tropp, LR. Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis: Its history and influence. In: Dovidio, JF.; Glick, PG.; Rudman, L., editors. *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*. Malden, MA: Blackwell; 2005. p. 262-277.
- Phinney JS. The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 1992; 7:156–176.
- Phinney JS, Cantu CL, Kurtz DA. Ethnic and American identity as predictors of self-esteem among African American, Latino, and White adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 1997; 26:165–185.
- Postmes T, Haslam SA, Swaab RI. Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation. *European Review of Social Psychology*. 2005; 16:1–42.
- Prislin R, Limbert WM, Bauer E. From majority to minority and vice versa: The asymmetrical effects of losing and gaining majority position within a group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2000; 79:385–397. [PubMed: 10981841]
- Putnam RD. *E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century*. Scandanavian Political Studies. 2007; 30:137–174.
- Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1965.
- Sachdev I, Bourhis RY. Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 1991; 21:1–24.
- Sahdra B, Ross M. Group identification and historical memory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2007; 33:384–395. [PubMed: 17312319]
- Schmitt, MT.; Branscombe, NR. The meaning and consequences of perceived discrimination in disadvantaged and privileged social groups. In: Stroebe, W.; Hewstone, M., editors. *European Review of Social Psychology*. Vol. 12. Chichester, England: Wiley; 2002. p. 167-199.
- Sellers RM, Rowley SA, Chavous TM, Shelton JN, Smith MA. Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity: A preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1997; 73:805–815.
- Shelton JN, Richeson JA. Intergroup contact and pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2005; 88:91–107. [PubMed: 15631577]
- Shelton, JN.; Richeson, JA. Interracial interactions: A relational approach. In: Zanna, MP., editor. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Academic; 2006. p. 121-181.
- Smith TB, Silva L. Ethnic identity and personal well-being of people of color: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 2011; 58:42–60. [PubMed: 21171745]
- Stock ML, Gibbons FX, Walsh LA, Gerrard M. Racial identification, racial discrimination, and substance use vulnerability among African American young adults. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2011; 37:1349–1361. [PubMed: 21628598]
- Tajfel, H. *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1981.
- Tajfel, H.; Turner, JC. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In: Austin, WG.; Worchel, editors. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole; 1979. p. 33-47.
- Van Vugt M, Hart CM. Social identity as social glue: The origins of group loyalty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2004; 86:585–598. [PubMed: 15053707]
- Verkuyten M. Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: A discursive and experimental study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 2005; 44:223–240. [PubMed: 16004647]

Zdaniuk B, & Levine JM. Group loyalty: Impact of members' identification and contributions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2001; 37:502–509.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Figure 1.
The interaction of majority-minority status and the outgroup members' ethnic identification predicting personal self-esteem.

Figure 2.
The interaction of majority-minority status and the outgroup members' ethnic identification predicting attraction to the laboratory group.

Actor and Partner Effects of Ethnic Identification Predicting Personal Self-Esteem and Group Attraction

Table 1

	Personal self-esteem			Overall group attraction			Ingroup attraction			Outgroup attraction		
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Majority/minority status	0.35	1.04	.30	-0.17	-0.62	.54	0.28	0.85	.40	-0.005	-0.02	.99
Ethnic Identification												
Actor effect	0.66	1.93	.06	0.29	1.09	.28	0.72	2.20	.03	0.45	1.78	.08
Ingroup-partner effect	-0.45	-0.87	.39	0.11	0.42	.68	-0.10	-0.31	.76	0.13	0.53	.60
Outgroup-partner effect	0.01	0.03	.98	-0.27	-0.70	.49	-0.08	-0.17	.87	-0.23	-0.62	.54

Interactions between Majority/Minority Status and Ethnic Identification (Actor and Partner Effects) Predicting Personal Self-Esteem and Group Attraction

Table 2

	Personal self-esteem			Overall group attraction			Ingroup attraction			Outgroup attraction		
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Actor × Status	−0.46	−0.67	.51	−0.28	−0.51	.61	−0.38	−0.56	.58	−0.04	−0.08	.94
Ingroup-partner × Status	0.97	1.43	.16	−0.92	−1.71	.09	−0.89	−1.35	.18	−0.52	−1.01	.31
Outgroup-partner × Status	2.53	2.50	.01	−1.86	−2.39	.02	−1.99	−2.02	.05	−1.44	−1.89	.06